

APPENDIX 1: The Rejected FTE (FTE3) and previous versions FTE2 and FTE1

FTE 3¹ (FINAL, REJECTED VERSION)

WHAT IF OUR THEORY WAS CRITICAL?

The preparation of this essay has been prompted by an anomaly. The operational mission of *AMR* is to “*challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society*” (AMR, Information for Contributors, emphasis added). Heterodox scholarship, including CMS, is defined by its non-conformity with orthodox standards or beliefs that comprise “conventional wisdom”. Yet, during the first 12 months of my term as an AMR associate editor, there were only 3 CMS (Critical Management Studies) submissions (about 1%), a figure which could be stretched to 5 if a looser notion of critical management scholarship is applied². This was despite the appointment of associate editors and editorial board members (about 7%) who indicate specialist knowledge of CMS. This anomaly merits consideration, which is the purpose of the present FTE. Expressed sharply, the anomaly begs the question: which bit of “challenge conventional wisdom” is not comprehensible?

¹ This is a compressed revision of a much longer FTE (47 pages reduced to 20) that included reference to responses received to a straw poll of the 600-plus subscribers to the Critical Management List-Serve [CRITICAL-MANAGEMENT@JISCMail.AC.UK]. The survey sought to shed light on (i) their experience of the conditions of reception of their scholarship at *AMR* relative to other journals and (ii) why little critical scholarship has appeared in *AMR* in comparison to other journals. To comply with the word restrictions imposed by the Editor, the responses have been removed from this version.

² As a further indication of the dearth of CMS scholarship appearing in *AMR*, a search revealed a total of 28 articles published in *AMR* between January 1995 to June 2015 containing the phrase ‘critical management’. This number is perhaps suggestive of a modest degree of recognition and inclusion of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in the journal. Yet, on closer examination, little support for this proposition can be garnered. 4 of the 28 references appear in book reviews; 5 appear in editorial comments, notes or responses; 10 are in the References to articles; 1 appears in the key words; 3 articles use the phrase ‘critical management’ to refer to a (mainstream) competency or task, or just mention it in passing; and 1 is listed in publications received. That leaves 4 articles during two decades of *AMR* in which there is, at best, anything more than a fleeting recognition of, or trivial engagement with, ‘critical management’.

The anomaly is persistent: its recognition can be traced back at least as far as a 2003 FTE where, referring directly to *AMR*'s mission to "challenge conventional wisdom ...", Art Brief (2003), the then editor of *AMR*, notes that "After reading the articles in the journal and reviews of literally hundreds of manuscripts as associate editor, *I can confidently say that the operational mission statement [of TOP] has been ignored more often than not*" (Brief, 2003: 7, emphasis added). He then details how "the journal's content, in several ways, simply is too narrow in light of this wonderfully crafted mission statement" (ibid).

Supply side analyses of the anomaly between mission and content suggests that scholars are inadequately educated about the mission of *AMR* to "challenge conventional wisdom"; or that they lack sufficient tutoring or encouragement to engage in heterodox scholarship; and that potential contributors to *AMR* require advice on how to render their scholarship more compliant with the journal's mission. Such diagnoses and prescriptions are repeatedly found in *AMR*'s FTEs. This FTE also contributes to supply side analysis but its primary focus is upon the demand side of the editorial process - the conditions and practices that may inhibit the submission, or impede the acceptance, of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, that *challenge(s) conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society*" (*AMR*, Information for Contributors, emphasis added).. It draws and builds upon previous FTEs to offer a series of reflections and proposals that are responsive to the questions: What if our theory were critical? And what does it require in terms of the transformation of *AMR*?

I begin with a sketch of the distinctiveness of CMS scholarship that, for the interested reader, is supplemented by a selected bibliography of CMS texts appended to this FTE. I then engage a strand of critical theoretic scholarship, comprising Weber's ideas on power and domination,

in order to provide an analysis of editorial processes that, in principle, has some applicability to *TOP*. Finally, I suggest how the editorial capacity of *AMR* might be (further) developed to attract heterodox submissions, including *CMS*, and thereby correct the anomaly.

It is relevant to appreciate that, from the heterodox perspective taken here, orthodox challenges to conventional wisdom are more compellingly viewed as refining, rather than contesting, conventional wisdom. From a heterodox standpoint, it is difficult to grasp how, for example, Whetten's (1989) widely cited FTE (2000+ Google Scholar citations) on "What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution" connects to the *AMR*'s mission statement. Whether the focus is upon on managerial work, theory building or editorial processes, orthodox analysis tends to downplay, or even taboo, considerations of power and, especially, domination. For *CMS*, in contrast, the operation of power and domination is of central importance, politically and scientifically. Accordingly, *CMS* does not regard the adjudication of conflicting interpretations and accounts of organizational phenomena as a 'simple', apolitical, empirical matter of designing a study that tests propositions by following prescribed methodological protocol. That is because the very purpose attributed to managerial work or to the meaning of 'improvements' to scholarship ascribed to editorial practice is understood to be contingent upon a politically charged, value-based subscription to a particular (e.g. orthodox or heterodox) approach or tradition.

CRITICAL SCHOLARSHIP?

What makes *CMS* distinctive? The short answer is its understanding of 'politics' in relation to knowledge. A more extensive answer can be obtained by consulting the appended bibliography. Exponents of *CMS* doubt that knowledge can be cleansed of power, and so are suspicious of scholarship that is silent on its value commitment(s) even if value-neutrality is

eschewed. The critical impulse in *small 'c'* critical scholarship does not typically extend to a declaration of its values; and, relatedly, its variants are typically silent on their politics. In our field, many of strands of *small 'c'* scholarship form what, in an FTE, Byron and Thatcher (2016:5, emphasis added) term “*the North American management paradigm*” (see also Burrell, 1996: 644) where there is minimal acknowledgment of, or reflection upon, the values and norms underpin and animate knowledge claims. Exponents of CMS, in contrast, are less buttoned up about their value commitments as their scholarship “highlight[s] such issues as control and exploitation, the inequities and *unitarist assumptions* of management practices” (Delbridge, 2014: 99, emphasis added). Eschewing value vacuity or neutrality, whether espoused or implied, exponents of CMS concur with Suddaby’s (2014) assessment, offered in an AMR FTE, that “the effectiveness of science” (ibid: 409) is not primarily attributable to “its attention to method”. Of greater importance, as Smolin (2006) indicates, is scientists’ collective capacity for “reflection” (ibid: 410), including reflection upon what Delbridge and Fiss (2013), in another AMR FTE, term the “*structural and political aspects* of the social organization of *knowledge*” (ibid: 325, emphases added) - ‘*aspects*’ that are the focus of the present FTE.

Consideration of the “structural...aspects” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 325) of knowledge production includes reflection on its “*social organization*” (ibid, emphasis added). This reflection is diminished, if not closed off, when, for example, the quality of scholarship is assessed primarily by reference to its (often dramaturgical) adherence to prescribed methodological protocol – as signaled by the offering up of ever-expanding, stylized methods sections in TOP. The forces of closure are identified by Ghoshal (2005: 77) when he observes that “A precondition for making business studies a science has been the denial of any moral or ethical considerations in our theories and, therefore, in our prescriptions for management practice”. A consequence of this “precondition” is that “critique” becomes acceptable only “if

it conforms to that of which it is critical – the very thing that critique cannot do” (Grey, 2010: 687). It is this demand for “conformity” that inhibits or taboos acknowledgement and reflective appreciation of the “moral and ethical considerations” (*aka* ‘politics’) to which Ghoshal (2005) refers. A specific consequence of this restrictive ethos has been the assignment of a *uniquely* political, pre-scientific, status to heterodox scholarship, and especially to CMS (Willmott, 1997; Ezzamel and Willmott, 2014).

CMS exponents’ overt recognition of the infusion of scholarship by “moral and ethical considerations” (*ibid*: 77) informs an unapologetic attentiveness to “the discontents of actors, explicitly consider(ing) them in the very labour of theorization” (Boltanski, 2011:5). It articulates a value commitment that is pursued “in such a way as to alter their relationship to social reality and, thereby, that social reality itself, in the direction of *emancipation*” (*ibid*, original emphasis). Within this explicitly value-laden, emancipation-oriented framing of scholarship, the scientist is conceived to be simultaneously and inescapably a citizen (Horkheimer, 1972). As Popper (1976) cautions “we cannot rob the scientist of his partisanship without also robbing him of his humanity, and we cannot suppress or destroy his value judgments without destroying him as a human being *and as a scientist*” (*ibid*: 97, emphasis in original). However, CMS doubts the capacity and desirability of the Popperian intent “to *separate* purely scientific value problems of truth, relevance, simplicity, and so forth from extra-scientific problems” (*ibid*: 98). From a CMS standpoint, this ambition is politically naïve, practically infeasible and, as Ghoshal (2005) implies, ethically indefensible (Willmott, 2012). Instead of striving to downplay or engineer the removal of politics from knowledge production, varieties of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, acknowledge its centrality and seek to work within and through it.

“We need diverse voices...”

The encouragement of heterodox scholarship is ostensible evident in the AMR's editor's declaration that:

‘We need diverse voices that push forward the frontiers of our knowledge. We need to be inclusive and open to a variety of voices...irrespective of their school, background, or geographic region’ (Ragins, 2015: 5)

The welcoming of heterodox scholarship is unequivocal, but it would be needless if the link between the “inclusiveness” of “diverse voices” and “pushing back the frontiers of knowledge” (ibid) had already been well established. The deficit implied by the “need to be inclusive and open” is evident, for example, in the list of ‘best papers’ published in AMR. From 2000-2103 (the latest date when preparing this FTE in June 2015), these papers had 29 authors (many papers were co-authored). Of these, only 2 authors, neither of whom was the lead author, received PhDs from schools outside of North America. These figures show that *AMR* publishes papers by non-US based authors but they also reflect and reinforce an editorial culture in which what is considered ‘best’ is produced by authors trained in the US where what Byron and Thatcher (2016: 5) term the “North American management paradigm” is most deeply entrenched.

It is important to appreciate that the dominant, “North American management paradigm” (NAM) is *not geographical*: it extends globally to scholars who are its hosts or subscribers to it (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2017; Üsdiken, 2014; Li and Parker, 2013; Murphy and Zhu, 2012). It is also relevant to acknowledge the increasing number of non-US based authors publishing in *TOP* (e.g. *AMJ* and *Organization Science*)³. From an orthodox perspective, this increase may suggest a growing openness of TOP, including AMR, to “a

³ The percentages of non-US authors are: 2012/46%; 2013/37%; 2014/59%; 2015/65%. The current indications are that 2016 will contain at least the same number of non-US authors as for 2014/15. In 2009, 16% of board members were non-US based. This had increased to 37% by 2015.

variety of voices...irrespective... of geographical region” (Ragins, 2015: 5). From a more critical perspective, the increase is more symptomatic of the rapid globalization of NALP, whose diffusion is seen to be propelled by the influence of the ‘unitary hierarchy’ of journal and business school league tables (Grey, 2010). It is this isomorphism that institutionalizes what Suddaby (2014), in an AMR FTE, refers to as the “considerable *consensus* on what theory is” (ibid: 407; see also Grey, 2010). Given that the mission to publish “novel, insightful” and “ground-breaking” work (Ragins, 2015: 5), the challenge is to detect and change whatever institutional conditions inhibit and restrict its submission and publication.

VALUES, ANOMALIES AND REFLECTIVE DISTANCE

To situate and justify the mission of *TOP*, it is relevant to consult the Academy of Management’s (AoM) Code of Ethical Conduct (http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/About_AOM/Governance/AOM_Code_of_Ethics.pdf).

The Code explicitly commends scholarship that “views issues *from a multiplicity of perspectives, including the perspective of those who are the least advantaged*” (cited in Adler and Jermier, 1995: 941, emphasis added). If *TOP* is to observe the Code, it is necessary to disclose and challenge the conventionality of norms that impede or restrict its fulfillment. This process of change necessitates gaining some *reflective distance* from the influence of norms that may be so taken-for-granted that they become as invisible as they are powerful.

Consider the norm of “clear writing”. In commentaries that extol its virtues, it is seldom acknowledged that the attribution of clarity to a text is contingent upon the reader’s familiarity with the conventions of the tradition in which it is embedded. This ‘insight’ does not imply that ‘anything goes’, or that authors have no

responsibility for their texts. Rather, the recollection that texts are products of scholarly traditions prompts critical reflection upon the self-evidence of a pervasive scholarly norm, and it highlights the politics as well as the pitfalls of ‘translation’. When a tradition or ‘voice’ is unfamiliar to the reader, the meanings of constructs (e.g. ‘organization’, ‘management’, or ‘science’) risk becoming scrambled as the (alien) ‘other’ is reduced to the (familiar) ‘same’ (Durand & Calori, 2006); or critical scholarship risks being labeled “unscholarly” or “incomprehensible”.

Or consider how a “multiplicity of perspectives” (AoM Code of Conduct) may be crowded out by the entrenched division of theory and data that is based upon a particular (e.g. hypothetico-deductive) conception of ‘science’. As a consequence of this division, variants of heterodox scholarship are assessed using criteria that are minimally adapted from protocols applied within NAMP (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2017). Critical reflection on what may seem, self-evidently, to be “best practices” of scholarship places in question established forms of closure in ways that potentially open up space for other, heterodox studies whose scholarly commitment is more closely aligned to *the* espoused AMR mission to “challenge conventional wisdom.”

Values in Knowledge Production and The Crack in the Consensus

The central importance of values is underscored in Suddaby’s (2014) observation, offered in an AMR FTE, that forms of theory do “more than abstract and organize knowledge” as they also “*signal the values upon which knowledge is built*” (Suddaby, 2014: 407, emphasis added; see also Willmott, 2009). The acknowledgement of values is absent, or the ‘signaling’ of them is oblique, in scholarship that conveys the appearance of objectivity by displaying its rhetorical trappings. An outcome of the conflation of science with scholarship that is silent on

its values is, as Delbridge and Fiss (2013: 329) note, in their AMR FTE, the “hegemony of correlational net-effects theorizing in AMR [that] *stifles other styles of theorizing*” (ibid: 329, emphasis added). The “stifling” of awareness of how forms of scientific knowledge, like institutions, are infused by values has the effect of concealing or obscuring what Suddaby (2014) refers to as a “crack” in our field’s “considerable *consensus* on what theory is” (ibid: 407, emphasis added).

The “social organization” (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013: 325) of this “considerable consensus” (Suddaby, 2014: 407) is an example of (Gramscian) hegemony: the exercise of moral and intellectual leadership universalizes a particular definition (e.g. of theory) as (scholarly) commonsense, or ‘normal’, orthodox science. Its practical effect is to obfuscate differences and/or avoid debate around *how* “conceptual order” is “imposed” (ibid) and *how* “empirical complexity” (ibid) is – critically or uncritically - theorized. In *small ‘c’* critical scholarship, the “cracks” identified by Suddaby are routinely denied or ignored; or discussion of them is deemed “old hat”, or futile, as they are naturalized, being impossible resolve; or it may be claimed that the “cracks” will gradually disappear with the maturation of the field (of management ‘science’). Such debate on differences may be characterized as *the theorization of theory* which may pose an existential threat to established bases of power and privilege that are protected by commonsense. This threat results in debate being avoided, discouraged or suppressed. Nonetheless, the “cracks” in the “consensus” remain, and they repeatedly reappear. Currently, CMS is perhaps the most visible and potentially transformative of these “cracks”. Its subaltern or outcast status is symptomatic of the threat that it poses: it nurtures theory which, to adopt Suddaby’s (2014: 407) terminology, is “needed” to fulfill *TOP*’s objective of “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom”. The targets of this challenge include the wisdom enshrined in the ‘normal science’ scholarship that fills the pages of *TOP* and informs orthodox “prescriptions for management practice” (Ghoshal, 2005: 77).

The *TOP* Deficit

A perusal of the contents of *AMR* during the period under consideration (January 2005-June 2015) reveals a deficit of contributions guided by values oriented to “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” (*AMR*, Information for Contributors). The deficit is apparent in the restricted range of issues studied; in the abstraction of those issues from “their role in society” (*ibid*; see also Barley, 2016); and in the scarcity of heterodox analyses, including variants of CMS. Consider the issue of climate change (see also Corley and Gioia, 2011). Between January 2005 and June 2015, 10 articles with climate change in the title appeared in *Organization*. None appeared in *AMR*. Or consider the processes of financialization that are widely held to be central to post-1980s processes of restructuring and hollowing out organizations and the reshaping of orientations to managerial / executive work (see Røyrvik, 2013). With the partial exception of Starkey’s (2015) contribution to *AMR*’s new “What Inspires the Academy?” section, analysis of financialization is absent from the journal during the decades leading up to the 2008 financial crisis; and that silence has not been broken in the past seven years. Or, finally, consider postcolonialism and queer theory as examples of heterodox analysis. During the same period, 2 articles with the term postcolonialism in the abstract appeared in *AMR* compared to 8 in *Organization*. No articles with queer theory in the abstract were published in *AMR* compared to 3 in *Organization*. The point here is not to imply that one journal is better than another – each has a distinctive mission – but instead to provide indicators of an anomaly in respect of *AMR*’s espoused mission – a mission whose fulfillment is most congruent with the “challenge [to] conventional wisdom” contained in heterodox analyses, including CMS.

These reflections suggest that the elite of theory scholars publishing in TOP has acquired a ‘trained incapacity’ to address key or “big issues” of management and organization amongst which Barley (2016: 2) recently includes “inequality, poverty, elites, environment, terrorism and privacy” (see also Clegg, 2015). This incapacity seems to extend to a very limited interest in, let alone engagement with, the diverse forms of theorizing developed within heterodox traditions. The lists of references accompanying the ‘best papers’ published in AMR (see earlier) indicate a preferred theorization of theory that results in authors rarely consulting, or at least seldom citing, scholarship published in non-US based journals where, currently, almost all heterodox scholarship appears.

It might be counter-argued that the *TOP* deficit simply mirrors a broader editorial orientation of ‘top’ journals, and so bears no comparison with the explicitly critical ‘niche’ occupied by *Organization*, for example. However, *AMR* is explicitly and exclusively a theory journal with a mission to “challenge conventional wisdom”. Its ‘Information to Contributors’ states that the journal is “particularly interested in interesting (sic) and important theoretical advances that incorporate *thought from multiple disciplines*” (emphasis added). So, might *AMR* not be expected to contain a *majority* of articles that mobilize heterodox strands of social science, including variants of CMS, in order to address issues such as climate change and financialization, and to publish analyses based upon postcolonialist analysis and queer theory? In the remainder of this FTE, I offer a supply-side diagnosis of the disconnect between the dearth of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, currently submitted to and published in *TOP*, and an espoused “open(ness)” to a wide variety of voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5), as advocated in *AMR*.

THE ACADEMY AND DOMINATION

In addressing the disconnect, I situate what I have termed the *TOP* deficit within the context of the Academy by which I do not mean the *Academy of Management* but the wider academy of scholars who are potential contributors to *TOP*. To this end, I engage Max Weber's thinking on power and domination⁴. Domination is, for Weber, pervasive "even where it is not obvious at first sight" (Weber, 1978: 941). Given this pervasiveness, domination and power are here understood to infuse the organization of editorial processes (see also Nord, 1977). From this it follows that elements of my analysis, apply, to some degree and in differing ways, to many and perhaps all journals, including those closely associated with *big 'C'* critical scholarship, such as *Organization*. And, unless its editorial processes are unique, the analysis is also applicable, in some measure, to *TOP*.

Power, Domination and Editorial 'Advice'

Editorial and review processes are widely regarded as pivotal to the production and refinement of scholarly knowledge. Yet they have received little scrutiny in academic journals, even where scholarly work on practices of managing and organizing is published. The main sources are chapters in edited books. Frost and Taylor's (1977, 2nd ed.) *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* and Baruch *et al*'s (2008) *Opening the Black Box of Editorship* each contains a minority of contributions which, by focusing upon the demand side of the editor process, shed light on aspects of the *TOP* anomaly.

Weber conceives of *power* as "the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behavior of other persons" (Weber, 1978: 942). From a Weberian perspective, *power* is continuously exercised in editorial processes of review. [T]he imposition of...will" is most manifestly

⁴ It could be easily argued that other strands of CMS (e.g. the insights of Marx or Foucault) are equally relevant for informing this analysis. Weber's thinking has been selected because *TOP* readers, including readers of *AMR*, are likely to be more familiar it.

evident in editors' decision letters as the prospect of publication is conditional upon responding convincingly to the evaluations provided by the referees and editor. Power may take the form of naked coercion, as when an editor makes the acceptance of a manuscript conditional upon citing specific articles published in the target journal, or by redacting controversial content. More often, as Weber stresses, the exercise of power is less obtrusive and is most effective when lubricated by some measure of legitimacy so that, in the editorial process for example, its operation is experienced by authors as an enactment of (editorial) authority, not domination.

Domination is conceived as “the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) will be obeyed by a certain group of persons” (ibid, 212). It occurs when “a certain group of persons” (e.g. those who submit manuscripts to a journal) obey “commands”. But can the ‘advice’ of an editor be credibly characterized as a “command” (Weber, 1978: 212) when, arguably, decision letters typically contain no more than recommendations that authors are at liberty to ignore? It is precisely this sense of freedom (e.g. to withdraw their manuscripts at any stage) that is prefigured by Weber’s understanding that “every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of *voluntary* compliance - that is, an *interest* (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience” (ibid: 212, emphasis added). In the context of scholarly publishing, this “interest” is formed *inter alia* by considerations of reputation as well as career progression. So, does this “interest” affect the preparation and revision of scholarly work?

In a study of 173 lead authors of articles published in two ‘top’ journals during 1999-2001 (Bedeian, 2003) Bedeian (2008) reports that authors encountered an editorial process in which they felt pressured to suppress or change their “voice”. He notes that “Nearly 25 percent of the authors reported that to placate a referee or editor they had actually made

changes to their manuscripts that they (as authors) felt were incorrect” (ibid: 139; see also Bedeian, 2004). For reasons that cannot be explored here as there is insufficient space (see Willmott, 2011), it is improbable that pressures to respond positively and compliantly to editorial ‘recommendations’, even when authors assess the ‘advice’ to divert or degrade their scholarship, have diminished since 1999-2001. The low percentage of manuscripts withdrawn after one or more rounds of review⁵ also lends circumstantial support to this conjecture. While the low withdrawal rate may testify to the effectiveness of truly developmental refereeing, it may equally, and perhaps more probably, point to the pressures experienced by authors who are willing to undertake ‘recommended’ revisions that they believe to be “incorrect” (ibid), or who compliantly accommodate ‘advice’ that may not be “incorrect” but is considered by them to be ill-informed or tangential to their purpose. Of course, accommodation is no guarantee of publication as removing weaknesses is not the same thing as building upon strengths.

The intention of the editor or reviewer may be to improve the manuscript but the effect can be to domesticate it by making its acceptance conditional upon retro-fitting the (alien) other into the (familiar) same (Durand & Calori, 2006). On this point, the advice of Eden (2008), a past associate editor of *Academy of Management Journal*, is unequivocal: “don’t fight back. It consumes enormous energy and it arouses reviewer animosity. Furthermore, it makes you look argumentative and, worse in the minds of reviewers and editors, unresponsive” (ibid: 246). “Playing by the[ir] rules” (ibid: 247) - by providing a positive, acquiescent response to editorial ‘advice’ - is, according to this conventional wisdom, rational as it is the way “to get your work published” (ibid). If this advice is followed, then journals which publish little work that “challenge[s] conventional wisdom” will receive few heterodox submissions; and the editorial process ensures that such work will be rejected or domesticated.

⁵ I repeatedly requested this information but it was not forthcoming.

Unless a journal's editorial structure and process is purposefully designed and maintained to limit impulses to colonize or domesticate submissions, authors will hesitate to question editorial 'advice'. Moreover, if we accept Weber's insights into the relational quality of domination, then any feelings of discomfort or misgiving associated with pressures to suppress or change the voice of the author are soothed when authors are trained to believe, or to persuade them/ourselves, that such pressures are (fairly) legitimate; or, at least, that 'advice' cannot be challenged without provoking editorial displeasure and retribution. The point here is not to advocate or entertain an "anything goes" position. Rather, the intention is to provide an analysis of, and prompt reflection upon, the power dynamics of the review processes, and the importance of the structural conditions required to attract and respect scholarship that, in the case of *AMR*, is congruent with its mission to "challenge conventional wisdom".

To further illuminate the dynamics of acquiescence and challenge in editorial processes, responses to editorial 'advice' can be characterized, following Weber, in terms of three "ideal types" - "simple habituation", "rational calculation of advantage" and "resistance" (Weber, 1978: 212; cf Oliver, 1991). Each response is conceived as a "one-sided accentuation[s] of one or more points of view" (Weber, 1949: 89) in the sense that particular authors may, on different occasions, embrace, alternate between, blend or prevaricate over these types of compliant response. Authors' responses that exemplify *simple habituation* assume that editorial advice is based upon expertise underwritten by qualifications and other indicators of competence. *Simple habituation* is distinguished by an absence of reflection upon the role of 'politics' or 'values' in the preparation and assessment of scholarly work. As a monopoly of expertise is ascribed to reviewers and editors, the author is absolved of responsibility for the

(intellectual) integrity of their work; and authors are also spared any troubling awareness of the “stifling” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 329) effects of conformity on scholarly diversity.

When exemplifying the “*rational calculation of advantage*”, some degree of reflection on the role of ‘politics’ or ‘values’ in the preparation and assessment of scholarship is required in order to calculate and optimize the likelihood of a manuscript’s acceptance (see also Miller, 2006; McDonald and Kam, 2007) – perhaps by endeavouring to “disguise[e] nonconformity behind a façade of acquiescence” (Oliver, 1991: 154). The focus is upon how to ‘get past’ editors and reviewers by expending the minimum of time and effort, irrespective of whether the ‘advice’ is (privately) assessed to be well-directed or misconceived (see Altman and Baruch, 2008). By declining to “fight back” in an overt way, the integrity and mental wellbeing of author is assured by taking it for granted that scholarship will be improved, or at least published, by demonstrating compliance with editorial ‘advice’. This presumption inhibits recognition of, and reflection upon, the consequences of colluding in the reinforcement of the “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) for the development of the Academy or its wider political implications (see Grey, 2010; Sloterdijk, 1988).

CHANGING THE CULTURE OF SCHOLARSHIP

When the response of an author approximates either “simple habituation” or “rational calculation of advantage”, or it involves some combination of them, the “probability” of editorial ‘advice’ being “obeyed” (Weber, 1978: 212) is high; and the effect is to reproduce, rather than challenge, the conventional wisdom institutionalized in the prevailing “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941). If the conventional wisdom enshrined in, and reproduced by, this “structure” is to be challenged, then the conditions of possibility for offering a different, less compliant, response to editorial processes must be identified and developed.

Resistance is a third, “ideal type” of response that, in marked contrast to “simple habituation” and the “rational calculation of advantage”, keeps faith with the voice of the author (Willmott, 2013); and, to continue with the religious theme, resistance is a condition of possibility of “a moment of grace” (Giorgi, Guider & Bartunek, 2014: 281). It is ‘a path of “active engagement”’ (ibid: 288) that exercises the option to comply with ‘advice’ to the extent that the author assesses it to be congruent with, and faithful to, the value(s) and substantive purpose(s) of his or her scholarship. It “rejects an attempt at placing [the voice of the author] in a marginal or peripheral position” (ibid: 286), and so it is risky. It may, for example, be interpreted as “look[ing] argumentative” (Eden, 2008: 246) in a way that “arouses hostility”(ibid). Ultimately, the viability and effectiveness of a resistant response to editorial ‘advice’ depends upon the capacity of the gatekeepers - editors and reviewers – to reflect upon, and rein in, any impulse to “stifle” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 329) the voice of the other, or to translate the text of the (resistant) other into the (familiar) same (Durand & Calori, 2006).

If “diverse voices” are to be heard, and if “the frontiers of our knowledge” are to be “push[ed] forward” (Ragins, 2015: 5), then it is necessary actively to encourage and support this third, resistant type of response. For, unlike those positioned along the continuum of compliance (see above), resistance strongly affirms the distinctiveness of the voice, and revitalises the responsibility, of the author. By championing diversity, resistance also valorizes the pluralism commended in the opening quotation from Smolin (2006).

By “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom”, heterodox scholarship sustained by resistant responses to editorial ‘advice’ may of course elicit an unenthusiastic or even hostile response. Yet, as shown in Giorgi, Guider & Bartunek’s (2014) study of Cardinal Rose’s Apostolic Visitation upon “women religious” in the US, a hostile response to alleged deviance (e.g.

“feminist spirit”) can be fruitful insofar as it brings to the surface, confronts and debates contentious issues that may otherwise be ignored, suppressed or evaded. That said, productive debate also requires a willingness of authors who resist editorial ‘advice’ to contemplate the possibility that their scholarship is imperfect; and that, to be consistent, a developmentally resistant response *from editors or reviewers* is to be welcomed and respected. Through a process of reflection and dialogue, critique can serve to explicate, facilitate and strengthen the author’s purpose rather than frustrate or suppress it. In principle, an openness to the other - *on each side* - improves mutual understanding and thereby generates better informed, more inclusive, scholarship where, in Suddaby’s (2014) words, “the effectiveness of science” (ibid: 409) is not primarily attributable to “its attention to method” but to a collective capacity for “reflection” (ibid: 410). .

Turning now more directly to *AMR*, as an exemplar of TOP, its Information for Contributors states that *AMR* welcomes scholarship which challenges, rather than endorses, normalizes or sustains, “conventional wisdom”. It follows that forms of scholarship which do not subscribe to, or advance, the *AMR* mission have no place in the journal. Conversely, work based in traditions that present the most potent of challenges to “conventional wisdom”, including variants of CMS, but not limited to them, offer the strongest means of renewing and realizing its mission. *The appointment of CMS scholars, such as myself, to the position of associate editor at TOP, and the appointment of others to the journal’s editorial board is congruent with implementing a progressive, inclusive policy that fosters “ground-breaking work” (Ragins, 2015: 6) rather than the elaboration or refinement of “conventional wisdom”.*

Any expectation that these appointments alone will be sufficient to stimulate the submission of heterodox, including CMS, scholarship is, however, placed in question by the available evidence, giving rise to the anomaly that has been the focus of this FTE. Authors who are

currently publishing heterodox work in other, ‘lower tier’, management journals will require assurances that *AMR* associate editors and editorial board members have a track record of significantly “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom”, either as authors or as reviewers, and so are recognizably *peers*. Appointing associate editors and an editorial board that collectively have sufficient specialist knowledge of the “variety of voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5) would be a significant step in ensuring that peer review congruent with the mission of the journal is substantively practiced *and so is experienced* by authors. To assist in the selection of well-informed, developmental reviewers committed to the *AMR* mission, authors already have the opportunity to suggest suitable candidates. This support could be easily extended by making available - to prospective authors – information on the specialist expertise of editorial board membersk extended to include their credentials as challengers of conventional wisdoms, that are currently accessible only to the editor and associated editors.

Constructively, what more is required to valorize, attract and support the “diverse voices” needed to “push forward the frontiers of our knowledge” (Ragins, 2015: 5), and thereby challenge rather than reproduce “conventional wisdom”? In order to publish “ground-breaking work” (Ragins, 2015: 6) developed from “a variety of perspectives, including those...critical of management and organizations” (Brief, 2003:7) , editorial and review processes must decisively reject a *modus vivendi* geared to fashioning and refining scholarly products generated within any and all traditions that presume and reproduce “conventional wisdom”, whether these are generated within the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) or by variants of heterodox scholarship, including CMS.

There are signs of movement in this direction. Notably, there has been some internationalization of the *AMR* editorial board and other TOP journals; and one or two associate editors trained outside of North America have been appointed. However, unless

these changes are institutionalized, they are vulnerable to reversal. Promising indications of greater diversity must be embedded and extended. To this end, the practice of alternating between North American and non-North American *trained* editors-in-chief could be adopted; and a majority of non-North American *trained* Associate Editors and editorial board members could be appointed that are well informed about the full “variety of voices” that *AMR* is committed to publish⁶. To believe that these changes would *necessarily* address or counteract the globalization of the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) in the training of researchers, or correct the *TOP* deficit, is to engage in wishful thinking. But the proposed means of institutionalizing diversification and inclusiveness to fulfill the mission of “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom” would, arguably, go some considerable way to realizing *AMR*’s ambition to be an international journal, intellectually and geographically, as well as to fulfilling its espoused mission.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This FTE has focused upon factors that may act to impede the openness and inclusiveness necessary to achieve what Brief (2003: 3) calls *AMR*’s “operational mission statement”. Orthodox scholarship has either ignored or accommodated the anomaly. The anomaly has been diagnosed primarily in terms of ‘supply side’ shortcomings, such as the insufficient encouragement of CMS submissions. In contrast, this FTE has related the *AMR* / *TOP* deficit to processes of power and domination operating through ‘demand side’ institutional factors and forces.

If the “diverse voices” that “push forward the frontiers of our knowledge” (Ragins, 2015: 5) are to be heard in *AMR* / *TOP*, then it is necessary to build editorial capacity that values,

comprehends, represents and supports the heterodox scholarship that it is, by definition, committed to “challenge” the orthodoxy of “conventional wisdom”. To this end, it has been proposed that something ‘structural’ must be done to reassure or convince heterodox scholars that “their theoretical contributions...are valued” by *TOP* (King and Lepak, 2011: 2010). Remedying the *TOP* deficit requires a process of collective critical self-reflection and transformation - a process to which this FTE is intended to contribute. Some encouraging indicators of a movement in this direction , as yet not institutionalized, have been highlighted and welcomed. *Preparers of heterodox theory manuscripts, including exponents of CMS, take note!*

Indicative Bibliography of Critical Management Studies

Alvesson, M. (2011), ed. **Classics in Critical Management Studies**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (2000), **Doing Critical Management Research**, London: Sage

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (1992), eds., **Critical Management Studies**, London : Sage

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (1996), **Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction**, London : Sage (2nd ed. 2012)

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2003) ed., **Studying Management Critically**, London: Sage

Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T. and Willmott, H.C. (2009), eds., **Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2011) eds., **Critical Management Studies** (4 volume set), London: Sage

Anonymous (2015), ‘The Case of the Hypothesis that Never Was; Uncovering the Deceptive Use of Post Hoc Hypotheses’, **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 24,2: 214-216

Bridgman T. and Stephens M (2008), ‘Institutionalizing critique: A problem of CMS’, **Ephemera**, 8, 3: 258–70.

Brooke C (2009), ed., **Critical Management Perspectives on Information Systems**, London: Elsevier Press.

Grey C. and Willmott, H. (2002), Contexts of CMS, **Organization** 9, 3: 411–8.

Grey, C. and Willmott, H.C. (2005), eds., **Critical Management Studies: A Reader**, Oxford: Oxford University Press (20145)

Jeanes, E. and Huzzard, T. (eds), **Critical Management Research: Reflections from the Field**, London: Sage

Malin, V. ,Murphy, J. and, Siltaoja, M. (2013), eds., **Getting Things Done**, Bingley, UK: Emerald

Prasad, A., Prasad, P., Mills, A.J. and Helms Mills, J. (2015), eds., **The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies**, London: Routledge

Wolfram Cox, J., Le Trent-Jones, T.G., Voronov, M. and Weir, D. (2009), eds., **Critical Management Studies at Work**, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar

References

- Adler, P. and Jermier, J. (2005), Developing a Field with More Soul: Theory and Public Policy Research for Management Scholars, **Academy of Management Journal**, 48,6: 941-944
- Altman, Y. and Baruch, Y. (2008), 'Strategies for Revising and Resubmitting Papers to Refereed Journals', **British Journal of Management**, 19: 89-101
- Barley, S.R. (2016), '60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on How We Became a Mystery House and How We Might Get Out', **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 61, 1: 1-8
- Baruch, Y., Konrad, A.M., Aguinis, H. and Starbuck, W.H., eds., (2008), **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Bedeian, A.G. (2003), 'The manuscript review process: The proper roles of authors, referees, and editors', **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 12, 331-8
- Bedeian, A.G. (2004) 'Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the Management discipline', **Academy of Management Learning and Education** 3, 2: 198–216
- Bedeian, A.G. (2008), 'Balancing Authorial Voice and Editorial Omniscience: The "It's My Paper and I'll Say What I Want To" versus "Ghostwriters in the Sky" Minuet' in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp134-140

Bell, E, Kothiyal, N. and Willmott, H.C. (2017), 'Methodology-as-Technique and the Meaning of Rigor in Globalized Management Research', **British Journal of Management**, 28,3: 534-550

Boltanski, L. (2011), **On Critique: A Sociology of Emancipation**, Cambridge: Polity

Brief, A.P. (2003) Editor's Comments: AMR—The Often Misunderstood Journal, **Academy of Management Review**, 28,1: 7-8

Burrell, G. (1996), 'Normal Science, Paradigms, Metaphors, Discourses and Genealogies of Analysis' in S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord, eds., **Handbook of Organization Studies**, London: Sage

Byron, K. and Thatcher, S.M.B. (2016), Editors' Comments: "What I Know Now that I Wish I Knew Then" – Teaching Theory and Theory Building', **Academy of Management Review**, 41,1: 1-8

Clegg, S. (2015), 'Reflections: Why Old Social Theory Might Still Be Useful', **Journal of Change Management**, 15,1: 1-7

Corley, K.G. and Gioia, D.A. (2011), 'Building Theory About Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?', **Academy of Management Review**, 36, 1: 12-32

Delbridge, R. (2014), Promising Futures: CMS, Post-Disciplinarity, and the New Public Social Science, **Journal of Management Studies**, 51,1: 95-116

Delbridge, R. and Fiss, P.C. (2013), 'Editor's Comments: Styles of Theorizing and the Social Organization of Knowledge', **Academy of Management Review**, 38,3: 325-331

Durand, R. & Calori, R. 2006. Sameness, otherness? Enriching organizational change theories with philosophical considerations on the same and the other. **Academy of Management Review**, 31: 93-114.

Eden, D. (2008), 'What Authors Need to Know to Navigate the Review Process Successfully: Understanding and Managing the Editor's Dilemma' in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 239-249

Ezzamel, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2014) 'Registering "the ethical" in Organization Theory Formation: Towards the Disclosure of an "invisible force"', **Organization Studies**, 35, 7: 1013-1039

Frost, P.J. and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage

Ghoshal, S. (2005), 'Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices', **Academy of Management Learning & Education**, 4, 1: 75-91

Giorgi, S., Guider, M.E. & Bartunek, J.M. (2014), 'Productive Resistance: A Study of Change, Emotions, and Identity in the Context of the Apostolic Visitation of U.S. Women Religious, 2008-2012', **Research in the Sociology of Organizations**, 41: 259-300

Grey, C. (2010) Organization Studies: Publications, Politics and Polemic, **Organization Studies**, 31, 6: 677-694

Hirschman, A.O. (1990), **Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States**, Harvard University Press

Horkheimer, M. (1972), **Traditional and Critical Theory**. New York: Herder and Herder

King, A.W. and Lepak, D. (2011), 'Editors Comments: Myth-Busting – What We Hear and What We've Learned about AMR', **Academy of Management Review**, 36,2: 207-214

Li, E. Y. and Parker, M. (2013), 'Citation patterns in organization and management journals: Margins and centres', **Organization**, 20(2):299-322.

Macdonald, S. and Kam, J. (2007), Ring a Ring o' Roses: Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies. **Journal of Management Studies**, 44: 640–655.

Miller, C. C. (2006), 'Peer Review in the Organizational and Management Sciences: Prevalence and Effects of Reviewer Hostility, Bias, and Dissensus', **Academy of Management Journal**, 49, 3: 425-431

Murphy, J. and Zhu, J. (2012), 'Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals', **Organization**, 19: 915-927.

Nord, W.R. (1977), 'Looking at Ourselves and We Look at Others: An Exploration of the Publication System for Organizational Research' in P.J.Frost and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage, pp 64-78

- Oliver, C. (1991), 'Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes', **Academy of Management Review**, 16,1: 145-179
- Popper, K. (1976), 'The Logic of the Social Sciences' in T. W. Adorno, H. Albert, R. Dahrendorf, J. Habermas, H. Pilot and K.R. Popper, eds., **The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology**, London: Heinemann, pp 87-104
- Ragins, B.R. (2015), 'Editor's Comments: Developing Our Authors', **Academy of Management Review**, 40,1: 1-8
- Røyrvik, E.A. (2013), **The Allure of Capitalism: An Ethnography of Management and the Global Financial Crisis**, New York: Berghahn Books
- Sloterdijk, P. (1988), **Critique of Cynical Reason**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Smolin, L. (2006), **The Trouble with Physics: The Rise of String Theory, the Fall of Science and What Comes Next**, Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Starkey, K. (2015), 'The Strange Absence of Management During the Current Financial Crisis,' **Academy of Management Review**, 40,4: 652-663
- Suddaby, R. (2014), 'Editor's Comments: Why Theory', **Academy of Management Review**, 39,4: 407-411
- Üsdiken, B. (2014), 'Centres and Peripheries: Research Styles and Publication Patterns in

“Top” US Journals and their European Alternatives’, **Journal of Management Studies**, 51,5:
764-789

Weber, M. (1949), **The Methodology of the Social Sciences**, New York: Free Press

Weber, M. (1978), **Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology**, ed. G.
Roth and C. Wittich, Berkeley: University of California Press

Whetten, D.A. (1989), ‘What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?’, **Academy of
Management Review**, 14, 4: 49-95

Willmott, H.C. (1997), Management and Organization Studies as Science?,
Organization, 4, 3 : 309-344

Willmott, H.C. (2009), ‘Science as Intervention: Recasting Weber's Moral Vision’,
Organization, 16, 1: 143-154

Willmott, H.C (2011), ‘Journal List Fetishism and the Perversion of Scholarship:
Reactivity and the ABS List’, **Organization**, 18, 4: 429-442

Willmott, H.C. (2012) ‘Reframing Relevance as ‘Social Usefulness’: A Comment on
Hodgkinson and Starkey’s ‘Not Simply Returning to the Same Answer
Over and Over Again’, **British Journal of Management**, 23: 598-604

Willmott, H. C. (2013) “the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another”:
Reflections on Resistance, Gaming and Subjugation'. **Journal of Management**

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Belle Ragins and my fellow Associate Editors for the detailed comments on earlier drafts of this FTE. These have been invaluable for focusing and integrating my essay and avoiding inadvertent offence. I am also grateful to the subscribers to the Critical Management List-Serve who responded to my survey (see Note 1). I would also like to thank the following for their very helpful comments upon the previous draft of this FTE: David Jacobs, Alistair Mutch and Scott Taylor.

FTE 2 (SECOND DRAFT)

WHAT IF OUR THEORY WAS CRITICAL? DRAFT

‘After reading the articles in the journal and reviews of literally hundreds of manuscripts as associate editor, I can confidently say that the operational mission statement [of AMR] has been ignored more often than not’ (Brief, 2003: 7).

‘We do research because even the smartest amongst us doesn’t know the answer. Often it lies in a direction other than the one pursued by the mainstream. In those cases, and even when the mainstream guesses right, the progress of science depends on healthy support from scientists who hold divergent views’ (Smolin, 2006: xxi-xxii)

‘in most of the varieties of social action domination plays a considerable role, even where it is not obvious at first sight’ (Weber, 1978: 941)

The preparation of this essayⁱ has been prompted by an anomaly. Much critical theoretic scholarship appears in other generalist and specialist management journals, such as *Organization Studies* and *Human Relations*, *Organization* and *Journal of Management Inquiry* (see also King and Lepak, 2011: 208). But little is published in the journal that is widely regarded as leading the fieldⁱⁱ. That mismatch is surprising, given that Critical Management Studies (CMS) scholars are, arguably, the most committed to, and capable of, “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” (Ragins, 2015: 6 citing

AMR Information for Contributorsⁱⁱⁱ). During the first 12 months of my term as associate editor, I handled all the submissions identified by the editor as CMS that were not desk rejected. Of these 2/28 submissions, 2 were clearly critical management papers, a figure which could be stretched to 4 if a looser notion of critical management scholarship is applied^{iv}. This is despite recent indications of a widening geographical spread of AMR authors^v and the appointment of associate editors and editorial board members who are knowledgeable about critical theoretic scholarship^{vi}.

Why might this be? On the *supply* side, it might be that few CMS submissions to AMR have been of the required quality. The concern to improve the quality of submissions is evident in numerous FTEs that advise authors and referees on how to render manuscripts more AMR-compliant. Here, I offer a counterbalancing contribution which reflects on conditions and practices – the demand side - that may inhibit the submission or impede the acceptance of critical theoretic scholarship.

Since familiarity with CMS amongst AMR readers cannot be assumed, I first outline its distinctiveness. I then apply a strand of critical theoretic scholarship, informed primarily by Weber’s ideas about power and domination, to examine editorial practice. Finally, I reflect upon how the editorial culture of AMR might be (further) reformed to attract and host heterodox management scholarship, including CMS.

CRITICAL SCHOLARSHIP?

What makes CMS distinctive? The short answer is its understanding of ‘politics’ in relation to knowledge. A more extensive answer can be obtained by consulting the bibliography appended to this FTE. Exponents of CMS doubt that knowledge can be cleansed of power, and so are skeptical about the espoused value-neutrality of ‘normal’, scholarship that I describe as (variants of) small ‘c’ critical scholarship. That is because its critical impulse is largely confined to avoiding or eliminating whatever its exponents assess to contaminate its vaunted impartiality or neutrality. CMS scholarship does not subscribe, explicitly or tacitly, to a notion of rigor, distilled in “logical empiricist philosophy”, with its covering law model of scientific explanation Üsdiken and Pasadeos, 1995: 516 cited in Grey, 2010: 685). Instead, as Delbridge (2014) notes, the priority of CMS is to “highlight such issues as control and exploitation, the inequities and *unitarist assumptions* of management practices” (ibid: 99, emphasis added). Its exponents concur with Suddaby’s (2014) assessment, that “the effectiveness of science” (ibid: 409) is not primarily attributable to “its attention to method”. Of greater importance is scientists’ collective

capacity for “reflection” (ibid: 410), including reflection upon the “*structural and political aspects* of the social organization of *knowledge*” (Delbridge and Foss, 2013: 325, emphases added). CMS addresses head-on the realization that failure to “change our scholarly traditions in ways that enhance theoretical relevance to practice...will condemn [us] to increasing irrelevance” (Corley and Gioia, 2011: 29). An aim of CMS, it is worth underscoring, is to “connect the practical shortcomings in management...to the demands of a socially divisive and ecologically destructive system in which managers work”^{vii}.

By debunking the semblance of neutrality and seeking to “change our scholarly traditions” (ibid), CMS seeks to open up a scholarly space for raising and exploring a practical question – namely, what are the interests and values that do, and could, guide the identification and production of scientific knowledge? This question is closed off when it is presumed that compliance with methodological protocol eliminates bias and thereby renders scholarship value-neutral. As Ghoshal (2005: 77) has observed, “a precondition for making business studies a science has been the denial of any moral or ethical considerations in our theories and, therefore, in our prescriptions for management practice”. A consequence of this “precondition” is that “critique” is acceptable only “if it conforms to that of which it is critical – the very thing that critique cannot do” (Grey, 2010: 687). Ignored or castigated by (small ‘c’) critical scholarship for being (uniquely) biased by “moral and ethical considerations” (aka ‘politics’) (Ghoshal, 2005: 77), variants of CMS are assigned a pre-scientific, if not anti-scientific, status.

The smear of ‘political bias’ targets CMS exponents’ non-closeted recognition of how “moral and ethical considerations” (ibid) inescapably infuse our scholarship, regardless of whether it is insistently and elaborately denied. Big ‘C’ critical scholarship is unapologetically attentive to “the discontents of actors, explicitly consider(ing) them in the very labour of theorization” (Boltanski, 2011:5). And this is pursued “in such a way as to alter their relationship to social reality and, thereby, that social reality itself, in the direction of *emancipation*” (ibid, original emphasis). In this framing of scholarship, the scientist is conceived to be simultaneously and inescapably a citizen (Horkheimer, 1976). As Popper (1976) cautions “we cannot rob the scientist of his partisanship without also robbing him of his humanity, and we cannot suppress or destroy his value judgments without destroying him as a human being *and as a scientist*” (ibid: 97, emphasis in original). However, CMS doubts the capacity and desirability of Popper’s intent “to *separate* purely scientific value problems of truth, relevance, simplicity, and so forth from extra-scientific problems” (ibid: 98). From a CMS standpoint, this

ambition is politically naïve, practically infeasible and ethically indefensible.

“We need diverse voices...”

The devaluing and marginalizing of scholarship that disavows the tenets of logical empiricism and critical rationalism, including contributions to CMS, has been confronted and parried in the current AMR editor’s introductory FTE:

‘We need diverse voices that push forward the frontiers of our knowledge. We need to be inclusive and open to a variety of voices...irrespective of their school, background, or geographic region’ (Ragins, 2015: 5)

The message is clear: AMR is open to all kinds of scholarship. Yet, if the link between “inclusiveness” and “pushing back the frontiers of knowledge” (ibid) were already well established, this call for “diverse voices” (ibid) would be needless. The deficit is evident in the dearth of AMR ‘best papers’^{viii} authored by scholars trained outside the dominant “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5; see also Burrell, 1996: 644). This “paradigm” is *not geographical*. It extends beyond North America to scholars who are either hosts of, or become subscribers to, its neo-imperial transfer (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2015; Üsdiken, 2014; Li and Parker, 2013; Murphy and Zhu, 2012). Accordingly, the increased number of non-US based authors publishing in AMR is more symptomatic of the spread and emulation of the “North American management paradigm” than it is an indicator of the inclusion of diverse forms of scholarship that “challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” (Ragins, 2015: 6). The spread of the “paradigm’ has been lubricated and consolidated by the “unitary hierarchy” of journal lists and league tables, in which diverse traditions of scholarship are evaluated according to criteria forged within it (see Grey, 2010). If AMR’s espoused mission to publish “novel, insightful” work (Ragins, 2015: 5)) is to be realized and *the call for “diverse voices”* (Ragins, 2015: 5) *is to be effectively answered, then it is necessary to diagnose, and change, the institutional conditions that exclude or impede their expression.*

VALUES, ANOMALIES AND REFLECTIVE DISTANCE

It is a social scientific platitude that norms conferring legitimacy upon established practices are routinely taken-for-granted by their adherents. Dis-closing the conventionality of norms, including those underpinning editorial practices, requires gaining some *reflective distance* from their invisible grip.

The Academy of Management's (AoM) Code of Ethical Conduct explicitly commends scholarship that "views issues *from a multiplicity of perspectives, including the perspective of those who are the least advantaged*"^{ix} (cited in Adler and Jermier, 1995: 941, emphasis added). Normative practices that restrict the preparation and publication of such scholarship are legion. "Clear writing", for example, is routinely presented as a universal good, yet the attribution of clarity is also contingent upon the reader's familiarity with the tradition articulated in a text. When a tradition of "voice" is unfamiliar to the reader, the meanings of concepts (e.g. 'organization', 'management', or 'science') - are *ipso facto* difficult to comprehend, or their (tradition-contingent) meanings becomes scrambled in the process of ill-informed translation. Readers' perplexity is too easily attributed to authors' lack of clarity when, on reflection and a redoubling of effort, confusion and frustration reflect limited acquaintance, and possible impatience, with the conventions of a different scholarly tradition. Or consider another example of "multiple perspectives" (AoM Code of Conduct) being crowded out by restrictive practices: the entrenched division of theory and data based upon a particular (e.g. hypothetico-deductive) conception of 'science'. When conflated with scientific endeavor, the institutionalization of the theory/data division justifies non-compliant forms of scholarship being dismissed as misconceived or immature.

Values in Knowledge Production

The significance of values in knowledge production is underscored in the previous AMR editor's FTE: forms of theory do "more than abstract and organize knowledge" as they also "*signal the values upon which knowledge is built*" (Suddaby, 2014: 407, emphasis added; see also Willmott, 2009; Ezzamel and Willmott, 2014). This 'signaling' is often implicit or denied – for example, when scholarship contrives an appearance of neutrality. Whether scholars engage in collective self-deception or subscribe cynically to an ideology of scientism, the outcome is, as Delbridge and Fiss (2013: 329) put it, the "hegemony of correlational net-effects theorizing in AMR [that] *stifles other styles of theorizing*" (ibid: 329, emphasis added). This "stifling" of awareness (e.g. of how knowledge of management and organization is infused by values) may conceal, but it cannot repair, what Suddaby (2014) refers to as a "crack" in our field's "considerable *consensus* on what theory is" (ibid: 407, emphasis added).

The presumed "consensus" provides a fig-leaf that obfuscates differences and/or avoids debate around *how* "conceptual order" is "imposed" (ibid) and how "empirical complexity" (ibid) is – critically or uncritically - theorized. "Cracks" appear when awkward questions are raised about "why we need theory and what role it

should play in creating, maintaining, and shaping what type of knowledge we value in the field” (ibid). “Cracks” are habitually ignored or papered over in small ‘c’) critical scholarship when it is claim that the “cracks” will gradually disappear as our ‘science’ matures. Or, more cynically, recognition of differences is strongly discouraged as it draws attention to an unseemly problem. One of the most visible and potentially transformative “cracks” is CMS. Its Domain Statement (see note XX) presents a strikingly different and, in the context of the established scholarship of the Academy, anomalous conception of the kind of theory that, to adopt Suddaby’s (2014: 407) terminology, is “needed”, and of the “type of knowledge” that is “valued”.

The AMR Deficit

Are the concerns expressed by Corley and Gioia (2011), noted earlier, and shared by CMS, prioritized, or even regularly present, in AMR? A perusal of its contents during the period under consideration (January 2005-June 2015) reveals a deficit of contributions guided by values oriented to changing our “scholarly traditions in ways that enhance theoretical relevance to practice” (Corley and Gioia, 2011: 27), let alone articles that prioritize the substantive concerns of CMS, as set out in the Domain Statement. The deficit is apparent in the limited range of issues studied and in the dearth of heterodox approaches, including CMS, deployed to theorize those issues. Consider the issue of climate change identified by Corley and Gioia (2011). Between January 2005 and June 2015, 10 articles with Climate Change in the title appeared in the journal *Organization*. None appeared in AMR. Or consider postcolonialism and queer theory. During the same period, 2 articles with the term postcolonialism in the abstract appeared in AMR compared to 8 in *Organization*. No articles with queer theory in the abstract were published in AMR compared to 3 in *Organization*.

Or consider processes of financialization that are widely held to be central to post-1980s processes of restructuring and hollowing out organizations and the reshaping of orientations to managerial / executive work (see Royrvick, 2013). With the partial exception of Starkey’s (2015) contribution to AMR’s new “What Inspires the Academy?” section, analysis of financialization is absent from AMR during the decades leading up to the 2008 financial crisis; and that silence has not been broken in the past seven years^x. The established elite of theory scholars has, it seems, acquired a ‘trained incapacity’ to recognize and/or address the significance of issues such as climate change and financialization (see Clegg, 2015); and this incapacity has extended to exploration of the relevance of developments in social science for analyzing contemporary realities of management and organization.

It might be counter-argued that the deficit of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in AMR reflects the journal’s broader editorial orientation compared to the ‘niche’ occupied by *Organization*, for example. However, AMR is explicitly and exclusively a theory journal. Might it not be expected to contain articles that mobilize influential strands of contemporary social science, including variants of CMS, to address issues such as financialization? AMR’s ‘Information to Contributors’ explicitly states that the journal is “particularly interested in interesting (sic) and important theoretical advances that incorporate *thought from multiple disciplines*” (emphasis added)^{xi}. Either prospective authors have not generated and submitted such work, or editors and reviewers have rejected it. In the remainder of this FTE, I offer a supply-side diagnosis of the disconnect between the dearth of CMS scholarship in AMR and its espoused “open(ness” to a wide variety of voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5) and to “theoretical advances that incorporate *thought from multiple disciplines*”^{xii}.

THE ACADEMY AND DOMINATION

To diagnose the AMR deficit, I apply a staple element of modern organizational analysis: Max Weber’s thinking on power and domination^{xiii}. Weberian theory has been widely engaged to study practices of organizing and managing that extend, in the contemporary context, to editorial processes (see also Nord, 1977). Since it is unlikely that editorial practice as AMR is entirely unique, it is probable that elements of the following analysis apply, in some measure, to other journals, including those that actively solicit big ‘C’ critical scholarship.

Scholarly Publishing, Domination and ‘Advice’

Editorial and review processes are widely understood to be pivotal in the production and refinement of scholarly knowledge. It is therefore remarkable how little analysis these processes have received, even in journals where scholarly work on practices of managing and organizing is published^{xiv}. To contemplate the possibility that Max Weber’s thinking on power and domination may be relevant for studying editorial processes presupposes a (value-based) view, or conjecture, that they are enacted within and through relations of power and domination. Weber conceives of *power* as “the possibility of imposing one’s will upon the behavior of other persons” (Weber, 1978: 942); and *domination* is conceived as “the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) will be obeyed by a certain group of persons” (ibid, 212)^{xv}. Where power relations become institutionalized and normalized, the “imposition of...will” (ibid: 942) becomes routine. From a Weberian perspective, *power* is continuously exercised in editorial processes of review, and is most manifestly evident in decision letters. For

Weber, *domination* occurs when “a certain group of persons”, such as those who submit manuscripts to AMR, obey “commands”, such as the ‘advice’ contained in editorial letters. Exercises of power may sometimes take the form of comparatively naked coercion, as when an editor makes the acceptance of a manuscript conditional upon citing specific articles, including additional information or redacting controversial content. More often, as Weber stresses, power is enacted, and is most effective, when lubricated by some measure of legitimacy. Exercises of power are then at least partly experienced (e.g. by authors) as enactments of (editorial) authority, not domination.

Editorial decision letters routinely contain more or less veiled threats of future rejection that take the form of ostensibly considerate warnings: ‘The resubmission of your manuscript is “high risk!” or even “very high risk!”’. If an author declines to comply with editorial ‘advice’, or if s/he fails to provide sufficiently convincing reasons for such recalcitrance, then the likely (but not inevitable, see below) fate of the submission is sealed. In the face of the high risk of rejection, a positive, acquiescent response to editorial ‘recommendations’ is widely normalized, as distilled in the counsel provided by Eden (2008). A past associate editor of AMJ, his advice to authors is: “don’t fight back. It consumes enormous energy and it arouses reviewer animosity. Furthermore, it makes you look argumentative and, worse in the minds of reviewers and editors, unresponsive” (ibid: 246). Accommodating the ‘advice’ and ‘recommendations’ of reviewers and editors by “playing by the[ir] rules” (ibid: 247) is, according to this conventional wisdom, the rational response. Why? Because it is the way “to get your work published” (ibid), and author recalcitrance will likely be psychologized as “unresponsive(ness)” (ibid). Any feelings of discomfort or misgiving about such an acquiescent response are, of course, soothed when, following Weber’s insights into the relational quality of domination^{xvi}, authors (are trained to) believe, or persuade them/ourselves, that the editorial process is (fairly) legitimate, and so warrants compliance.

But can the ‘advice’ of an editor be credibly characterized as a “command” (Weber, 1978: 212)? Don’t decision letters contain no more than recommendations that authors are at liberty to ignore? That is formally or abstractly the case. Authors are formally free to withdraw their manuscripts at any stage. This option is fully consistent with Weber’s (1978) conception of domination: “every genuine form of domination implies *a minimum of voluntary compliance* - that is, an *interest* (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience” (ibid: 212, first emphasis added). Contextually and substantively, authors find them/ourselves under pressure to treat editorial ‘advice’ as if were a series of “commands”. In a *context* where scholars tenure, promotion and reputation

depend upon articles bearing their names being published in a small number of elite journals, there is intense pressure to respond positively and compliantly to editorial ‘recommendations’, even if authors assess the ‘advice’ to divert or degrade their scholarship. As Bedeian (2008: 139) has noted, “the extent of pressure felt ... is suggested by a study of 173 lead authors of articles published in the *Academy of Management Journal* and the *AMR* from 1999-2001 (Bedeian, 2003)” (ibid: 139). He continues: “Nearly 25 percent of the authors reported that to placate a referee or editor they had actually made changes to their manuscripts that they (as authors) felt were incorrect” (ibid; see also Bedeian, 2004). It is improbable that such pressures have diminished since 1999-2001. That so few manuscripts are withdrawn by authors after one or more rounds of review – it is around X% at AMR - testifies either to the excellence of truly developmental refereeing; or it points to the pressures experienced by authors who consider the ‘recommended’ revisions to be “incorrect” (ibid), or to other authors who compliantly accommodate ‘advice’ that is not “incorrect” but is ill informed or tangential.

When interpreted within a Weberian framework, responses to editorial ‘advice’ can be positioned along a *spectrum of compliance* extending “from simple habituation to the most purely rational calculation of advantage” (Weber, 1978: 212; cf Oliver, 1991). Authors who treat this ‘advice’ as unerringly authoritative exemplify the mode of ‘simple habituation’. Advice is believed to rely upon expertise underwritten by qualifications and other indicators of competence. Compliance with editorial ‘recommendations’ is equated with the rectification of scholarly shortcomings. Reflection upon the role of ‘politics’ or ‘values’ in the preparation of scholarly work and in its assessment is minimal. Any concerns about the preservation of (intellectual) integrity are stilled or annulled by diligent following of editorial advice. “Simple habituation” also safeguards authors from troubles that may accompany awareness of the “stifling” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 329) effects of conformity on scholarly diversity.

At the other end of the compliance spectrum is the “rational calculation of advantage” (ibid), as endorsed by Eden’s (2008) advice to authors. In this mode, authors’ responses to editorial ‘advice’ are informed by *some* degree of reflection on the role of ‘politics’ or ‘values’ in the preparation of scholarship and its assessment. This reflection is restrictively harnessed to calculating how to optimize the likelihood of a manuscript’s acceptance – perhaps by “disguising nonconformity behind a façade of acquiescence” (Oliver, 1991: 154). Irrespective of how well-informed the ‘guidance’ is (privately) assessed to be (see Altman and Baruch, 2008), authors contrive to demonstrate dramaturgically their responsive compliance while expending minimum time and effort on this

undertaking. There is a forensic analysis of how to ‘get past’ editors and reviewers by nominally, but adequately, complying with their ‘advice’.

Whether authors’ engagement in processes of review approximate to the acquiescence of “simple habituation” or the “rational calculation of advantage^{xvii} or some blending of them, the “probability” of editorial ‘advice’ being “obeyed” (Weber, 1978: 212) is high. Along the continuum, doing what is editorially ‘advised’ to get a paper accepted in a prestigious journal assumes greater importance than safeguarding the integrity of the work under review. For participants in Milgram’s (1963) obedience experiments, rapid compliance was rewarded by collecting the \$4.50 payment, and their conformity was facilitated by the ‘scientific’ authority conferred on the ‘experimenters’ by their white lab coats. Authors engage in equivalent assessments as they seek to achieve the rapid acceptance of their manuscript. Notably, they strive to demonstrate compliance with editorial ‘advice’, a process that is smoothed when a measure of legitimacy is ascribed to the editorial process. Lingered doubts or ethical qualms are suspended as energies are channeled into complying, at least minimally but sufficiently, with the ‘advice’. Where scholarship is instrumentally shoehorned into an established ‘structure of dominancy’ (Weber, 1978: 941) – in this context, the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) - there is little incentive or inclination to consider the integrity or mental wellbeing of the (compromised) author, the solidarity and development of the scholarly community, or the wider political consequences of cynical, expedient “obedience” (see Grey, 2010) Sloterdijk, 1988).

CHANGING THE CULTURE OF SCHOLARSHIP

‘Simple habituation’ and ‘rational calculation’ each reproduce, whether deferentially or cynically, the authority ascribed to the ‘advice’ provided by editors and reviewers. The alternative is for authors to recognize and exercise their option to comply *only* with ‘advice’ assessed by them to be consistent with the value(s), and substantive purpose(s) of their scholarship^{xviii}. This ‘resistant’ response to editorial “commands” spares authors from the adoption of an ingratiating posture that may be playful (Eden, 2008) but is potentially demeaning. Resistance is undoubtedly risky as it not deferential towards revered aspects of the prevailing “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941). The challenge, which requires the affirmation of some degree of authorial power and responsibility, is necessary, however, if “diverse voices” are to be heard, and if “the frontiers of our knowledge” are to be “push[ed] forward” (Ragins, 2015: 5) in directions that question and transform established, ‘normal’ editorial and scholarly practices.

The resistant response to editorial ‘advice’ is, I suggest, consistent with the ethos and agenda of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship (Willmott, 2013)^{xix}. It directly valorizes the pluralism commended in the opening quotation from Smolin (2006). At the same time, it can be expected that resisting advice conveying “conventional wisdom” (Ragins, 2015: 6) will elicit an unwelcome, if not hostile, response, especially when big ‘C’ critical scholarship is seen to deviate from proper scientific practice (e.g. Eden, 2003; see also Grey, 2010). Open hostility is not pleasant but can be fruitful insofar as it provides occasions to debate contentious issues rather than ignore, suppress or evade them.

When championing a resistant response to editorial “commands”, I have been concerned to acknowledge the intensity of pressures to comply with ‘advice’. In this pressured context, it is disingenuous for editors to urge authors to submit or revise their work while ignoring or downplaying the pressures. But, of equal importance, it is relevant to recall that reviewers and editors are also authors. They/we are not inescapably compelled to provide, or to respond to, ‘advice’ as if it comprises a series of “commands”. There remains the possibility of resisting, or even sometimes partially escaping pressures to comply. At such moments, less formulaic and instrumentalized forms of scholarship can, and do, emerge in which “conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” is “challenge(d)” (Ragins, 2015: 6)^{xx}. If an espoused ethos of pluralism and developmentalism is to be realized, then the restrictions upon scholarship highlighted above must be openly acknowledged and discussed as a basis for strengthening editorial processes that permit and enable scholars’ to establish and retain the authorship of, and responsibility for, their work.

In its Information for Contributors, AMR explicitly invites submissions that challenge “conventional wisdom”. Scholarship that endorses and normalizes “conventional wisdom” is, by implication, unwanted. Consistent with this policy, it would be appropriate to underscore how work based in traditions that present the most potent challenge to “conventional wisdom” - including variants of CMS, but not limited to them - are especially welcome; and that editorial appointments and procedures are adopted so that submissions are genuinely *peer* reviewed. The appointment of CMS scholars, such as myself, to the position of associate editor at AMR, and the appointment of others to the journal’s editorial board is congruent with implementing a progressive, inclusive policy that fosters “ground-breaking work” (Ragins, 2015: 6). However, it is unlikely that these appointments will be sufficient to remove and replace entrenched practices that militate against publishing “a variety of

voices...irrespective of their school, background or geographic region” (Ragins, 2015: 5; see also Grey 2010). Those currently submitting their heterodox work to other management journals will require assurances that *peer* review is not just formally invoked but is substantively practiced *and* is *experienced*. Appointing associate editors and an editorial board composed of scholars with specialist knowledge of the “variety of voices” that AMR seeks to attract would be a significant first step. To assist in the selection of well-informed, developmental reviewers, authors could be invited to suggest suitable candidates. To this end, the specialist expertise of editorial board members, currently accessible on to the editor and associate editors, were made available to prospective authors.

The strongest evidence of AMR receptiveness to heterodox work is evidence of the regular publication of a “variety of voices”, including CMS scholarship. On this count, a cautious welcome can be given to articles that “challenge” and unsettle conventional wisdom about management practice, such as Crane’s (2013) ‘Modern Slavery As A Management Practice: Exploring the Conditions and Capabilities for Human Exploitation’. This article is, however, also an example of potentially critical analysis being shoehorned, by the author and/or its reviewers, into a rather mainstream, anodyne format and account. Propositions are ritually invoked to theorize its topic, and the category of slavery is reserved for the most extreme, coercive employment relations. By default, this theorization tends to condone, or at least deflect attention from, the normalization of institutionalized forms of exploitation within the everyday ‘wage slavery’ of capitalist enterprise, most brazenly exhibited in the rise of zero-hours contracts. Nonetheless, the appearance of such articles in AMR demonstrates that the journal is occasionally receptive to heterodox scholarship, even if it is engineered and/or revised to fit a conventional format.

What more, then, is required to valorize, attract and support a “variety of voices” that do not comply with, or attempt to emulate, the “conventional wisdom” (Ragins, 2015; 6) of the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5)? Above all, editorial and review processes must decisively reject a *modus vivendi* geared to fashioning and refining scholarly products that presume and reproduce the “conventional wisdom” (Ragins, 2015) - ontological, epistemological and ethical - of this “paradigm”. Escaping this restriction where, at the extreme, the honing and self-policing of monist methodological means becomes an end in itself, requires a process of collective critical self-reflection, to which this FTE is intended to contribute, so that the insights of more diverse traditions of scholarship are valued and disseminated^{xxi}.

A developmental editorial culture worthy of the name is dedicated to expanding and protecting the scholarly space in which authors articulate their distinctive and diverse voices. A major impediment to this progressive process, as Ghoshal (2005) indicates, is the schooling of management academics within the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) that is insufficiently broad or philosophically literate to comprehend and *peer* review manuscripts that breach its confines. This restrictiveness is manifest in shallow understandings and limited tolerance of other scholarly traditions. That AMR has been deeply invested in this “paradigm” is evident from reviewers that are deemed to be outstanding. During the period 2010-2014 of the 47 listed, all but 6 are North American based^{xxii}. Such numbers need to be radically rebalanced if they are to offer encouragement to heterodox authors contemplating submitting their work, including CMS, to AMR as many of these “outstanding” papers are likely to be alien, rather than “good place to start” (King and Lepak, 2011: 209).

For AMR to publish “ground-breaking work” (Ragins, 2015: 6) developed from “a variety of perspectives, including those...critical of management and organizations” (Brief, 2003: 7), this espoused purpose must be actualized in the journal’s editorial and reviewing processes. There are signs of movement in this direction. Notably, there has been some internationalization of the AMR editorial board; and one or two associate editors trained outside of North America have been appointed. But unless these changes are institutionalized, they are vulnerable to reversal. If there is to be a substantial and sustained “pushing forward [of] the frontiers of our knowledge by diverse voices irrespective of their intellectual tradition or geographic region” (Ragins, 2015), then these promising indicators of diversity must be embedded and extended. To this end, the practice of alternating between North American and non-North American *trained* editors-in-chief could be adopted; and a majority of non-North American *trained* Associate Editors and editorial board members could be appointed that are well informed about the full “variety of voices” that AMR is committed to publish^{xxiii}. Even these changes would not necessarily address the globalization of the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) in the training of researchers. Nonetheless, the proposed measures to institutionalize diversification and inclusiveness would go some considerable way in realizing AMR’s ambition to be an international journal, intellectually as well as geographically.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Nearly fifty years ago, Davis (1971) raised and addressed the concern that “most contemporary research...is dull” (ibid: 336). Today, much management research is not only dull, or even duller, but it has become pathologically

fixated on valorizing scholarly prowess. Grey (2010: 691) compares to the skills and dedication of an expert cryptic crossword solver. It is preoccupied with making marginal refinements to the unchallenging theories that currently comprise “the routinized taken-for-granted world of everyday [scholarly] life (Garfinkel, 1967)” (Davis, 1971: 311). The antidote is not simply to generate more “interesting” theory but to make theorizing more challenging and extroverted by engaging diverse forms of theory to address major, pressing issues.

To encourage this return to, and renewal, of the objectives of the journal’s “operational mission statement” (Brief, 2007: 3), this FTE has focused upon structural and political factors that impede the openness and inclusiveness necessary to achieve it. In the case of CMS, its recognition as a legitimate form of scholarship is contingent upon challenging and disarming allegations of its serial ‘failure’ to accept and endorse the tenets of “conventional wisdom” (Ragins, 2015: 6) such as the monist methodological ideal attributed to the physical sciences. That step is required because, in common with other strands of heterodox scholarship, the exclusion or airy dismissal of CMS is warranted by (mis)representations of it as *uniquely* value-laden and/or politically motivated. To its detractors, the marginal presence of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in AMR confirms its unscientific status. An alternative interpretation, presented here, ascribes the marginalization and denigration of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, to how processes of power and domination operate through ‘demand side’ institutional factors and forces (see Grey, 2010).

The diagnosis and prescriptions presented in this FTE, including the parallel drawn between studies of obedience and authors’ compliance with editorial “commands” (Weber, 1978: 212), may be derided as jaundiced, injudicious and perhaps offensive or even unhinged. Heterodox scholars who work with unfamiliar sources or perspectives, or who deviate from familiar formats, or who challenge editorial decisions, or question the suitability, competence or expertise of the selected reviewer(s), can expect to be targets of repressive tolerance – that is, “tolerance of policies, conditions, and modes of behavior which should not be tolerated” (Marcuse, 1965: 82). Such repression is institutionalized in policies and practices that ostensibly encourage but effectively marginalize, or even silence, the “diverse voices” that “push forward the frontiers of our knowledge” (Ragins, 2015: 5). For this forward “push” to occur, it is necessary to develop an editorial culture and capability that comprehends, values and supports the contribution of diverse theoretical traditions. Without it, editorial judgment, emboldened by a self-congratulatory sense of its (‘scientific’) authority, takes a sinister form: a clenched iron fist protrudes through the apparently inviting velvet glove of an overtly developmental but

operationally repressive editorial ethos.

Finally, it is worth underscoring how, from the perspective of big ‘C’ critical scholarship, current agonising over the lost relevance of management research is not interpreted as the consequence of a failure to develop sufficiently rigorous, predictive knowledge that promises to deliver substantial improvements in organizational and/or individual performance. Nor is it ascribed to executives’ incapacity, or disinclination, to absorb and endorse the theory published in ‘leading’ journals. Rather, the problem of lost relevance is theorized in terms of the alienated division of the (aspirationally value-neutral) scholar from the (inevitably value-laden) citizen (see also Willmott, 2012). I have acknowledged some signs, as yet not institutionalized, of AMR editorial policy and board membership moving in a direction that is more welcoming and supportive of heterodox scholarship, including CMS. Preparers of CMS manuscripts take note! I have also sought to provide further impetus to the movement of AMR scholarship beyond the “North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) by offering some reflections and proposals in response to the questions: What, practically, might the transformation of AMR involve? And what does it require?

Bibliography of Critical Management Studies (incomplete)

Alvesson M (2011), ed. **Classics in Critical Management Studies**. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (1992), eds., **Critical Management Studies**, London : Sage

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (1996), **Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction**, London : Sage (2nd ed. 2012)

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2003) ed., **Studying Management Critically**, London: Sage

Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T. and Willmott, H.C. (2009), eds., **Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2011) eds., **Critical Management Studies** (4 volume set), London: Sage

Bridgman T. and Stephens M (2008), ‘Institutionalizing critique: A problem of CMS’, **Ephemera**, 8, 3: 258–70.

Brooke C (2009), ed., **Critical Management Perspectives on Information Systems**, London: Elsevier Press.

Grey C, Willmott, H. (2002), Contexts of CMS, **Organization** 9, 3: 411–8.

Grey, C. and Willmott, H.C. (2005), eds., **Critical Management Studies: A Reader**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

References

Adler, P. and Jermier, J. (2005), Developing a Field with More Soul: Theory and Public Policy Research for Management Scholars, **Academy of Management Journal**, 48,6: 941-944

Altman, Y. and Baruch, Y. (2008), ‘Strategies for Revising and Resubmitting Papers to Refereed Journals’, **British Journal of Management**, 19: 89-101

Bedeian, A.G. (2003), ‘The manuscript review process: The proper roles of authors, referees, and editors’, **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 12, 331-8

Bedeian, A.G. (2004) ‘Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the Management discipline’, **Academy of Management Learning and Education** 3, 2: 198–216

Bedeian, A.G. (2008), ‘Balancing Authorial Voice and Editorial Omniscience: The “It’s My Paper and I’ll Say What I Want To” versus “Ghostwriters in the Sky” Minuet’ in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp134-140

Bell, E, Kothiyal, N. and Willmott, H.C. (2015), ‘Methodology-as-Technique and the Meaning of Rigor in Globalized Management Research’, mimeo

Boltanski, L. (2011), **On Critique: A Sociology of Emancipation**, Cambridge: Polity

Brief, A. (2003), Editor’s Comments: AMR- The Often Misunderstood Journal, **Academy of Management Review**, 28, 1: 7-8

Burrell, G. (1996), 'Normal Science, Paradigms, Metaphors, Discourses and Genealogies of Analysis' in S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord, eds., **Handbook of Organization Studies**, London: Sage

Byron, K. and Thatcher, S.M.B. (2016), Editors' Comments: "What I Know Now that I Wish I Knew Then" – Teaching Theory and Theory Building', **Academy of Management Review**, 41,1: 1-8

Clegg, S. (2015), 'Reflections: Why Old Social Theory Might Still Be Useful', **Journal of Change Management**, 15,1: 1-7

Cooper, D., Ezzamel, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2008), '[Examining "Institutionalization"](#): A Critical Theoretic Perspective' in R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby and K. Sahlin-Anderson, eds., **Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism**, London: Sage

Corley, K.G. and Gioia, D.A. (2011), 'Building Theory About Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?', **Academy of Management Review**, 36, 1: 12-32

Crane, A. (2013), Modern Slavery as a Management Practice: Exploring the Conditions and Capabilities for Human Exploitation', **Academy of Management Review**, 38, 1: 49-69

Davis, M. (1971), "That's Interesting", **Philosophy of the Social Sciences**, 1, 1: 309-344

Delbridge, R. (2014), Promising Futures: CMS, Post-Disciplinarity, and the New Public Social Science, **Journal of Management Studies**, 51,1: 95-116

Delbridge, R. and Fiss, P.C. (2013), 'Editor's Comments: Styles of Theorizing and the Social Organization of Knowledge', **Academy of Management Review**, 38,3: 325-331

Eden, D. (2003), 'Critical Management Studies and the Academy of Management Journal: Challenge and Counterchallenge', **Academy of Management Journal**, 46,4: 390-394

Eden, D. (2008), 'What Authors Need to Know to Navigate the Review Process Successfully: Understanding and Managing the Editor's Dilemma' in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 239-249

Ezzamel, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2014), '[Registering "the ethical" in Organization Theory Formation: Towards the Disclosure of an "invisible force"](#)', **Organization Studies**, 35, 7: 1013-1039

Frost, P.J. and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage

Garfinkel, H. (1967), **Studies in Ethnomethodology**, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Ghoshal, S. (2005), 'Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices', **Academy of Management Learning & Education**, 4, 1: 75–91

Horkheimer, M. (1976), 'Traditional and Critical Theory', in P. Connerton, ed. , **Critical Sociology**, London: Harmondsworth, pp206-224

King, A.W. and Lepak, D. (2011), 'Editors Comments: Myth-Busting – What We Hear and What We've Learned about AMR', **Academy of Management Review**, 36,2: 207-2 14

Li, E. Y. and Parker, M. (2013), 'Citation patterns in organization and management journals: Margins and centres', **Organization**, 20(2):299-322.

Marcuse, H. (1965), 'Repressive Tolerance' in R.P. Wolff, Moore, B. and Marcuse, H. , eds, **A Critique of Pure Tolerance**, Boston: Beacon Press, pp 81-118

Milgram, S. (1963), 'Behavioural Study of Obedience', **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, 67: 371-378

Miller, C. C. (2006), 'Peer Review in the Organizational and Management Sciences: Prevalence and Effects of Reviewer Hostility, Bias, and Dissensus', **Academy of Management Journal**, 49, 3: 425-431

Murphy, J. and Zhu, J. (2012), 'Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals', **Organization**, 19: 915-927.

Nord, W.R. (1977), ' Looking at Ourselves and We Look at Others: An Exploration of the Publication System for Organizational Research' in P.J.Frost and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage, pp 64-78

Oliver, C. (1991), 'Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes', **Academy of Management Review**, 16,1: 145-179

Popper, K. (1976), 'The Logic of the Social Sciences' in T. W. Adorno, H. Albert, R. Dahrendorf, J. Habermas, H. Pilot and K.R. Popper, eds., **The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology**, London: Heinemann, pp 87-104

Ragins, R. (2015), 'Editor's Comments: Developing Our Authors', **Academy of Management Review**, 40,1: 1-8

Røyrvik, E.A. (2013), **The Allure of Capitalism: An Ethnography of Management and the Global Financial Crisis**, New York: Berghahn Books

Sloterdijk, P. (1988), **Critique of Cynical Reason**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Smolin, L. (2006), **The Trouble with Physics: The Rise of String Theory, the Fall of Science and What Comes Next**, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Starkey, K. (2015), 'The Strange Absence of Management During the Current Financial Crisis,' **Academy of Management Review**, 40,4: 652-663

Suddaby, R. (2014), 'Editor's Comments: Why Theory', **Academy of Management Review**, 39,4: 407-411

Üsdiken, B. (2014), 'Centres and Peripheries: Research Styles and Publication Patterns in "Top" US Journals and their European Alternatives', **Journal of Management Studies**, 51,5: 764-789

Üsdiken, B. and Pasadeos, Y. (1995), Organizational Analysis in North America and Europe: A Comparison of Co-citation Networks, **Organization Studies**, 16: 503-526

Weber, M. (1949), **The Methodology of the Social Sciences**, New York: Free Press

Weber, M. (1978), **Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology**, ed. by G. Roth and C.

Wittich, Berkeley: University of California Press

Willmott, H.C. (2009), 'Science as Intervention: Recasting Weber's Moral Vision', **Organization**, 16, 1: 143-154

Willmott, H.C. (2012) 'Reframing Relevance as "Social Usefulness": A Comment on Hodgkinson and Starkey's 'Not Simply Returning to the Same Answer

Over and Over Again', **British Journal of Management**, 23: 598-604

Willmott, H. C. (2013) '"the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another": Reflections on Resistance, Gaming and Subjugation'. **Journal of Management Studies**, 50, 3: 443-473

Willmott, H.C. (2015), 'Why Institutional Theory Cannot Be Critical', **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 24, 1: 105-111

Notes

¹ This is a highly compressed revision of the submitted FTE. Notably, responses to a straw poll of the 600-plus subscribers to the Critical Management List-Serve [CRITICAL-MANAGEMENT@JISMAIL.AC.UK] - which sought to shed light on their experience of the conditions of reception of their scholarship at AMR relative to other journals and on the question of why little critical scholarship has appeared in AMR in comparison to other journals, - have been excluded or paraphrased. To comply with the word restriction imposed upon AMR FTEs, the Appendix summarizing responses to this poll has also been removed. The interested reader will find the earlier draft of this FTE at: [www \[URL TO BE INSERTED\]](#).

¹ As an indicator of the dearth of CMS scholarship appearing in AMR, a search revealed a total of 28 articles published in AMR between January 1995 to June 2015 containing the phrase 'critical management'. This number is perhaps suggestive of a modest degree of recognition and inclusion of (big 'C') critical scholarship in the journal. Yet, on closer examination, little support for this proposition can be garnered. 4 of the 28 references appear in book reviews; 5 appear in editorial comments, notes or responses; 10 are in the References to articles; 1 appears in the key words; 3 articles use the phrase 'critical management' to refer to a (mainstream) competency or task, or just mention it in passing; and 1 is listed in publications received. That leaves 4 articles during two decades of AMR in which there is, at best, anything more than a fleeting recognition of, or trivial engagement with, 'critical management'.

¹ <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

¹ According to the AMR office, I was assigned 42 manuscripts, rather than 28. The overall acceptance rate for submitted to AMR is around 5%. So, unless CMS submissions significantly exceed this average rate, the current prospect of CMS papers appearing in AMR is vanishingly small. It is this issue that this FTE seeks to address.

¹ The percentages of non-US authors are: 2012/46%; 2013/37%; 2014/59%; 2015/65%. The current indications are that 2016 will contain at least the same number of non-US authors as for 2014/15. In 2009, 16% of board members were non-US based. This had increased to 37% by 2015.

¹ I have served on the AMR Board since 2003. Rick Delbridge served as associate editor during the previous editorial term. Currently 10 editorial board members (7%), selected primarily on the basis of their evaluation as reviewers, indicate an expertise in CMS

¹ <http://aom.org/Divisions-and-Interest-Groups/Academy-of-Management-Division---Interest-Group-Domain-Statements.aspx#cms>. When drawing attention to the CMS Domain Statement, my primary purpose is not to endorse its claim that organizations and/or management are 'instruments of domination', etc. I readily acknowledge that the Statement is not one to which all CMS proponents and sympathizers unreservedly subscribe. My concern, instead, is to highlight the presence and significance of (differences of) values for our understanding of processes of theory formation and dissemination.

¹ The papers identified as 'best' from 2000-2103 (the latest date when preparing this FTE in June 2015) had 29 authors (many papers were co-authored). Of these, 8 were not North American based, and only two of them had not received PhDs from North American schools. Neither of these, who received their PhDs in the UK and the Netherlands respectively, was a lead author. In general, what is assessed to be the 'best' research published in AMR does not originate from authors trained outside of North America - the very population of scholars who, to date, have produced most of the heterodox scholarship, including contributions to CMS. However, as argued in the body of the paper the North American management paradigm" is intellectual, not exclusively geographical.

¹ http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/About_AOM/Governance/AOM_Code_of_Ethics.pdf

¹ <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

¹ <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

¹ It could be argued, compellingly, that other strands of CMS (e.g. the insights of Marx or Foucault) are equally relevant for informing this analysis. Weber's thinking has been selected because AMR readers are likely to be more familiar it.

¹ The main exceptions to this neglect are Frost and Taylor's (1977, 2nd ed) collection *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* and Baruch *et al*'s (2008) collection *Opening the Black Box of Editorship*. Each contains a number of chapters on the 'demand side' of the process to which I make reference. See also Miller,(2006) and Grey (2010).

¹ Weber's ideas about power and domination are adopted not because they are the most authoritative or compelling but because his work is highly influential in the field of organization studies and is therefore likely to be both more familiar and convivial to AMR readers.

¹ Within structure(s) of domination, there is an interdependence of the ostensibly "powerful" (editors) and the "powerless" (authors). Notably, the reputation of journal editors and their associated capacity to exercise power depends, to some degree, on the experiences of authors.

¹ Editorial communications may, in addition, be conditioned and compromised by other (e.g. defensive or nepotistic) considerations. They are, nonetheless, ostensibly based upon impersonal, expert evaluations framed within impartial, bureaucratic procedures as set out in editorial policy and advice to reviewers. At AMR, reviewer selection, for example, is, in principle, based upon ascribed expertise and performance is closely monitored and measured.

¹ Each of the responses to editorial 'advice' - 'habituation', 'calculation' and 'resistance' - is a Weberian "ideal type" in the sense that it is a "one-sided accentuation[s] of one or more points of view" (Weber, 1949: 89). Each orientation is one to which authors tend to approximate, and may alternate between, blend or prevaricate over.

¹ As Oliver (1991: 156) observes, institutional theory struggles to account for resistance: it is “unable to explain the continuing reappearance of alternative schools that attempt to make a virtue of their active departure from institutional beliefs and commonly held definitions...”. See also Cooper, Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008 ; Willmott, 2015.

¹ Citing <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>. The critical interrogation of mundane, ‘practical consciousness’ is no panacea. Its impact may be limited. It may fuel cynicism and gaming when, for example, reflection is harnessed to securing authors’ and/or editors’ investments in normality. Nonetheless, when critical insights into the limits of ‘normal science’ and the regressive effects of the scholarly “structure of dominance” (Weber, 1978: 941) are not ignored or shrugged off, subjection to its norms may be weakened, and “the frontiers of our knowledge” may be “pushed back” (Ragins, 2015: 5)

¹ This is consistent with Weber’s belief that what differentiates human beings from other life forms and events in nature is the capacity to make such a commitment while recognizing that it involves a leap of faith that can be rationally framed but never rationally justified. An example of this commitment is the embrace by exponents of big ‘C’ critical scholarship of emancipation as the ultimate value, in which is incorporated an awareness that whatever value and meaning is ascribed to scholarly activity is inherently a matter of contestation.

¹ <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Outstanding-Reviewers.aspx>. There was a marked increase in 2015 when 4/15 were non-US based,

¹ It may be objected that such reforms should be discounted as they might provoke resistance and other negative consequences. However, that takes insufficient account of the *institutionalized*, but currently normalized, negative consequences of the existing arrangements. No system is perfect but if the ambition is to overcome “insular thinking” (King and Lepak, 2011:209) and “engage a full range of scholars who belong to the Academy of Management” (ibid: 210), then something more substantial and ‘structural’ must be done to reassure prospective authors that “their theoretical contributions...are valued by AMR” (ibid).

FTE 1

WHAT IF OUR THEORY WAS CRITICAL? DRAFT

‘We do research because even the smartest amongst us doesn’t know the answer. *Often it lies in a direction other than the one pursued by the mainstream.* In those cases, and even when the mainstream guesses right, *the progress of science depends on healthy support from scientists who hold divergent views*’ (Smolin, 2006: xxi-xxii, emphases added)

‘in most of the varieties of social action domination plays a considerable role, even where it is not obvious at first sight’ (Weber, 1978: 941)

This essay considers the conditions of possibility for critical scholarship in AMR. Its presumption is that ‘healthy support’ (ibid) for the inclusion of the theorizing of ‘scientists with divergent views’ (ibid), such as those of critical management scholars, will have progressive consequences. The preparation of this essay has been prompted by an anomaly: much critical theoretic scholarship appears in other generalist and specialist management journals but little is published in what is widely viewed as the

leading theory journal in the field.

Why might this be? On the supply side, it could be that AMR receives little critical scholarship of requisite quality. On the demand side, there may be limited receptiveness to such submissions.

Restricted supply and weak demand can be mutually reinforcing. The focus of *From the Editor* (FTE) pieces is generally upon supply as editors like myself urge authors to render their work more AMR-ready. The present, counterbalancing contribution concentrates on the demand side. I reflect (critically) on conditions and practices that may inhibit the submission of critical scholarship, and so dim the prospects of its publication.

The essay comprises two main sections. The first outlines what is distinctive about critical scholarship since familiarity with it amongst AMR readers cannot be assumed. The second section applies a critical perspective, primarily informed by Weber's ideas about power and domination, to examine the practices of scholarly publishing and how the editorial culture of AMR might be (further) reformed to attract and host critical scholarship.

CRITICAL SCHOLARSHIP?

Let's start with my choice of title. It is, of course, a provocation: isn't 'critical' a defining feature of *all* scholarship worthy of the name? And, isn't any contrary assessment arrogant, patronizing or oxymoronic? Proponents of critical scholarship stress the *distinctively critical motivation and character* of their work. They highlight the specificity of the values and assumptions that underpin and motivate it, in contrast to critical *facets* of more established – 'mainstream' or 'traditional' - forms of scholarship that are largely concerned with removing obstacles to the delivery of a presumed value neutrality.

At the centre of critical scholarship is skepticism about the espoused value-neutrality of established, 'normal science' scholarship. The claim to neutrality is regarded as a seductive professional ideology which harbors and institutionalizes a technocratic vision of science and society wherein existing ends are taken as givens, and these are served by the evidence generated by ostensibly value-neutral science. It is by debunking the necessity of this ideology that a space is opened up for engaging the practical question

of what interests and values do, and could, guide the production of forms of scientific knowledge. It is precisely the voicing and addressing of this practical question that the presumption of value-neutrality in conventional (small 'c' critical) scholarship acts to silence. This presumption results in (big 'C') critical scholarship being devalued for its lack of objectivity. Maligned for being (uniquely) biased by politics, it is assigned a pre-scientific, if not anti-scientific, status.

To better understand the distinction between (small 'c') scholarship that is critical and (big 'C') critical scholarship, it is relevant to refer to how Horkheimer (the first director of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory), distinguishes "critical" from "traditional" theory (Horkheimer, 1976). The theory of "traditional" social science, Horkheimer contends, is based upon a division between *the theorist qua 'scientist'* who "regards social reality and its products as extrinsic to him" (ibid: 220) and *the theorist qua 'citizen'* who "exercises his interest in [society] through political articles" etc (ibid). Horkheimer's objection to this division is that it uncritically reflects and reproduces an alienated condition of existence – not only for scientists but also for citizens in societies where a value neutral conception of science is widely accepted. By naturalizing the present, and by de-historicising its own formation, "traditional" theory implicitly supports the *status quo* as it (mis)represents itself as value-neutral, and therefore uniquely authoritative. It is by challenging and narrowing the scientist/citizen division, Horkheimer contends, that the ideology of value neutrality is debunked, thereby enabling the enlightening potential of science to become unified with the "goal...of man's emancipation from slavery" (ibid: 224). In other words, (big 'C') critical scholarship calls for a revitalization and (re)connection of the enlightenment impetus of science to dispel forms of ignorance, both unforced and manipulated, with the practical emancipatory intent of reducing and eventually eliminating avoidable, socially unnecessary, suffering.

The case for critical scholarship made by Horkheimer has been reprised recently by Boltanski (2011), the prominent French social theorist and student of Bourdieu, who also distinguishes "critical theory" from "traditional theory". Big 'C' critical scholarship, Boltanski argues, is attentive to "the discontents of actors, explicitly consider(ing) them in the very labour of theorization, in such a way as to alter their relationship to social reality and, thereby, that social reality itself, in the direction of *emancipation*" (ibid: 5, original emphasis). He conceives proponents of critical scholarship to understand scientific practice as inescapably embedded in social reality: the scientist is simultaneously and inescapably a

citizen. When taking a comparatively non-alienated form, scholarship actively strives to detect, address and facilitate the removal of the socially unnecessary “discontents of actors” (ibid). This conception of critical scholarship affirms Popper’s proposition that “we cannot rob the scientist of his partisanship without also robbing him of his humanity, and we cannot suppress or destroy his value judgments without destroying him as a human being *and as a scientist*” (ibid: 97, emphasis in original). However, in contrast to Popper’s scientific critical rationalism, where truth is ostensibly pursued for its own sake, (big ‘C’) critical scholarship is inspired by, and geared to, the emancipatory potential of knowledge. From the latter standpoint, the ambition of mainstream, ‘uncritical’ science - ‘to *separate* purely scientific value problems of truth, relevance, simplicity, and so forth from extra-scientific problems’ (ibid: 98) – is assessed to be both practically infeasible and ethically indefensible.

“We need diverse voices...”

The entrenched investment of scholars in ‘normal science’ helps to account for hostile reactions to the claims and contributions of (big “C”) critical scholarship, including those of critical management studies (CMS^{xxiv}), as outlined in the previous section and signaled by the title of this FTE. The devaluing of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, has been directly confronted and parried in the current AMR editor’s introductory FTE:

‘We need diverse voices that push forward the frontiers of our knowledge. We need to be inclusive and open to a variety of voices...irrespective of their school, background, or geographic region’ (Ragins, 2015: 5)

The message is clear: AMR is open to all kinds of scholarship. Yet, if the link between “inclusiveness” and “pushing back the frontiers of knowledge” were already well established, the call for “diverse voices...irrespective of their school, background, or geographic region” (ibid) would be redundant. In order to address and accommodate the call for “diverse voices”, it is relevant to address the conditions that restrict their expression. What are the institutional conditions that exclude or stifle their voices? What has to change in order for critical voices to be heard so that the frontiers of knowledge may be

pushed forward?

That many voices are largely absent or unheard, and so make only a marginal contribution so little to fulfilling AMR's espoused mission, is circumstantially evident from the dearth of AMR 'best papers' published in AMR by authors trained outside the dominant "North American management paradigm" (Byron and Thatcher, 2016:5) (http://amr.aom.org/cgi/collection/2011_amr_best_article_winners). The papers identified as 'best' from 2000-2103 (the latest date) had 29 authors (many papers were co-authored). Of these, 8 were not North American based, and only two of them had not received PhDs from North American schools. Neither of these authors, who received their PhDs in the UK and the Netherlands respectively, was a lead author. So, in general, what is assessed to be the 'best' research published in AMR does not originate from authors trained outside of North America - that is, the very population of scholars who, to date, have produced most of the heterodox scholarship, including contributions to CMS. In this context, the question begged is: why would authors submit their work to a journal that rarely admits, and shows so little appreciation of the value of, work produced by scholars trained outside of North America, let alone the work of CMS scholars? The risk for AMR is that the absence of work which is most congruent with its espoused mission is published elsewhere, and that its 'leading' role in the field is lost as opportunities to attract and develop manuscripts that "push forward the frontiers of knowledge" (Ragins, 2015: 5) are missed or spurned.

To shed some light on why so little critical scholarship has appeared in AMR in comparison to other journals, I invited the 600- plus members of the critical management list-serve [CRITICAL-MANAGEMENT@JISCMAIL.AC.UK] to share their experience of the conditions of reception of their scholarship at AMR relative to other journals. [Throughout this essay, I make illustrative reference to the responses of critical management list-serv members (identified as Responses summarized in the Appendix)]. As an indicator, one Respondent reported that in his/her experience of submitting critical scholarship to AMR, its reviewers "displayed a fundamental lack of appreciation of the scholarly traditions in which I work". S/he added that the submission was treated "like some kind of flawed graduate work...by people clearly unfamiliar with more European styles of thought". Since AMR enjoys an enviable reputation for the dedication and professionalism of its reviewers, such comments more likely betray a narrowness rather than casualness of associate editors or members of the journal's

reviewer pool. Another respondent anticipated that publishing in AMR would require “writing in a style that is not honest to oneself” – which suggests that successful revision of manuscripts would require compliance with an inhospitable framing, or uncomfortable shoehorning, of ideas into an alien scholarly tradition and/or format. The representativeness of such responses is, of course, unknown and probably unknowable, and they are open to diverse interpretations – notably, as paranoid fantasies, wounded responses to rejection or as symptoms of narcissism. To interpret them *only*, or even primarily, as expressions of defensiveness and self-rationalization may, however, itself be symptomatic of a methodologically monist and philosophically shallow culture of scholarship whose restrictiveness has prompted the current AMR editor’s call for the inclusion of “diverse voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5).

VALUES, ANOMALIES AND REFLECTIVE DISTANCE

Norms that confer legitimacy upon established practices are routinely taken-for-granted by their adherents. To dis-close the conventionality of such practices necessitates gaining some *reflective distance* from their self-affirming grip. Only when entrenched norms become unsettled does it become apparent that they operate in a limiting manner. The call to be “inclusive and open to a variety of voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5), so as to push back the frontiers of knowledge, is an invitation to break free of such restrictiveness.

It is with the issue of inclusiveness that Smolin’s *The Trouble with Physics*, which provides the opening quote for this essay, engages. Smolin (2006) reflects upon the current domination of physics by proponents of string theory - a field in which he has been active for many years but from which he has developed sufficient distance to become a vocal critic^{xxv}. String theory, Smolin observes, has become so established that “it is practically career suicide for young theoretical physicists not to join the field” (ibid: xx). There is, I suggest, a parallel with the field of management where (big ‘C’) critical scholars encounter similar forms of exclusion^{xxvi}, in part because many exponents of mainstream scholarship, like string theorists, consider that “reflection on foundational problems ha[s] no place in research” (ibid: xxiii). Meta-theorizing is perturbing and unwelcome as it may surface and destabilize the presumptions of mainstream management scholarship. Accordingly, scholarship that deviates from, or takes issue with, variants of “traditional theory” is assigned to other domains of social science (e.g. the ‘pure’

disciplines of sociology or economics or to specialists in the philosophy of social science). This division of labor marginalizes the relevance of such meta-theoretical awareness amongst management scholars, including the authors and reviewers of manuscripts submitted to its leading theory journal. To be clear, in his reflections on physics, Smolin does not seek to suppress the contributions made by ‘normal science’ in the form of string theory. Instead, he commends the opening up of the field to “the reflective and foundational style of the early-twentieth-century pioneers” (ibid: xxiii). Many (big ‘C’) critical scholars would welcome a similar opening up of the field of management, and of AMR more specifically, to the seminal thinking of its pioneers (e.g. Marx and Weber).

Making comparisons between the physical and social sciences, including the field of management, is inherently hazardous (Davis, 2010) as objections may be legitimately raised on ethical as well as ontological and epistemological grounds. Here, analysis is focused upon *the social organization of knowledge production*. In this regard, consideration of the Academy of Management’s (AoM) Code of Ethical Conduct is instructive as it explicitly commends scholarship that “views issues *from a multiplicity of perspectives, including the perspective of those who are the least advantaged*”. (http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/About_AOM/Governance/AOM_Code_of_Ethics.pdf cited in Adler and Jermier, 1995: 941, emphasis added). This clause is not elaborated further or justified, but it is plausible to infer that it bestows legitimacy upon theoretical perspectives underpinned by heterogeneous assumptions.

In which case, practices that discourage or impede the examination of “issues from multiple perspectives” (ibid) would seem to contravene the AoM Code of Ethics. The existence of such impediments is signaled by a Respondent who comments upon the “clear writing” expectation of AMR. For this Respondent, the experience of submitting work to the journal had left a strong impression that “there is a certain ‘one best way’ style [that] *prejudices against writing about difficult ideas*” (emphasis added). The good sense of insisting upon “clear writing” might seem unobjectionable, and perhaps incontestable. However, if the communication of some demanding ideas requires “sentences to be read more than once and a dictionary to be at hand”, then a seemingly benign and unobjectionable requirement – to write clearly – may have exclusionary consequences. The notion of ‘clarity’ is not immune to critical scrutiny. Arguably, its (rhetorical) attribution to a text is often contingent upon a

familiarity with the *tradition*, and the associated ‘path-dependency’ of the meaning it ascribes to concepts - such as ‘organization’ or ‘management’, or indeed ‘science’. If the tradition in which an author works is unfamiliar to a reader or reviewer, it will *ipso facto* be difficult to understand; and this difficulty may well be attributed to the author’s lack of clarity rather than the reader’s limited familiarity, and possible impatience, with the conventions of the tradition. To take another example of how an impalpable normative structure can pervade a culture of scholarship, consider the observation of another Respondent: that from “a European perspective”, the division between theory and data, which is based upon “an assumed hypothetico-deductive model of ‘science’ made it “very hard to develop an historical argument”. It is restrictions of this kind that routinely and almost invisibly impede the scholarly examination of “issues from a multiplicity of perspectives” (AoM Code of Ethical Conduct), including variants of CMS.

Contrasting Ethics in Knowledge Production

In one of comparatively few contributions to (big ‘C’) critical scholarship published in AMR, Jacques (1992) makes this issue more visible when he attends to how, in the words of the out-going AMR editor, forms of theory do “more than abstract and organize knowledge” as they also *signal the values upon which knowledge is built*’ (Suddaby, 2014: 407, emphasis added; see also Willmott, 2009; Ezzamel and Willmott, 2014). Jacques identifies two broad “ethics” of inquiry: “judgment” and “care”^{xxvii}.

When subscribing, more or less consciously, to an ‘ethic of judgment’, Jacques argues, scholars produce knowledge that exemplifies what, in their recent FTE, Delbridge and Fiss (2013: 328) call “net-effects thinking” (after Ragin, 2008). Such thinking bears a strong family resemblance to what Horkheimer (1976) terms “traditional theory” (see above) in which the social world is explained “mainly in terms of linear relationships that take a correlational form of ‘the more of X, the more of Y’” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 328). When guided by this “ethic”, “truth is assumed to exist external to the [researcher and] the role of knowledge is to reflect this truth as *accurately* as possible” (Jacques, 1992: 585, emphasis added) - an accuracy that is pursued and validated by following “a ‘neutral’ system of rules” (ibid). Its contributions to knowledge thereby assume and reproduce a subject-object division that allows very limited attentiveness to the presence of “the goals and values of the researcher” in the production of

knowledge, including their shaping of the conditions and consequences of an espoused value-neutrality. Following rules that are equivalent to those ascribed to the physical sciences provides an assurance that “the ‘truth will emerge’, transcending the values, opinions, and social goals of the contestants” (ibid).

When subscribing to an “ethic of care”, in contrast, researchers give priority to the question of how knowledge “affects people’s lives” so that the “*first concern* of the researcher is the consequences [the research] will have on the lives it affects” (ibid: 588, emphasis added). This ethic transgresses the methodological division between the subject (researcher) and object (researched) as it rejects any suggestion that facts about the latter can be untangled from the values of the former. The objectivist impulse to achieve compliance with the rules ascribed to the methods of the physical sciences is abandoned as it is considered to be incompatible with the (open, reflexive) ontology of the social world. In scholarship underpinned by the “ethic of care”, the “goal of theory development is to create a story that helps one to make sense of one’s own experience’ in a way that also has a ‘role in creating change” (ibid: 588).

As already noted, Suddaby (2014) helpfully identifies values as the basis of knowledge production and, in so doing, he implies that much scholarship is engaged in contriving and conveying an appearance of neutrality or impartiality by denying, ignoring or obscuring its value-basis. This contrivance is manifest in contributions to mainstream scholarship that deny, and so refuse to address, the pervasive and inescapable influence of values. Its advocates are seen to engage in forms of collective self-deception or to subscribe cynically to an ideology of scientism when, for example, it is presumed that the influence of values can be neutralized by methodological fiat. This is an example of how, as Delbridge and Fiss (2013: 329) put it, the “hegemony of correlational net-effects theorizing in AMR stifles other styles of theorizing” (ibid: 329)^{xxviii}. As Boltanski (2011: 4) has observed, such (mainstream) scholarship “seek(s) to conform to the vulgate of neutrality”. Critical scholarship, in contrast, “contain(s) critical judgments on the social order which the analyst assumes responsibility for in his own name, thus abandoning any pretensions to neutrality” (ibid).

That knowledge of management and organization is inescapably infused by values points to a “crack” in what Suddaby (2014) refers to as our field’s “considerable consensus on what theory

is: theory is simply a way of imposing conceptual order on the empirical complexity of the phenomenal world” (ibid: 407). From a CMS standpoint, such “consensus” is phoney as “cracks” (ibid) become immediately apparent when questions are raised about “why we need theory and what role it should play in creating, maintaining, and shaping what type of knowledge we value in the field” (ibid:). The vaunted “consensus” is a fig-leaf deployed to conceal difference and avoid debate around *how* “conceptual order” is “imposed” and, more specifically, how “empirical complexity” is theorized.

In response to the concerns identified by Suddaby (2014), strenuous efforts may be made to ignore, paper over, or obscure those unwelcome, telltale “cracks”. It may be claimed that the “cracks” will gradually disappear as our ‘science’ matures. Defenders of the “consensus about theory” may also calculate that open acknowledgement of differences is best avoided or “stifled” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 329) as it draws attention to an unseemly problem for which no effective solution has been found. *If* knowledge is indeed build upon values in the plural, as Suddaby (2014: 407) contends, then disagreements - apparent in the “cracks” - about what is to count as a *bona fide* contribution to social science are endemic. One of the most visible of the “cracks” in management theory is the emergence of CMS and its institutionalization in the CMS Division of the Academy of Management (AoM).

CRITICAL MANAGEMENT STUDIES

“Our premise is that structural features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility often turn organizations into instruments of domination and exploitation. Driven by a shared desire to change this situation, we aim in our research, teaching, and practice to develop critical interpretations of management and society and to generate radical alternatives. Our critique seeks to connect the practical shortcomings in management and individual managers to the demands of a socially divisive and ecologically destructive system within which managers work” (<http://aom.org/Divisions-and->

The Domain Statement of the CMS Division of the AoM presents a strikingly different and, in the context of the established scholarship of the Academy, anomalous conception of the kind of theory that, to adopt Suddaby's terminology, is "needed", and of the "type of knowledge" that is "valued"^{xxxix}. As Delbridge (2014), a past AMR Associate Editor, has observed, many exponents of CMS are concerned to "highlight such issues as control and exploitation, the inequities and unitarist assumptions of management practices" (ibid: 99). When addressing such issues, there is no methodological equivalent in CMS to the (standardizing) benchmark(s) favored by exponents of scholarship drawn to an 'ethic of judgment'^{xxx}. The single, logical exception is the hostility of CMS exponents to scholarship governed by methodological monism as this directly opposes, or pays mere lip service to, the inclusive plurality advocated by Ragins (2015) and endorsed by CMS. Exponents of CMS share Suddaby's (2014) assessment that "the effectiveness of science" (ibid: 409) is not primarily attributable, to "its attention to method". Rather, the more important consideration is scientists' collective capacity for "reflection" (ibid: 410). CMS comprises diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives that, collectively, facilitate and contribute to processes reflection as they detect, address and challenge the many forms of domination and exploitation institutionalized in the "structural features of contemporary society" (CMS Domain Statement). Common to the diverse constituencies of CMS is an explicit, value-based, "shared desire" to undertake research that can contribute to highlighting and changing the dysfunctionalities (e.g. inequality, "exploitation", "ecological irresponsibility") harbored and perpetuated by those "structural features" (CMS Domain Statement) – features that are present and perpetuated within and through organizations and management practices, including the Academy.

This desire and attendant focus is congruent with directing critical attention to the existence of "*structural and political aspects of the social organization of knowledge*" (Delbridge and Foss, 2013: 325, emphases added). Exponents of CMS seek to disclose and question the role and value of these "aspects" of knowledge production. The search is expressive of a concern that failure to "change our scholarly traditions in ways that enhance theoretical relevance to practice...we will condemn ourselves to increasing irrelevance" (Corley and Gioia, 2011: 29). Recall that an aim of critical scholarship is to

“connect the practical shortcomings in management...to the demands of a socially divisive and ecologically destructive system in which managers work” (CMS Domain Statement).

Being “problem driven” (Corley and Gioia, 2011: 22) and/or anticipating “opportunities for enlightened practice” (ibid: 22, note 5), CMS contributes to a prospective shift in the conception of theorizing and theory building - from one devoted to the accumulation of “objectified, static knowledge” (ibid: 22) to one where knowledge production, including the development of theory, is dynamic and processual. Since no distinction is made between scientists as “theorists”, and as “citizens” (see earlier discussion), the shift involves “a recursive dialogue between theorists and reflective practitioners” (ibid: 23; Willmott, 2014). It is therefore responsive to the call for building the capacity to “anticipat[e] and influenc[e] the type of managerial knowledge needed to deal with coming societal and organizational concerns” (ibid: 23) - such as sustainability and climate change. The strength of affinity between Corley and Gioia’s (2011) diagnosis of the shortcomings of mainstream scholarship and the aspirations of CMS is, arguably, evident in their ‘answer’ to the question: ‘What constitutes a theoretical contribution?’.

“...if theory does not have the potential for foresight and or changing the conversation, why do theory building? Our charge, then, is to become more expansive in our theorizing, to work to infuse our theorizing with significance for practice – present and future – and to ‘give sense’ to wider communities within society about the relevance of our theoretical work” (ibid: 27)

Specifically, CMS attends to how organizations are developed and deployed as “instruments of domination and exploitation” (CMS Domain Statement) in which “patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility” are routinely fostered and normalized (CMS Domain Statement). CMS is “expansive”; it is directly concerned with theorizing that has “significance for practice”; and it is of relevance to “wider communities” (see Willmott, 2012).

The AMR Deficit

Are the concerns set out by Corley and Gioia (2011), and shared by exponents of CMS, prioritized, or even regularly present, in articles appearing in AMR? A perusal of its contents reveals a deficit of

contributions guided by values oriented to changing our “scholarly traditions in ways that enhance theoretical relevance to practice” (Corley and Gioia, 2011: 27), let alone articles that prioritize the concerns of CMS, as set out in the Domain Statement, which focus upon practices of organization and management as “instruments of domination and exploitation” (CMS Domain Statement).

As an indicator of the dearth of CMS scholarship appearing in AMR, a search revealed a total of 28 articles published in AMR between January 1995 to June 2015 contained the phrase ‘critical management’. This number of references is perhaps suggestive of a modest degree of recognition and inclusion of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in the journal. Yet, on closer examination of these references, little support is found for this proposition. 4 of the 28 references appear in book reviews; 5 appear in editorial comments, notes or responses; 10 are in the References to articles; 1 appears in the key words; 3 articles use the phrase ‘critical management’ to refer to a (mainstream) competency or task, or just mention it in passing; and 1 is listed in publications received. That leaves 4 articles during two decades of AMR in which there is, at best, anything more than a fleeting recognition, or trivial engagement with, ‘critical management’.

Those who are hostile to (big ‘C’) critical scholarship may construe this analysis as a confirmation of the sub-standard – unscientific or prescientific – status of CMS. The vanishingly marginal presence of CMS in AMR is taken to confirm its deficiency as science (e.g. failure to comply with the protocols developed with scholarship regulated by an “ethic of judgment” that routinely bestow scientific status upon scholarship), and so justifies its exclusion. An alternative interpretation is that the marginalization of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship is a symptom of what Delbridge and Foss term the “structural and political aspects of the social organization of knowledge” (ibid: 325). In other words, from the latter perspective, it is the operation of power in the form of, institutional factors and forces (“structural and political aspects”) that accounts for the lack of critical scholarship in AMR. That assessment finds some support in the observation that CMS scholarship is widely published in management and organization journals such as *Organization Studies* and *Human Relations* as well as in many other well-regarded specialist international outlets like *Organization* and *Journal of Management Inquiry*.

The CMS deficit in AMR is apparent in the range of limited issues studied as well as the scarcity of

CMS approaches to theorizing those issues. Consider the issue of climate change identified by Corley and Gioia (2011). Between January 2005 and June 2015, 10 articles with Climate Change in the title appeared in the journal *Organization*. None appeared in AMR. Or consider postcolonialism and queer theory. During the same period, 2 articles with the term postcolonialism in the abstract appeared in AMR compared to 8 in *Organization*. No articles with queer theory in the abstract were published in AMR compared to 3 in *Organization*.

It might be counter-argued that the deficit of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship attributed to AMR is simply indicative of its broader editorial orientation, in contrast to the specialist ‘niches’ occupied by journals like *Organization*. Unlike *Organization*, however, AMR is explicitly and exclusively a theory journal. Might it not be expected to contain a substantial number of articles that draw upon influential contemporary strands of social theory, including variants of critical theory, from across the social sciences? AMR’s ‘Information to Contributors’ explicitly states that the journal is “particularly interested in interesting (sic) and important theoretical advances that incorporate *thought from multiple disciplines*.” (<http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>, accessed 20 June 2015, emphasis added). *Prima facie*, there is a significant disconnect between an espoused openness to “theoretical advances that incorporate *thought from multiple disciplines*” and the dearth of CMS scholarship in AMR. In the second part of this FTE, I apply CMS scholarship to offer a diagnosis of this disconnect as I consider its conditions of development, reproduction and potential transformation.

THE ACADEMY AND DOMINATION

It was suggested in the previous section that the deficit of CMS scholarship in AMR is attributable to the unacknowledged presence of significant but unaddressed “structural and political” restrictions (Delbridge and Foss, 2013: 325) upon “theoretical advances” within that “multiple disciplines” that AMR seeks to “incorporate” (AMR Information to Contributors). In the remainder of this essay, the focus is primarily upon the ‘demand side’ of scholarly work as I consider editorial processes that can enable, but may also constrain, inclusiveness within AMR – an inclusiveness that is *a* condition of possibility for ‘our theory [becoming] critical’. To study these processes, I invoke a staple element of

modern organizational analysis: Max Weber's thinking on power and domination that is central to his examination of modern practices of organizing and managing which, in the contemporary context, extend to those that comprise the processes of scholarly knowledge production (see also Nord, 1977).

Scholarly Publishing, Domination and 'Advice'

The generation and refinement of scholarly knowledge relies heavily upon an editorial and review process that incorporates practices of organizing and management. At the heart of the process is the *particular culture of scholarship* into which the journal's editors and reviewers have been inducted. Given the centrality of this culture to scientific knowledge production, it is remarkable how little critical scrutiny it, and editorial processes more specifically, have received, especially in the very field where much of the most celebrated scholarly work on management and organization is published^{xxxii}.

How and when might Weber's thinking on power and domination be relevant for analyzing editorial processes as core activities of the Academy? Only, I conjecture, to the extent that there is a (value-based) inclination to contemplate the possibility of these processes being organized within and through relations of power and domination where, following Weber, *power* is conceived as "the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behavior of other persons" (Weber, 1978: 942); and *domination* is defined as "the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) will be obeyed by a certain group of persons" (ibid, 212:)^{xxxiii}. Relations of power are, for Weber, key to the analysis of all forms of organized life (see also Frost and Taylor, 1977). Power relations become institutionalized and normalized wherever the "imposition of...will" (ibid: 942) becomes routine. In editorial processes of review, power can, from a Weberian perspective, be seen to be regularly exercised through decisions that result in the rejection, conditional acceptance, or acceptance of a manuscript. While exercises of power may ultimately take the form of naked coercion, Weber stresses that the imposition of will is more widely enacted, and is generally most effective, when benefitting from some degree of legitimacy. It is then at least partly experienced as an exercise of authority, not domination.

In editorial processes, power is most overtly exercised in decision letters that either communicate rejection or, when inviting resubmission of a manuscript, contain the more or less veiled threat of future

rejection, taking the form of an ostensibly considerate warning: *Achtung!* The resubmission of your manuscript is “high risk!” or even “very high risk!”. If the author is disinclined to comply with editorial ‘advice’ or if s/he fails to provide compelling reasons to justify refusal/defiance, then the likely (but not inevitable) fate of the submission is sealed. In the face of the prospect of rejection, a compliant response to ‘advice’ is widely normalized, as distilled in the advice offered by Eden (2008) to authors who contemplate dissent: “my advice is: don’t fight back. It consumes enormous energy and it arouses reviewer animosity. Furthermore, it makes you look argumentative and, worse in the minds of reviewers and editors, unresponsive” (ibid: 246).

Eden’s candid articulation of the dominant narrative of editor-author communication, in which questioning the authority ascribed to editors and/or reviewers is strongly discouraged, is justified on the wholly plausible grounds that it is likely to arouse “animosity” by seeming to be “argumentative” and “unresponsive, rather than receptive. Eden then exempts from this general advice any issue that is “of prime importance” or that would be “intellectually dishonest” (ibid). But this exemption rather begs the question of why dissent would be expressed unless it is felt by the author that the issue is of sufficient importance and/or that they are being asked (‘commanded’?) to revise their manuscript in a way that transgresses their intentions and, ultimately, compromises their intellectual commitments?

Accommodating the ‘recommendations’ of reviewers and editors by “playing by the[ir] rules” (ibid: 247) is, in the dominant narrative, the more appropriate, justifiable response. Why? Because, as Eden candidly puts it, the way “to get your work published” (ibid) without consuming “enormous energy” (ibid: 246). This expedient but also potentially demeaning response is, of course, smoothed when authors (are trained to) believe, or are able to persuade themselves, that the editorial and review process is (fairly) legitimate.

Legitimacy, in respect of editorial processes for scientific journals, is most closely connected to Weber’s conception of rational authority where, in his words, “obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order. It extends to the persons exercising the authority of office under it by virtue of the formal legality of their commands and only within the scope of authority of the office” (ibid: 215-6). What relevance, then, does Weber’s conception of *domination* have for the analysis of the world of scholarly publication? If it is assumed that the academic world is not devoid of power and domination, is

editorial ‘advice’ to an author an example of a “command” (Weber, 1978: 212)? One possible response is to insist that the contents of editorial decision letters comprise no more than recommendations that authors are at liberty to address or ignore. It is therefore implausible, and indeed farfetched, to claim that editorial ‘guidance’ is equivalent to the commands issued to armed forces. Without denying a difference of degree between scholarly and military institutions, the scare quotes around ‘advice’ and ‘guidance’ suggest that such terms have become euphemisms for what are, or are becoming, interpreted and internalized as commands. And authors are required to account in detail for how the ‘concerns’ and ‘advice’ set out in decision letters have been properly heeded. As Bedeian observes, with regard to the pressures to comply with editorial ‘commands’, which must have intensified since 1999-2001:

“the extent of pressure felt ...is suggested by a study of 173 lead authors of articles published in the *Academy of Management Journal* and the *AMR* from 1999-2001(Bedeian, 20013). Nearly 25 percent of the authors reported that to placate a referee or editor they had actually made changes to their manuscripts that they (as authors) felt were incorrect” (see also Bedeian, 2004).

The contents of decision letters are usually politely, if rather formulaically and a tad patronizingly, framed as developmental recommendations. Yet, in its practical implementation, such ‘advice’ is received and followed by many authors as a set of instructions to act. In Weberian terms, editorial ‘advice’ and ‘guidance’ have a high “probability” of being “obeyed” by authors who, facing intensified competition to occupy the very limited number of available publication slots in prestigious journals, are anxious to see papers bearing their names in print. Rather like Milgram’s (1963) subjects, authors are formally free to exercise their option of withdrawing their manuscript at any stage, and not only when they assess the ‘guidance’ provided to be incongruent with retaining the integrity of their scholarly endeavour. This is entirely consistent with how Weber conceives of domination: as something that is not wholly coercive since, as he puts it, “every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance -that is, an *interest* (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience” (ibid: 212, emphasis in original). In practice, formal withdrawal rarely occurs. More usually, and especially when the place of publication assumes greater importance than the

contents of the work under review, authors strive to improve the prospects of their paper's acceptance by 'voluntarily' complying with, or obeying, editorial 'advice'.

Within this 'structure of dominancy' (Weber, 1978: 941), processes of review most closely approximate *Zweckrationalitat* (legal-rational action) in which social relations are governed more by calculation and an associated faith in the authority of referees and editors who, in the editorial process, are the equivalent of Milgram's experimenters dressed in white lab coats. Editorial communications may be coloured and compromised by other (e.g. affective and nepotistic) considerations. But they are ostensibly based upon impersonal, expert evaluations framed within impartial, bureaucratic procedures. Reviewer selection, for example, is, in principle, based upon ascribed expertise and, at AMR, is closely monitored and measured by editors.

Positioned within this legal-rational "structure of dominancy" (Weber, 1978: 941), the responses of authors to editorial 'advice' can be theorized as ranging across a spectrum of compliance that extends "from simple habituation to the most purely rational calculation of advantage" (Weber, 1978: 212). 'Simple habituation' is exemplified by authors who regard editorial 'advice' as comparatively authoritative and so uncontested. At the deferential end of the compliance (, authors engage in minimal reflection upon the role of 'politics' or 'values' in the production and assessment of scholarship^{xxxiii}. The authority of reviewers and editors is respected as it is believed to be based upon expertise warranted by processes of qualification and impartial indicators of demonstrated competence^{xxxiv}. Compliance with editorial 'recommendations' is understood to deliver better scholarship. By heeding and following reviewers' advice, it is anticipated that the shortcomings of the submission will be rectified. This mode of "obedience" (Weber, 1978: 212) may risk obsequiousness that not all editors welcome, but the author is largely untroubled by any concern for their (intellectual) integrity as its preservation is equated with unqualified compliance with editorial advice. Nor, relatedly, are authors at this end of the compliance spectrum concerned about the "stifling" (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013: 329) effects of their compliance on scholarly diversity.

At the other end of the compliance spectrum, revision processes rely upon the “rational calculation of advantage” (ibid), as exemplified by Eden’s (2008) advice to authors. Whereas “simple habituation” is marked by the dutiful execution of authoritative advice, the response of authors operating at the calculating end of the spectrum is informed by *some* degree of reflection on the role of ‘politics’ or ‘values’ in producing knowledge and assessing scholarship, including the ‘advice’ tendered by reviewers and editors. This reflection takes a restricted and instrumental form: it is tightly harnessed to calculating how the prospect of a manuscript’s acceptance can be maximized by dramaturgically demonstrating sufficient compliance with editorial ‘advice’ while expending minimum time and effort on this expedient undertaking . As Eden (2008) advises authors when preparing the letter in which their responses to editorial ‘advice’ is outlined, “successful writing of that letter may entail a measure of impression management. Be responsive and make yourself “sound” responsive. But do not be obsequious...It is poor impression management” (ibid: 246).

In the mode of “rational calculation of advantage”, the process of manuscript revision involves a detailed weighing up of how to ‘get past’ editors and reviewers by nominally, but adequately, complying with their ‘advice’, irrespective of whether the ‘guidance’ provided is (privately) judged to be instructive, hostile, developmental or just pig ignorant or plain stupid (see Altman and Baruch, 2008). If the earlier parallel drawn with Milgram’s (1963) experiments is revisited, then the focus of the subjects/authors here is upon calculating what is required – that is, economical obedience to the experimenter’s command - in order to collect their payment (\$4.50 at the time) or to gain rapid acceptance of their manuscript. When confronting the ‘obstacles’ placed by reviewers and editors in the path to publication, authors at the calculating end of the spectrum suspend whatever doubts they may harbor about the authority or the merit of editorial ‘advice’. Instead, their energies are concentrated on showing how they have complied, at least minimally but sufficiently, with the ‘guidance’ provided. What Weber (1978: 212) terms “ulterior motives” for authors engagement in this dramaturgical form of “obedience” are legion: to enhance the prospects of gaining tenure, to obtain a bonus, to increase status, to assist promotion, to have a quiet life, and so on (see Frost and Taylor, 1977). These motives are characterized as “ulterior” because they bear no *necessary* relationship to the ostensible purpose of revising the manuscript, where this is taken to be the improvement of scholarship, rather than its acceptance for publication. When governed by “the rational calculation of advantage”, the revision

process is propelled by a pressing concern to be published regardless of the consequences of such instrumental compliance for the substantive content or form of the paper. Where scholarship is shoehorned into the established 'structure of dominancy' (Weber, 1978: 941), there is scant regard for the integrity or mental wellbeing of the (compromised) author, the solidarity and development of the scholarly community, or the wider political consequences of cynical, expedient "obedience" (see Sloterdijk, 1988).

Changing the Culture of Scholarship

Responses to editorial 'guidance' that range along the compliance spectrum from simple habituation to rational calculation reproduce, whether deferentially or cynically, the authority ascribed to the 'advice' provided by editors and reviewers. There is, of course, always the possibility that authors will fall short or miscalculate as reviewers and editors are unpersuaded by their revisions and/or their accompanying justifications. In Weber's terminology, the desired outcome of acceptance is only "probable", even when every effort is made to "obey" editorial "commands". By default, responses across the habituation – calculation spectrum pose no challenge to the entrenched 'structure of dominancy' (Weber, 1978: 941). In this regard, Davis's (1971) conjecture in which, taking issue with Kuhn's (1962) thesis, he contends that the sheer boredom of compliance "would motivate many scientists to *look for* anomalies unexplainable by the old paradigm" (Davis, 1971: 343) is repeatedly refuted.

There remains, however, the possibility of a higher risk response in which authors comply *only* with editorial 'advice' that they assess to be consistent with the value(s), and substantive purpose(s) of their scholarship. Such partial compliance is likely to increase the risk of rejection even, and perhaps especially, when the revisions are carefully supported by detailed justifications for dissenting from, or disregarding, editorial 'advice'. Such partial compliance, or conditional "obedience" (Weber, 1978: 212), prioritizes and preserves the author's scholarly integrity but, as Eden (2008) notes, it may well "arouse reviewer animosity" (ibid: 246). Such selective compliance may indeed be regarded as "unresponsive" (ibid) by editors, rather than, say, interpreted as engaging their interest and critical

reflection upon their evaluations and ‘advice’. Deliberate resistance to editorial “commands” poses a more or less explicit challenge, and presents an alternative, to aspects of the prevailing “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941). By making “diverse voices” heard and thereby potentially “push[ing] forward the frontiers of our knowledge” (Ragins, 2015: 5), deviant scholarship anticipates the prospect of changing the conventions and direction of ‘normal’ scholarly practice.

Each responses to editorial ‘advice’ – that is, ‘habituation’, ‘calculation’ and ‘resistance’ - is a Weberian “ideal type” in the sense that it is a “one-sided accentuation[s] of one or more points of view” (Weber, 1949: 89). Each orientation to the editorial process is one to which authors tend to approximate, and which they/we may alternate between, blend or prevaricate over. A question raised by their identification is this: which is preferable? Here, I consider and commend, the third, resistant type of response (Willmott, 2013) as it is, I believe most consistent with the agenda of CMS. It is also, and relatedly, most supportive of the value of pluralism that, arguably, is central within the quotation that begins this editorial: “the progress of science depends on healthy support from scientists who hold divergent views” (Smolin, 2006: xxi-xxii).

Diversity and progress in scholarly work is, I conjecture, more facilitated than it is impeded by authors’ refusal to dilute or subordinate their scholarship, whether deferentially or expediently, to ‘advice’ and expectations of reviewers and editors. When such authors assess reviewer evaluations and editor ‘recommendations’ as lacking an adequate appreciation of, or “support for scientists who hold divergent views” (ibid), editorial ‘guidance’ is taken up only to the extent that following it is considered to be consistent with the substantive purpose or value motivating their work. Such selective or ‘uncompromising’ compliance is not invariably welcomed, let alone encouraged, by reviewers or editors. Authors’ resistance to ‘advice’ may be deemed incompatible with proper scientific practice insofar as it involves ‘unscientific’ deviation from established protocols and conventions. It may also be mocked and scorned as wildly utopian in a dog-eat-dog context where tenure, promotion or stardom are seen to depend upon appeasing reviewers and editors of ‘top’ journals, such as AMR. Nonetheless, when the ethos of developmentalism is consistently embraced, it is vital that authors are enabled, and indeed encouraged, to take ownership of their scholarly labour process.

For Resistance

Pressures to comply with editorial ‘advice’ - whether deferentially or instrumentally - are not inconsiderable. Even so, it is sometimes possible to resist, or even to escape, these pressures precisely because reviewers and editors are themselves authors, and they/we are not compelled to receive ‘advice’ as if it comprises a series of “commands”. When ‘resistance’ by authors *and* reviewers/editors coincides, less formulaic and instrumentalized forms of scholarship can, and do, sporadically appear. On such occasions, the normalization of deferential and instrumental practices is, at least to some degree, subverted as pressures to exclude or domesticate the publication of “articles that challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” (Ragins, 2015: 6 citing <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-forContributors.aspx>) are relaxed even if they are not entirely eliminated. Articles that produce the reaction “That’s Interesting” – that is, which “*deny* certain assumptions of their audience”, in contrast to “non-interesting theories which *affirm* certain assumptions of their audience” (Davis, 1971: 309) – are then more likely to appear.

The challenge is to nurture, defend and develop an alternative ethos of scholarship that counteracts, and moves beyond, a culture of scholarship currently infused by ‘habituated’ and ‘calculative’ forms of “obedience” (Weber, 1978: 212). The spirit of resistance calls for editorial and review processes where sight is no longer lost of any purpose for the development of scholarship other than fashioning a product that is acceptable for publication in a sufficiently prestigious journal. In the pursuit of this purpose, the compliant honing and self-policing of monist methodological means becomes an end in itself. Escaping this pathology requires a process of collective critical self-reflection, to which this FTE is intended to contribute, so that a substantive purpose for scholarship is embraced or renewed. An example of such a purpose is a commitment to an ultimate value like emancipation, while recognizing that whatever value and meaning is ascribed to scholarly activity, this purpose is inherently a matter of contestation^{xxxv}.

For defenders of the *status quo*, resistance to editorial and reviewer “commands” is readily construed as a confirmation of authors’ defensive egoism or wounded intellectual pride. It may also be claimed that compliant responses to editorial ‘advice’ mostly serve to strengthen the moral and intellectual integrity of authors. Far from compromising their integrity, “obedience”

is seen to propel errant authors along a straight and narrow path, thereby sparing them the embarrassment of falling victim to their own self-deceptions and infelicities. It is pointless to deny the grains of truth in such diagnostics or to ignore the frailties and flaws of ‘resistant’ scholars. But negative assessments of resistant scholarship also psychologize and pathologize dissent. They act, whether intentionally or inadvertently, to control or suppress dissenting voices that depart, in content and/or style, from the conventions of ‘normal science’. What, ostensibly, may be a sympathetic and benign assessment of an author’s ‘bruised’ reactions to the rejection of their work acts latently as a potent instrument of domination. In the form of repressive tolerance, its effect is to colonise and domesticate manifestations of resistance by translating expressions of ‘otherness’, in the form of dissent, into the normality and familiarity of fragile egos.

The psychologization of resistance operates to maintain the established culture of scholarship as it impedes the questioning, or postpones the overhaul, of a system or “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) in which, for example, reviewer assessments and ‘recommendations’ are not necessarily well informed by the theoretic traditions in which the dissenting author is embedded, and to which s/he seeks to contribute. In a recent FTE, Bryon and Thatcher (2016) presume, perhaps correctly, that the range of interest of the majority of AMR readers does not presently extend far beyond the confines of what, within “the North American management paradigm” (ibid: 5), is recognisable as theory and scholarship. Bryon and Thatcher write that those “trained in institutions or disciplines” that escape the confines of this “paradigm” “may have additional insights into approaches for making theoretical contributions” (ibid). But they also acknowledge that the intended audience of their FTE is restricted to those working within this “paradigm” as its “readings and activities *address those questions most asked by readers of the Academy of Management Review*” (ibid: 5-6, emphasis added).

A condition of a genuinely developmental editorial culture is the appointment of editors and reviewers who recognize, adequately grasp and respect authors’ distinctive value commitments and associated

theoretical orientations. Indeed this capacity provides the basis for subjecting submissions to informed, thoroughgoing critique. A developmental culture worthy of the name is established and maintained by expanding and protecting the space in which authors discover, realize and expand their ability to articulate their distinctive and diverse voices. What is questionable is whether the training of many management scholars - especially those educated in North America, or are the recipients of a neo-imperial transfer of this training (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2015) – is sufficiently broad and philosophically literate to evaluate non-mainstream manuscripts. The limitations of “the North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016: 5) may account for shallow understandings, and limited tolerance, of alternative (e.g. critical) theoretical traditions. On this issue, consider the statistics for AMR reviewers deemed to be outstanding during the period 2010-2015. Of the 47 listed, all but four are North American based (<http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Outstanding-Reviewers.aspx>, accessed 20 June 2015). These numbers offer little comfort to those seeking reassurance about the receptiveness of AMR reviewers to diverse forms of scholarship, including variants of CMS.

An emphasis upon meaningful, inclusive pluralism is consistent with Arendt’s (1965) reflections upon obedience which, it will be recalled, is central to Weber’s (1978) conception of domination. As noted earlier, Milgram (1963) relates compliance to the influential role of normative structures – such as that of science symbolized by the white lab coat of his experimenters. Arendt, in contrast, complements and qualifies Milgram’s comparatively deterministic explanation with an emphasis upon the open and contingent quality of human beings’ relationship to normative structures; and, relatedly, she advances a critique of the deterministic presuppositions informing a positivistic conception of social science to which Milgram subscribes. For Arendt, what fosters obedience is not the dominant normative structure *per se* but, rather, the lack, or suspension, of critical discourse capable of questioning and disarming such structures. Diverse voices that articulate alternative understandings enable critical reflection upon established theory and practice. It is when those voices are excluded or stifled that a one-dimensional (e.g. Nazi) ideology becomes established and operates to silence and suppress dissent. Arendt contends that positivist social science contributes, albeit unintentionally, to the marginalization and weakening of critical discourse as it supports and legitimises an acceptance of the “*right*” of those in authority to “demand obedience” (Lang, 2014: 655, emphasis added) to its conception of science and scholarship.

Conversely, critical social science, including CMS, fosters resistance by scrutinizing whatever authority, including 'science', claims obedience. For Milgram, the possibility of resistance is assured by an essential freedom that defines human nature, and so empowers research subjects to walk away from his experiment; or, in the case of authors, to withdraw a manuscript even if its resubmission is invited. Reliance upon a freedom located in human nature, Arendt argues, is dangerous, not least because it can be overwhelmed. The capacity to resist authority, she contends, depends upon fostering a form of social organization in which human beings collectively develop and internalize a plurality of viewpoints, and, relatedly, engaged in existential struggles over the meaning and significance of competing and irreconcilable viewpoints. It is by nurturing this countervailing multiplicity, Arendt argues, that the prospect of submission to an apparently unassailable authority is effectively resisted.

The concerns expressed in this FTE, including unwelcome parallels drawn between studies of obedience and the compliance of authors with editorial processes, may be considered outlandish, or even offensive, and so may induce defensive and dismissive reactions. I hope that sceptical readers may be willing to suspend their doubts or antagonism a little longer, especially if they are sympathetic to Suddaby's (2014) concerns for 'the lack of reflexivity with theory in our profession' (ibid: 409). In the absence of reflexivity, scholars who are audacious, or naïve, enough to introduce unfamiliar sources or perspectives, or depart from conventional formats, or challenge editorial decisions, or question the suitability, competence or expertise of the selected reviewer(s), are likely to encounter the operation of repressive tolerance – that is, "tolerance of policies, conditions, and modes of behaviour which should not be tolerated" (Marcuse, 1965: 82). Such behaviour includes impeding and silencing "the diverse voices that push forward the frontiers of our knowledge" (Ragins, 2015: 5). In the absence of an editorial culture in which authors' diverse, distinctive theoretical contributions are genuinely and warmly appreciated and respected, and not just formally and ritualistically welcomed, it is probable that editorial judgment, emboldened by a compelling sense of its (scientific) authority, will take the form of a closed iron fist that protrudes through the apparently inviting velvet glove of an overtly receptive and even developmental editorial ethos.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

To recap briefly, my earlier reflections on the dominant culture of scholarship led me to pose the question of how a particular norm of scholarship – what Horkheimer calls “traditional theory” - in which the method(ology) of inquiry *ascribed* to the physical sciences is emulated - has become conflated with scientific knowledge *per se*. To its devotees, the conflation appears unremarkable, even natural and seemingly unassailable. There is, as a consequence, little hesitation in imposing its requirements upon those whose scholarship does not comply with what passes as ‘normal’. Other forms of scientific endeavour, including what Horkheimer terms “critical theory”, and what Jaques (1992) characterizes as being governed by an “ethic of care” are deemed to be (uniquely) politically motivated. From the standpoint of “traditional theory”, they are seen to engage in forms of methodological deviancy that are strictly *verboten*. Non-compliance with ‘normal science’ is met by exercises of power of varying subtlety, in the form of degrading and exclusionary practices.

It has also been suggested that resisting the pull of “obedience” by challenging and potentially changing the established “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) is, in principle more probable where a plurality of perspectives is valued and nurtured. In such conditions, entrenched standards and rules are more readily exposed, problematized and transgressed as what is currently taken to be a necessity or inevitability is dis-closed as contingent and mutable. In *The Trouble with Physics*, Smolin indicates how “structures of dominancy” are maintained by an unexamined ‘practical consciousness’ in ways that discourage, minimize and restrict processes of reflexivity. In this respect, his analysis has unsettling parallels with the “thoughtlessness” ascribed to perpetrators of Nazism, such as Eichmann (Arendt, 1965). In the face of conditions that impede reflexivity and stifle diversity, the challenge is to nurture and develop ways of unsettling the compliant harnessing of consciousness to the rationalization, protection and reproduction of what is taken to be ‘normal’, and thereby subvert the demonstrations of one-dimensional competence upon which it depends.

Submissions to AMR are expected to ‘challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society’ (<http://aom.org/amr/>). Each element of that expectation merits close consideration. The invitation is to prepare submissions that question conventional wisdom, rather than contribute to its continuous normalization and refinement. To pursue this expectation, it is appropriate to formulate, and consistently communicate, a strong editorial signal that unambiguously underscores the warm welcome given to “challenging” scholarship. This declaration of editorial policy might helpfully be accompanied by an equally clear warning – *Achtung!* - that submissions which show little sign of, or potential to, “challenge conventional wisdom” will likely be desk rejected. In support of this editorial policy, it would be appropriate to assure authors working in diverse scholarly traditions, including variants of CMS but not limited to them, that the “challenge(s)” presented by heterodox submissions are especially welcome and genuinely peer reviewed. The attractiveness of submissions informed by variants of (big ‘C’) critical theory would then be clearly signaled as their very purpose is to provide penetrating challenges to “conventional wisdom”.

The appointment of critical management scholars, such as myself, to the position of Associate Editor at AMR and to the journal’s editorial board is consistent with the publication of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in the journal. This development is welcome but it is probably insufficient to remove and replace established practices that have militated against publishing “a variety of voices...irrespective of their school, background or geographic region” (Ragins, 2015: 5), and which have prompted the reactions from Respondents collected in the Appendix. It is an assessment that finds support in the profile of submissions to AMR allocated to me during my first 12 months as an Associate Editor. Assuming that CMS submissions are comparatively easy to identify, that a normal proportion of them is desk rejected, and that most of the remainder are allocated to me, it is remarkable that only 2 of the 28 manuscripts that I handled during those 12 months were unequivocally critical management papers. This number could be stretched to 4 if a looser notion of critical management scholarship is applied. If my assumptions and calculations stack up, then they confirm my ‘proposition’ that AMR is currently failing to attract work based in a scholarly tradition that, arguably, is most dedicated to, and capable of , “challeng[ing] conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society”

(Ragins, 2015: 6 citing <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-forContributors.aspx>). Such scholarship is simply being submitted and published elsewhere.

To attract manuscripts to AMR that are currently published in other journals requires, above all else, credible reassurances about how (big ‘C’) critical scholarship is refereed. It requires that *peer* review is not just formally invoked but is substantively practiced *and* is actually *experienced* by authors whose testimony will then, hopefully, encourage other CMS scholars to submit their work to AMR. In order to attract manuscripts that “challenge conventional wisdom” (ibid), and thereby move scholarship beyond the confines of “the accepted North American management paradigm” (Byron and Thatcher, 2016: 5), it is imperative to address the concerns voiced by a Respondent who wrote: “I tend to put material where I think the relevant conversations are happening. For me, that is usually *Organization*.” Encouragingly, s/he also observes that, despite the dearth of such conversations in AMR, there is “a certain challenge that is posed is worth taking on”, although s/he then notes that this challenge, and the likely prospect of rejection, “is a luxury not available to others at different stages of their careers”. The significance of this consideration was underscored by another Respondent who referred to the very high rejection rate at AMR, observing that, on the face of it, this could be a strong deterrent to early career researchers who are under great pressure to publish in the ‘leading’ journals. and especially so when splitting theory from data is not a practice followed by journals that are less embedded in the North American context. What, less visibly, contributes to this rejection rate is the large number of manuscripts submitted to AMR that are unequivocally unsuitable because, for example, they contain substantial empirical material or offer no more than a review. More concerning is the legacy of published AMR scholarship that contains few examples of “diverse voices, including contributions to CMS, outside of some special issues. An editorial process must be developed that minimizes and eventually eliminates the prospect of authors receiving reviews that, in the experience of the Respondent quoted earlier, “displayed a fundamental lack of appreciation of the scholarly traditions in which I work”, or that treat critical scholarship “like some kind of flawed graduate work”.

The strongest signal of AMR’s receptiveness to diverse work, including critical scholarship, would be evidence of the latter’s regular publication. On this count, a cautious welcome can be given to the appearance of articles such as Crane’s (2013) ‘Modern Slavery As A Management Practice: Exploring

the Conditions and Capabilities for Human Exploitation'. The welcome is qualified as the article is a classic case of potentially critical analysis being shoehorned, by the author and/or its reviewers, into a rather mainstream, anodyne format and account. Its deviation from mainstream conventions is, at best, partial. Notably, propositions are ritually invoked to theorize its topic. More substantively, by reserving the category of slavery for the most extreme, coercive employment relations, there is little recognition, or even contemplation, of how institutionalized forms of exploitation are normalized within the everyday 'wage slavery' of capitalist enterprise, most brazenly exhibited in the rise of zero-hours contracts. Nonetheless, the appearance of such work shows that AMR is at least occasionally somewhat receptive to more heterodox forms of scholarship even if it is engineered and/or revised to fit a conventional format.

As another Respondent wrote, who had experience of a paper that was rejected after the second round at AMR but subsequently published elsewhere, s/he *would* submit other papers to AMR *if* s/he could be more confident that the journal would potentially "accept critical and philosophical papers". Given that AMR does indeed extend a formal welcome to such papers, providing of course that they deliver on the requirement to "challenge conventional wisdom" (Ragins, 2015: 6), then this welcome must be signaled very directly and strongly to the prospective submitters of such manuscripts if the journal is to become a preferred outlet for their work. For AMR to realize its espoused interest in publishing "ground-breaking work" (ibid: 6) developed from "a variety of perspectives, including those...critical of management and organizations" (Brief, 2003: 7), its ostensibly inclusive *policy* must be reflected in the journal's editorial and reviewing *processes*, and ultimately in what are annually identified as its 'best' articles. To this end, there must be a preparedness to accommodate formats and modes of discourse of a plurality of scholarly traditions, including variants of "critical theory".

On a more positive note, it important to acknowledge that a number of the concerns raised by Respondents to my straw poll (Appendix) are being, or have been, at least partially addressed. There has been some internationalization of the AMR editorial board; and one or two Associate Editors trained outside of North America have been appointed. These developments were noted by one Respondent who, having "frankly" acknowledged that s/he had not looked at AMR for at least a decade, found, on the basis of browsing a recent issue, that "it seems to be changing". In order to sustain the "pushing

forward [of] the frontiers of our knowledge by diverse voices irrespective of their intellectual tradition or geographic region” (Ragins, 2015), positive signs of progressive change must be extended and institutionalized. To this end, considerably more could be done. To facilitate the policy of inclusivity, the practice could be adopted of alternating between North American and non-North American trained editors-in-chief. A majority of non-North American Associate Editors and editorial board members could be appointed. Such changes would go some way to fulfilling AMR’s aspiration to be an international journal. At the very least, these changes would send a clear and forceful demonstration of the intent to be diverse and inclusive.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The development of a pluralist culture of scholarship, in which editorial processes are “inclusive and open to a variety of voices” (Ragins, 2015: 5) requires a radical reorientation of scholarly practice. It is unsatisfactory, for example, to categorize differences of scholarship in terms of ‘style’. The distinction between the *style* of “narrative reasoning” and a more established “formal analytical approach” (Delbridge and Fiss, 2013), for example, displaces consideration of the *purpose and value* of different traditions of scholarship. In a style-centric framing of theorizing, no direct attention is paid to “the values on which knowledge is built” (Suddaby, 2014: 407). The commitment of (big ‘C’) critical forms of scholarship to reframed within a broad, anodyne genre of “narrative reasoning”. From a “critical theory” standpoint, differences ascribed to ‘style’ are comparatively shallow and inconsequential as they rather skate over deeper divisions associated with ontological, epistemological and ethico-political assumptions.

The differentiation of theory into “styles” is ironic and instructive because, as noted earlier, Delbridge and Foss (2013) commend paying attention to the “structural and political aspects of the social organization of knowledge” (ibid: 325) – “aspects” that are largely excluded and domesticated when theoretical differences are framed in terms of “style”. The focus upon “structural and political aspects” has been more sharply conveyed in the contrast drawn between “traditional” and “critical” theory

(Horkheimer, 1976 ; Boltanski, 2011). This FTE has focused upon structural and political ‘demands’ placed upon authors, in contrast to most FTEs that address the ‘supply side’ of scholarly work by specifying what authors should do and deliver. It is hoped that increased reflection on editorial processes may increase the space for a pluralization of scholarship congruent with AMR’s espoused intent to publish “articles that challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society” (Ragins, 2015: 6 citing <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-forContributors.aspx>). Currently, a number of significant “aspects” of contemporary organizations and their “role” in society are almost entirely missing from AMR. Consider, for example, processes of financialization which are widely held to be central to post-1980s processes of restructuring and hollowing out organizations and the reshaping of orientations to managerial / executive work (see Royrvick, 2013). With the partial exception of Starkey’s (2015) contribution to AMR’s new “What Inspires the Academy?” section, consideration of financialization was absent from AMR during the decades leading up to the 2008 financial crisis; and that silence has not been broken in the past seven years^{xxxvi}. Management scholars have, it seems, acquired a ‘trained incapacity’ - a phenomenon originally identified by Veblen and subsequently popularized by Merton - to register and address the significance of financialization. Why?

In a recent commentary on this issue, Clegg (2015) connects the silence on financialization in leading management journals to academy members’ lack of awareness and/or engagement of relevant contributions to (critical) social theory. Specifically, he observes that *‘we seem to have a disinclination to reflect in terms of a political economy of finance in favor or recipes drawn from industrial and neo-classical economics’* (ibid: 11, emphasis added). This ‘disinclination’ is associated with the neglect of a wider, heterodox literature on political economy – such as O’Connor’s (1972) thesis on fiscal crises associated with large budget deficits and Habermas’s (1976) anticipation of a legitimacy crisis precipitated by large sections of the population becoming disillusioned and/or disenfranchised by ostensibly democratic politics.

In my reflections on “What if our theory were critical?”, financialization stands as a placeholder for many other “big issues” - such as climate change, rising inequality and the limits to economic growth, touched upon earlier – whose significance for management and organization is rarely theorized in AMR.

Lack of engagement with theories that are attentive to “the big picture” and “big issues”, such as financialization (e.g. Harvey, 2007; 2011; Krippner, 2011; Engelen et al, 2011; Lazonick, 2014), deprives management scholarship of key resources for studying what it means to organize and manage in the contemporary context. Exclusion of theory capable of illuminating the “social and organizational changes” (Clegg, 2015: 16) propelled *inter alia* by the dynamics of financialization (Davis, 2009; Lounsbury and Hirsch, 2010) is symptomatic of a scholarly culture that has become narrowly focused in rigorously superficial ways upon amenable but comparatively trivial topics. Technically competent and politically inoffensive, much of what is published in AMR has the dubious virtue of being as unobjectionably anodyne to its readers as it is unfathomably harmless to the corporate sponsors of business schools and recruiters of faculty. This culture of dullness readily accommodates submissions that are undemanding to read and which offer a coherent, if marginal, contribution to what is recognizable as theory within the “North American management paradigm” (Bryon and Thatcher (ibid: 5). Such scholarship, which Rynes (2005: 12) describes as incremental stuff that may be very tight methodologically but that offers little that is really new” (Rynes, 2005: 12), exemplifies what Davis (1971) terms the “uninteresting”.

In ways that parallel Smolin’s observations on string theory in physics, the contents of AMR have “triumphed in the academy” (Smolin, XXXX: xxii) where it is widely regarded as a paragon of rigorous scholarship and prized for its impact factor. Yet, it ‘struggles’ on ‘the scientific side’ (ibid) to the extent that it is repeatedly faulted for a lack of practical relevance: in effect, there is a disconnect between *the theorist qua ‘scientist’* and *the theorist qua ‘citizen’* (Horkheimer, 1976: 228). In physics, Smolin describes how physicists are induced to “narrow their vision as they are reward[ed] for taking small, safe steps” at the expense of “asking the big, risky questions” (ibid: 6). In management, an equivalent narrowing of vision results from the emulation of a conception of rigor, often ascribed to the physical sciences, that effectively rules out, or at least domesticates and shoehorns, other (e.g. critical) traditions of research into its monist framework.

There is, fortunately, a silver lining to this rather dark and oppressive cloud. Scholarship that has little to say about the “big questions”, whether managerial or philosophical, is vulnerable to discursive challenge - ontologically and epistemologically as well as ethico-politically. For this lining to become more

visible, however, it is necessary to recognize, problematize, and disrupt the prevailing “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) as this currently overshadows, demeans or suppresses more challenging forms of scholarship. A start may be made by disavowing the widespread (mis)representation of critical scholarship as *uniquely* value-laden and/or politically motivated – an indictment based primarily upon its refusal (or ‘failure’) to subscribe to a (neo) positivist conception of science with its associated protocols of rigor.

This refusal is consistent with Weber’s (1949) insistence that whatever passes for scientific knowledge cannot adjudicate between values, nor can it confer validity upon values as adjudication between them is ultimately an existential, not a rational matter. Since the *conditions* of making an existential commitment to science are irreducible to the choices ascribed to seemingly sovereign, atomized ‘individuals’, the responsibility for embracing the specific “values upon which knowledge is built” (Suddaby, 2014: 407) is collectively vested within communities of scholarly practice. This collective responsibility is *inter alia* articulated in the mundane activity of journal editing and reviewing. More specifically, the fulfillment of this responsibility is associated with a culture of scholarship in which the value of pluralism is upheld so that, at the very least, the pursuit of science is not equated to, or regulated by, a monist methodological ideal, and related set of protocols, that is attributed to the physical sciences.

We face a collective challenge to generate theory that engages with how contemporary crises and their associated problems are pervasively manifest in practices of organizing and managing. The issue of lost relevance is not framed here in terms of a failure to develop sufficiently rigorous, predictive knowledge whose application promises to deliver substantial improvements in organizational and/or individual performance. Nor is lost relevance ascribed to an incapacity, or disinclination, of managers to absorb and apply the theory published in ‘leading’ journals such as AMR. Rather, the present analysis diagnoses this problem in terms of the alienated division of the (aspirationally value free) scholar and the (inevitably value laden) citizen. Nearly fifty years ago, Davis (1971) addressed the concern that “most contemporary research...is dull” (ibid: 336) inasmuch that it “says what everybody knows or what nobody cares about” (ibid). Today, much management research is not only dull, or even duller, but it has become pathologically introverted. Exemplified by new institutional theory, it is preoccupied with making marginal refinements to unchallenging theories that currently comprise “the routinized taken-

for-granted world of everyday [scholarly] life (Garfinkel, 1967)” (Davis, 1971: 311). The antidote is not simply to develop theory that is more “interesting” but to make the practice of theorizing more extroverted by engaging with more diverse forms of theory, including variants of “critical theory”, thereby extending and enriching what is perceived to be “interesting”. Release from the grip of “dull” normality – routinely enforced by an insistence that the voice of authorship is properly subordinated to the recommendations of reviewers and editors – demands some degree of reflective distance from “what everybody knows or what nobody cares about” (Davis, 1971: 336). The critical interrogation of mundane, ‘practical consciousness’ is not a panacea, however. Its impact may be limited. It may also fuel cynicism and gaming when, for example, reflection is harnessed to securing authors’ and/or editors’ investments in normality. Nonetheless, when critical insights into the limits of ‘normal science’ and the regressive effects of the scholarly “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) are not ignored or shrugged off, subjection to its norms may be weakened, “diverse voices...irrespective of their school, background, or geographic region” may be heard, and “the frontiers of our knowledge” may be “pushed back” (Ragins, 2015: 5)

Adopting a (big ‘C’) position, as set out in the AoM CMS Domain Statement, this FTE has commended an engagement of the skeptical yet inquisitive interest of people, including students of business, who currently find much of what is published in the ‘leading’ management journals irrelevant or who, at best, fantasize that some career-enhancing nugget may be extracted from their contents. The most pressing, scholarly and practical challenge is not to pander to such fantasies but, rather, to diversify the “the values upon which knowledge is built” (Suddaby, 2014: 407) so as to propel research, but also teaching, in a direction that may transform the hypothetical ‘what if’ of theory published in AMR becoming critical into its realization. It is cause for celebration that AMR editorial policy and board membership is moving in a direction that actively welcomes and supports the submission of critical scholarship. Critical scholars take note! In this FTE, I have sought to provide further impetus to that effort by offering some responses to the questions: What, practically, might this transformation involve? And what does it require?

References

Altman, Y. and Baruch, Y. (2008), 'Strategies for Revising and Resubmitting Papers to Refereed Journals', **British Journal of Management**, 19: 89-101

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2003) ed., **Studying Management Critically**, London: Sage

Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T. and Willmott, H.C. (2009), eds., **Handbook of Critical Management Studies**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Arendt, H. (1965), **Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil**, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Ballinger, G.A. and Johnson, R.E. (2015), 'Editors' Comments: Your First *AMR* Review', **Academy of Management Review**, 40,3: 315-322

Bedeian, A.G. (2003), 'The manuscript review process: The proper roles of authors, referees, and editors', **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 12, 331-8

Bedeian, A.G. (2004) 'Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the Management discipline,

Bedeian, A.G. (2008), ‘Balancing Autorial Voice and Editorial Omniscience: The “It’s My Paper and I’ll Say What I Want To” versus “Ghostwriters in the Sky” Minuet’ in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp134-140

Bell, E, Kothiyal, N. and Willmott, H.C. (2015), ‘Methodology-as-Technique and the Meaning of Rigor in Globalized Management Research’, mimeo

Boltanski, L. (2011), **On Critique: A Sociology of Emancipation**, Cambridge: Polity

Byron, K. and Thatcher, S.M.B. (2016), Editors’ Comments: “What I Know Now that I Wish I Knew Then” – Teaching Theory and Theory Building’, **Academy of Management Review**, 41,1: 1-8

Clegg, S. (2003), “Power, Legitimacy and Authority’ in G. Delanty and S.P. Turner, eds., **Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Social and Political Theory**, London: Routledge, pp 215-225

Clegg, S. (2015), ‘Reflections: Why Old Social Theory Might Still Be Useful’, **Journal of Change Management**, 15,1: 1-7

Corley, K.G. and Gioia, D.A. (2011), ‘Building Theory About Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?’, **Academy of Management Review**, 36, 1: 12-32

Davis, G.F. (2009), **Managed by the Markets: How Finance Reshaped America**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Davis, G.F. (2010), Do Theories of Organizations Progress?, **Organizational Research Methods**, 13, 4 : 690-709

Davis, M. (1971), "That's Interesting", **Philosophy of the Social Sciences**, 1, 1: 309-344

Delbridge, R. (2014), Promising Futures: CMS, Post-Disciplinarity, and the New Public Social Science, **Journal of Management Studies**, 51,1: 95-116

Delbridge, R. and Fiss, P.C. (2013), 'Editor's Comments: Styles of Theorizing and the Social Organization of Knowledge, **Academy of Management Review**, 38,3: 325-331

Eden, D. (2008), 'What Authors Need to Know to Navigate the Review Process Successfully: Understanding and Managing the Editor's Dilemma' in Y. Baruch, A.M. Konrad, H. Aguinis and W.H. Starbuck, eds., **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**, London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 239-249

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989), 'Building Theories from Case Study Research', **Academy of Management Review**, 14,4: 532-550

Engelen, E., Erturk, I., Froud, J., Johal, S., Leaver, A., Moran, M., Nilsson, A. and Williams, K. (2011), **After the Great Complacence: Financial Crisis and the Politics of Reform**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ezzamel, M. and Willmott, H.C. (2014), 'Registering "the ethical" in Organization Theory Formation: Towards the Disclosure_{SEP} of an "invisible force"', **Organization Studies**, 35, 7: 1013-1039

Frost, P.J. and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage

Frost, P.J. and R.N. Taylor' (1977), 'Partisan Perspective: A Multi-level Interpretation of the Manuscript Review Process in P.J.Frost and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences**, London: Sage, pp 13-43

Garfinkel, H. (1967), **Studies in Ethnomethodology**, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Grey, C. and Willmott, H.C. (2005), eds., **Critical Management Studies: A Reader**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Habermas, J. (1976), **Legitimation Crisis**, London: Heinemann

Harvey, D. (2007), **A Brief History of Neoliberalism**, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Harvey, D. (2011), **The Enigma of Capital and the Crisis of Capitalism**, London: Profile Books

Horkheimer, M. (1976), 'Traditional and Critical Theory', in P. Connerton, ed. , **Critical Sociology**, London: Harmondsworth, pp206-224

Jacques, R. (1992), 'Critique and Theory Building: Producing Knowledge "From the Kitchen"', **Academy of Management Review**, 17,3: 582-606

Krippner, G.R. (2011), **Capitalizing on Crisis: The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance**, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Kuhn, T.S. (1962), **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Lang, J. (2014), 'Against Obedience: Hannah Arendt's Overlooked Challenge to Social-Psychological Explanations of Mass Society', **Theory and Psychology**, 24, 5: 649-667

Lazonick, W. (2014), 'Profits Without Prosperity', **Harvard Business Review**, September, 47-55

Levy, D.L. (2008), 'Political Contestation in Global Production Networks', **Academy of Management Review**, 33,4: 943-963

Lounsbury, M. and Hirsch, P.M. (2010), eds., **Markets on Trial: The Economic Sociology of the US Financial Crisis**, Bingley, England: Emerald

Marcuse, H. (1965), 'Repressive Tolerance' in R.P. Wolff, Moore, B. and Marcuse, H. , eds, **A Critique of Pure Tolerance**, Boston: Beacon Press, pp 81-118

Martin. A.W., Lopez, S.H., Roscigno, V.J. and Hodson, R. (2013), 'Against the Rules: Synthesising Types and Processes of Bureaucratic Rule-Breaking' **Academy of Management Review**, 38, 4:550-574

Milgram, S. (1963), 'Behavioural Study of Obedience', **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, 67: 371-378

Miller, C. C. (2006), 'Peer Review in the Organizational and Management Sciences: Prevalence and Effects of Reviewer Hostility, Bias, and Dissensus', **Academy of Management Journal**, 49, 3: 425-431

Nord, W.R. (1977), ' Looking at Ourselves and We Look at Others: An Exploration of the Publication System for Organizational Research' in P.J.Frost and R.N. Taylor (1977), eds., **Publishing in the Organizational Sciences, London: Sage**, pp 64-78

O'Connor, J . (1972), **The Fiscal Crisis of the State**, New York: St Martins Press

Picketty, T. (2014), **Capital in the 21st Century**, Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Popper, K. (1976), 'The Logic of the Social Sciences' in T. W. Adorno, H. Albert, R. Dahrendorf, J. Habermas, H. Pilot and K.R. Popper, eds., **The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology**, London: Heinemann, pp 87-104

Ragin, C.C. (2008), **Redesigning social inquiry: Fuzzy sets and beyond**, Chicago: Chicago University Press

Ragins, R. (2015), 'Editor's Comments: Developing Our Authors', **Academy of Management Review**, 40,1: 1-8

Røyrvik, E.A. (2013), **The Allure of Capitalism: An Ethnography of Management and the Global Financial Crisis**, New York: Berghan Books

Rynes, S. L. 2005. Taking stock and looking ahead, **Academy of Management Journal**, 48: 9–15.

Sloterdijk, P. (1988), **Critique of Cynical Reason**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Smolin, L. (2006), **The Trouble with Physics: The Rise of String Theory, the Fall of Science and What Comes Next**, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Suddaby, R. (2014), 'Editor's Comments: Why Theory', **Academy of Management Review**, 39,4: 407-411

Weber, M. (1949), **The Methodology of the Social Sciences**, New York: Free Press

Weber, M. (1978), **Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology**, ed. by G. Roth and C. Wittich, Berkeley: University of California Press

Weber, M. (1999) 'The Area of Economics, Economic Theory and the Ideal Type' in R. Swedberg, ed., **Max Weber: Essays in Economic Sociology**, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Willmott, H.C. (2009), '[Science as Intervention: Recasting Weber's Moral Vision](#)', **Organization**, 16, 1: 143-154

Willmott, H.C. '[Reframing Relevance as 'Social Usefulness'](#): A Comment on Hodgkinson and Starkey's 'Not Simply Returning to the Same Answer Over and Over Again', **British Journal of Management**, 23: 598-604

Willmott, H. C. (2013) [“the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another”](#): Reflections on Resistance, Gaming and Subjugation'. **Journal of Management Studies**, 50, 3: 443-473

Willmott, H.C. (2014), [‘Science, Governance and Self-Understanding: From Anthropocentrism to Ecocentrism?’](#), **Critical Policy Studies**, 8,1: 22-40

Appendix

I received 10 replies to my invitation to answer 3 questions. Whether the responses are in any sense representative of exponents of critical management or of the population of list members it is impossible to say. In this summary of the replies to my 'straw poll', I have sought to convey their contents as directly and comprehensively as possible. At best, the responses provide some indication of how AMR is viewed by some members of this particular group of actual and potential contributors. The first question was:

1. What was your experience of submitting a 'critical' paper to AMR?

For those who had experience of submitting a paper to AMR, the experience was mixed. There were many positive observations about the professionalism of the review process (e.g. ‘timely’, ‘clear’, ‘detailed’, ‘encouragement from the editor’). But these assessments were qualified. One respondent expressed concerns about AMR reviewers’ conceptions of ‘theory’, writing that reviews ‘displayed a fundamental lack of appreciation of the scholarly traditions in which I work’. S/he added that the submission was treated by reviewers ‘like some kind of flawed graduate work...by people clearly unfamiliar with more European styles of thought’. Another anticipated that publishing in AMR would require ‘writing in a style that is not honest to oneself’. Commenting upon the importance of clear writing, s/he had the impression that ‘there is a certain “one best way” style [that] ‘prejudices against writing about difficult ideas’. This respondent went on to observe that the communication of demanding ideas may require ‘sentences to be read more than once and a dictionary to be at hand’. In terms of content, it was noted that the division between theory and data, which is based upon ‘an assumed hypothetico-deductive model of “science” is, from a European perspective, ‘bizarre’ and, for this respondent, this division made it ‘very hard to develop an historical argument’.

2. Why would you choose not to submit a paper to AMR?

An answer to this question is implicit in a number of responses to the first question. One respondent wrote that s/he would hesitate to submit papers to AMR because articles in the journal appear ‘overly stifled’ and ‘stylistically formulaic’, and so would not be a good fit for his/her scholarship. Another respondent referred to the abstract of the most cited AMR paper (Eisenhardt, 1989) as ‘a barely sublimated apology for American imperialism’ while acknowledging this to be something of an exaggeration. This point was developed by yet another respondent in relation to what s/he refers to as US v European approaches to structuring an argument. The European approach, s/he opines, ‘starts from critique of existing ideas [that] seeks to answer the problems thus revealed. In contrast, for US scholars, ‘this smacks of personal attacks and [they] prefer to start from the positive presentation of a case’. Other off-putting signals (for potential submissions from critical scholars) include the uncertain place of dialogue and comment within the journal. A respondent regarded these opportunities to be particularly

important because they ‘constitute excellent means for introducing critical perspectives and challenging normal science’. I would add the suggestion that FTEs can also serve this purpose.

3. What would make it more likely that you would submit a paper to AMR in the future?

In reply, respondents offered a number of suggestions in addition to those that may be deduced from their responses to the previous questions. One wrote that submitting a paper to AMR would be more likely if ‘there were serious changes to the editorial board, the removal of American dominance, and a very explicit statement of editorial intent’. Another indicated that a submission would be more likely if s/he were less ‘confused as to what the journal stands for, how its politics work, and how publication is negotiated’. Yet another respondent referred to the ‘chicken and egg’ problem – it is necessary to identify a body of work in AMR that is recognizably ‘critical’ before developing the confidence to submit a paper without the prospect of having to ‘contort the argument to make it fit’.

ⁱ This is a highly compressed revision of the submitted FTE. Notably, responses to a straw poll of the 600-plus subscribers to the Critical Management List-Serve [CRITICAL-MANAGEMENT@JISCMAIL.AC.UK] - which sought to shed light on their experience of the conditions of reception of their scholarship at AMR relative to other journals and on the question of why little critical scholarship has appeared in AMR in comparison to other journals, - have been excluded or paraphrased. To comply with the word restriction imposed upon AMR FTEs, the Appendix summarizing responses to this poll has also been removed. The interested reader will find the earlier draft of this FTE at: [www \[URL TO BE INSERTED\]](#).

ⁱⁱ As an indicator of the dearth of CMS scholarship appearing in AMR, a search revealed a total of 28 articles published in AMR between January 1995 to June 2015 containing the phrase ‘critical management’. This number is perhaps suggestive of a modest degree of recognition and inclusion of (big ‘C’) critical scholarship in the journal. Yet, on closer examination, little support for this proposition can be garnered. 4 of the 28 references appear in book reviews; 5 appear in editorial comments, notes or responses; 10 are in the References to articles; 1 appears in the key words; 3 articles use the phrase ‘critical management’ to refer to a (mainstream) competency or task, or just mention it in passing; and 1 is listed in publications received. That leaves 4 articles during two decades of AMR in which there is, at best, anything more than a fleeting recognition of, or trivial engagement with, ‘critical management’.

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

^{iv} According to the AMR office, I was assigned 42 manuscripts, rather than 28. The overall acceptance rate for submitted to AMR is around 5%. So, unless CMS submissions significantly exceed this average rate, the current prospect of CMS papers appearing in AMR is vanishingly small. It is this issue that this FTE seeks to address.

^v The percentages of non-US authors are: 2012/46%; 2013/37%; 2014/59%; 2015/65%. The current indications are that 2016 will contain at least the same number of non-US authors as for 2014/15. In 2009, 16% of board members were non-US based. This had increased to 37% by 2015.

^{vi} I have served on the AMR Board since 2003. Rick Delbridge served as associate editor during the previous editorial term. Currently 10 editorial board members (7%), selected primarily on the basis of their evaluation as reviewers, indicate an expertise in CMS

^{vii} <http://aom.org/Divisions-and-Interest-Groups/Academy-of-Management-Division---Interest-Group-Domain-Statements.aspx#cms>. When drawing attention to the CMS Domain Statement, my primary purpose is not to endorse its claim that organizations and/or management are ‘instruments of domination’, etc. I readily acknowledge that the Statement is not one to which all CMS proponents and sympathizers

unreservedly subscribe. My concern, instead, is to highlight the presence and significance of (differences of) values for our understanding of processes of theory formation and dissemination.

^{viii} The papers identified as ‘best’ from 2000-2103 (the latest date when preparing this FTE in June 2015) had 29 authors (many papers were co-authored). Of these, 8 were not North American based, and only two of them had not received PhDs from North American schools. Neither of these, who received their PhDs in the UK and the Netherlands respectively, was a lead author. In general, what is assessed to be the ‘best’ research published in AMR does not originate from authors trained outside of North America - the very population of scholars who, to date, have produced most of the heterodox scholarship, including contributions to CMS. However, as argued in the body of the paper the North American management paradigm” is intellectual, not exclusively geographical.

^{ix} http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/About_AOM/Governance/AOM_Code_of_Ethics.pdf

^{xi} <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

^{xii} <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>

^{xiii} It could be argued, compellingly, that other strands of CMS (e.g. the insights of Marx or Foucault) are equally relevant for informing this analysis. Weber’s thinking has been selected because AMR readers are likely to be more familiar it.

^{xiv} The main exceptions to this neglect are Frost and Taylor’s (1977, 2nd ed) collection *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* and Baruch *et al*’s (2008) collection *Opening the Black Box of Editorship*. Each contains a number of chapters on the ‘demand side’ of the process to which I make reference. See also Miller,(2006) and Grey (2010).

^{xv} Weber’s ideas about power and domination are adopted not because they are the most authoritative or compelling but because his work is highly influential in the field of organization studies and is therefore likely to be both more familiar and convivial to AMR readers.

^{xvi} Within structure(s) of domination, there is an interdependence of the ostensibly “powerful” (editors) and the “powerless” (authors). Notably, the reputation of journal editors and their associated capacity to exercise power depends, to some degree, on the experiences of authors.

^{xvii} Editorial communications may, in addition, be conditioned and compromised by other (e.g. defensive or nepotistic) considerations. They are, nonetheless, ostensibly based upon impersonal, expert evaluations framed within impartial, bureaucratic procedures as set out in editorial policy and advice to reviewers. At AMR, reviewer selection, for example, is, in principle, based upon ascribed expertise and performance is closely monitored and measured.

^{xviii} Each of the responses to editorial ‘advice’ – ‘habituation’, ‘calculation’ and ‘resistance’ - is a Weberian “ideal type” in the sense that it is a “one-sided accentuation[s] of one or more points of view” (Weber, 1949: 89). Each orientation is one to which authors tend to approximate, and may alternate between, blend or prevaricate over.

^{xix} As Oliver (1991: 156) observes, institutional theory struggles to account for resistance: it is “unable to explain the continuing reappearance of alternative schools that attempt to make a virtue of their active departure from institutional beliefs and commonly held definitions...”. See also Cooper, Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008 ; Willmott, 2015.

^{xx} Citing <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Information-for-Contributors.aspx>. The critical interrogation of mundane, ‘practical consciousness’ is no panacea. Its impact may be limited. It may fuel cynicism and gaming when, for example, reflection is harnessed to securing authors’ and/or editors’ investments in normality. Nonetheless, when critical insights into the limits of ‘normal science’ and the regressive effects of the scholarly “structure of dominancy” (Weber, 1978: 941) are not ignored or shrugged off, subjection to its norms may be weakened, and “the frontiers of our knowledge” may be “pushed back” (Ragins, 2015: 5)

^{xxi} This is consistent with Weber’s belief that what differentiates human beings from other life forms and events in nature is the capacity to make such a commitment while recognizing that it involves a leap of faith that can be rationally framed but never rationally justified. An example of this commitment is the embrace by exponents of ‘big ‘C’ critical scholarship of emancipation as the ultimate value, in which is incorporated an awareness that whatever value and meaning is ascribed to scholarly activity is inherently a matter of contestation.

^{xxii} <http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/Outstanding-Reviewers.aspx>. There was a marked increase in 2015 when 4/15 were non-US based,

^{xxiii} It may be objected that such reforms should be discounted as they might provoke resistance and other negative consequences. However, that takes insufficient account of the *institutionalized*, but currently normalized, negative consequences of the existing arrangements. No system is perfect but if the ambition is to overcome “insular thinking” (King and Lepak, 2011:209) and “engage a full range of scholars who belong to the Academy of Management” (ibid: 210), then something more substantial and ‘structural’ must be done to reassure prospective authors that “their theoretical contributions...are valued by AMR” (ibid).

Notes

^{xxiv} It is worth underscoring how the diverse critical approaches that comprise CMS are applied *across the full range of domains of scholarship represented by the AoM Divisions*, and indeed extend beyond those domains to the disciplines of accounting, marketing, information systems, operational research and so on (see Alvesson and Willmott, 2003; Grey and Willmott, 2005; Alvesson, Bridgman and Willmott, 2009). Critical scholarship is not a distinct *topic* area equivalent to many other Divisions of the AoM, such as entrepreneurship or spirituality. It is, rather, a *perspective*, or bundle of related approaches, deployed to theorize the entire range of management fields and issues.

^{xxv} An indicator of the dominance of string theory is that in the top US departments (Berkeley, Caltech, Harvard, MIT, Princeton and Stanford) in 2005, 20 out of 22 tenured professors in the field of particle physics who gained their PhD after 1981 have made their reputations in string theory or related approaches (Smolin, 2006: xx). Smolin adds that ‘In the last fifteen years there have been a total of three assistant professorships appointed to American research universities who work on approaches to quantum gravity other than string theory, and these appointments were all to a single research group (ibid)

^{xxvi} Davis (2010: 705) notes how ‘a half dozen paradigms maintain hegemony every year, facing little danger that new evidence will pile up against them, with [neo-institutional theory] at the head of the class’. It is not, however, simply ‘new evidence’ but new thinking – including critical scholarship - that is necessary to unsettle this ‘hegemony’ (see also Cooper, Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008) ‘New evidence’ alone is

readily absorbed in ways that bolster rather than subvert the (value-based) assumptions that underpin and animate those ‘paradigms’ (see Ezzamel and Willmott, 2013).

^{xxvii} It is relevant to note that the significance of Jacques’ (1992) paper has not been taken up within the pages of AMR. According to Google Scholar, there are 87 citations of his work of which only 5 are in AMR.

^{xxviii} Forms of knowledge more closely connected with the “ethic of judgment” may contribute to critical scholarship, as Picketty’s (2014) exposure of the dynamics of inequality demonstrates. But their inclusion is conditional upon being assessed to have a potentially emancipatory effect, and to incorporate an associated awareness of how concrete circumstances condition what counts as scientific knowledge, and what is ‘seen’ by it.

^{xxix} When drawing attention to the CMS Domain Statement, my purpose is not primarily to endorse its claim that organizations and/or management are ‘instruments of domination’, etc., not least because I acknowledge that it is not one to which CMS proponents and sympathizers universally or unreservedly subscribe. My concern, instead, is to highlight the presence and significance of (differences of) values for our understanding of processes of theory formation and dissemination.

^{xxx} My view is that this ‘accommodation’ extends to varieties of positivist scholarship, with the strict proviso that its limitations are clearly signaled and that any imperialist impulse is firmly held in check. To exclude positivist research on any grounds is to imply that other forms of knowledge can somehow be cleansed of power, in the sense of making ontological and epistemological assumptions that fully overcome the shortcomings ascribed to positivist research.

^{xxxi} The principle exceptions to this neglect are Frost and Taylor’s (1977, 2nd ed) edited collection *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences* and Baruch *et al*’s (2008) edited collection *Opening the Black Box of Editorship*. Each contains a number of chapters on the ‘demand side’ of the process to which I make reference. See also Miller, 2006.

^{xxxii} Weber’s conception of power and domination is adopted not because it is the most authoritative or compelling but because his work is highly influential in the field of organization studies and is therefore likely to be both more familiar and convivial to AMR readers.

^{xxxiii} It is not difficult to think of examples of academics who have been narrowly trained to comply quasi-automatically with the ‘commands’ contained in editorial decision letters, with minimal regard for the consistency of their compliance with whatever purpose or value informed their research activity or the preparation of their manuscript. Authors who tend towards this ‘habituated’ type of response assume the judgments of the editor and reviews are authoritative, rather like some students who reify their marks without regard for the multiple contingencies associated with the determination of their grades.

^{xxxiv} In addition to having relevant scholarly qualifications, appointees to the AMR editorial board are likely to have achieved an outstanding performance as reviewers, as rated by editors.

^{xxxv} This is consistent with Weber’s belief that what differentiates human beings from other life forms and events in nature is the capacity to make such a commitment while recognizing that it involves a leap of faith that can be rationally framed but never rationally justified.