



Kent Academic Repository

Ogbonnaya, Chidiebere and Brown, Andrew (2022) *Editorial: Crafting review and essay articles for Human Relations*. *Human Relations* . ISSN 0018-7267. (In press)

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/97434/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal* , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Editorial: Crafting Review and Essay Articles for Human Relations

Abstract

Human Relations has long welcomed different types of reviews – systematic reviews, meta-analyses, conceptual reviews, narrative reviews, historical reviews – and critical essays that are original, innovative, of high-quality, and contribute to theory building in the social sciences. The main purpose of this essay is to sketch out our current broad expectations for reviews and essays as a guide for authors and reviewers. As Editors of the journal, we do not wish to be overly prescriptive. After all, reviews may be integrative and focus on synthesis and integration to generate new concepts, frameworks and perspectives, or they may be more problematizing and contribute by identifying problematics, tensions, and contradictions in a literature. Furthermore, consonant with its heritage, *Human Relations* invites scholarship from all research traditions across the social sciences that focus on social relations at work. It is a pluralistic, heterodox journal that will continue to publish a range of reviews and critical essays so long as authors have clear objectives and contribute meaningfully to the field. This will generally involve writing reviews and essays that seek to maximize what we see and are sufficiently complex to deal adequately with the richness and variety of the literatures and ideas considered.

Key Words

Literature review, critical essay, meta-analysis, organization theory, *Human Relations*

Introduction

Social science, as a conversation (Kuhn, 1970), relies on review articles and critical essays to maintain an effective discourse for the advancement of research. They are an important means of synthesising prior works, comparing their findings, highlighting relevant gaps and puzzles, challenging and extending theory, and proposing new questions and directions for future studies (Palmatier, Houston and Hull, 2018; Paré, Trudel, Jaana and Kitsiou, 2015; Shepherd and Suddaby, 2017). Such papers are a distinctive genre of research article that contribute to theoretical, conceptual, and methodological advancement by allowing readers to reflect more deeply on what we know and do not know about a specific topic or domain (Rousseau, Manning and Denyer, 2008). In this regard, well-conceived review and essay papers remain central to encouraging critical reflection on existing knowledge with the goal of broadening and deepening understanding, highlighting implications for theory and practice, and stimulating future activity (Patriotta, 2020). *Human Relations* has long published original, innovative, and high-quality review articles and critical essays that contribute substantively to theory-building in the social sciences and will continue to do so (Perlman and Hartman, 1982; Salin, 2003; Staines, 1980).

To avoid confusion, it is useful to start with a few brief definitions. We regard a literature review as a synthesis and critical assessment of existing texts relating to a topic, field, or domain (Bem, 1995; Hart, 1998). While seeming to specify a discrete scholarly form, literature reviews are increasingly recognized to take multiple guises, and various classification schemes have been developed to capture their rich diversity (Cooper, 1988; Fan, Breslin, Callhan, and Iszat-White, 2022; King and He, 2005; Paul and Criado, 2020). The ‘essay’, originating with Montaigne, is also broad in its connotations, referring among other things to the trialling, sampling, tasting, practising, experimenting, improvising, and trying out of ideas (Atwan, 2012; Adorno, Hullot-Kentor and Will, 1984). Indeed, Atwan, (2012: 114) has argued

that ‘in Alice-in-Wonderland fashion, an essay can be whatever anyone claims it is’. In inviting authors to submit ‘critical essays’ *Human Relations* is asking for submissions in which the writer’s personal views and reflections on a topic are integral to arguments that are provocative and perhaps polemical, but which are also revealing, generative, and compelling. Our principal intention in this article is not to draw hard and fast boundaries between types of review articles, or between critical essays and reviews – though we make distinctions we hope are useful – but to offer insight on the kinds of works the journal seeks to publish.

A considerable ‘meta-level discourse’ has emerged on what it takes to demonstrate originality and relevance (Bartunek et al., 2006), how best to make a theoretical contribution (Corley and Gioia, 2011), and the importance of having scholarly impact (Ashford, 2013). An array of academic papers provide tips on how to prepare review articles (e.g., Patriotta, 2017; Shepherd and Suddaby, 2017; Torraco, 2016; Tranfield et al., 2003; Van de ven and Johnson, 2006) and several editorials have discussed various types of reviews and offered suggestions of best practices to help authors avoid common pitfalls (Bacq et al., 2021; Jones and Gatrell, 2014; Paul and Criado, 2020; Palmatier et al., 2018; Short, 2009). These papers provide a starting point for both early career and established researchers and may assist initial thinking, though they may not always be entirely helpful. As a leading social science journal, *Human Relations* has a distinguished history of publishing outstanding review articles alongside other empirical papers in regular and special issues. We welcome submissions from all social science disciplines and publish research that informs, innovates, and impacts meaningfully on social science discourses (Learmonth, 2020, 2022). To foster this work, our goal here is to elaborate on some key issues in writing worthwhile reviews and essays and highlight problematics that our editors and reviewers will consider when evaluating such manuscripts.

First, we outline six features that tend generally to characterize the best quality reviews and essays. Second, we discuss five of the most common types of review articles found in

Human Relations – systematic reviews, meta-analyses, conceptual reviews, narrative reviews and historical reviews – and critical essays. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses employ a rigorous search strategy and specified criteria to ensure a representative coverage of the literature (Paré et al., 2015; Paul and Criado, 2020), while narrative reviews, conceptual reviews, historical reviews, and critical essays synthesize and sometimes problematize what has been written on a topic without necessarily conducting an exhaustive literature search. We discuss the purposes of each, a few of the practical difficulties that come with their implementation and point to some exemplary *Human Relations* review and essay papers. Finally, we offer some thoughts for writing a persuasive article based on the interlinked principles of ‘seek to maximise what we see’ (Weick, 1987) and ‘write to complexify’ (Tsoukas, 2017). We hope our commentary will serve as a springboard for authors to meet the high editorial standards that have defined *Human Relations*’ legacy over the past 75 years.

The process of writing and publishing a review article or essay involves several potentially contested aspects, such as how authors gather and use information to prepare their submissions, how reviewers evaluate work after submission, and how different editors decide what is publishable or not. We offer our thoughts while acknowledging that our assessments are inevitably personal. Rather than viewing our considerations as rules, guidelines or heuristics, readers should regard them as points for reflection when writing an effective, generative, rigorous, and hopefully creative and inspiring review or essay. Authors of academic works may conceive themselves using diverse images (Morgan, 1986) – such as puzzle solvers or detectives, artists or construction workers, craft workers, bricoleurs or scientists etc. – and these self-conceptions, along with the predicates and assumptions they embody, will result in them writing very different papers (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2020). When it comes to writing review articles and essays, very little is definitive or absolute and *Human Relations* delights in the diversity of papers that it publishes. We hope the views articulated here will help authors,

reviewers, and editors to better align expectations when authoring and evaluating manuscripts for publication in leading journals. That said, the guidance for authors of reviews contained in the current statement of *Human Relations*' Aims and Scope remains unchanged:

'... reviews advance a field through new theory, new methods, a novel synthesis of extant evidence, or a combination of two or three of these elements. Reviews that identify new research questions and that make links between management and organizations and the wider social sciences are particularly welcome. Surveys or overviews of a field are unlikely to meet these criteria' (*Human Relations*, 2022).

Features of high-quality reviews and essays

Researchers have often struggled with the process of writing a review or essay article. This can be attributed in part to the significant amount of time and effort required to assess the current state of knowledge on a given topic and the breadth of empirical research in a field (Baumeister and Leary, 1997; Webster and Watson, 2002). Most importantly, writing a review or essay paper for *Human Relations* is not uncomplicated, as it requires substantive advancement of theory in the social sciences as well as pushing the frontiers of research in an area. This may be accomplished in diverse ways; for example, by identifying gaps in the literature, commenting on emerging perspectives or developing new ones, exposing assumptions, critiquing established positions, improving construct clarity, testing theory, and discussing boundary conditions (Breslin and Gatrell, 2020; Palmatier et al., 2018; Pare et al., 2015; Post et al., 2020). Thus, writing an excellent review article and most essays necessitates the following key aspects: (i) choosing an appropriate topic or domain of inquiry, (ii) conducting an insightful synthesis of relevant literature, (iii) identifying knowledge gaps issues, or areas requiring additional research, (iv) formulating generative frameworks, hypotheses or propositions, (v) highlighting key directions for future research, and (vi) telling a good story.

(i) *Choice of topic* is one of the most important considerations when writing a review article or essay (Paul and Criado, 2020; Webster and Watson, 2002). Authors must often choose

between mature literatures with well-developed knowledge bases and new, emerging fields that require more holistic understanding and synthesis. Sometimes it is appropriate to draw on seemingly disparate literatures and make novel and as yet unrealized connections between streams of research that have previously been considered distinct or which are unhelpfully fragmented (Chudzikowski and Mayrhofer, 2011). Scholars must then justify their choices and make a convincing case for a review of that area, keeping in mind that the number of texts selected for review will depend on a range of field-specific factors and the author's intent, with typical estimates of what is required varying between 40-50 to more than 500 articles (Paul and Criado, 2020). High-quality reviews and essays often tackle topics that are distinctive, but also relevant to the broader scope of the target literature. This helps a manuscript to make a good first impression on those evaluating it. On the other hand, editors and reviewers are generally quite sceptical about review articles that are overly conservative, cover previously published research questions, and add little additional value as these are unlikely to engage a broad readership (Torraco, 2016).

(ii) Whether a review article or essay tackles a mature or emergent topic, readers expect *a thought-provoking synthesis* that generates new insights into the subject matter (Brannan, Fleetwood, O'Mahoney and Vincent, 2017). A thorough, integrative overview, for example, employs a formal, transparent, and rigorous method for evaluating prior research and presents it to a target audience in an easily digestible manner (Baumeister and Leary, 1997). Writing a provocative synthesis is a creative process that, when executed with sophistication and elegance, enhances understanding of what is known and unknown about a research topic (Torraco, 2016). Rousseau et al. (2008) argued that an exhaustive synthesis allows authors to decipher the most salient characteristics of the phenomena under study, rather than simply summarizing published work. In this way, authors are better able to connect previously unrelated pieces of literature to enhance readers' appreciation of their topic. Through a

comprehensive assimilation of relevant texts, authors may gain a more informed understanding of the literature and thus provide readers with a unique perspective on the subject matter (Rousseau et al., 2008). What is more, for systematic reviews and meta-analyses it is important to do this without undue ‘cherry picking’ of ideas and evidence so that readers have confidence that the review process was comprehensive and appropriately rigorous, and that all important components of a literature have been accounted for (Paré et al., 2015). A systematic review article that does not deal adequately with all pertinent materials may fail to reasonably explain what has been explored and discovered, or what insights the research adds beyond what have been previously published. Such papers are more likely to be rejected or returned to the authors for reanalysis as they fall short of fulfilling basic requirements. See, for example, Knight and Parker (2021), who were able to blend new ideas from different streams of research on work redesign interventions. From reviewing fifty-five studies, the authors reported three fundamental reasons why work redesigns improve performance: change in job motivation, quick response, and learning.

(iii) Additionally, high-quality review articles and essays often *identify important knowledge gaps* or areas for further investigation in the literature (Snyder, 2019; Webster and Watson, 2002). One of the primary reasons why such articles are published in leading journals is to shed light on specific aspects of a literature that have received little attention. As Short (2009) explained, emphasizing the evidence gap between what we know and what we need to know alerts other scholars to areas for contribution – which is precisely the aim of many review articles. That is, a well-written review requires not just a synthesis of previous research, but also, generally, the development of a meaningful account of what the literature is missing. See Healey and Hodgkinson (2014) for an example of a *Human Relations* paper that identified a significant knowledge gap in the literature (using brain imaging and neurophysiological techniques in management and organizational research) and provided specific guidelines (in

the form of a critical realist framework) to help future research in addressing it. We can compare writing a review article to creating a new recipe, where existing ingredients must be researched, and new ingredients and preparatory techniques may sometimes be developed through critical reflection and creativity.

(iv) It is difficult for a leading journal to publish a review paper if the authors do not *expand on, extend, or add new insights to any theoretical or conceptual frameworks* (Patriotta, 2020; Snyder, 2019). Generally, editors and reviewers place a greater premium on the theoretical contribution of a manuscript above merely describing the available evidence on a topic. Thus, depending on the breadth and maturity of the field, a vital feature of the best reviews is often the presentation of clear, logical, and field-specific theoretical and conceptual contributions (Baumeister and Leary, 1997). This enables authors to identify and sometimes reconcile tensions and antagonisms in prior research, while offering well-grounded suggestions or perhaps propositions or hypotheses upon which other researchers can build to advance a field (Boyd and Solarino, 2016; Rodell, Breitsohl, Schröder, and Keating, 2016). There are several examples of theory-building reviews that have been published in *Human Relations* (e.g., Bernerth, Walker, and Harris, 2016). In these studies, authors seek generally to ensure that key ideas and lines of reasoning are theoretically justified, thereby resulting in intellectually cohesive works.

(v) Well-written review papers have the potential to *influence the future direction of research* on a given topic (Webster and Watson, 2002). Editors and reviewers are generally enthusiastic about manuscripts that not only draw on and synthesize numerous studies, but also highlight unresolved issues and questions (Baumeister and Leary, 1997). Nielsen and Miraglia (2017) provide a good example of a review article published in *Human Relations* in which the authors were able to dissect the current state of research and provide concise suggestions to guide future theoretical and empirical efforts. One caveat, however, is that authors should avoid

the appearance of being narrowly selective when picking topics and areas for future research. Rather, a clear theoretical rationale should govern the proposed research agenda which may take multiple forms, including generative research propositions, hypotheses, questions, and conceptual models.

(vi) We follow Dyer and Wilkins (1991: 617) in arguing that the most persuasive and compelling academic papers ‘are good stories’. That is, a great review paper or critical essay, whatever its format, intent, or structure, should *tell an interesting story* that captivates readers’ attention (Corbett et al., 2014; Harley and Hardy, 2004). This position draws on a broad social science literature that recognizes humans are inveterate storytellers and interpreters of narrative (Fisher, 1984; MacIntyre, 1981), and stories a ‘primary cognitive instrument’ (Mink, 1978: 131) for simplifying and making comprehensible complex social realities. This is important in part because it suggests that an insightful review or essay, unlike a simple listing or chronology, is a ‘creative re-description of the world such that hidden patterns and hitherto unexplored meanings can unfold’ (Kearney, 2002: 12). All reviews and essays are author-contingent, make use of rhetorical devices, and written for a specific audience, and these features are best embraced rather than ignored (Aristotle, 1941; McCloskey, 1983). To embark on writing a review or essay is not just a voyage of discovery but of invention. Furthermore, these are processes in which the author/researcher always features – albeit generally more latently in systematic reviews and meta-analyses than in essays – and whose intentions, whims, and prejudices are revealed in both the choices that govern its content and the rhetorical choices by which ideas are communicated.

Types of Human Relations Review

In this section, we discuss five of the most common types of review articles published in *Human Relations* – systematic reviews, meta-analyses, conceptual reviews, narrative

reviews, historical reviews – and critical essays (see Table 1). Each type, depending on its goals and research questions, can lead to a better understanding of a topic, build theory, and lay the groundwork for further research. Of course, it is important to note that actual reviews and essays are likely to blur the boundaries of these ideal types. Our discussion should not be interpreted rigidly, as there is no requirement for articles submitted to *Human Relations* to fit neatly into a single category, nor should any type of review or essay be considered more valuable than another (Pare et al., 2015). While the format and design of a review or essay article will vary depending on the research questions it seeks to address, as well as the methodologies used to appropriate the literature, for *Human Relations* they must contribute meaningfully to the theoretical development of the social sciences. Importantly, reviews and essays published in this journal may also inform scholarship outside the social sciences. Leadership, for example, is a topic prominent in some branches of finance and engineering and self-identity is a concept of interest in philosophy and theology. Reviews and essays submitted to *Human Relations* must be conceived primarily for social scientists but when appropriate, may also be written to appeal to these broader constituencies. As editors, our goal here is to offer suggestions to help authors prepare their work and avoid unnecessary distracting issues with reviewers.

---Table 1 about here---

Systematic reviews

Systematic reviews often focus on a specific research question and adopt a robust methodology for identifying relevant studies for review, summarising their key findings, and suggesting key implications for theory and sometimes practice (Briner, Denyer, and Rousseau, 2009; Jones and Gatrell, 2014; Rowe, 2014; Tranfield et al., 2003). In this type of review, the decisions for selecting and compiling evidence are transparent such that overt bias is minimized, findings are reliable, and readers can assess the overall quality of the review

process. A *Human Relations* example is Knight and Parker (2019), which uses a systematic review protocol known as the PICOS (population, intervention, comparators, outcomes, study design; Shamseer et al., 2015). The authors employ this approach to examine a wide range of study designs, including experiments, quasi-experiments, observational studies, and field studies. Another example is Shao and Guo (2021), who review the literature on leader anger expression based on a systematic analysis of 48 studies. Employing clearly-defined research questions, the authors conducted their literature search in two widely used databases, Business Source Complete and PsycINFO. The benefits of such detailed procedures include rigorous analyses of relevant evidence, clarity in retrieving articles for review, and the potential to maximize future replicability (Tranfield et al., 2003).

Authors should be aware of the practical difficulties that come with conducting systematic reviews (Briner et al., 2009; Dijkers, 2009; Palmatier et al., 2018), including conflicts of interest, limited access to databases and peer-reviewed publications, and time-costs. Furthermore, systematic reviews may nevertheless overlook potentially relevant studies depending on the research design and search strategy. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are frequently used in these reviews to evaluate relevant research and ensure objectivity. However, choice is inherent in the screening process, and when several researchers are involved each member of the research team may interpret inclusion criteria differently. This increases the possibility of inconsistency in the studies chosen for analysis. Moreover, grey literature (such as government reports and policy papers) can be particularly difficult to account for. Considerations such as these have led Rousseau et al. (2008) to argue that, although systematic review procedures are more transparent than those for narrative articles, they can result in unjustifiable or misplaced conclusions when inappropriate selection criteria are used. Another potential problem with systematic reviews is the danger of offering merely a summative and wholly or largely descriptive analysis of a literature. This presents a notable challenge for

authors as *Human Relations* editors and reviewers require submissions that make a substantive theoretical contribution.

Meta-analyses

Meta-analyses are an increasingly popular form of review that address a well-defined research question (Elsbach and van Knippenberg, 2018; Tranfield et al., 2003). They are recognized as one of the most effective methods for synthesizing and summarizing prior research and generating statistically-derived answers to research questions (Boyd and Solarino, 2016; Rosenthal and DiMatteo, 2001). Meta-analyses can help researchers better understand a phenomenon by providing effect size estimations with precision. In a *Human Relations* meta-analysis, Reichl and colleagues (2014) quantified the correlations between dimensions of work–nonwork conflict (work-to-nonwork and nonwork-to-work conflict) and different burnout subscales. Their findings were based on 86 primary studies with 91 independent samples, 220 coefficients and a total of 51,700 participants. Graßmann et al. (2020) quantify the correlations between working alliance and client outcomes in coaching using data from 27 independent samples and a total of 3563 coaching processes. Another recent example is Holtom et al. (2022) which analyses response rate information reported in 1014 surveys published across 703 articles in 17 journals to investigate trends in survey response rates.

There are analytical and practical challenges associated with conducting a meta-analysis (Brannan et al., 2017; Rosenthal and DiMatteo, 2001; Rousseau et al., 2008). First, meta-analyses are prone to publication bias, which occurs frequently because primary studies with no statistically significant findings are less likely to be published and are, therefore, more likely to be excluded from the analysis (Rousseau et al., 2008). Where publication bias occurs, it may result in an over-representation of positive results in the meta-analysis, while non-significant results are substantially under-reported (Brannan et al., 2017). Moreover, the

effectiveness of a meta-analysis is highly dependent on the quality of the original primary research, and if the study's statistical methodology was flawed, effect size estimates could be invalidated. This limitation may have serious consequences when the findings of a meta-analysis are used to inform theoretical, practical, and policy-based decision-making. Another possible limitation for meta-analyses stems from issues with the inclusion and exclusion criteria employed and their application in practice by authors. The decision to include or exclude studies will vary depending on the precise specification of the research topic and researchers' preferences and can result in arguably inaccurate or biased effect size estimates (Brannan et al., 2017). This said, as with systematic reviews, the greatest challenge for authors of meta-analyses is often determining how their study can make a meaningful contribution to theory.

Conceptual reviews

The purpose of conceptual reviews is to synthesize and extend existing literature to develop a new (or refine an existing) concept, theoretical framework, model, approach or perspective (Palmatier et al., 2018). Authors may often present a set of research propositions that assist in bridging previously fragmented but interrelated theoretical perspectives (for exemplary *Human Relations* articles, see: Ashforth and Humphrey, 2022; Bernerth et al., 2016; Brown, 2022; Dawkins, Martin, Scott, and Sanderson, 2015; Gundlach, Zivnuska, and Stoner, 2006). Besides seeking to integrate existing ideas, such reviews aim to be generative and to yield new knowledge, novel thinking or innovative critique (Cronin and George, 2020). Bernerth et al. (2016), for example, develop a new theoretical model by bringing together diverse streams of work from a mature literature, and offering a series of testable propositions. Brown (2022) draws on a vast literature on identities and identity work to argue for the emergence of a nascent but distinctive 'identity work perspective' to rival established identities

theorizing associated with Social Identity Theory (SIT) and role theory. At their best, conceptual reviews are highly generative with the potential to spark, as well as guide, future empirical and theoretical research (Shepherd and Suddaby, 2017).

Conceptual reviews are among the most challenging types of manuscripts to get published (Shepherd and Suddaby, 2017; Weick, 1995; Van de Ven and Johnson, 2006). One of the primary difficulties is that these contributions are highly dependent on the authors' unique ideas and the elegance with which they are communicated (Jacques, 1992). Shepherd and Suddaby (2017) discuss activities that assist authors in the process of theory development, including: identifying a narrative tension that will motivate theorizing, developing and naming core constructs early in the process of argumentation, elaborating contexts or settings, and actively engaging audience imagination through the introduction of plots and themes (see also Breslin and Gatrell, 2020; Hoon and Baluch, 2020). Each of these requires a degree of skill and creativity which Snyder (2019: 336) is sceptical that many scholars possess. Some argue that the quality of the theorizing process is likely improved when researchers address research problems with real-world ramifications and structure their study in a manner that connects with practice (Van de ven and Johnson, 2006), though this is not generally a strong requirement for conceptual reviews. Ford et al. (2022), for example, developed a psychoanalytical framework using Lewis Carroll's (1876) nonsense poem to explain why the search for new leadership theories continues despite 150 years of failure to find a workable theory. Their study deviates from the traditional research approaches by focusing on those who study leadership (e.g., academics in business and management schools) rather than organizational leaders per se.

Narrative reviews

Narrative reviews are particularly common in the social sciences. Their principal goal is to consider, and often critically analyse, key aspects of a topic sometimes without expressly adopting a systematic approach (Paul and Criado, 2020). In describing how to write narrative reviews, Fan, Breslin, Callahan and Iszatt-White (2022) explain that a scholar may begin with a relatively small number of texts and pursue a snowballing approach to identify other works using their intuition. In this respect, those narrative reviews which are relatively unsystematic may not always describe fully the procedures for searching and retrieving relevant evidence from the literature (Baumeister and Leary, 1997). It has previously also been observed that some topics – especially those that are spread across disciplinary boundaries or domains – are better suited to a narrative rather than a systematic approach (e.g., Burke and Morley, 2016). At *Human Relations*, however, authors of narrative reviews while not obliged are strongly encouraged to say how they conducted their literature search and determined the selection criteria for texts. Burke and Morley (2016), for example, offer a narrative overview of the literature on temporary organizations, which is somewhat heterogeneous but adds value by providing an inductively derived framework for analysing the individual/team attributes and outcomes of temporary organizations. Another example is Tsoukas and Hatch (2001) which advances complexity theory by developing a narrative framework for addressing the inherent limitations of logico-scientific thinking in organizational research.

Compared with systematic reviews, editors and reviewers may be sceptical of the depth and rigour of narrative reviews (Fan, Breslin, Callahan and Iszatt-White, 2022). It is more difficult to evaluate whether authors of narrative reviews have merely selectively cited evidence that reinforces their own preconceived notions about a topic, or whether they have presented a certain perspective to advance a specific agenda. This can be a significant drawback for readers who want to learn more about particular aspects of a topic but are unsure whether

the information provided is both comprehensive and (with all the usual caveats) ‘unbiased’. Readers can have difficulties discerning the extent to which available evidence was synthesized and compiled, or the reasons why some studies were given more weight than others. Neophyte readers may be unable to differentiate between recommendations based on authors’ idiosyncratic interpretations and those which reflect mainstream views (Dijkers, 2009; Williams, 1998). Recognizing explicitly and reflexively these issues is crucial not only for raising authors’ and readers’ awareness, but also for improving the depth and persuasiveness of narrative reviews. However, as Baumeister and Leary (1997: 312) observe, when well accomplished there is broad consensus that ‘...narrative literature reviewing is a valuable theory-building technique, and it may also serve hypothesis-generating functions’.

Historical reviews

Historical reviews are often a specific type of narrative review, that can also sometimes be relatively systematic. They trace the historical development of a specialist field of knowledge, stream of theorizing, or concept, and sometimes the historic forces that shaped its formation (Callahan, 2010). Generally, the point of origin for historical reviews is the initial set of empirical studies or conceptual essay(s) that initiated a novel complex of scholarly conversations that has had substantive influence within a branch of the social sciences. Historical reviews show how these conversations emerged and flourished, while attending also to their key predicates, guiding principles and precepts, the major contributions that have been made, any flaws or contradictions that have arisen, and prospects (see Cluley and Parker, 2022; Fleming et al., 2022). A brave and seldom taken choice is to conclude that a topic has been largely exhausted and that scholars are best advised to move on to other territory. At their best, historical reviews make important connections between distinct authors and specific contributions that were previously un-noticed or unexploited and which spur new pathways

forward for research (see, for example, Maclean, Shaw and Harvey's (2022) historical analysis of the British origins of CSR discourses). The major difficulty faced by authors of historical reviews is to go beyond merely telling a story of how a topic has been developed and to make a compelling theoretical contribution.

The seventy-fifth anniversary special issue of *Human Relations* contains several insightful historical reviews that also highlight the important role played by this journal as an outlet for the most influential social science research (e.g., Petriglieri and Petriglieri, 2022; Pol, Bridgman and Cummings, 2022; Jarzabkowski, Seidl and Balogun, 2022; Guest, Knox and Warhurst, 2022). Guest, Knox and Warhurst (2022) trace the evolution of socio-technical systems (STS) theory and the Quality of Working Life (QWL) literatures detailing how they rose to prominence before becoming less fashionable, and the resurgence of interest in them that has accompanied the challenges posted by digital technologies and Covid-19. Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2022) provide an account of the development of the systems psychodynamic approach and mount a spirited case for its intellectual and practical value as a means for discovering and mitigating defences, fostering pluralism and furthering democracy in human relations. Another example is Jarzabkowski, Seidl and Balogun (2022) who show how the Strategy as Practice (SAP) field progressed from an embryonic fringe to mainstream strategy perspective through phases they refer to as 'germination', 'blossoming', 'harvesting' and most recently 'propagating'.

Critical essays

Critical essays are often characterized as more open, less bounded and sometimes experimental exercises in thought and ideas (Adorno, Hullot-Kentor and Will, 1984; Atwan, 2012). They allow authors to reflect on an existing body of work to identify and discuss strengths, weaknesses, contradictions, controversies, or inconsistencies (Pare et al., 2015). As the current Aims and Scope of the journal state:

‘Critical essays address contemporary scholarly issues and debates within the journal's scope. They are more controversial than conventional papers or reviews, and can be shorter. They argue a point of view, but must meet standards of academic rigour. Anyone with an idea for a critical essay is particularly encouraged to discuss it at an early stage with the Editor-in-Chief’ (Human Relations, 2022).

These manuscripts have appeared in *Human Relations* as, for example, critique (e.g., Brannan et al., 2017; Cabantous et al., 2016) and as a provocative discourse about key shortcomings in organizational research and practice (e.g., Chowdhury, 2021; Fournier and Grey, 2000; Willmott, 2021). Some of the most influential critical essays are those that express the author's perspective in relation to what we already know about the subject, as well as new knowledge acquired from the literature. The strength of such essays lies in their ability to highlight problems, discrepancies, or areas in which existing understanding of a topic is inchoate. As illustrative examples, see Cabantous et al.'s (2016) essay that discusses the potential limitations of critical performativity theory within management and organizational research, and Healey and Hodgkinson's (2014) work which lays out a philosophical and theoretical framework to better understand social neuroscience. Critical essays that take a provocative approach can often clarify understandings, reveal unwarranted assumptions, point out tensions between different streams of theorizing, explain limiting or boundary conditions, and thus help to expand the field's knowledge base and strengthen the prospects for its development (Klein and Potosky, 2019; Torraco, 2016; Van de Ven, 2007; Post et al., 2020).

Critical essays are comparable to other types of review in terms of the synthesis they offer and their capacity to address knowledge gaps or areas for further investigation (Pare et al., 2015). However, unlike systematic reviews, they are often polemical in that they may proceed by assertion, be based on avowedly partial accounts of the literature, and depend for their validity on the subjective appreciation of readers (Keenoy, 1999: 2). That is, critical essays are, to an extent, dialectical exercises with ourselves (Rascaroli, 2017) and as such are often more personal projects (see, for example Grint, 2022). Some regard this as a serious limitation

irrespective of whether the key issues addressed in the essay are consistent with the broader literature (Baumeister and Leary, 1997). However, critical essays that draw attention to potential flaws, contradictions, or controversies in a field are welcomed by *Human Relations*. While the authors of essays may occasionally propose tentative solutions to these issues, the primary objective is often to enlighten readers regarding the challenges and concerns inherent in the phenomena being studied. Critical essays are thus often written with the intention of eliciting more questions than they resolve, enabling other scholars to probe more deeply into the issues they raise (Baumeister and Leary, 1997).

Although in this paper we treat different types of review and critical essays as a set of related scholarly forms, it is important to acknowledge that they may be based on different ontological and epistemological assumptions (Morrell, 2008). In general, systematic reviews and meta-analyses tend to evince a commitment to positivism, which suggests that the social sciences parallel the natural sciences, that knowledge is in principle objective and cumulative, and that such knowledge can be assembled and assessed through techniques which are rigorous and transparent to make ‘progress’ in a field (Hammersley, 2001). Often these predicates are complemented by commitments to develop consensually agreed models and frameworks, shared definitions, and a common language (Pfeffer, 1995). In contrast, narrative and historical reviews and critical essays often accept or even insist, either explicitly or implicitly, that scientific objectivity is a value-laden ideological position, question assumptions of progress and embrace ‘the uncertainty and flexibility of knowledge’ in the social sciences (Lewis and Kelemen, 2002: 251). Conceptual reviews may either be more positivist or interpretive in their orientation depending on the proclivities of the authors, and as often champion the production of testable knowledge as they do recognition of the importance of contingent understanding, reflexivity, aesthetic appreciation, and the politics of critique.

Recognizing the distinct paradigmatic assumptions that authors of reviews and essays may have is important because it fosters an understanding that their works deserve to be evaluated using criteria specifically appropriate to them. While systematic reviews have been criticised for assuming that knowledge is additive (Hammersley, 2001: 548) and that in pursuit of this the findings of studies can be rendered ‘commensurate’ (Morrell, 2008), they are instead more appropriately assessed using the positivistic principles which inform them. Narrative reviews are not infrequently dismissed as lacking ‘thorough-ness’ and ‘rigour’ (Tranfield et al., 2003: 207) but are perhaps best appraised in terms of, for example, their credibility and the insights they generate by defamiliarizing what has previously been taken-for-granted (Barry and Elmes, 1997). Likewise, critical essays which are not designed with the intention of yielding a thorough, rigorous, procedure-driven account of a literature are best critiqued not using the language and assumptions of positivism but polemical interpretivism. That is, in addition to being plausible and coherent texts do they help to ‘re-radicalize debate’ (Learmonth and Harding, 2006), and are they meaningfully provocative, interesting, insightful, and generative? Not uniquely, but perhaps more than most social science journals, *Human Relations* is receptive to reviews based on a broad range of orienting predicates, especially those that take seriously Kilduff and Mehra’s (1997: 476) view that ‘the practice of research should never be a timid adventure’.

Writing Generative Reviews

As we have emphasized, while there are many avenues to writing a review or essay paper for *Human Relations*, and many acceptable formats, all such papers must nevertheless be theoretically generative and able to instantiate solid foundations for future scholarship (Gatrell and Breslin, 2017). Not doing so risks the dreaded ‘so what?’ question that leads reviewers to recommend the rejection of an otherwise promising manuscript. Certainly, there

is a need to guard against the production of a review that is little more than a listing of citations and findings, what Alvesson and Sandberg (2020: 1296) refer to as ‘vacuum cleaning large sets of literatures’, in ways that lack an identifiable plot (Bem, 1995; Webster and Watson, 2002). Again, there are no rules that must necessarily be followed, as the community of researchers that supports this journal is heterogeneous in its interests but, we hope, united in being sophisticatedly inclusive, open to innovation, tolerant, and broad-minded. Post et al. (2020) state that some of the most commonly used strategies for making a theoretical contribution include offering a taxonomy or some form of conceptual classification, devising innovative models and frameworks, and developing metatheory, though as we have sought to emphasize, there are many other possibilities (Weick, 1995, 2007).

As mentioned, a growing body of literature offers a range of guidance, tips, rules and supposed insights on how to craft different types of scholarly review papers for various outlets (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2020; Baumeister and Leary, 1997; Bem, 1995; Denyer and Tranfield, 2009; Jones and Gatrell, 2014; Paul and Criado, 2020; Post et al., 2020; Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2016; Webster and Watson, 2002). Much advice offered is, however, rather banal (e.g., ‘eliminate grammatical and typographical errors’) and sometimes freighted with paradigm-specific assumptions, such as ‘ensure methodological transparency’ and ‘fill a gap, resolve a puzzle or address an anomaly’. Alvesson and Sandberg (2020) note how such strictures, when interpreted narrowly, are likely to result in reviews which are superficial and simplistic, strengthen ‘box thinking’, unjustifiably assume ‘author neutrality’ and introject a ‘pseudo-unity’ in the literatures reviewed. Patriotta (2017) has usefully remarked on the difficulties authors face as they seek to represent their arguments as sufficiently novel and surprising to merit publication while abiding by and paying due homage to conventions, those ‘boundaries of correctness’ (p.748) that enforce conformity in scholarly discourse. With this said, we offer reflexively and with due caution, two brief and intertwined thoughts (which do

not quite amount to heuristics) regarding the kind of scholarly attitude that may most likely result in success: (i) write to maximise what we see while (ii) doing adequate justice to the complexity of our world and its literatures.

Write to maximise what we see

Writing about the value of ideas in organization studies several decades ago, Weick (1987: 122) sagely opined that:

Ideas ... gain their value from what they allow us to see in organizations. Evocative ideas need to be cultivated by theorists from the beginning because belief, not skepticism, precedes observation.... If believing affects seeing, and if theories are significant beliefs that affect what we see, then theories should be adopted more to maximise what we see than to summarise what we have already seen.

Seeking to maximise what we can see by cultivating evocative ideas to inspire novel scholarship is precisely the spirit we encourage authors to adopt when writing review and essay papers for *Human Relations*. The eclectic theory base and vast range of fields of application that scholarship published in this journal exhibits may reasonably encourage authors to be bold and to seek to inspire readers. While there is no specific requirement for papers to provide knowledge that is actionable by practitioners, for some authors this may reasonably be one part of the contribution that is made. Maximising what can be seen often means not being bound by the traditional confines of the literature (or literatures) under review but seeking to forge connections and resonances with other relatable streams of empirical research and theory. Those reviews and essays that focus wholly on a single literature can nevertheless function effectively to cleanse the doors of perception and reinvigorate debates by revealing new ways of thinking (Blake, 1975 [1790]). As we have made clear, systematic reviews and meta-analyses of course have their rightful place in *Human Relations*. However, when it comes to narrative, conceptual, historical and critical papers, closed circuit reviews characterized by intellectual myopia and conservatism are almost always much less satisfactory than reviews

which are imaginatively conceived, appropriately pluralistic, questioning, and perhaps playful. That is, we advise authors to be appropriately expansive and liberal in their approach, draw on multiple related sources in creative ways without unnecessarily kowtowing to tradition, and strive to produce truly innovative arguments and insights.

It has often been noted that social scientific research tends to develop within established paradigms, and while reviews and essays can play important roles promoting within-paradigm theorising and empirical work, they can also be a disruptive influence, drawing attention to parallels, consonances and other points of connection between apparently disparate communities (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Kuhn, 1970; Schultz and Hatch, 1996). Reviews and critical essays may be vital in exposing arrested theoretical development, uncomfortable silences, anomalies that lack adequate explanation, and competing interpretations. This is particularly important in an applied field such as management, which is notoriously dynamic and inherently prone to disconnects evolving to the point where dominant theories and entrenched assumptions are no longer valid or fit for purpose. The Covid-19 pandemic is merely the latest disruptive influence to assault conventional thinking regarding organizations, organizing, and practices of management and has joined with discourses centred on globalization and technological changes associated with digital technologies and artificial intelligence in reshaping the everyday challenges faced by managers and scholars interested in their practices. Always there is a need for reviews that allow us to see more and to see more clearly.

In seeking to write reviews and essays that reveal more, we should not overlook the importance of author intuition, sometimes - referred to as, *inter alia*, a form of creativity that is non-conscious (Barnard, 1938), experiential (Epstein, 1994), automatic (Bargh and Chartrand, 1999), tacit (Hogarth, 2001) or associative (Sloman, 1996) - as a complement to self-consciously rational analysis. Insightful reviews and essays frequently expose latent

patterns in a literature and creatively explore and link seemingly disparate ideas. Intuition is a ‘perception of coherence (pattern, meaning, structure)’ which ‘guides thought and inquiry’ and which can lead to ‘gestalt-like perception or insight’ (Bowers, Regehr, Balthazard and Parker, 1990: 74). Intuitive processes of justification and discovery when they are based on an in-depth reading of a rich literature can lead to the unearthing of new connections and associations, the recognition of unexpected features and patterns, and a more holistic appreciation that the sum of a literature is greater than its individual parts (Epstein, 1994; Kahneman, 2003). While some may object that the use of intuition is antithetic to requirements for traceability, Kump (2022) argues that in those instances where conventional standards of scholarly ‘rigour’ are required, the outcomes of creative imagination can reasonably be validated through conventional analytical procedures. As Janesick (2001: 539) counsels:

‘Intuition is connected to creativity, for intuition is the seed, so to speak, of the creative act ... If we take the time to carve out some space to understand the place of intuition and creativity in our work, like the dancers of the pas de deux, we present a more complete, holistic, and authentic study of our own role as storytellers and artist-scientists.... And nothing is so important to the story as the words we use, both intuitively and creatively’.

It is important also not to lose sight of the fact that scholarly territories are disciplinary spaces characterized by relations of power that structure their contours, privileging some actors while marginalizing others (Foucault, 1972, 1977). These ‘regimes of truth’ (Foucault, 1980) are often highly coercive, subject to processes of surveillance, correction, and control by gatekeepers who guard jealously rights to entry. The assumptions, preferred methods and customs embedded in distinctive paradigms may enforce normativity leading to conventionalized research that side-lines, squeezes and silences non-standard voices. Reviews and essays that analyse and highlight the key assumptions of within-paradigm research, reflect critically on supposed ‘knowledge’, encourage cross-border exchanges, reveal under-researched topics, or issues, and raise seemingly left-field questions are a means to contest conservative and regressive tendencies. Brown and Starkey (2000: 113) describe how, at an

organizational level, cultivating ‘an attitude of wisdom’ is necessary to mitigate dysfunctional defensiveness; which implies ‘... a willingness to explore ego-threatening matters’ and to engage in ‘profound self-questioning’. A similar lens, we suggest, can valuably be applied to specific scholarly communities and their discourses to question established structures of power and mitigate narcissistic conceits on which they are often predicated.

Write to complexify

Drawing on a substantial social science literature, Tsoukas (2017) has argued that there is a need for more complex theories to cope with unpredictable practices because ‘only variety can absorb variety’ (Ashby, 1956: 207; Beer, 1985: 26) and ‘it takes richness to grasp richness’ (Weick, 2007: 16). While Tsoukas’ target is ‘management theory’, there are lessons for authors of reviews and essays whose task it is to contribute to theory building and who might benefit from adopting what Morin (2008: 5) refers to as a paradigm of complexity which implies recognition of the inseparability of ‘events, actions, interactions, retroactions, determinations, and chance that constitute our phenomenal world’. Most social science literatures are far from tidy, well-ordered, and clear-cut; indeed, they are mostly uncomfortably disordered, disconcertingly ambiguous, and alarmingly uncertain. Recognizing this, and the (perhaps inevitable) choices that must be made to render a literature comprehensible and clear is often a good first step, as is distinguishing concepts without forcing unnecessary separations and making associations without unwarranted reductions in meaning. As Tsoukas (2017: 132) observes, ‘Complex theorizing is conjunctive: it seeks to make connections between diverse elements of human experience through making those analytical distinctions that will enable the joining up of concepts normally used in a compartmentalized manner.’

In relation to reviews and critical essays, complexifying may take many forms. For Alvesson and Sandberg (2020) it means writing problematizing reviews which aim at

generating re-conceptualizations of what we think we know. This involves critically interrogating and reimagining extant literature to ‘open up’ ideas rather than merely build on them, recognizing that boundaries are not discovered but imposed, being sensitive to ambiguities and frictions, regarding critically the assumption that knowledge is simply cumulative, emphasizing productive dissensus, acknowledging that labels are often unreliable indicators of concepts and positions, and valuing creative thinking. Alvesson and Sandberg’s views meld with an understanding of the literatures by which we attempt to appropriate and understand organizations and organizing as continuously in processes of becoming, knowledge is tied reflexively to the knower, authors and their intentions are opaque and political, texts are products of social and cultural contexts, and produced subject to journal deadlines and the demands of editors and reviewers. Scholarly arguments are all too often and arguably inappropriately dressed up in a discourse of studied amorality and we should always be sensitive to how they are garlanded with legitimizing rhetorical labels (Aristotle, 1941; McCloskey, 1983).

An important aspect of the requirement for adequate complexity is the need for the authors of reviews and essays to be reflexive (Alvesson, Hardy, and Harley, 2008). A concern for reflexivity places the researcher centre-stage in the article-writing process, suggesting the need to draw effectively on an array of intellectual resources to challenge orthodoxy and to look continuously at alternatives and new sources of inspiration (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2020). It means learning to work with sufficient doubt, to be less insular, to treasure intuition, serendipity, and imagination as much as logic, and to ensure that ‘rigour’ is complemented by insightfulness (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2018). We support both Baumeister and Leary’s (1997: 316) critique of authors who ‘think that the purpose of a literature review is simply to describe a collection of relevant findings’ and Alvesson and Sandberg’s (2020: 1300-1301) position that ‘Just because there is a wealth of studies does not necessarily mean that they

represent a wealth of valuable knowledge'. To paraphrase Freese (1980: 40-41), the problem for the social sciences is not to add more but proportionately less knowledge that counts for more. A complexifying approach means not engaging in mind-numbing cataloguing exercises but thinking more deeply about ourselves and our literatures, problematizing and box breaking as we go.

Concomitantly, authors should consider that *Human Relations* has a considerable and highly differentiated audience and that papers should be accessible to those previously unfamiliar with a topic to augment their potential readership and impact. This dilemma may be understood as the need for authors to negotiate felicitously the fundamental tension between, on the one hand, presenting their ideas as novel, original and exciting, and on the other, conforming sufficiently to conventions, i.e., sensemaking mechanisms, that generate shared meanings and facilitate effective meaningful communication of ideas (Patriotta, 2017). Scholarly writing has always been highly conventionalized, the works produced by scholars as well as authors themselves speak to one another forming a nexus of pre-established understandings (Eco, 1984), and the editorial teams of social science journals are increasingly less reticent to provide detailed recipes for publication (see, for example, Pratt, 2009; Thatcher and Fisher, 2022). Complexifying reviews and essays cannot simply ignore the shared codes that conventions enforce, and which function to ensure that core messages are communicated, nor do they have slavishly to follow every detail they specify. *Human Relations* is a journal that appreciates plurality and diversity and recognizes that if not all then at least many paths may lead to Rome.

Conclusions

Advancing the discourse in any discipline is nearly impossible without review articles and scholarly discourses are considerably invigorated by essays. Reviews and critical essays have

a valued place in the *Human Relations* canon, and while the journal will continue in the main to publish the highest quality empirical work, we will also publish reviews and essays that are appropriate for a journal that strives to be theoretically generative, multi-disciplinary, inclusive, and relevant. We therefore welcome original and innovative reviews and essays that contribute substantively to theory-building in the social sciences, especially those which ‘encourage a cross-fertilization of ideas...between disciplinary conversations’ (Learmonth, 2022: 1428). We hope this article will answer key questions faced by authors and urge the submission of their best reviews and essays to *Human Relations*.

References

- Adorno TW, Hullo-Kentor B and Will F (1984) The essay as form. *New German Critique*, 32(Spring/Summer): 151-171.
- Ahonen P, Tienari J, Meriläinen S and Pullen A (2014). Hidden contexts and invisible power relations: A Foucauldian reading of diversity research. *Human Relations*, 67(3): 263-286.
- Alvesson M, Hardy C and Harley B. (2008) Reflecting on reflexivity: Reflexive textual practices in organization and management theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(3): 480-501.
- Alvesson M and Kärreman D (2011). Decolonializing discourse: Critical reflections on organizational discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, 64(9): 1121-1146.
- Alvesson, M and Sandberg J (2020) The problematizing review: A counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg's argument for integrative reviews. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6): 1290-1304.
- Aristotle (1941) *Rhetoric*. New York. Random House.
- McCloskey DN (1983) The rhetoric of economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* 21(2), 481-517.
- Ashby WR (1956) *An introduction to cybernetics*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Ashford SJ (2013) Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 12(4): 623-633.
- Ashforth B and Humphrey RH (2022) Institutionalized affect in organizations: Not an oxymoron. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1483-1517.
- Atwan R (2012) Notes towards the Definition of an Essay. *River Teeth: A Journal of Nonfiction Narrative* 14(1): 109-117.
- Bacq S, Drover W and Kim PH (2021) Writing bold, broad, and rigorous review articles in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* 36(6): 106147.

- Banerjee SB (2018). Transnational power and translocal governance: The politics of corporate responsibility. *Human Relations*, 71(6): 796-821.
- Bargh JA and Chartrand TL (1999) The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist* 54(7): 462.
- Barnard CI (1938) *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barry D and Elmes M (1997) Strategy retold: toward a narrative view of strategic discourse. *Academy of Management Review* 22(2): 429-52.
- Bartunek JM, Rynes SL and Ireland RD (2006) What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1): 9-15.
- Baumeister RF and Leary MR (1997) Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of General Psychology* 1(3): 311-320.
- Beer S (1985) *Diagnosing the system for organizations*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Bem DJ (1995) Writing a review article for Psychological Bulletin. *Psychological Bulletin* 118(2): 172.
- Bernerth JB, Walker HJ and Harris G (2016) Rethinking the benefits and pitfalls of leader–member exchange: A reciprocity versus self-protection perspective. *Human Relations* 69(3): 661-684.
- Blake (1975[1790]) *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Bowers KS, Regehr G, Balthazard C and Parker K (1990) Intuition in the context of discovery. *Cognitive Psychology* 22(1): 72-110.
- Boyd BK and Solarino AM (2016) Ownership of corporations: A review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management* 42: 1282–1314.
- Brannan MJ, Fleetwood S, O’Mahoney J and Vincent S (2017) Critical Essay: Meta-analysis: A critical realist critique and alternative. *Human Relations* 70(1): 11-39.

- Breslin D and Gatrell C (2020). Theorizing through literature reviews: The miner-pro prospector continuum. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1094428120943288.
- Briner RB, Denyer D and Rousseau DM (2009) Evidence-based management: concept cleanup time? *Academy of Management Perspectives* 23: 19–32.
- Brown AD (2022) Identities in and around organizations: Towards an identity work perspective. *Human Relations*, 75(7), 1205-1237.
- Brown AD and Starkey K (2000) Organizational identity and learning: A psychodynamic perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 25(1): 102-120.
- Burke CM and Morley MJ (2016) On temporary organizations: A review, synthesis and research agenda. *Human Relations* 69(6): 1235-1258.
- Burnes B and Cooke B (2012) The past, present and future of organization development: Taking the long view. *Human Relations*, 65(11): 1395-1429.
- Burrell G and Morgan G (1979) *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. London: Routledge.
- Cabantous L, Gond JP, Harding N and Learmonth M (2016) Critical essay: Reconsidering critical performativity. *Human Relations* 69(2): 197-213.
- Callahan JL (2010) Constructing a manuscript: Distinguishing integrative literature reviews and conceptual and theory articles. *Human Resource Development Review* 9(3): 300-304.
- Chowdhury R (2021) Critical essay: (In) sensitive violence, development, and the smell of the soil: Strategic decision-making of what? *Human Relations* 74(1): 131-152.
- Chudzikowski K and Mayrhofer W (2011). In search of the blue flower? Grand social theories and career research: The case of Bourdieu's theory of practice. *Human Relations*, 64(1): 19-36.
- Cluley R and Parker M (2022). Critical theory in use: Organizing the Frankfurt School. *Human Relations*, 00187267221111219.

- Cooper HM (1988) Organizing knowledge syntheses: A taxonomy of literature reviews. *Knowledge in Society* 1(1): 104-126.
- Corbett A, Cornelissen J, Delios A and Harley B (2014) Variety, novelty, and perceptions of scholarship in research on management and organizations: An appeal for ambidextrous scholarship. *Journal of Management Studies* 51(1): 3-18.
- Corley KG and Gioia DA (2011) Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review* 36(1): 12-32.
- Cronin MA and George E (2020) The why and how of the integrative review. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1094428120935507.
- Dawkins S, Martin A, Scott J and Sanderson K (2015) Advancing conceptualization and measurement of psychological capital as a collective construct. *Human Relations* 68(6): 925-949.
- Denyer D and Tranfield D (2009) Producing a systematic review. In: Buchanan D and Bryman A (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Research Methods*. London: Sage, 671–689.
- Desmond J and Wilson F (2019). Democracy and worker representation in the management of change: Lessons from Kurt Lewin and the Harwood studies. *Human Relations*, 72(11): 1805-1830.
- Dijkers MP (2009) The value of “traditional” reviews in the era of systematic reviewing. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 88(5): 423-430.
- Dyer WG and Wilkins L (1991) Better stories, not better constructs, to generate better theory: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3): 613-619.
- Eco U (1984) *Postscript to the name of the rose*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- Elsbach KD and van Knippenberg D (2020) Creating high-impact literature reviews: An argument for ‘integrative reviews’. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(6): 1277-1289.

- Epstein S (1994) Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist* 49(8): 709.
- Fan D, Breslin D, Callahan JL and Iszatt-White M (2022) Advancing literature review methodology through rigour, generativity, scope and transparency. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 24(2): 171-180.
- Fisher WR (1984) Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communications Monographs* 51(1): 1-22.
- Fleming P, Godfrey R and Lilley S (2022). Conceptualizing business logistics as an ‘apparatus of security’ and its implications for management and organizational inquiry. *Human Relations*, 00187267221110458.
- Ford J, Harding N and Gilmore S (2022). Re/searching leadership: A critique in two agonies and nine fits. *Human Relations*, 00187267221079167.
- Foucault M (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault M (1977) *Discipline and punishment: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M (1980) Truth and power. In Gordon C. (ed.) *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*. 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon, 109-133.
- Fournier V and Grey C (2000) At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations* 53(1): 7-32.
- Freese L (1980) The problem of cumulative knowledge. In L Freese (ed.) *Theoretical methods in sociology*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 13-70.
- Gatrell C and Breslin D (2017) Editors’ statement. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 19(1): 1-3.

- Graßmann C, Schölmerich F and Schermuly CC (2020) The relationship between working alliance and client outcomes in coaching: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations* 73(1): 35-58.
- Grint K (2022) Critical Essay: Wicked problems in the Age of Uncertainty. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1518-1532.
- Guest D, and Knox A Warhurst C (2022) From Socio-Technical Systems to quality of working life: Legacy and lessons. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1461-1482.
- Gundlach M, Zivnuska S and Stoner J (2006) Understanding the relationship between individualism–collectivism and team performance through an integration of social identity theory and the social relations model. *Human Relations* 59(12): 1603-1632.
- Hammersley M (2001) On ‘systematic’ reviews of research literatures: a ‘narrative’ response to Evans & Benefield. *British Educational Research Journal* 27(5): 543-554.
- Harley B and Hardy C (2004) Firing blanks? An analysis of discursive struggle in HRM. *Journal of Management Studies* 41(3): 377-400.
- Hart C (1998) *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Healey MP and Hodgkinson GP (2014) Rethinking the philosophical and theoretical foundations of organizational neuroscience: A critical realist alternative. *Human Relations* 67(7): 765-792.
- Hogarth RM (2001) *Educating intuition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holtom B, Baruch Y Aguinis H and Ballinger G A (2022) Survey response rates: Trends and a validity assessment framework. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1560-1584.
- Hoon C and Baluch AM (2020) The role of dialectical interrogation in review studies: Theorizing from what we see rather than what we have already seen. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(6): 1246-1271.

- Hughes KD and Silver WA (2020). Beyond time-binds: Rethinking work–family dynamics for a mobile world. *Human Relations*, 73(7): 924-952.
- Human Relations (2022) Aims and Scope. <https://journals.sagepub.com/aims-scope/HUM>.
[Accessed 21 02 2022](#).
- Kump B (2020) No need to hide: Acknowledging the researcher’s intuition in empirical organizational research. *Human Relations*, 0018726720984837.
- Jacques R (1992) Critique and theory building: Producing knowledge “from the kitchen”. *Academy of Management Review* 17(3): 582-606.
- Janesick VJ (2001) Intuition and creativity: A pas de deux for qualitative researchers. *Qualitative Inquiry* 7(5): 531-540.
- Jarzabkowski P, Seidl D and Balogun J (2022) From germination to propagation; Two decades of Strategy-as-practice research and potential future directions. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1533-1559.
- Jones O and Gatrell C (2014) The future of writing and reviewing for IJMR. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 16(3): 249-264.
- Kahneman D (2003) A perspective on judgment and choice: mapping bounded rationality. *American Psychologist* 58(9): 697-720.
- Kearney R (2002) *On stories*. London: Routledge.
- Keenoy T (1999) HRM as hologram: A polemic. *Journal of Management Studies* 36(1): 1-23.
- Kilduff M and Mehra A (1977) Postmodernism and organizational research. *Academy of Management Review* 22: 453–81.
- King WR and He J (2005) Understanding the role and methods of meta-analysis in IS research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 16(1): 32.
- Klein HJ and Potosky D (2019) Making a conceptual contribution at human resource management review. *Human Resource Management Review* 29: 299-304.

- Knight C and Parker SK (2021) How work redesign interventions affect performance: An evidence-based model from a systematic review. *Human Relations* 74(1): 69-104.
- Kuhn T (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Learmonth M (2020) Reading for interest. *Human Relations* 73(5): 627–630.
- Learmonth M (2022) Editorial: Introducing the Special Issue to mark the 75th Anniversary of *Human Relations*. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1423-1430.
- Learmonth M and Harding N (2006) Evidence-based management: the very idea. *Public Administration* 84(2): 245-266.
- Lewis M W and Kelemen ML (2002) Multiparadigm inquiry: Exploring organizational pluralism and paradox. *Human Relations* 55(2): 251-275.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. London: Duckworth.
- Macleane M, Shaw G and Harvey C (2022) Business as service? Human Relations and the British interwar management movement. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1585-1614.
- Mink LO (1978) Narrative form as a cognitive instrument. In: Canary RH (ed.) *The writing of history: Literary form and historical understanding*. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 129-149.
- Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organization*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- Morin E (2008) *On complexity*. Translated by R Postel. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Morrell K (2008) The narrative of ‘evidence based’ management: A polemic. *Journal of Management Studies* 45(3): 613-635.
- Nielsen K and Miraglia M (2017) What works for whom in which circumstances? On the need to move beyond the ‘what works?’ question in organizational intervention research. *Human Relations* 70(1): 40-62.

- Palmatier RW, Houston MB and Hulland J (2018) Review articles: Purpose, process, and structure. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 46: 1–5.
- Paré G, Trudel MC, Jaana M and Kitsiou S (2015) Synthesizing information systems knowledge: A typology of literature reviews. *Information and Management* 52(2): 183-199.
- Patriotta G (2017) Crafting papers for publication: Novelty and convention in academic writing. *Journal of Management Studies* 54(5): 747-759.
- Patriotta G (2020) Writing impactful review articles. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(6): 1272-1276.
- Patton E and Johns G (2012). Context and the social representation of absenteeism: Absence in the popular press and in academic research. *Human Relations*, 65(2): 217-240.
- Paul J and Criado AR (2020) The art of writing literature review: What do we know and what do we need to know? *International Business Review* 10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101717.
- Petriglieri G and Petriglieri J (2022) The work is alive! Systems psychodynamics and the pursuit of pluralism without polarization in Human Relations. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1431-1460.
- Perlman B and Hartman EA (1982) Burnout: Summary and future research. *Human Relations* 35(4): 283-305.
- Pfeffer J (1995) Mortality, reproducibility, and the persistence of styles of theory. *Organization Science* 6(6): 681-686.
- Pol O, Bridgman T and Cummings S (2022) The forgotten ‘immortalizer’: Recovering William H Whyte as the founder and future of groupthink research. *Human Relations* 75(8): 1615-1641.
- Post C, Sarala R, Gatrell C and Prescott JE (2020) Advancing theory with review articles. *Journal of Management Studies* 57(2): 351-376.

- Pratt MG (2009) From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5): 856-862.
- Putnam LL, Myers KK and Gailliard BM (2014). Examining the tensions in workplace flexibility and exploring options for new directions. *Human Relations*, 67(4): 413-440.
- Rascaroli L (2017) *How the essay film thinks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reichl C, Leiter MP and Spinath FM (2014) Work–nonwork conflict and burnout: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations* 67(8): 979-1005.
- Rodell JB, Breitsohl H, Schröder M and Keating DJ (2016) Employee volunteering: A review and framework for future research. *Journal of Management* 42: 55–84.
- Rosenthal R and DiMatteo MR (2001) Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52(1): 59-82.
- Rowe F (2014) What literature review is not: diversity, boundaries and recommendations. *European Journal of Information Systems* 23(3): 241-255.
- Rousseau DM, Manning J and Denyer D (2008) Evidence in management and organizational science: Assembling the field’s full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. *The Academy of Management Annals* 2(1): 475–515.
- Schultz M and Hatch MJ (1996) Living with multiple paradigms the case of paradigm interplay in organizational culture studies. *Academy of Management Review* 21(2): 529-557.
- Salin D (2003) Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, 56(10): 1213-1232.
- Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. (2015) Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: Elaboration and explanation. *British Medical Journal* 349: g7647.

- Shao B and Guo Y (2021) More than just an angry face: A critical review and theoretical expansion of research on leader anger expression. *Human Relations* 74(10): 1661-1687.
- Shepherd DA and Suddaby R (2017) Theory building: A review and integration. *Journal of Management* 43(1): 59-86.
- Shirom A, Gilboa SS, Fried Y and Cooper CL (2008). Gender, age and tenure as moderators of work-related stressors' relationships with job performance: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 61(10): 1371-1398.
- Short J (2009) The art of writing a review article. *Journal of Management* 35(6): 1312-1317.
- Slovic SA (1996) The empirical case for two systems of reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin* 119(1): 3-22.
- Snyder H (2019) Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research* 104: 333-339.
- Staines GL (1980) Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork. *Human Relations*, 33(2): 111-129.
- Steel P, Schmidt J, Bosco F and Uggerslev K (2019). The effects of personality on job satisfaction and life satisfaction: A meta-analytic investigation accounting for bandwidth–fidelity and commensurability. *Human Relations*, 72(2): 217-247.
- Thatcher SM and Fisher G (2022) From the Editors—The Nuts and Bolts of Writing a Theory Paper: A Practical Guide to Getting Started. *Academy of Management Review* 47(1): 1-8.
- Tsoukas H (2017) Don't simplify, complexify: From disjunctive to conjunctive theorizing in organization and management studies. *Journal of Management Studies* 54(2): 132-153.
- Tsoukas H and Hatch MJ (2001) Complex thinking, complex practice: The case for a narrative approach to organizational complexity. *Human Relations* 54(8): 979-1013.

- Tranfield D, Denyer D and Smart P (2003) Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management* 14: 207–222
- Torraco RJ (2016) Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review* 15(4): 404-428.
- Van de Ven AH and Johnson PE (2006) Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review* 31(4): 802-821.
- Van Kleef GA (2014). Understanding the positive and negative effects of emotional expressions in organizations: EASI does it. *Human Relations*, 67(9): 1145-1164.
- van Baarle S, Bobelyn AS, Dolmans SA and Romme AGL (2022). Power as an enabling force: An integrative review. *Human Relations*.
- Webster J and Watson RT (2002) Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly* xiii-xxiii.
- Weick KE 1987 Organizational culture as a source of high reliability. *California Management Review* 29(2): 112-127.
- Weick KE (1995) What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40: 385-390.
- Weick KE (2007) The generative properties of richness. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(1): 14-19.
- Williams CJ (1998) The pitfalls of narrative reviews in clinical medicine. *Annals of Oncology* 9(6): 601-605.
- Willmott H (2021) Critical essay: Blinding faith–Paradoxes and pathologies of opacity in peer review. *Human Relations* 00187267211016752.

Table 1

Types of reviews and essays	Main features	Limitations	Exemplar <i>Human Relations</i> articles	Research contribution	Design and approach
<i>Systematic reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Clear research questions b) Well-defined research protocol and search strategy c) Specific details on inclusion and exclusion criteria d) The use of a systematic methodology reduces bias for selecting and analysing existing studies e) Studies are replicable as detailed information about data abstraction and analytical procedure is provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prone to authors' bias and conflicts of interest b) Limited access to broader databases; c) Grey literature, working papers, theses and unpublished manuscripts are often ignored d) Time-consuming to write 	Knight and Parker (2021)	Examined the effectiveness of top-down work redesign interventions in improving performance	Reviewed 55 heterogeneous work redesign intervention studies published between 1956 and 2017
			Shao and Guo (2021)	Explored the literature on leader anger expression and proposed a dynamic framework to better understand this phenomenon	Reviewed 58 studies on leader anger expression based on two widely used databases in this area: Business Source Complete and PsycINFO
			Hughes and Silver (2020)	Proposed a "mobilities lens" as a means of rethinking established theoretical and methodological approaches in the work-family literature	Reviewed 301 articles in leading management, organization, and work journals published between 1995 and 2015
			Putnam, Myers and Gailliard (2014)	Explored the work-life literature and identified three primary tensions for managing workplace flexibility initiatives more effectively	Adopted a systematic search strategy that identified over 449 relevant articles, book chapters, and books in the workplace flexibility literature
			van Baarle et al. (2022)	Discussed four social mechanisms that drive the concept of enabling power - formal authority, language shaping action, community formation, and the dynamics of safety and trust - and identified actions that activate these mechanisms.	Adopted a three-step integrative review approach, which resulted in the selection and synthesis of 188 publications.
<i>Meta-analyses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Clear research questions b) Well-defined research protocol c) Clear details of inclusion and exclusion criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Non-empirical studies are often ignored b) Prone to publication bias c) Positive empirical findings may be over-represented 	Graßmann et al. (2020)	Developed a framework for understanding the relationship between working alliance and a broad range of coaching outcomes for clients	Reviewed 23 studies, including 27 independent samples and a total of 3563 coaching processes and employed Hedges and

	d) Rigorous methodology with statistical summary of data e) Clear effect size estimations that allow for an objective appraisal of evidence	d) Non-significant results are often under-reported e) Highly dependent on the quality of the original primary research f) Heterogeneity of selected studies may lead to estimation bias			Olkin's (1985) approach to meta-analysis
			Patton and Johns (2012)	Discussed the parallels and contrasts between the press and academic research and proposed a number of ideas from news articles that might improve future research	Performed a comprehensive search of more than 4000 articles, which resulted in a final sample of 2847 articles after applying standard coding procedures
			Reichl et al. (2014)	Examined the relationship between work–nonwork conflict (conflict between work and nonwork and nonwork and work) and burnout (tiredness, cynicism)	Reviewed 86 primary studies based on a comprehensive search of relevant studies published between 2000 and 2012
			Steel et al. (2019)	Examined how the Big Five personality traits accounted for about 10% of the variance in job satisfaction, which in turn accounted for 13% of the variance in life satisfaction	Summarized a total of 12,682 correlations among combinations of personality, job satisfaction and life satisfaction in both published and unpublished literature
			Holtom et al. (2022)	Critically assessed survey response rates over time to enhance understanding of the contextual factors that contribute to the quality, appropriateness, and representativeness of study samples	Analysed the response-rate information reported in 703 articles derived from a systematic search of relevant studies published in the years 2010, 2015, and 2020
			Shirom et al. (2008)	Examined the extent to which three socio-demographic variables – including employee gender, age, and tenure – moderated the links between role conflict and role ambiguity with job performance	Conducted a quantitative synthesis of 30 independent studies (total N = 7700) derived from a systematic search of relevant studies published between 1975 and 2002
<i>Conceptual reviews</i>	a) Extend existing literature by proposing a new concept, theoretical	a) Ideas can be highly dependent on the authors' unique point of view	Ashforth and Humphrey (2022)	Proposed an integrative model for considering how affective states (emotions, moods, and	Key concepts and ideas were developed based on existing research on affective states,

	<p>framework, conceptual model, approach or perspective</p> <p>b) Often provide relevant and feasible propositions to guide future empirical research</p> <p>c) Set an agenda for future research by reconciling key ideas from previous studies</p>	<p>b) Information about research design and search strategy is not always provided</p> <p>c) Key concepts and ideas risk being overly descriptive and speculative</p> <p>d) Require a high level of creativity and writing skills, which some authors lack</p>		<p>feelings) can become more institutionalized within an organization</p>	<p>climates, cultures, and a confluence of top-down and bottom-up processes</p>
			Bernerth et al. (2016)	Proposed a theoretical framework for explaining how the outcomes of leader-member exchanges (LMX) could play out in certain environmental conditions	Framework was developed based on the principles of social exchanges in the workplace, as well as foundational assumptions in existing LMX models
			Dawkins et al. (2015)	Developed a higher-level theoretical model to improve understanding of psychological capital (PsyCap), and described the processes associated with the five proposed forms of collective PsyCap	To reinforce their theoretical model and guide future empirical research in this area, the authors proposed a series of testable propositions about the antecedent network of collective PsyCap
			Brown, 2021	Identified a novel identity work perspective on identities issues in and around organizations drawing on a broad literature	Reviewed existing identities theories and showed how they were resources for an emerging identity work perspective
			Elsbach and Breitsohl (2016)	Proposed a theoretical framework to illustrate how both motivated and automatic modes of categorization might better account for organizational perceptions	The framework was built on existing psychological research and theory about the role of categorization in shaping perceptions of organizational identity and legitimacy
			Van Kleef (2014)	Offered a theoretical analysis of when and how expressions of anger and happiness generate symmetrical versus asymmetrical effects	The theoretical model was developed on the basis of Emotions as Social Information (EASI) theory
<i>Narrative reviews</i>	<p>a) Authors can develop new theoretical and practical insights into a subject or topic and lay the groundwork for future research</p>	<p>a) Poor replicability as process of retrieving data/evidence is overlooked</p> <p>b) Details of inclusion and exclusion criteria are not always provided</p>	Burke and Morley (2016)	Presented a narrative account of how research on temporary organizations has evolved and can be organized	Reviewed a variety of studies from organization and management studies, and the literatures on innovation, strategic management, and economic geography

<p>b) Summarize the literature without a systematic methodology</p> <p>c) Can be less time-consuming as a comprehensive search strategy is not required</p>	<p>c) Sometimes no discussion of the methodology used to evaluate included articles</p> <p>d) Not always a critical assessment of wider studies in the literature</p> <p>e) Can be less analytical and more descriptive</p> <p>f) Hard to replicate precisely</p>	<p>Tsoukas and Hatch (2001)</p>	<p>Developed the concept of second-order complexity by examining and critiquing dominant forms of thinking about organizational complexity and our understanding of complex systems</p>	<p>The authors' narrative approach to complexity theory was based on Jerome Bruner's contrast between logico-scientific and narrative modes of thinking.</p>
		<p>Ahonen et al. (2014)</p>	<p>A narrative representation of diversity as discourse that is dependent on the prevailing forms of knowledge and choices made by researchers rather than being independent of the specific research exercise of which it is a part</p>	<p>The authors' narrative approach was based on a theoretical reading inspired by Michel Foucault</p>
		<p>Alvesson and Spicer (2012)</p>	<p>Outlined an approach that simultaneously recognizes the potentially negative consequence of leadership as well as the potentially positive value of functional exercises of authority</p>	<p>The authors' narrative approach was based on a thorough review of existing critical leadership studies</p>
		<p>Banerjee (2018)</p>	<p>Presented a critical analysis of the politics of corporate social responsibility, describing it as a strategy that allows multinational corporations to exercise power in the global political economy</p>	<p>Employed a narrative approach based on a critical analysis of theoretical insights from the emerging literature on political CSR (PCSR)</p>
		<p>Chudzikowski and Mayrhofer (2011)</p>	<p>Discussed five touchstones for advancing the interdisciplinary dialogue on careers, namely- contextuality and multilevel issues, structure and agency, boundaries, dynamics, and methods and methodology in career research</p>	<p>Employed a narrative approach based on Bourdieu's theory of practice, which outlines its contributions to such a dialogue in the light of these touchstones</p>

<i>Historical reviews</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Demonstrate how conversations emerged and flourished in a specific research domain b) Trace the historical development of a specialist field of knowledge c) Discuss the guiding principles and flaws in a given literature over time. d) Learn how past theories and methodologies can be applied to current or future research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) May privilege story-telling over making a compelling theoretical contribution b) Information about research design and search strategy is not always presented systematically c) Author bias is possible since a thorough search strategy is not required 	Jarzabkowski et al. (2022)	The development of Strategy as Practice research is not only due to the quality of the scientific material produced, but also engaging other scholars, recruiting receptive audiences, and creating a space for concepts to gain traction	Reviewed the development of Strategy as Practice research over the last two decades, distinguished three phases of its development, and discussed its institutionalization as a field
			Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2022)	Presented a historical perspective on the viability of the systems psychodynamic approach and its capacity to humanise organisational research, management practise, and working life	The authors provided historical context for studies that shaped the principles of the systems psychodynamic approach, as well as their contribution to our understanding of hybrid organizations
			Pol et al. (2022)	The authors provide a chronological account of how the concept of "groupthink" evolved from Irving Janis' initial ideas to William H Whyte's conceptualizations	The authors relied on Nietzsche's three relationships to history and his critique of objectivist history as outlined in one of his essays
			Desmond and Wilson (2019)	The authors conclude that the Harwood studies should not be regarded as a model of democratic change but rather as a cautionary tale to convey the lesson that researchers can open themselves up to new perspectives	The authors provided a historical perspective on Harwood studies based on Kurt Lewin's theoretical model on the efficiency of democracy
			Guest et al. (2022)	The literatures on socio-technical systems and the quality of working life are being revisited, but to be effective, scholars must apply the lessons of the past	Analyzed the evolution and legacy of socio-technical systems and the quality of working life in the 21st century and developed a set of guiding principles to help advance the field

			Burnes and Cooke (2012)	Organization development remains the dominant approach to organizational change, but it must address significant issues to achieve ambitious social and organizational objectives	Reviewed the 'long' history of organization development, beginning with Kurt Lewin's work in the late 1930s and concluding with its current state and future prospects
<i>Critical essays</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Draw attention to existing issues or gaps in the current understanding of a subject. b) Highlight promising new research directions for a specific field c) Demonstrate a level of analysis and conceptual creativity that goes beyond a mere description of the literature d) Discuss weaknesses, controversies, or inconsistencies in an existing body of work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Can be polemical or controversial without theoretical purpose b) Highly reliant on authors' subjective opinions c) No detailed description of the literature search and selection criteria used d) Provide only illustrative information about how the review process was conducted e) May show inconsistency with the wider literature 	Chowdhury (2021)	Discussed the fundamental flaws in economic and human perspectives of development that encourage insensitive violence at the expense of the environment and marginalized communities.	A critical analysis based on the author's experience with the Phulbari mining project proposed by the Bangladesh government but opposed by thousands of locals
			Willmott (2021)	Highlighted the significance of peer review as the "gold standard" for scientific work and argued that the blinding of peer review diminishes its overall value for scientific progress	A critical analysis based on the authors' personal observations and perspectives on the reviewer and editorial practices in the field of management and organization studies
			Cabantous et al. (2016)	Considered the limitations of critical performativity theory and proposed a possible alternative that engages with the intersection of theory and practice	Reviewed the literature on critical performativity theory and incorporated key ideas from Butler's and Callon's work on performativity
			Fournier and Grey (2000)	Considered the popularization of critical management studies and examined the various factors that have contributed to its emergence	Based on a review of the debates between neo-Marxism and post-structuralism, and their practical implications
			Nielsen and Miraglia (2017)	Challenged the suitability of randomized, controlled trials and meta-analyses in evaluating the effectiveness of organizational interventions and	Assessed existing gaps in organizational intervention research and proposed a more appropriate framework to answer the question of what works for better outcomes.

				proposed a realist evaluation as a more suitable framework	
--	--	--	--	---	--