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Greetings, communities with critical interests. The October newsletter of the Critical Management Studies Division of the Academy of Management focuses on the Annual Meeting, occurring yearly in August. The meeting this year was in Boston, with the theme Understanding the Inclusive Organization. Inclusion has been an ongoing concern for our Division, and challenges of inclusion have been addressed in past newsletters such as December 2018 and June 2018. We have highlighted inspiring, courageous doctoral research in these newsletters, and we urge PhD and Early Career Scholars to contact us to share and educate us about their endeavours and analyses.

In this newsletter, we highlight the Division’s activities in Boston, which connected with dynamics of inclusion. Our annual Get Out of the Hotels (GOOTH) is an event that prioritises inclusion by connecting with communities where the Annual Meeting is held, and learning from individuals in these communities about historical struggles, and resistance striving for humane organising and living. We share the work of this year’s Doctoral and Early Career Consortia, which builds upon our Division’s prior efforts for these groups, and we feature a spotlight on this year’s awarded doctoral research. Our Division’s committed organisers of these events have recognised that our PhD students and Early Career scholars face an array of challenges stepping into academia, particularly when pursuing challenging critical topics that may be dismissed or derided in spaces dominated by capitalist logics.

As we celebrate our Division’s Boston efforts and ongoing concerns for inclusion, I would like to echo appeals for communities and institutions to step and do more for our PhD students and Early Career Scholars, from PhD application stage through to early career experiences. It is alarming the ways that some academic contexts can be punishing, with experiences such as financial insecurity, amplified for individuals from non-privileged economic backgrounds; migration status barriers which affect PhD and job applications and increase financial hardships; gendered and racialized marginalisation; insufficient institutional prioritisation of doctoral and early career needs; and work exploitation, intensified for doctoral and early career groups as the most disadvantaged in academic hierarchies.

Effective solutions have been offered - on social media, in meetings, in informal exchanges. I hope that those with power are listening to these ongoing discussions about how to make academia inclusive. I hope that University structures will only have space for selecting and retaining role-holders who don’t operate on careerism or default to exploitative logics, and think about marginalised groups to create new knowledge landscapes. Am I dreaming? Yes, it’s not like this now in many a place, but if we don’t keep having these conversations, together with many others I have shuddered to contemplate the losses of talent and knowledge input, the traumas experienced, the betrayals of a University’s social aims which are so much a fixture of showy University management-speak.

I feel energised and grateful for the spaces and places that have been working hard for marginalised groups, for a healthier global academia. I’m happy that our Division has been actively reaching out to groups such as doctoral students for inclusive aims, as detailed for instance in this newsletter. I’m encouraged by Division participants’ energy devoted to researching movements and struggles for inclusion. Before detailing and celebrating these examples, we first start with a call for future leaders of our Division, to continue our efforts for collaboration, concern, and inclusion.
In April/May of next year, we will be holding the Division’s annual elections, at which point we will be electing an individual or a team (of two) to the Division’s five-year rotation through the Division’s executive (Professional Development Workshop Chair, Main Program Chair, Chair-Elect, Chair and Past Chair). Perhaps you have thought about self-nominating to run for the role, or you’ve been thinking of nominating someone, but you’re not quite sure what the five-year commitment entails. So, I thought it would be helpful to sketch out for you what is involved as you progress from year to year through the rotation in serving our community.

In the first year, you serve as Professional Development Workshop (PDW) Program Chair. This means you will be: developing the call for proposals; promoting the call as widely as possible to generate interest; responding to queries from members regarding the call; overseeing the review and selection of submitted proposals for the program; communicating decisions to those who submitted proposals; deciding on co-sponsorships of PDWs accepted by other divisions; scheduling accepted proposals to allocated time slots; proofreading PDW entries in the meeting program; contributing articles to the newsletter; organising and hosting the PDW and Welcome Social at the annual meeting; attending the AOM meeting for incoming main program chairs; and participating in the executive and business meetings. For all five years of this rotation, AOM HQ will provide you with timelines and support throughout, and you will be able to count on the experience of the Division executive.

The second year sees you progress to Program Chair, where your responsibility is to: select the keynote speaker and organise the keynote plenary session; organise the best doctoral dissertation/thesis competition; contribute articles to the newsletter; serve on the nominations and elections subcommittee; organise the annual informal get together between the executive and past division chairs at the annual meeting; participate in the executive committee meeting; organise and chair the business meeting; attend the AOM meeting for incoming division chairs; represent the Division at the Board of Governors meeting with other Division chairs; liaise with the Treasurer regarding award sponsorships; and provide general support to the Program Chair.

By the third year, you will move into the Chair-Elect role. Here, your responsibility is to: select the keynote speaker and organise the keynote plenary session; organise the best doctoral dissertation/thesis competition; contribute articles to the newsletter; serve on the nominations and elections subcommittee; organise the annual informal get together between the executive and past division chairs at the annual meeting; participate in the executive committee meeting; organise and chair the business meeting; attend the AOM meeting for incoming division chairs; represent the Division at the Board of Governors meeting with other Division chairs; liaise with the Treasurer regarding award sponsorships; and provide general support to the Program Chair.

In your fourth year, you serve as Chair, where your responsibilities are to facilitate and support the work of all members of the executive. Amongst many other things, you will: organise and chair the executive meeting; participate in the business meeting; represent the Division at the Board of Governors meeting with other Division chairs; attend the AOM meeting...
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for outgoing division chairs; serve on the nominations and elections sub-committee; liaise with AOM HQ as and when necessary; and contribute articles to the newsletter.

Every five years, the Chair writes the Division’s Academy-mandated quinquennial review (next review will be 2022/23); in the intervening years, the Chair works with the executive to realise the aspirations set out in the most recent quinquennial review. In your **fifth and final year**, as Past Chair, your role largely shifts to one of support, advice and knowledge sharing, thanks to the institutional memory you will have acquired. You will also chair the nominations and elections sub-committee, organise and chair the doctoral student and early career scholar consortia, contribute articles to the newsletter, participate in the executive meeting, and represent the Division at the Board of Governors meeting with Division chairs.

Of course, issues can surface during your rotation that are outside the routine we have described above, as happened for me with the Trump travel ban when I was program Chair. In such circumstances, we worked collectively with everyone on the executive, along with the wider community as necessary, to figure out how best to engage with such issues when they arise.

As you will have gathered, joining the Division executive means committing to attending all five Academy of Management annual meetings over the course of your rotation. It would also be helpful, if possible, to attend the annual meeting the year you are elected to meet members of the executive in person and attend the AOM meeting for incoming PDW chairs. As a Division, we are open to people serving in the rotation on an individual or shared (i.e., two people sharing the role as a team) basis. In any case, I have found that serving our community is both challenging and rewarding. You will engage with, and enjoy the camaraderie of, a committed bunch of fellow executive members. You will come to know many more members of our community. And, through volunteering your time and energy, you will be contributing to the sustainability of our community and the work we do. If you would be interested in joining the executive, then please email me at mark.learmonth@durham.ac.uk and we can arrange to talk further. I look forward to hearing from you!
Another Academy of Management Annual Meeting has come and gone. The very accommodating weather in Boston coupled with the fact that the division was assigned to a relatively small hotel which maximized interactions among members, led to a particularly lively CMS program this year.

The PDW program was kicked off by the doctoral and early career researcher (ECR) consortia. These consortia gave emerging scholars in the field the opportunity to engage with more seasoned academics in small group and one-on-one formats. The division executive recognizes the importance of fostering doctoral students and ECRs. As such, we are actively seeking to identify additional ways through which these groups can be supported throughout the year. We are pleased to have Alex Bristow and Nadia de-Gama lead this initiative.

The PDW and the Scholarly Programs were brimming with interesting and timely presentations. As further evidenced this year, our division’s sessions are becoming increasingly more interactive and experimental, moving away from the conference traditions of a time’s past. We were equally thrilled to see the international representation of scholars on many of our division’s sessions. Much credit goes to Amon Barros and Fernanda Sauerbronn as well as Marcos Barros and Patrizia Zanoni who, respectively, co-chaired the PDW and Scholarly Programs.

We invited Professor Cynthia Enloe to deliver the division’s plenary address. Professor Enloe offered a powerful and impassioned talk about sexual harassment in the workplace. Her incisive analyses of the ubiquity of sexual harassment in contemporary culture were thoughtfully punctuated with her own anecdotal stories. This led to a moving account of how sexual harassment ought to be made sense of in relation to prevailing systems of power. The eloquence of Professor Enloe’s words resonated in the well-attended room as evidenced by the conversations and the standing ovation that followed her talk. And, she did all of this without making use of Powerpoint! We are most grateful to Professor Enloe for accepting and delivering our division’s plenary address this year.

This year, we also had the privilege of organizing the CMS Best Critical Dissertation competition. We had a healthy number of excellent submissions representing six different countries, instilling in us the confidence that CMS will be in good hands for many years to come. Dr. Paulina Segarra, who earned her PhD from EGADE Business School at Tecnologico de Monterrey in Mexico, was selected as this year’s winner of the competition. Paulina is now an assistant professor at Anahuac University. We will take this opportunity to thank those scholars who agreed to review the submissions made to the competition: Emmanouela Mandalaki (NEOMA Business School), Jamie McDonald (U. of Texas, San Antonio), Scott Taylor (U. of Birmingham), Terry Weatherbee (Acadia U.), Ghazal Zulfiqar (Lahore U. of Management Sciences), and our very own, Eda Ulus (U. of Dundee).

We look forward to seeing all of you next year when AOM returns to beautiful Vancouver.
Planning for the Doctoral Student and Early Career Scholar Consortia focused on delivering a great developmental experience for participants, along with seeking to build a community well beyond the Academy meetings. While we looked after the Doctoral Student Consortium, we invited Alexandra Bristow and Nadia deGama to organize and run the Early Career Scholar Consortium, which they report on separately in the Newsletter.

Altogether, 17 students—hailing from universities in Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Netherlands, UK, USA, and Sweden—participated in the Doctoral Consortium. Grouped according to their stage in the dissertation process, the doctoral students met with established CMS scholars for round-table discussions on questions and concerns they had raised in their applications related to dissertation, research and publishing, teaching, and engagement and career.

In addition, as consortium organizers, we established mentoring matches between participants and more established CMS scholars whose area of research and experiences were well suited. In order to provide the most productive relationship, while being mindful of the limited consortium time, we asked each mentoring pair to meet up at a mutually agreeable time during the Academy meeting.

Feedback was overwhelmingly positive from the consortium and the mentoring matches. However, as the annual meeting happens but once a year, many doctoral students expressed interest in staying connected to each other and to the CMS community between meetings. To this end, in conjunction with interested doctoral students, we will be putting our collective heads together to bring forward ideas to build, support and meet the needs of our doctoral student members on an ongoing basis. In supporting our student members, our community can continue to renew and grow in an inclusive fashion.

Finally, by way of thanks, we would like to recognize colleagues who so generously volunteered their time to act as discussion leaders and mentors during the consortium and beyond. Our sincere thanks to Alexandra and Nadia for all the work they did in planning, organizing and running the Early Career Scholar Consortium. And, we are grateful to FGV EAESP [Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo / São Paulo School of Business Administration] for sponsoring the consortia breakfast.

Thanks to the Doctoral Student Consortium round-table discussion leaders:
- Ozan Alakavuklar, Utrecht University, Netherlands.
- Amon Barros, FGV EAESP.
- Marcos Barros, Grenoble École de Management, France.
- Stephen Cummings, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- Mark Learmonth, Durham University, UK.
- Virpi Malin, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Arturo E. Osorio, Rutgers University, USA.
- Ajnesh Prasad, Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico.
- Alison Pullen, Macquarie University, Australia.
- Fernanda Sauerbronn, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Patrizia Zanoni, Hasselt University, Belgium.

Thanks to the Doctoral Student Consortium mentors:
- Marta Calás, University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA.
- Paul Donnelly, Technological University Dublin, Ireland.
- Mark Learmonth, Durham University, UK.
- Raza Mir, William Paterson University, USA.
- Banu Özkazanç-Pan, Brown University, USA.
- Ajnesh Prasad, Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico.
- Fernanda Sauerbronn, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Maureen Scully, University of Massachusetts Boston, USA.
- Patrizia Zanoni, Hasselt University, Belgium.
The Early Career Consortium was slightly different this year, as it was the first consortium to be organised by the Division’s recently formed Early Career Scholar Committee (ECSC) (which is a legacy of the now former Division Chairs, Banu Özkazanç-Pan and Paul Donnelly, to whom we are very grateful). The committee currently consists of 13 volunteers from around the world, including two committee chairs, and its remit is to work for the benefit and interests of early-career members of the Division and early-career CMS scholars in general. As such, we are hoping that our work will extend well beyond supporting early-career scholars during the AOM Annual Meetings (more on this below). However, organising this year’s Early Career Consortium (ECC) was our first substantive task as committee chairs and one that is likely to remain a regular task for the committee in years to come.

This year, with the global political landscape ever more volatile and uncertain, and with no sign that pressures on academics, including those starting their careers on the margins of business schools, are abating, we wanted to use the ECC as a space for reflecting on both the challenges we face as early-career CMS scholars, and the positive impact we can make in this context in our institutions, our academic field, and in the wider society. To this end, we decided to return to and build on the theme of the highly successful 2015 ECC that took place in Vancouver and was organised by Alex Bristow, Olivier Ratle, Sarah Robinson, and Sophie Tessier, on the theme of ‘Making a difference as an early-career CMS scholar through reflexive and transformative action’.

As it was in 2015 in Vancouver, the ECC shared the room with the Doctoral Consortium, which was taking place at the same time. This created a bustling atmosphere and meant that participants, facilitators and organisers from both groups could mix together and meet each other over a generous breakfast of pastries, fruit, teas and coffees that opened both of our sessions. The continuing access to breakfast was much appreciated and kept us going through the consortium (there is nothing quite like a pecan plait when faced with the thorny issue of your university’s unreasonable publication targets!). Prior to the consortium, we had made plans to split into small groups to work on individual issues before debriefing to the group as a whole, but during the consortium the dynamics were such that we collectively decided to stay together as a single group of 10, as we were all interested in getting to know each other better and learning from each other’s experiences. This was reflective of a major theme that emerged through our discussion – the importance of making connections of friendship, mutual support, and encouragement, if we are to be able to face the contemporary challenges with courage and determination to make the world around us a better place.

With the importance of friendship and getting to know each other so centrally acknowledged, we were glad that the end of the consortium did not mark the end of our time together. In addition to the conference ahead, we had the first ever Early Career Social to look forward to that very evening. The social was organised by two ECSC volunteers, Paulina Segarra and Cristian Villanueva (to whom we owe our heartfelt thanks), and involved drinks and a wonderful meal at the nearby Back Bay Social Club, where we had a great time despite a number of us struggling with jet lag.

Now that the excitement and flurry of this year’s Annual Meeting is over, as the ECSC we are reflecting on the conference experiences and making plans for our future work. As part of these plans, we are hoping to expand the programme of events for early-career scholars at the 2020 Meeting in Vancouver and repeat the Early Career Social on a bigger scale. We also have plans for supporting early-career Division members not only at, but also between, Annual Meetings. These plans include a year-round international mentorship scheme, developing a dedicated area for early-career members on the Division website, and initiating virtual events (such as webinars and podcasts) for early-career CMS scholars. We will report on these and other plans in more detail in future newsletters.

Cheers from the Early Career Social!
Cooming from a dynamic, engaging, and extremely interest-
ing three days of debates and ideas in Boston, we want
to look back on the CMS Division’s scholarly program and
acknowledge the contributions of all involved that helped make
this year’s main program.

Altogether, our division received 151 papers, 11 symposia,
and 9 Dark Side case submissions. These figures are significantly
higher than previous years, thanks to the 2019 theme – The Inclu-
sive Organization – that resonates with the critical research many
members of the division are involved in, and likely with a little
help of the Boston venue. Our division had two paper sessions
that specifically discussed our critical perspective on inclusion:
“Inclusion: Critical Re-Conceptualizations” and “Inclusiveness,
Care and Dignity”. Among our symposia, two dealt with the issue
of exclusion in the post-truth era – the session “Implications of
Brexit and Trumpism for Ethnic Minority Migrants in the Work-
place” – and through an intersectionality lens – “Intersectional
Identities: The Impact of Multiple Marginalization on Workplace
Experiences”.

The division was able to host 21 scholarly paper sessions in
the program, including time slots for the presentation of the
shortlisted Dark Side cases. Ultimately, we could accept 77 pa-
pers in regular paper sessions, resulting in an acceptance rate
of around 50%, down from previous years because of the high
number of submissions and despite the increase in the allocated
sessions. An additional eight papers were accommodated in two
discussion paper sessions, which as usual took place on Sunday.
As for the Dark Side Case Competition, four of the nine submis-
sions, a remarkably high number, were accepted for presentation
in the showcase session.

Thanks to collaboration with other divisions of the AOM, a
total of 7 symposia were accepted. Four symposia were co-spon-
sored with two divisions, and two symposia were co-sponsored
with one other division. Four of the symposia were co-spon-
sored with the Division Organization and Management Theory
(OMT). The following divisions each co-sponsored one sympo-
sium with our CMS division: Social Issues in Management (SIM),
Management History (MH), Gender & Diversity in Organizations
(GDO), Organizational Behavior (OB), and Careers (CAR). One
symposium was sponsored only by CMS. Unfortunately, one of
the accepted symposia was ultimately withdrawn.

The program could not have been put together without the
generous support of our reviewers. Given the high number of
submissions, we called on 162 of the 177 division members who
had signed up to review. We aimed at assigning 3 reviewers to
each submission to enhance fairness. The overall completion rate
was 88%, somewhat lower than last year. Despite our communi-
cation, 19 review assignments were started but not completed,
and 39 were never started.

In all, 150 reviewers completed all of their assignments, for an
average 3.06 submissions per reviewer, and an average of 3.19 re-
viewers per submission. We want to say a really big “THANKYOU!”
to everyone who submitted a paper, symposium and/or case; to
all 177 members who signed up as reviewers, but in particular,
the 150 members who completed their review assignments; Virpi
Malin and all those who reviewed for the Dark Side Case Compe-
tition; all session chairs, who created a wonderful environment
for participants; and our colleagues on the CMS division’s exec-
utive for their invaluable support. Without you all, the CMS pro-
gram in Boston would simply not have been possible.

By way of closing, in addition to submitting your papers, sym-
posia and/or cases for the Annual Meeting in Vancouver next
year, we strongly encourage you to sign up as reviewers. This
service to the community is essential to help CMS colleagues
advance with work and to keep the quality of the CMS division
program high. We very much wish incoming Program Co-Chairs,
Fernanda Sauerbronn and Amon Barros, all the very best with the
work that lies ahead. Finally, as Division Co-Chairs Elect, we are
especially keen on bringing again strong, passionate and rele-
vant scholarship to the AOM Annual Meeting in August 2020. We
invite you to engage critically with the theme Broadening Our
Sights, contributing to making the 2020 edition in Vancouver as
great as Boston 2019.

Review of the 2019 AOM Boston CMS Scholarly Program

Patrizia Zanoni, Division Co-Chair Elect, Hasselt University, Belgium, and Utrecht University, Netherlands
Marcos Barros, Division Co-Chair Elect, Grenoble École de Management, France
October 2019

This year in Boston we had eight PDW sessions accepted for the Critical Management Studies Division of the AOM. Some of these sessions were co-sponsored with other divisions. We were happy with the attendance and saw many rooms with people standing. We believe that this suggests the success of the program, although we perceived some points that need improvement. One would be to avoid scheduling of various workshops at the same time. This year we had four sessions happening concomitantly on Saturday, which splintered the audience and barred people from participating in more PDWs.

Another problem was the distance between venues that sometimes was not considered, making it difficult for people participating in sessions in different divisions. Since it is not possible to anticipate where each division will be, this seems unavoidable, but we thought we should vent the frustration from some of the participants.

The PDW sessions that took place with the CMS Division as their main sponsor were 1)Philosophies Of Organizational Research; 2) Creatively and Critically Teaching Business Ethics Using Cases; 3) Organizational Fringework: Methodological Incursions into Research and Inclusivity; 4) Inequality, Violence & Humanity: Subalterm & the Neoliberal Politics of Identity and Inclusivity; 5) The Junior Faculty Quagmire: Challenges in Today’s Business Schools; 6) Towards the Anthropocene Economy: Business Models Beyond Growth. The community was able to engage in discussions around the structures of power such as class, gender, and race. The sessions also covered education both in relation to teaching, as well as reflections around career. Finally, the discussion around the climate crisis guaranteed a space for an urgent debate. We thank all the organizers, and all participants for their engagement.

Besides these six, our already traditional session of Getting Out of the Hotels (GOOTH) was a success which was sold out and will have a comment by its organizers, led by Arturo E. Osorio. The same goes for the new format of the Early Career and PhD workshops that occurred in a friendly atmosphere.

We had a good range of co-sponsoring from other divisions through our sessions. Additionally, people whose main affiliation was not CMS attended PDWs in our division, broadening the scope of debates through the conference. It is our understanding that a core objective for the next year is to advance engagement with the AOM community broadly speaking. Young scholars, PhD students, individuals new to CMS and academia from other sectors, and academics from other divisions are especially welcome and should always feel that way.

To do that, we believe that the PDW format may be explored even further, helping in building connections and interests that go beyond the session. We already had some innovative proposals that tested the PDW format, inviting participation from the audience with hands on practices. We welcomed those initiatives, as we think that PDWs should move away from the lecture-only mindset. We also must reiterate the importance of presenting and participating in the PDWs, for exposure to new ideas, connecting to scholars with like-minded interests and goals, and ongoing building of collaborative scholarship and collegiality.

Finally, we would like to thank Marcos Barros and Patrizia Zanoni for their help in running the PDW program this year. We also welcome Alison Pullen and Ozan Nadir Alakavuklar in this role and put ourselves at their disposal to make our next meeting in Vancouver August 2020 even better.
Thirty AOM Annual Meeting attendees took part in the CMS-sponsored PDW session “Getting Out of the Hotels” (aka ‘GOOTH’) this past August in Boston. This year’s event featured a walking labor history tour of downtown Boston, which is commemorating the 100th anniversary of its Police-Force Strike (of 1919). Chris Hall, a 20th-century U.S. history Master’s student at the UMass-Boston Labor Resource Center, acted as our guide. Chris fittingly centered our urban escapade on the antecedents and events of the strike, and the strike’s repercussions for the city’s functioning and its population, and more widely for the U.S. labor movement. Our guide-narrator also introduced us to more recent aspects of the city’s history.

Commencing at the Boston Common, we were led in a fascinating tour through some of the neighborhoods affected first-hand by the state of chaos and unrest that resulted from the organized strike. Chris, our resourceful guide, restituated and reimagined before us century-old dramas involving ever-so-familiar macro-organizational processes and experiences of inequality: the intersections of class-based interests, labor, migration-status, ethnicity, and cultural struggles. Boston’s Police-Force Strike (of 1919) evidenced a process of organized political resistance and contestation to exploitation. Underlying the strike mobilization was a class struggle between a rather homogeneous and aloof ruling establishment, vis-à-vis the increasingly numerous and diverse groups of disenfranchised newcomers to the social formation, mostly Irish, followed by Italians, Eastern Europeans, and other Southern Europeans. The latter groups found themselves pitted against the power brokers in city and state government. Front-stage in these sociopolitical processes were the squalid labor, work, and living conditions of the immigrants and immediate descendants thereof, of whose men the ranks of the police force were made for the most part.

These conditions were the immediate antecedents that motivated the members of the Force to vote and fight for unionization rights, their efforts being ultimately crushed by the city and state establishment. Also underlying the fight against the Force’s organization to unionize were the phobias and the suspicions that the Yankee ruling class held toward the organized out-groups, the migrants. Such othering, masqueraded in accusations of “abandoning duty,” provide an example of how the ruling group enacted strategies of social domination to secure control over their class interests and attendant civil power. The Police Strike of Boston called into question the nature of police work: whether it was labor or public service. The Strike established a precedent across the U.S. for the development of labor relations between the police force and the government as management.

... continued on following page
While taking in landmarks relevant to the conflict, such as where Scollay Square used to be (site of City Hall today), Faneuil Hall, the Old State House, and Downtown Crossing, we learned about how segregation and displacement across class and migratory ethnic lines took place as a result of state-sponsored neighborhood-razing after the Second World War. Chris retold how the project of urban “renewal” of the city’s West End led by government agencies in the late 1950s sought to create middle-class residences and promote big-business commerce, by displacing working poor communities of immigrants, descendants of immigrants, and of antebellum African slaves (i.e. 150+ year-old neighborhoods). Strategies included deploying the rhetoric of “crime-ridden” and “degraded” (slum-like) inner-city conditions voiced by middle-class and established Bostonians living outside of the West End neighborhoods.

Throughout the excursion, Chris enthusiastically entertained our questions and spoke knowledgably about how high-profile transit development projects have caused further community displacement and segregation. Examples include the elevated roadway north of the center (built ca. 1951-1954 and functioning through the early 2000s), which cut the Waterfront and the North End neighborhoods from the city’s center, and the Boston ‘Big Dig’ project (completed in 2007), which displaced thousands of residents across the city’s North-South axis.

The final stop of our walking tour was Democracy Brewing, a worker-owned craft brewery (www.democracybrewing.com). There we enjoyed beers brewed on site, great food, and fantastic hospitality. Set up as a cooperative, Democracy Brewing started with eight owners and after one year in business, it now has 11 worker-owners. We were able to sample some of their finest drafts, including the ‘Worker’s Pint’, ‘1919 Strike Stout’, ‘Lucy Stone’ and ‘Bicycle Race’. While we enjoyed our drinks, CEO and co-founder James Rasza, who boasts a labor organizing background, shared a brief origin of the organization, including the fundraising process and management structure. This was followed by a lively Q&A, where participants asked James more specific questions and gained further insights into the everyday operations of the brewery as a workers-owned venture and the organization’s plans for the future. A ‘GOOTH’ participant offered some observations about this aspect of the event: “Speaking with the CEO of the brewery was great because we managed to ask technical questions, like how you deal with bad employees, how your decision-making process works, and how you thrive in a neoliberal setting applying a more equitable business model. Another example was again Atlanta [AOM 2017], where we met grassroot activists that told us how important is for them research as it provides materials to be used in public debates or lobbying (‘look it is not only us, even scholars think we should change X’).”

Once again, we received encouraging feedback on the PDW. One participant stated for the record that this year’s ‘GOOTH’ PDW far exceeded his expectations, as he wasn’t expecting that this year was the centennial of the Boston Police Strike, almost to the day. “It is nice to see the historical events under a different lens.” Another participant complimented this year’s event by stating: “I believe that a major shortcoming of academic debate in organisation studies is the lack of proposal for alternative ways of organizing...“GOOTH’ offers “a great chance to see alternative ways of organising in practice, nice human connections, and deeper understanding of the city hosting us. Thanks for keeping ‘GOOTH’ alive.” Similarly, another participant commented that as every year, ‘GOOTH’ session offered “…the possibility to make new connections. It is a very good opportunity to share and compare experiences and learn (from each other) in an informal way.”

... continued on following page
As is the tradition with all ‘GOOTH’ events, a portion of our registration fees were used for a monetary donation to our host organization, the Labor Resource Center at UMASS Boston (www.umb.edu/lrc). The Center provides degree and certificate programs in labor and employment studies. Having recently celebrated its 35th anniversary, the Center is dedicated to teaching workers’ rights, organizing advocacy and outreach activities, and providing significant financial support for its faculty and students in the form of research grants and travel scholarships. The Center also conducts important research through its $250,000 UMASS Future of Work grant. The ‘GOOTH’ donation will be used to continue this support for students, Labor conferences, the Peoples’ History Walk, which we enjoyed, and additional labor-related events and programs.

**Open Call: GOOTH 2020 Vancouver, Canada**

The success of every year’s ‘GOOTH’ depends on the help and support the CMS division gets from its members who have connections with the hosting city. The CMS division is inviting proposals to host our next “Getting Out of the Hotels” (GOOTH) PDW. Individuals and/or groups with connections to organizations with a focus on social enterprise, community-building, social justice, etc., and particularly those organizations operating in proximity of the AOM conference host city (Vancouver), are strongly encouraged to contact Arturo E. Osorio about how to submit a proposal. Questions and requests for further information should be directed to: osorio@business.rutgers.edu
The 2019 Dark Side case writing competition received nine submissions of which four were chosen to be presented at the AOM. Thank you to all authors for submitting teaching cases that problematize dominant conceptualizations and practices, are well-developed, and foster critical reflection skills. The topics were unique, but the topics that the cases address are found globally. Modern slavery, ethical violations, non-inclusive practices, or inhuman working conditions are the reality for many regardless of the organization or location. Critical teaching cases are good means for bringing these issues under discussion in the classrooms, too.

All cases were reviewed both through the official blind review system and by external expert reviewers, who received the cases anonymously. A big thank you to our reviewers for your thoughtful and professional reviews, which made the decision of the winner easy. Congratulations to the 2019 winner, Stefanie Ruel!

Dr. Ruel’s winning case “Rogue One: The Canadian Space Agency and Understanding the (Non)Inclusive Organization” is based on the experiences of “Samaa” (pseudonym), who is a highly technically-trained individual in her early career at the Canadian Space Agency (CSA). The case brings front and center a highly skilled woman/Muslim/lesbian facing an organization that appears, on the surface, to support the organizational diversity rhetoric, represented via the Canadian Employment Equity legislation. Samaa faces, on a day-to-day basis, mostly all White, heterosexual men who are technically-trained and who reflect the organization’s approach to inclusivity, or lack thereof, with respect to her complexity as an individual. She also sees evidence that some of her women colleagues, mostly White, who self-identify as being part of the non-dominant class and who have been in the industry longer than she has, are facing their own challenges within this organization. The experiences of Samaa and her colleagues show how underneath the surface, the reality differs from the rhetoric. Samaa is the protagonist that the students follow throughout the case. The presentation of this case and its analysis requires the students to focus not only on what the organization can and should do to value inclusion of complex individuals, but also on a consideration of the complex individual and her constituting and interdependent identities. The case engages with questions around subjectivity, sexuality, intersecting identities and the postcolonial embodiment of the self while recognizing the centrality of power in the workplace. The case is intended for undergraduate third and fourth year management studies. The working assumption is that students using this Dark Side Case have completed an Organizational Behavior course as a precursor to the level and type of course identified for this case.

Thank you Dr. Stefanie Ruel for this case and analysis.

We are also pleased to share the 2019 Dark Side Case Finalists:

1. Amazon.com, Inc. and the Human Cost of Fast Shipping by Debapratim Purkayastha, ICFAI Business School, IFHE, Hyderabad and Vijay Kumar Tangirala, Freelancer, Hyderabad
3. Nestlé and Modern Slavery by Debapratim Purkayastha, ICFAI Business School, IFHE, Hyderabad and Syeda Maseeha Qumer, ICFAI Business School, Hyderabad

For the 2020 Dark Side Competition, our community welcomes teaching cases Broadening Our Sight and providing an opportunity for students to explore and debate on the “dark side” of contemporary organizations in neoliberal times. For more information, please see our next CMS newsletter, distributed in December, or contact Virpi Malin (virpi.malin@jyu.fi).

Also, as a reminder our calls for cases and papers are shared on Twitter and Facebook by our Social Media Editor, Marie Hasbi. Information is also regularly posted on the new Connect@AOM for our CMS Division, which is open to all individuals to join, as explained in our June 2019 newsletter, which can be accessed at our Division website here.
The adversities that undocumented Latinx immigrants face while trying to achieve the coveted ‘American Dream’ have been highlighted in the last few years due to President Donald Trump’s hateful rhetoric against them. Trump made headlines all around the world when he described Mexican people as rapists, criminals, and drug dealers who migrate to the United States not only to break the law, but to take jobs from Americans.

Like millions of other Latinxs, I was shocked by the way in which he was describing my community. His statements motivated me to study what Latinx undocumented immigrants experience while in the United States. In September 2016, I moved to Southern California to conduct an ethnographic study of undocumented immigrants at work. It was a crucial time to be there, since my time in the field was immediately before and immediately after Trump’s election as president.

Gathering data proved to be a much more difficult project than what I had expected it to be. People, understandably so, were very worried and not very open to sharing their experiences. They were afraid of strangers approaching them, especially one who was asking them about their immigration status in the country. I had to take different approaches and started volunteering at a Church’s outreach office, where I would not only help immigrants but also homeless people. I also volunteered at various organizations devoted to immigrant rights, taught ‘Know Your Rights’ workshops, and protested alongside undocumented immigrants on several occasions. Not only did this provide me with a level of legitimacy with my would-be informants, but I felt like I was also giving back to members of the community, who were, in the end, incredibly generous with me when they shared their lives, their stories, and even their homes.

My research project

The first part of my dissertation allowed me to present a concept that would become pivotal to make sense of the collected data. I first encountered Hannah Arendt’s philosophy as a suggestion from my supervisor, Professor Ajnesh Prasad, and I found her life and story to be fascinating. Her resilience and passionate thinking during some of the most challenging periods in human history—the interwar years and World War II—is awe-inspiring. While reading different texts by Arendt, it became clear that the banality of evil is ever present and that people still get lost in ‘bureaucratic labyrinths’ (Arendt, 2006 [1963]: 84), which allow them to rationalize evil.

It was somewhat surprising, still, that I would soon encounter someone who epitomized Arendt’s concept in a very public arena: Donald J. Trump. I thought that the effect of his discourse against undocumented immigrants needed to be studied.

A number of researchers have underscored the pressing need to account for the experiences of undocumented immigrants in the backdrop of an increasingly hostile political climate (Chomsky, 2017; Ngai, 2017). In response, scholarship published since the U.S. presidential election has already come to offer preliminary findings, which illuminate the detrimental outcomes created by pernicious political discourses on the
experiences of undocumented immigrants. Critical aspects of life are affected, including their ability to have a steady job, and even being uncertain about being able to pick up their children from school if they are to run into an ICE [Immigration and Customs Enforcement] agent. More research that identifies the nexus between the discourse on illegal immigration and the consequences for targeted communities remains needed; this is particularly significant, as the crux of the discourse is tacit legitimation of racism and prejudice.

The number of immigrants without legal status in the workforce is likely to increase, and yet organizational scholars have largely overlooked the significance of this immigration status for their experiences at work. These immigrants often undertake the most physically demanding of jobs for very low wages and no health or other social benefits, while facing constant deportation threats. Their labor has long helped sustain the American economy, yet without recognition. Their stories, their hardships, and willpower needs to have a more significant place in the management literature. This project allows for their voices to be heard in order to help in the shaping of better work conditions and, therefore, better lives for those who have sacrificed everything for a dream.

Getting to hear undocumented immigrants’ stories from their own perspective, was a life-changing experience. It allowed me to understand the difficulties that they face every day in an increasingly hostile environment. Furthermore, it made me feel even more committed to their cause. My time doing fieldwork was certainly one of intellectual stimulation and introspection. I am certainly looking forward to getting deeper insights from my data, so that the voices of those who were so generous with me, can be heard.

**Connection to the CMS AOM Community**

I remember attending the AOM Annual Meeting for the first time in Vancouver in 2015. At the time, I was a first-year doctoral student and I was apprehensive as it was my first conference ever, and I hardly knew any one there. Ultimately, I was welcomed by a friendly community of scholars who feel passionate about their research and about the importance of critical thinking.

I am currently working on achieving a better understanding of Latinx undocumented immigrants’ work experiences along with my former supervisor, Professor Prasad. Among other things, we are looking specifically at workplace violations and the effect that they have on this population. I am also working on another project with Professor Prasad and Professor Marianna Fotaki. We are looking at the lived experiences of journalists and reporters in Mexico, the most dangerous country to perform journalism in the world.

I believe that working with a supportive PhD supervisor makes a great difference in the PhD journey. I was indeed very fortunate to work with Professor Prasad, who was—and still is—incredibly helpful, patient, and generous. Having that experience has certainly encouraged me to be the best possible supervisor I can be when I am a supervisor myself.

A little over a year after starting my first academic job, I understand how challenging this stage can be. As junior scholars we are expected to teach, research, and take on admin functions and to do everything well, right after finishing our PhD programs. This can definitely be an overwhelming endeavor; however, I have realized that it is all about priorities and we have to do what makes us happy while juggling with all of our professional and personal roles. There have been a lot of discussions about mental health in academia, so I truly believe that it is paramount that we support each other, and that we work on projects that we are enthusiastic about.

Even when our supervisors are our main guidance when as students, I truly encourage PhD candidates to approach other professors if they have any queries. At the same time, it is very important for professors and senior academics to be as helpful as possible with those who ask for our advice. I have been incredibly lucky since CMS scholars have never denied their help or a word of advice. Belonging to the CMS community is a fantastic opportunity, since it is a group of cooperative and passionate students and professors alike.

Thank you to the CMS community for this Award and for the opportunity to share my academic journey.

**Dissertation Abstract, Best Critical Doctoral Dissertation, by Dr. Paulina Segarra:**

The three essays that comprise my dissertation are thematically unified by the ‘banality of evil,’ a concept developed by philosopher, Hannah Arendt.
The essays explore the origin of the concept and how it is operationalized, both theoretically and empirically. For Arendt, the banality of evil entails that ‘[t]he sad truth... is that most evil is done by people who never made up their minds to be or do either evil or good’ (1978 [1971]: 180). This idea captures the remoteness from reality and thoughtlessness, which can lead to all kinds of immoral acts (Arendt, 2006).

Through her work, Arendt advocated for the political relevance of thinking. She argued that relying on tradition, morality or religion can pose catastrophic consequences as ‘thinking is the only activity standing between ourselves and the most heinous of evils’ (Berkowitz, 2011). Notwithstanding its importance, thinking (as Arendt defines it) is often absent in everyday life (Arendt, 1978). Arendt’s concept is worthy of substantive engagement in today’s social and political environment; especially given the discourse targeting those who, like Arendt, have had to migrate looking for better opportunities and safety.

The essays of this dissertation not only achieve a better understanding of the banality of evil and its detrimental consequences, but also applies it to understand the undocumented immigrants’ experiences. As scholars, we are charged with the responsibility of responding to questions that are relevant to society (Adler & Harzing, 2009) and finding ways which may allow the voices from disenfranchised constituents of society to be heard (Durepos et al., 2016). I hope that this dissertation contributes to both aims.

References:


Congratulations to the CMS Division Award Winners!

Alexandra Bristow. The Open University, UK
Best Developmental Reviewer

Shalini. Indian Institute of Management – Calcutta, India
“Entrepreneurship Discourse as a Cultural Tool to Gain Legitimacy: The Case of Uber and Ola in India”
Best Doctoral Student Paper
(Sponsored by Organization)

Mona Florian. European University Viadrina in Frankfurt Oder
Best Developmental Reviewer

Paulina Segarra. EGADE Business School, Tecnologico de Monterrey, Mexico.
“Neither Free Nor a Slave: Three Essays on Subjectivity, Organization, and the Making of Exile”
Best Critical Doctoral Dissertation / Thesis
(Sponsored by Durham University Business School and Organization)
Congratulations to the CMS Division Award Winners!

**Kira Lussier. University of Toronto**

Best Critical Management Learning and Education Paper
(Sponsored by Management Learning)

**Ghazal Zulfiqar. Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan**
“The Politics of Informality in Localizing Transnational Activism in the Homeworker Network”

Best Critical Paper on International Business
(Sponsored by Critical Perspectives on International Business)

**Daniel Nyberg. University of Newcastle, UK**
Christopher Wright. University of Sydney, Australia
“Making Climate Change Fit for Capitalism: The Corporate Translation of Climate Adaptation”

Best Critical Paper
(Sponsored by Durham University Business School and Organization)

**Elena P. Antonacopoulou. University of Liverpool, UK**
Regina F. Bento. University of Baltimore, USA
Lourdes White. University of Baltimore, USA
“Why Didn’t the Watchdogs Bark? Internal Auditing and the Wells Fargo Scandal”

Best Paper in Critical Business Ethics
(Sponsored by Journal of Business Ethics)
Congratulations to the CMS Division Award Winners!

Stefanie Ruel. Concordia University, Canada
“Rogue One: The Canadian Space Agency and Understanding the (Non) Inclusive Organization”
Winner of the Dark Side Case Study Competition
(Sponsored by Sobey School of Business)

Ghazal Zulfiqar. Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan
Best Critical Gender/Feminist Paper
(Sponsored by Gender, Work & Organization)

Not pictured: Lee Robbins. Golden Gate University, USA. Best Developmental Reviewer.

For more photos and details of Division presentations, please see our Twitter page, edited by Marie Hasbi.
THANK YOU
The CMS Division would like to thank outgoing Co-Chairs Banu Özkazanç-Pan and Paul Donnelly, whose commitment and knowledge have been invaluable for the CMS Executive and Community.

Their service has been crucial for the development of the Division, and often during challenging political conditions.

THANK YOU and BEST WISHES in your roles as Co-Chairs of the Diversity & Inclusion Theme Committee (D&ITC) of the Academy of Management.
As the Division Co-Chairs Track (2019-2024), we have prepared a unique PDW call for our meeting next year in Vancouver. Please stay tuned for updates on Social Media and Connect@AOM when our call goes live, and we look forward to sharing more details in our December newsletter.

*Please see our June 2019 newsletter for the Co-Chairs’ platform and biographies.*