



Critical Work and Organizational Psychology: An Emerging Paradigm of Research in Psychology

Severin Hornung

University of Innsbruck, Department of Psychology, Innsbruck, Austria

Abstract

The objective of this brief meta-theoretical contribution is to outline recent developments associated with the emergence of an epistemologically critical paradigm in the academic field of psychology applied to work and organizations. First, the background of these developments and the shortcoming of conventional or mainstream work and organizational psychology are sketched out. Subsequently, attention is called to recent scientific debates involving calls for a critical paradigm in work and organizational psychology. Preliminarily and pragmatically, three waves of publications are distinguished. Building on early pioneering works and representing important geographical crystallization points, these debates were published in key journals of the field in Europe, the United States, and Germany. Further, extant contributions positioning and promoting the emerging paradigm of critical work and organizational psychology are reviewed. This includes journal articles, special issues, designated conferences, and academic organizing attempts aimed at institutionalizing the new paradigm. Integrating these contributions within the framework of meta-theory on social science paradigms in organizational research, a preliminary ontological, epistemological, and axiological definition of critical work and organizational psychology is attempted. Drawing on parallels with the adjacent field of critical management studies, alternative future trajectories for the emerging paradigm are developed, including promises, pitfalls, and opportunities for researchers striving for social transformation.

Keywords: critical work and organizational psychology, epistemological critique, meta-theory, philosophy of science, social transformation

1. Introduction

The objective of this meta-theoretical contribution is to outline recent developments associated with the emergence of a new epistemologically critical paradigm in the academic field of psychology applied to work and organizations (e.g., Gerard, 2016; Sanderson, 2024).

Internationally, work and organizational (W-O) psychology currently witnesses a (re)discovery of alternative and critical social science paradigms for the fundamental reform of mainstream research, which is seen as inherently biased towards managerial positions, organizational perspectives, and profit interests (e.g., Weber et al., 2020). Specifically, mainstream research is seen as losing integrity, credibility, and relevance to reality with regard to theoretical (ontological), methodological (epistemological), and ethical-moral (axiological) terms—particularly in eyes of an upcoming critically-minded generation of researchers (e.g., Gerard, 2023; Röhlmann et al., 2023).

Background of this development are increasingly glaring contradictions inherent in the current system of work and employment. Evidently, this refers to the escalating socio-ecological crisis and exploding social injustice, manifesting in abundant intolerable and dystopian developments in the discipline's immediate field of research and practice. Examples are the ubiquitous intensification and extensification of work (e.g., Pérez-Zapata et al., 2016; Telford & Briggs, 2022), socio-economic polarization and precarization of the global workforce (Ishchuk et al., 2024; Shin et al., 2023), and general shifts in risks and responsibilities from employers to employees (e.g., Hornung et al., 2021; Mumby, 2019). Increasing work-related psychological and psychosomatic disorders and illnesses are resulting from chronic overload, stress, and insecurity, as well as the ensuing social corrosion, alienation, and disintegration (Schulte et al., 2024; Thanem & Elraz, 2022). Conventional W-O psychology tends to neglect or downplay the systemic and structural nature of these social issues, disregard the human suffering of marginalized, exploited, or excluded workers in the Global South (and, increasingly, in the Global North as well), and ignore the contribution of the domain of work and production to the climate crisis threatening the survival of human civilization (e.g., Adams, 2021; Banerjee, 2021; Gerard, 2023).

While comprehensively reviewing this mushrooming academic debate is way beyond the present essay, its primary objective is to call attention to some recent scientific debates, groups, and events involved in the currently observed emergence of a more cohesive stream of critical perspectives in W-O psychology. This includes dedicated journal articles and special issues, conferences, scholarly networks, and other attempts at institutionalizing the new paradigm. Further, some characteristics and aspirations of critical W-O are reviewed. The general approach adopted in this brief overview corresponds to the principles of the “problematizing review” (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2020), as a critical engagement with a selective body of literature with the purpose to raise issues and open up discussion.

The reviewed literature was selected primarily based on the author's prior knowledge due to his active involvement in the emerging W-O movement (Hornung et al., 2023), complemented by targeted literature searches. Finally, a meta-theoretical framework on social science paradigms is presented, which permits a preliminary ontological, epistemological, and axiological allocation, as well as the projection of possible trajectories for the emerging critical paradigm. In addition to reviewing the literature, this part presents an attempt at theory-building, which is aimed at informing and cautioning scholars striving for social transformation in W-O psychology and beyond. Thus, while implications of this contribution are mostly theoretical, relevant for the academic discipline of psychology, they are also practical in terms of making the reviewed literature accessible and introducing main proponents of critical W-O psychology to interested researchers, potentially creating opportunities to connect, collaborate, and continue to collectively criticize the field of psychology applied to work and organizations.

2. Emergence

In the emergence of the current version of critical W-O psychology, three waves of academic contributions can—preliminarily and pragmatically—be distinguished from today’s vantage point. The first wave (before 2018) refers to early and pioneering works. Notably, Islam and Zyphur (2009) compare mainstream and critical perspectives on classic topics of W-O psychology, such as individual differences, motivation, leadership, employee selection and recruitment, training and socialization, occupational stress, changing career patterns, and organizational culture. In a seminal early contribution, McDonald and Bubna-Litic (2012) draw on the paradigm of critical management studies to discuss inherent shortcomings of social psychology applied to work and organizations.

These are summarized as a bias towards quantitative methods and positivist epistemology, an imbalanced focus on individual predispositions and psychological processes, while neglecting structural and systemic conditions, a one-sided identification with the perspective and interests of managers and owners, and a severe lack of moral-ethical grounding. Gerard (2016) introduced the epistemology of the critical, radical structuralist paradigm into industrial and organizational psychology, contrasting this critical tradition with the conventional positivist or functionalist mainstream and alternative social constructivist or interpretive approaches (e.g., Burrell & Morgan, 1979). A second wave of foundational publications commenced with Bal and Dóci’s (2018) analysis of neoliberal ideology in W-O psychology, published in the flagship journal of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP).

These authors have argued that both workplace practices as well as psychological research on these are contaminated by neoliberal political, social, and fantasmatic logics of individualism, competition, and instrumentality. At the same time, Mumby (2019) authored an influential discussion piece in the official outlet of the North American Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), questioning the ideological idealization of work in contemporary societies. Shortly thereafter, Weber et al. (2020) used the opportunity of responding to an article by Bal (2020) to lay out their vision for the future of critical W-O psychology. Each of these foundational articles has sparked controversial debates in work and organizational psychology in Europe, the United States, and Germany, representing three important geographical crystallization points of the emerging paradigm. Since then, a third wave of publications was aimed at elaborating, disseminating, and institutionalizing critical W-O psychology.

Important milestones in this phase were the comprehensive review of the emergence, principles, and positioning of critical W-O psychology by Islam and Sanderson (2022); two journal special issues, edited by Abrams et al. (2023) and Hornung et al. (2023); and, most recently, an entry in the Encyclopedia of Organizational Psychology (Sanderson, 2024), and a treatise on the ethics of critical W-O psychology (Dashtipur et al., 2024) in the Journal of Business Ethics. In the near future, the projected publication of a handbook of critical W-O psychology, edited by an international collective of scholars, is likely going to signify a new phase in the institutionalization of the emerging paradigm.

3. Institutions

At the time of writing, the movement of critical W-O psychology does not have a strong institutional framework. However, its emergence is tied to the international “Future of Work and Organizational Psychology” (FoWOP) network, which was formally founded at a small group meeting sponsored by EAWOP in Breda in 2018. A prominent outcome of this meeting

was the publication of a foundational manifesto, elaborating the social responsibilities of researchers in the field towards different communities, society, and the improvement of academic work environments (Bal et al., 2019). Initially comprising four streams, dedicated to critical research, substantive-methodological synergies, healthy universities, and equality in academia, the critical W-O psychology division turned out to be the most active and sustainable of these (e.g., Gerard, 2023).

Since then, members associated with this division have organized numerous events and activities, established a steering committee, meeting regularly to perform coordination functions, as well as several task forces (e.g., visions and values, climate change) and project-based committees (e.g., Sanderson, 2024). Despite continuous participation in activities of EAWOP, the FoWOP network does not have an institutionalized status within the association, but acts as an informal interest group.

Founded as a local spin-off in 2018 was the “Innsbruck Group on Critical Research in Work and Organizational Psychology” (I-CROP). Declared mission of this group is to theoretically and empirically elaborate research on the role of neoliberal ideology in W-O psychology, inspired by the seminal contribution of Bal and Dóci (2018), and aiming to strengthen the influence of Frankfurt School Critical Theory on the emerging paradigm (Weber et al., 2020). Although the recent conference of the German and Austrian Psychological Societies has prominently hosted a symposium by I-CROP on neoliberal ideology in current socio-ecological crises, and the Italian Psychological Association has financially supported a recent FoWOP small group meeting on the role of W-O psychology in addressing social inequality and ecological unsustainability, the institutional grounding of W-O psychology is sporadic, likely due to its aim of critiquing, challenging, and fundamentally transforming mainstream W-O psychology.

4. Activities

Even more than through publications, the paradigm of critical W-O psychology has established itself through scientific activities and events, often organized in the context of the broader FoWOP network and under the auspices of EAWOP (e.g., Gerard, 2023; Sanderson, 2024). As mentioned above, the network was founded during a small group meeting in Breda in 2018 and has, since then, organized two more of such specialized small-scale conferences in Brussels in 2022 and in Milan in 2024.

During the pandemic, a series of substitute online events were held to reassemble members and to connect with colleagues from the Global South. Additionally, several virtual workshops and well-attended discussion events were continuously organized over the years, featuring prominent speakers from the broader multidisciplinary community of critical scholars (e.g., Böhm, 2002; Fujishiro et al., 2022; Mumby, 2019). Another noteworthy activity is the organization of full-day pre-conference workshops at the biannual EAWOP congresses in 2019 in Turin and in 2023 in Katowice as well as at the upcoming congress in 2025 in Prague (the 2021 congress was cancelled due to the pandemic).

These workshops are accompanied by organized symposia and panel discussions on critical issues in the main conference program. Despite these activities, there seems to be an inherent tension in the relationship between FoWOP, specifically its critical division, and EAWOP, which is not known to be critically oriented, but predominately governed by an unitarist and managerialist ideology, characteristic for mainstream W-O psychology in general (e.g., Bal & Dóci, 2018). The most focused and unprecedented event was the first “International Conference on Critical and Radical Humanist Work and Organizational Psychology”, held

from 11th to 13th of July 2022 at the University of Innsbruck. Organized by I-CROP in conjunction with the critical division of FoWOP and the Erich Fromm Study Center at the International Psychoanalytic University Berlin, this three-day in-person event assembled more than 60 critical academics from institutions all around the globe. Keynote speeches included prominent scholars from critical psychology, critical theory, and critical management studies (e.g., Funk, 2023; Parker, 2023; Teo, 2023). Several follow-up projects emanated from this gathering, and for June 2025, a sequel event is planned.

5. Features

A universal definition of critical W-O psychology may be neither possible, nor desirable (Sanderson, 2024). Nonetheless, it seems essential to at least specify some general features. Several attempts in this direction have been made. Importantly, Islam and Sanderson (2022) have positioned critical W-O psychology between mainstream W-O psychology and critical management studies along the dimensions of core themes, disciplinary roots, socio-political context of emergence, dominant conceptions of the person, epistemological and methodological orientations, and relation to practice.

Weber (2023) has unearthed the disciplinary roots of critical W-O psychology in dialectic and materialist psychology and activity theory, Frankfurt School Critical Theory, different traditions of German critical psychology, socio-critical streams of action regulation theory and self-determination theory, and critical management studies (e.g., Parker, 2023). Based on these previous classification attempts, the characteristics and aspirations of critical W-O psychology can be summarized as being socio-critical, dialectical, deconstructing, self-reflexive, emancipatory, and humanist.

To elaborate these features somewhat, a) *socio-critical* implies firm grounding in critical social theory and critical psychologies—albeit with a pluralistic and undogmatic orientation—including sociological (unorthodox) Marxism (e.g., Burawoy & Wright, 2002) and Frankfurt School Critical Theory (e.g., Granter, 2014), (psycho-)analytical social psychology (e.g., Funk, 2023), various streams of critical psychology (e.g., Teo, 2015), such as psychology as a subject science (e.g., Tolman, 2009), feminist and postcolonial theory (e.g., Strasser & Dege, 2021), critical race theory (e.g., Teo, 2022) as well as critical theories of socio-ecological transformation, such as critical sustainabilities, degrowth, and ecosocialism (e.g., Fuchs, 2017; Rose & Cachelin, 2018); b) *dialectical* means addressing historically determined conflicts of interest and power imbalances in labor relations, the economy, and society—as well as examining their effects on social and ecological problems and crises, such as socio-economic inequality, marginalization, polarization, and shifting of social and environmental costs to underprivileged groups (e.g., Pitts, 2022; Saito, 2023); c) *deconstructing* refers to an ideology-critical perspective that transcends superficial explanations (e.g., Hornung et al., 2023; Islam & Zyphur, 2009), for instance, with regard to social responsibility and sustainability as “business models” (e.g., Schneider, 2020) or the narrative of convergence of interests in employment relations (e.g., Sandoval, 2015); d) *self-reflexive* means problematizing how scientific theories, methods, and results are influenced by epistemological positioning, economic interests, and power structures, for instance, with regard to the dominance of individualistic, managerialist, ethnocentric, and patriarchal perspectives (e.g., Cunliffe, 2022; Seubert et al., 2023); e) *emancipatory* intention challenges the primacy of economic goals, such as performance, efficiency, or growth, and prioritizes alternative socio-ecological concerns and objectives—for instance, health and personal development, social justice, democracy, environmental protection—as values in themselves (e.g., Klikauer, 2015; Weber et al., 2020); f) *humanist*, finally, emphasizes a strong

focus on human dignity and development, reconfirming the inherent value of human and non-human life, including the natural planetary environment (e.g., Dashtipur et al., 2024; Weber, 2023).

To some degree, these six criteria can be interpreted as an adaptation and extension of the three paradigmatic principles of *anti-performativity*, *denaturalization*, and *reflexivity*, formulated earlier for the field of critical management studies (Fournier & Grey, 2000). However, despite some parallels and overlaps, with some considering critical management as a precursor or role model of critical W-O psychology (e.g., Islam & Sanderson, 2022; Parker, 2023), the latter is unique and distinctive, partly due to its disciplinary roots in psychology.

6. Paradigm

One productive way to think about the emerging movement of critical W-O psychology is found in meta-theory of scientific paradigms (Hornung & Höge, 2024). Based on the dimensions of a) orientation towards conflict and radical societal change versus harmony and regulation and b) subjective versus objective conceptions of social realities, Burrell and Morgan (1979) have famously distinguished radical humanist, radical structuralist, interpretive, and functionalist paradigms (e.g., Ardan, 2019; Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Goles & Hirschheim, 2000). Later, these were recast by Deetz (1996) as dialogical, critical, interpretive, and normative studies.

Today, they are commonly referred to as poststructuralist or postmodern, critical, interpretive or hermeneutic, and postpositive or mainstream approaches (Hornung & Höge, 2024; Kornau et al., 2020). Over time, different dimensions have been suggested to differentiate these four paradigms, such as conflict vs. convergence of interests; structures as socio-historically determined vs. created or chosen; coercion vs. free will; deriving knowledge from vs. applying knowledge to organizations (Hornung & Höge, 2024).

However, an alternative way to characterize them is based on their distinct *ontological* (theories), *epistemological* (methods), and *axiological* (objectives) principles (e.g., Shan, 2022; Wrench & Punyanunt-Carter, 2012). Applied to organizational research, the critical paradigm is characterized by a *realist ontology*, such that organizational power structures and exploitation are assumed to have an objective existence that reflects dominant societal interests and is formed by socio-historical forces, but is independent of the subjective perceptions and interpretations of people (e.g., Telford & Briggs, 2022).

This is in contrast to the relativist ontologies of postmodern and interpretive paradigms, which see organizations as socially constructed and existing only temporarily and in the subjectivities of individuals (e.g., Deetz, 1996). Moreover, it is explicitly oppositional to the uncritical realist ontology of the postpositive paradigm, portraying organizations as objectively existing and enduring social systems with a legitimate societal function that typically is not called into question (e.g., Gerard, 2016).

In the critical paradigm, knowledge creation is based on the *epistemology of dialectical analysis and critique*, applying theoretical frameworks to expose hidden power structures and ideological delusions (e.g., Saito, 2023). In contrast, the epistemology of the postmodern paradigm emphasizes open, receptive deconstruction, more closely related to the hermeneutic approach of the interpretive paradigm (e.g., Primecz, 2020). These approaches are distinct from the systematic empirical observation, abstraction, and generalization of (allegedly) causal mechanisms in the postpositive paradigm (e.g., Teo, 2022).

Finally, the *critical axiology* is geared towards *emancipation*, that is, the disruption and transformation of power structures and liberation of people from oppressive, exploitative, limiting conditions and ideologies (e.g., Granter, 2014; Klikauer, 2015).

Less action-oriented, the postmodern paradigm is content with exposing, denaturalizing power relationships, while the interpretive paradigm is concerned with understanding the subjectivities of individuals, frequently even in the service of power (e.g., Davidson et al., 2006). Most explicitly a force of domination, the axiology underlying the postpositive paradigm seeks to design interventions to regulate and control organizational members to pursue managerial goals of increasing performance, efficiency or effectiveness (e.g., Delbridge & Keenoy, 2010). To conclude, critical W-O psychology can be preliminarily defined and differentiated from other scientific traditions as paradigmatically based in a realist ontology, employing an epistemology based on dialectical critique, and is axiologically oriented towards radical social transformation and emancipation.

7. Conclusion

The objective of this brief contribution was to outline the foundations and positioning of critical W-O psychology as a new scientific paradigm. Thus, the purpose of this cursory overview is to introduce this emerging paradigm to a broader professional audience and to call attention to the underlying ontological (theoretical), epistemological (methodological), and axiological (ethical) tensions and conflicts, which are also relevant and of current interest in other subfields of psychology, such as community psychology (e.g., Davidson et al., 2006), positive psychology (e.g., Cabanas, 2018), health psychology (e.g., Murray, 2015), clinical psychology (e.g., Coles & Mannion, 2017), and psychotherapy (e.g., LaMarre et al., 2019). Critical W-O psychology is shaped by critical scholarly influences from within psychology as well as other fields of social science (intra- vs. interdisciplinary), both those with a domain-specific focus on work and organizations as well as those with a broader socio-cultural applicability to life and societies (organizational vs. social science).

The emergence of a critical paradigm in W-O psychology was partly inspired by critical traditions in other fields, most notably, critical management studies (Islam & Sanderson, 2022; McDonald & Bubna-Litic, 2012). To date, the future of this emerging paradigm in psychology still exhibits an open and dynamic trajectory. The coming decades will show, whether it will (continue to) become largely independent from and incommensurate with the mainstream; dissolve and transform (i.e., criticalize) mainstream research from within; collapse and be (re-)integrated into the functionalist mainstream; or will fragment into a number of more or less marginalized critical sub-paradigms, precariously existing at the fringe of the mainstream, representing return to previous status quo. From the current vantage point, all four trajectories (as well as mixed or hybrid versions thereof) seem plausible (Hornung & Höge, 2024). The most desirable scenario seems to be a combination of the first two trajectories of paradigm consolidation and dissemination. Likely, the worst case is reflected by a combination of paradigm fragmentation and integration or assimilation into the mainstream (e.g., Alvesson & Spicer, 2016). Although, according to the present analysis, there is a dialectic dynamic at work here, which scenario will eventually manifest, is not predetermined, but remains to be observed (e.g., Röllmann et al., 2023; Weber et al., 2020).

In any case, the emerging paradigm reflects a direly needed contribution towards theoretical and methodological plurality and diversity in organizational psychology, which, in recent decades, has become increasingly streamlined towards a managerialist perspective, and has uncritically adopted a positivistic orientation towards the natural sciences, betraying its humanist aspirations, ethical responsibilities, and grounding in social sciences and humanities.

Acknowledgment

This paper is a product of the author's personal involvement in the Critical Work and Organizational Psychology division of the "Future of Work and Organizational Psychology" network (<https://fowop.eu>). Acknowledgments are dedicated to all associated scholars.

References

- Abrams, R., Bal, P. M., D'Cruz, P., Hornung, S., Islam, G., McDonald, M., Sanderson, Z., & Tonelli, M. J. (2023). The story of this special issue on critical perspectives in work and organizational psychology. *Applied Psychology*, 72(1), 3-12.
- Adams, M. (2021). Critical psychologies and climate change. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 42, 13-18.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2020). The problematizing review: A counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg's argument for integrative reviews. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6), 1290-1304.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2016). (Un)conditional surrender? Why do professionals willingly comply with managerialism? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 29(1), 29-45.
- Ardalan, K. (2019). Ideology: A multi-paradigmatic approach. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics*, 31(2), 124-142.
- Bal, P. M. (2020). Why we should stop measuring performance and well-being. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie / German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 64(3), 196-200.
- Bal, P. M., & Dóci, E. (2018). Neoliberal ideology in work and organizational psychology. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(5), 536-548.
- Bal, P. M., Dóci, E., Lub, X., Van Rossenberg, Y. G., Nijs, S., Achmak, S., ... & Van Zelst, M. (2019). Manifesto for the future of work and organizational psychology. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(3), 289-299.
- Banerjee, B. (2021). Modern slavery is an enabling condition of global neoliberal capitalism: Commentary on modern slavery in business. *Business & Society*, 60(2), 415-419.
- Böhm, S. (2002). Movements of theory and practice. *Ephemera: Critical Dialogues on Organization*, 2(4), 328-351.
- Burawoy, M., & Wright, E. O. (2002). Sociological Marxism. In T. Jonathan (Ed.), *The handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 459-486). Plenum Books.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Heineman.
- Cabanas, E. (2018). Positive psychology and the legitimization of individualism. *Theory & Psychology*, 28(1), 3-19.
- Coles, S., & Mannion, A. (2017). Critical clinical psychology. In B. Gough (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of critical social psychology* (pp. 557-573). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2022). Must I grow a pair of balls to theorize about theory in organization and management studies? *Organization Theory*, 3(3), online first, 1-28

- Dashtipour, P., Gerard, N., & Rolo, D. (2024). Toward an ethics of ambiguity in critical work and organizational psychology: From 'blank' to 'troubled' subjectivity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, online first, 1-12.
- Davidson, H., Evans, S., Ganote, C., Henrickson, J., Jacobs-Priebe, L., Jones, D. L., Prilleltensky, I., & Riemer, M. (2006). Power and action in critical theory across disciplines: Implications for critical community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(1-2), 35-49.
- Deetz, S. (1996). Crossroads—Describing differences in approaches to organization science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and their legacy. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 191-207.
- Delbridge, R., & Keenoy, T. (2010). Beyond managerialism? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(6), 799-817.
- Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1), 7-32.
- Fuchs, C. (2017). Critical social theory and sustainable development: The role of class, capitalism and domination in a dialectical analysis of un/sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 25(5), 443-458.
- Fujishiro, K., Ahonen, E. Q., & Winkler, M. (2022). Investigating employment quality for population health and health equity: A perspective of power. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(16), 9991.
- Funk, R. (2023). Productivity in face of a "pathology of normalcy". Erich Fromm's contribution to critical psychology. *Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 31-38.
- Gerard, N. (2016). Toward a critical I-O psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 54(2).
- Gerard, N. (2023). Still servants of work? Exploring the role of the critic in work and organizational psychology. *Applied Psychology*, 72(1), 13-25.
- Gioia, D. A., & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 584-602.
- Goles, T., & Hirschheim, R. (2000). The paradigm is dead, the paradigm is dead... long live the paradigm: The legacy of Burrell and Morgan. *Omega*, 28(3), 249-268.
- Granter, E. (2014). Critical theory and organization studies. In P. Adler, P. DuGay, G. Morgan, G., & M. I. Reed (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociology, social theory and organization studies* (pp. 534-560). Oxford University Press.
- Hornung, S., & Höge, T. (2024). Analyzing current debates in management and organization studies: A meta-theoretical review and dialectic interpretation. *Scientia Moralitas International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(2), 1-32.
- Hornung, S., Höge, T., & Unterrainer, C. (2021). Ideologies at work in organizations: An emerging critical perspective and reflexive research agenda. In M. H. Bilgin, H. Danis, E. Demir, & S. Vale (Eds.), *Eurasian Business Perspectives. Proceedings of the 29th Eurasia Business and Economics Society Conference* (pp. 165-182). Springer.
- Hornung, S., Unterrainer, C., & Höge, T. (2023). Editorial: A spectre is haunting Innsbruck. Documentation of the first International Conference on Critical and Radical Humanist Work and Organizational Psychology. *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 4-5.

- Ishchuk, M., Diedkov, M., Khrypko, S., Oblova, L., Binkivska, K., Syhyda, H., & Turchyn, M. (2024). Navigating precarity: Political struggles and the impact on the shadow economy. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13(2), 156-156.
- Islam, G., & Sanderson, Z. (2022). Critical positions: Situating critical perspectives in work and organizational psychology. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 12(1), 3-34.
- Islam, G., & Zyphur, M. (2009). Concepts and directions in critical industrial/organizational psychology. In D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky, & S. Austin (Eds.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 110-125). Sage.
- Klikauer, T. (2015). Critical management studies and critical theory: A review. *Capital & Class*, 39(2), 197-220.
- Kornau, A., Frerichs, I. M., & Sieben, B. (2020). An empirical analysis of research paradigms within international human resource management: The need for more diversity. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(2), 148-177.
- LaMarre, A., Smoliak, O., Cool, C., Kinavey, H., & Hardt, L. (2019). The normal, improving, and productive self: Unpacking neoliberal governmentality in therapeutic interactions. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 32(3), 236-253.
- McDonald, M., & Bubna-Litic, D. (2012). Applied social psychology: A critical theoretical perspective. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(12), 853-864.
- Mumby, D. K. (2019). Work: What is it good for? (Absolutely nothing)—A critical theorist's perspective. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 12(4), 429-443.
- Murray, M. (Ed.) (2015). *Critical health psychology* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parker, M. (2023). Hard lessons: (Critical) management studies and (critical) work and organizational psychology. *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 54-59.
- Pérez-Zapata, O., Pascual, A. S., Álvarez-Hernández, G., & Collado, C. C. (2016). Knowledge work intensification and self-management: The autonomy paradox. *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation*, 10(2), 27-49.
- Pitts, F. H. (2022). *Marx in management and organisation studies: Rethinking value, labour and class struggles*. Routledge.
- Primecz, H. (2020). Positivist, constructivist and critical approaches to international human resource management and some future directions. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(2), 124-147.
- Röllmann, L. F., Degen, J. L., Dóci, E., Bal, P. M., Hornung, S., Islam, G., Kühn, T., & Sanderson, Z. (2023). Bricolage of positions and perspectives from the panel discussion on prospects and contestations of critical and radical humanist work and organizational psychology: Are we ready to take over? *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 61-70.
- Rowe, J. K., & Carroll, M. (2014). Reform or radicalism: Left social movements from the Battle of Seattle to Occupy Wall Street. *New Political Science*, 36(2), 149-171.
- Saito, K. (2023). *Marx in the Anthropocene: Towards the idea of degrowth communism*. Cambridge University Press.

- Sanderson, Z. (2024). Critical work and organizational psychology. In P. M. Bal, *Elgar encyclopedia of organizational psychology* (pp. 100-105). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sandoval, M. (2015). From CSR to RSC: A contribution to the critique of the political economy of corporate social responsibility. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 47(4), 608-624.
- Schneider, A. (2020). Bound to fail? Exploring the systemic pathologies of CSR and their implications for CSR research. *Business & Society*, 59(7), 1303-1338.
- Schulte, P. A., Sauter, S. L., Pandalai, S. P., Tiesman, H. M., Chosewood, L. C., ... & Howard, J. (2024). An urgent call to address work-related psychosocial hazards and improve worker well-being. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 67(6), 499-514.
- Seubert, L., McWha-Hermann, I., & Seubert, C. (2023). Critical reflection and critical reflexivity as core processes for critical WOP: Precarious employment as an example. *Applied Psychology*, 72(1), 106-125.
- Shan, Y. (2022). Philosophical foundations of mixed methods research. *Philosophy Compass*, 17(1), e12804.
- Shin, K. Y., Kalleberg, A. L., & Hewison, K. (2023). Precarious work: A global perspective. *Sociology Compass*, 17(12), e13136.
- Strasser, I., & Dege, M. (Eds.) (2021). *The psychology of global crises and crisis politics: Intervention, resistance, decolonization*. Springer Nature.
- Telford, L., & Briggs, D. (2022). Targets and overwork: Neoliberalism and the maximisation of profitability from the workplace. *Capital & Class*, 46(1), 59-76.
- Teo, T. (2015). Critical psychology: A geography of intellectual engagement and resistance. *American Psychologist*, 70(3), 243-254.
- Teo, T. (2022). What is a white epistemology in psychological science? A critical race-theoretical analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 861584.
- Teo, T. (2023). Subjectivity and work: Critical-theoretical reflections. *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 39-44.
- Thanem, T., & Elraz, H. (2022). From stress to resistance: Challenging the capitalist underpinnings of mental unhealth in work and organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 24(4), 577-598.
- Tolman, C. W. (2009). Holzkamp's critical psychology as a science from the standpoint of the human subject. *Theory & Psychology*, 19(2), 149-160.
- Weber, W. G. (2023). Some lineages and resources of critical and radical humanist work and organizational psychology. *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity*, 16(1), 21-30.
- Weber, W. G., Höge, T., & Hornung, S. (2020). Past, present, and future of critical perspectives in work and organizational psychology—a commentary on Bal (2020). *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie / German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 64(3), 196-215.
- Wrench, J., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. (2012). *An introduction to organizational communication*. Retrieved from <https://2012books.lardbucket.org>.