



# City Research Online

## City St George's, University of London

**Citation:** Oswick, C., Biscaro, C., Bruni, E. & Cornelissen, J. (2024). Reconceptualizing Conceptual Engineering. *Academy of Management Review*, 49(2), pp. 429-431. doi: 10.5465/amr.2021.0031

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/26231/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2021.0031>

**Copyright and Reuse:** Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).



---


# Review

---

## Reconceptualizing Conceptual Engineering

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Review</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Dialogue
Theoretical Perspectives:	
Topic Areas:	
Abstract:	

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



Cass Business School  
106 Bunhill Row  
London  
EC1Y 8TZ  
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)20 7040 8600

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Main Editor  
15 AMR  
16 USA  
17  
18

19 25<sup>th</sup> January 2021  
20  
21  
22

23 Dear Sir or Madam,  
24

25 Please find enclosed a dialogue contribution that we would like to have considered for possible  
26 publication in AMR. Our dialogue piece offers a response to the paper written by Piotr Makowski  
27 (Forthcoming) on conceptual engineering. We feel that are well placed to comment on this contribution  
28 because of our collective expertise in the area and the fact that Makowski extensively utilizes work that  
29 we have previously published in AMR. In particular, the *AMR* paper by Oswick (i.e. Oswick, Fleming &  
30 Hanlon, 2011) is heavily cited and used to formulate the key arguments. In addition, three of  
31 Cornelissen's past AMR papers are also draw upon to develop the key assertions (i.e. Cornelissen,  
32 2005; Cornelissen & Durand, 2012; Ketokivi, Mantere & Cornelissen).  
33  
34

35 We feel that our dialogue offering is robust, constructive and offers some meaningful ways of  
36 progressing the optimal use of concepts in organizational theorizing and theory building. We hope you  
37 like it and we look forward to hearing from you in due course  
38

39 Yours sincerely,  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 *Cliff Oswick*  
45  
46

47 Professor Cliff Oswick (and for Joep Cornelissen, Claudio Biscaro and Elena Bruni)  
48 Chair in Organization Theory  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Reconceptualizing Conceptual Engineering

Drawing upon insights from the field of philosophy, Makowski (2021) introduces conceptual engineering (CE) as a tool to optimize concepts within the field of management. Although there is considerable merit in embracing CE, we contend that the scope for application of CE, the utility of the overall approach, and the resulting benefits, need to be qualified and reframed. In doing so, we discuss how CE can be reconceptualized as a contingent and reflexive device in order to provide additional value to the process of management theorizing.

### PRECISION ENGINEERING?

CE is concerned with scientifically and systematically constructing and reconstructing the concepts that form the building blocks of theory development. For Makowski (2021), CE “relies on a certain *know-how* allowing us to construe concepts, check if they are adequate, valid or sound, and correct them when needed” (p. 10). He also asserts that: “One of the key assumptions behind conceptual engineering used in theory development is that precision and correctness is something on the conceptual level: if a theory is practically significant, it also needs properly exercised micro-level conceptual rigor to realize the goal of scientific inquiry” (p. 6). For us, the importance of precision, correctness and rigor is somewhat overplayed, at least as general criteria that are assumed to apply to all concepts. And, this raises a practical question: Is it possible to precisely engineer management concepts?

Accompanying a preoccupation with precision, Makowski (2021) consistently refers to “correct and accurate concepts” (p. 4), using CE “to solve conceptual challenges” (p. 5), producing the ‘right concepts’ (p. 10), and that CE is necessary “if the management field is to be treated as a truly scientific discipline” (p. 27). Arguably, the metaphor of engineering seems to be somewhat over-engineered in this instance. We prefer to see CE as an ameliorative device

1  
2  
3 which can aid the development of ‘good theory’ rather than as a precise tool to engineer the  
4  
5 ‘right theory’. As we will demonstrate, this is far more than just a semantic point of difference.  
6

### 7 8 DISTORTED CONCEPTS 9

10 Makowski (2021) tells us that “concepts are susceptible to deformations” (p. 13) and that  
11  
12 CE is a way to avoid or overcome ‘conceptual difficulties’ (p. 5), ‘deficient concepts’ (p. 14) and  
13  
14 ‘conceptual distortions’ (p. 21). The borrowing of concepts from other fields by management  
15  
16 scholars is singled out for criticism as a typical source of conceptual transgression. The notion  
17  
18 of ‘conceptual blending’ (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002), which comes from cognitive linguistics,  
19  
20 is used to illustrate this problem. When originally developed, conceptual blending was  
21  
22 formulated as an everyday mental process of meaning-making involving an analogically-based  
23  
24 correspondence between two constructs to create a new synthetic insight. It is argued that when  
25  
26 this concept was imported by Oswick, Fleming and Hanlon (2011) into the field of management  
27  
28 it lost its original meaning and, as such, it “becomes a *normative* tool that allows them [i.e.  
29  
30 Oswick et al, 2011] to formulate direct recommendations in theory development” (Makowski,  
31  
32 2021:20-21). Hence, the concept is reconceptualized (or in Makowski’s terms ‘distorted’).  
33  
34 Ironically, this sort of conceptual distortion seems to be exactly what Makowski (2021) does  
35  
36 himself in borrowing the concept of CE from philosophy. Albeit inadvertently, this is  
37  
38 acknowledged:  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 “Philosophy has been studying it [CE] on the meta-theoretical level. Here, conceptual  
45  
46 (re)engineering will be used as a normative tool to advance theory” (Makowski,  
47  
48 2021:16).

49 Equally, the idea of ‘conceptual competence’ is put to work by Makowski (2021) in his  
50  
51 ‘management-friendly’ version of CE in an applied, normative way which is contrary to the  
52  
53 original formulation provided in philosophy by Higginbotham (1984). The point here is not to  
54  
55 score points. It is to assert that what Makowski (2021) refers to as conceptual distortions and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 deformations are in fact an inevitable and unavoidable facet of theory building and of the process  
4 of appropriating concepts and putting them to practical use. The transgression of existing  
5 concepts is in fact the very lifeblood of theory development. Failure to depart, at least to some  
6 degree, from the original usage and meaning of a concept is likely to stifle theorising and  
7 knowledge development and will result in the reproduction and replication of existing theories  
8 rather than the formation of new ones.  
9

### 16 SHARED AND SLIPPERY CONCEPTS

17  
18  
19 Ultimately, the value and utility of a management theory is not generally determined by  
20 the extent to which it rigidly adheres to pre-existing, established way of framing the underlying  
21 concepts it draws upon (i.e., scientific rigor). Rather, it is determined by the relevance and  
22 resonance it has with a given community of scholars in terms of persuasiveness, plausibility and  
23 applicability (Ketokivi et al., 2017). Meaningful theory development does not typically happen  
24 in a single academic contribution; it arises over time out of debate and dialogue between scholars  
25 which involves both deliberate and unintentional ‘conceptual distortion’ during the process.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Having multiple actors involved in theory building and in conceptual development  
36 presents a problem for advocates of CE who are focused on the pursuit of precise concepts and  
37 eschewing distortions. It also creates a significant challenge for the representation of a concept  
38 which, although ignored by Makowski (2021), is widely acknowledged in the philosophy  
39 literature where it is referred to as ‘externalism’ (Cappelen, 2018). In effect, externalism  
40 suggests that the CE concept (i.e., the theorist’s preferred version) is mediated by the extent to  
41 which there is an alternative commonly used alternative conceptualization (i.e. the dominant  
42 version). Put simply, it is hard to make a conceptionally engineered concept stick if there is a  
43 popular alternative(s) within a particular scientific or practitioner community.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 It is also difficult to undertake CE if there is wider conceptual contestation and/or  
4 significant conceptual ambiguity within a given area of inquiry. Hence, of all the possible areas  
5 of management theorizing that Makowski (2021) could use to demonstrate the veracity of CE, it  
6 is interesting that he settled on critiquing work on routines, performativity, habits and skill (e.g.  
7 Feldman & Pentland, 2003). Arguably, these are relatively uncontentious constructs in the  
8 extant literature and they are also quasi-concrete phenomena (i.e., they are largely visible and  
9 enacted behaviours). It is perhaps more difficult to apply CE to more contested and abstract  
10 management concepts (such as power or identity).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 TOWARDS CONCEPTUAL CARTOGRAPHY

22  
23  
24 So, what can we conclude about CE? And, what are its prospects for management  
25 theorizing? To begin with, we think that CE has a place in theorizing if we use it as a reflective  
26 and orienting tool to generate multiple ways of thinking and towards ameliorative ends rather  
27 than as a prescriptive tool to uncover the precise meaning of a given concept. It can also be  
28 enlisted to provide greater clarity around our personal use of a concept (i.e. knowing why we  
29 frame a concept in the way that we do) which can enable us to be more erudite in our exposition  
30 of our theories and more effective in conveying ideas during dialogue with other scholars.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Beyond this, and although a very popular and topical area of inquiry within philosophy,  
41 CE remains a controversial and contested concept (Cappelen, 2018; Simion, 2018). Perhaps part  
42 of the problem is etymological. The use of ‘engineering’ as a metaphor-based descriptor tends to  
43 evoke notions of fixity, precision and correctness. The recent arrival of the idea of ‘conceptual  
44 cartography’ (Smithson, 2020) in philosophy is arguably a far more apt metaphor for describing  
45 what we are advocating because it encourages us to interrogate a concept within the ‘landscape’  
46 (i.e. the wider conceptual context) in which it is located. As Smithson (2020) puts it:  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “Conceptual cartography is the project of investigating the necessity and contingency of the  
4 various features of conceptual schemes” (p.1). Hence, for us, conceptual cartography offers a  
5 potentially more fruitful way of re-engineering than Makowski’s (2021) conception of  
6 conceptual engineering within the field of management.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

## 12 REFERENCES

13  
14 Cappelen, H. 2018. *Fixing language: An essay on conceptual engineering*. Oxford: Oxford  
15 University Press.  
16  
17

18  
19 Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. 2002. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind’s*  
20 *hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.  
21  
22

23  
24 Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. 2003. Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source  
25 of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48: 94-118.  
26  
27

28  
29 Higginbotham, J. 1998. Conceptual competence. *Philosophical Issues*, 9: 149-162.  
30

31  
32 Ketokivi, M., Mantere, S., & Cornelissen, J. 2017. Reasoning by analogy and the progress of  
33 theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 42: 637–658.  
34

35  
36 Makowski, P. T. 2021. Optimizing concepts: Conceptual engineering in the field of  
37 management. The case of routines research. *Academy of Management Review*,  
38 Forthcoming.  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Oswick, C., Fleming, P., & Hanlon, G. 2011. From borrowing to blending: Rethinking processes  
44 of organizational theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 318- 337.  
45  
46

47  
48 Simion, M. 2018. The ‘should’ in conceptual engineering. *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary*  
49 *Journal of Philosophy*, 61(8): 914-948.  
50

51  
52 Smithson, R. Forthcoming. Conceptual cartography. *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of*  
53 *Philosophy*, available online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2020.1779805>.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60