



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Oswick, C., Biscaro, C., Bruni, E. & Cornelissen, J. (2021). Reconceptualizing Conceptual Engineering. *Academy of Management Review*, 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.

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

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

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. 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.




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

Main Editor
AMR
USA

25th January 2021

Dear Sir or Madam,

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Cliff Oswick

Professor Cliff Oswick (and for Joep Cornelissen, Claudio Biscaro and Elena Bruni)
Chair in Organization Theory

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 Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. 2002. *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind’s*
19 *hidden complexities*. New York: Basic Books.
20
21
22
23 Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. 2003. Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source
24 of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48: 94-118.
25
26
27
28 Higginbotham, J. 1998. Conceptual competence. *Philosophical Issues*, 9: 149-162.
29
30
31 Ketokivi, M., Mantere, S., & Cornelissen, J. 2017. Reasoning by analogy and the progress of
32 theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 42: 637–658.
33
34
35 Makowski, P. T. 2021. Optimizing concepts: Conceptual engineering in the field of
36 management. The case of routines research. *Academy of Management Review*,
37
38 Forthcoming.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000