

Daring to Care: Scholarship that Supports the Courage of Our Convictions

Journal of Management Inquiry
21(2) 128–139
© The Author(s) 2012
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1056492611427801
http://jmi.sagepub.com



Nancy J. Adler¹ and Hans Hansen²

Abstract

Whatever we choose to do, the stakes are very high.

David Whyte (1994, p. 298), poet

Researching questions that matter demands passionate conviction. Whether recognized as such or not, such conviction, combined with profound compassion, defines true scholarship. Daring to care requires courage—the courage to speak out and to act. Courage transforms convictions and compassion into action. Thus, by its very nature, daring to care calls into question the traditional role of rigid scientific objectivity and invites advocacy to play a vital role within our scholarly tradition. In focusing on daring to care, this article raises questions that academia must ask itself in order to support scholars in rigorously researching and teaching about issues that matter. It provides examples of scholarship that have required courage, conviction, and compassion, including a case example where the outcome of appropriate methodology is literally life or death. Throughout the discussion, readers are invited to consider what supports their core convictions, compassion, and courageous action in their own scholarship, teaching, and advocacy.

Keywords

courage, compassion, commitment, academic leadership, scholarship

Do not forget, you are here to enrich the world.

You impoverish yourself if you ever forget that errand.

Woodrow Wilson, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate
and U.S. President, 1913-1921

Caring, translated into compassionate research, requires a desire to help, to intervene, and even to obstruct in order to enrich the world. Yet, most of our scholarly traditions—stripped as they are of advocacy and action—limit scholars to observation and reporting, to scholarship that receives praise for its seemingly dispassionate objectivity. Compassionate research, by contrast, invites advocacy and encourages action. Although by no means considered mainstream, intervention is not entirely outside of academic norms. Advocacy and action fit within the long history of clinical, action research, and organizational development approaches whose aim has always been to help the people and systems they study (see Schein, 1987, among others).

Consider your own beliefs concerning action, compassion, and advocacy. Should scholars intervene? Or should they remain neutral? Can researchers who are advocates produce good scholarship? Can those who refuse to intervene produce good scholarship? Within their professional domain, can great scholars be equally good human beings? To conduct traditional, noninterventionist research, must we give up all claims to compassion? As we begin to reflect on the convictions, questions,

and assumptions that guide our research, teaching, and professional choices, consider the norms around advocacy and action that currently shape our field.

Which stories in our field, along with their underlying assumptions, support advocacy and action?

From the perspective of compassion and advocacy, a cynic might label the expressed aspirations of the field to be an ensemble of unheard calls and unanswered challenges. Consider, for example, recent conference themes selected by some of the profession's most respected senior leaders: *Doing Well by Doing Good; The Questions We Ask; Knowledge, Action, and Public Concern; What Matters Most; Call to Action*, and most recently, *Dare to Care: Passion and Compassion in Management Practice and Research*. Not

¹McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

²Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

Note:

For clarity in the narrative, the authors chose to write the article using the first person for Adler and the third person for Hansen.

Corresponding Author:

Nancy J. Adler, McGill University, Desautels Faculty of Management, 1001 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 1G5
Email: nancy.adler@mcgill.ca

surprisingly, these themes reflect the overarching vision of the Academy of Management: *We inspire and enable a better world through our scholarship and teaching about management and organizations.*

Based on the gap between the field's stated aspirations and contemporary practice, we invite the global community of management scholars to reflect on what matters most to us, individually and collectively (see Mohrman, 2001). As we reflect, we might reclaim, or even discover, the issues we care most profoundly about, even while some colleagues continue to believe that caring, and the courage it demands, remain not only irrelevant but also distinctly outside the boundaries of scholarly management. By more seriously asking the questions that push our scholarship into new territory, we hope to encourage an important public conversation. Our starting point is to ask ourselves questions about our own scholarship. We might begin by asking, *To what extent have we achieved our scholarly aspirations? If not, why not?* Only after having reflected on our own aspirations and scholarship can we begin to reshape the field into one that can succeed in achieving the Academy's vision and the profession's potential.

To date, how has the field fostered the courage, compassion, and conviction necessary to conduct scholarship that matters to society—scholarship that achieves the stated aspirations of the profession's leaders? One approach has been to formally encourage reflection, discussion, and action. A few prominent journals have long histories of fostering such discourse. Notably, it was here, in the *Journal of Management Inquiry*, that Peter Frost (1999) first implored the field to consider compassion. More than a decade later, Dutton and Workman (2011) recounted how compassion has now become “a core idea, central both to the field of organizational studies and in the lives of scholars,” a generative force that “opens new vistas and creates new insights.” Whiteman's (2010) recent work, and the ensuing discussion (Dutton & Morhart, 2010; Mohrman, 2010; Van Maanen, 2010), introduced the image of management studies that break your heart. Their seemingly radical contention, given the nexus of the field, is that if your heart is not broken, then your research has not gone far enough. Counter to the prevailing paradigm, these studies have allowed scholars to recognize that their emotions, far from being irrelevant or, worse yet, confounding distractions, constitute valuable data that can elucidate social phenomena and build richer theory (Mohrman, 2010). Whereas Whiteman warned that heartbreak may or may not lead to compassion, our current work begins to reveal why compassion alone is rarely sufficient to engender action. Without courage, action is unlikely. Courage enables the compassionate action that neither feelings of compassion nor heartbreak alone can generally foster.

Helping us to understand the complex relationship between compassion, commitment, courage, and action, Van Maanen (2010) explored the motivations for advocacy research,

which include personal experiences, emotions, and strong desires to right a social wrong. Dutton and Morhart (2010) further expanded our understanding by inviting us to reflect on heartwarming occasions during the research process that enhance our own lives as scholars. Given that compassion, as the field has broadly defined it, is about noticing, empathizing with, and acting to alleviate the suffering of others (Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006), the intent in this article is to extend prior understandings of compassion by reflecting on the ways in which courage is needed to transform commitment and compassion into advocacy and action.

Daring to Care

As scholars, when do we dare to care? When do we care so passionately about the issues we research that we might be willing to go to jail rather than change the focus or direction of our inquiry? Reflecting on the consequences—positive and negative—of courageously expressed commitments, University of Chicago Professor Mark Slouka (2009) observed,

To maintain its “sustainable edge,” a democracy requires its citizens to actually risk something, to test the limits of the acceptable; the “trajectory of capability-building” they must devote themselves to, above all others, is the one that advances the capability for making trouble. If the value you're espousing is one that could never get anyone, anywhere, sent to prison, then strictly democratically speaking, you're useless.

The passionate conviction that would put one at risk of imprisonment feels alien to most management scholars. It has little to do with the all-too-consuming day-to-day skirmishes involved in placing articles in A-listed journals and counting citations prior to fateful tenure decisions and merit reviews (Adler & Harzing, 2009). Such conviction requires caring more about the broader consequences of our work and its contributions to society than about its more circumscribed impact on us personally. In the vernacular of the type of leadership that we often teach, but much more rarely see exhibited within academia, passionate conviction targets societal significance above individual success.

United States Senator Ted Kennedy gave us a very public example of daring to care. In the final months of his life, attempts to arrest the growth of a malignant tumor in his brain left his once healthy immune system incapable of fending off even the smallest threat. Yet, Kennedy still chose to come to Washington, D.C. when the Senate Majority Leader alerted him to a crucial upcoming vote on health care—the issue Kennedy had committed himself to for more than a half century. Well aware that venturing out in public without a functioning immune system could result in his death, Kennedy nevertheless chose to show up and to vote.¹

As management scholars, who among us would consider risking our life to publish our next article, or even the article after that? When do we choose to commit our substantial research skills to better understanding issues that really matter? When, based on the results of our research, do we feel compelled to advocate for evidence-based societal change?

The Roots of Courage and Conviction

Truth is that which makes an ethical difference in the quality of our lives.

William James²

As a teenager immersed in the excitement of speaking out for the first time, I joined my California friends in a series of antiwar peace marches. I was shocked when my mother dismissively referred to our participation in the marches as political-action parties and told me that unless I was willing to die for what I believed in, I did not actually believe in anything. So much for my budding career as a teenaged peace activist.

Notice that my mother did not admonish me to be willing to kill for what I believed in; rather, she guided me to consider what I might be willing to die for. The ultimate courage of passionate conviction is the courage to risk our own life (or livelihood or popularity or professional respect) for what we believe. Such courage has nothing to do with taking the lives of others.

My mother's question to me did not emerge from an idle reading of popular books on how to raise rebellious teenagers. Rather, she knew that she would not be alive had it not been for the profound courage, compassion, and conviction of others. At the beginning of World War II, at age 14, my Viennese mother sought refuge from the Nazis—who had already incarcerated her father. The Janns, a Catholic family that was not in any imminent danger from the Third Reich, saw my mother-to-be on their doorstep and immediately let her in. Even knowing the Nazis would murder their entire family if they discovered them hiding a Jewish child, the Janns opened the door so my mother might live (Adler, 2008). Needless to say, I am overwhelmingly grateful to them, for without the Janns' daring to care, my mother would not have made it past age 14, would not have met the American man who was to become my father, and I would never have been born.

Daring to care demands that we ask the question: For whom or for what would we be willing to open the door. For whom or for what might we be willing to go to prison? For whom or for what might we be willing to die? In the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.,³

*On some positions, cowardice asks the question "Is it safe?"
Expediency asks the question "Is it politic?"
And vanity comes along and asks the question "Is it popular?"
But conscience asks the question "Is it right?"
And there comes a time when one must take a position
that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular;
but he must do it because conscience tells him it is right.*

Without compassion for the people and organizations we study, and the courage to act on that compassion, none of us would be willing to "open the door." As Peter Frost eloquently reminded scholars in our field, compassion demands that we open ourselves to feel the pain within organizations as well as the pain caused by organizations (Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000). The onus is on us to empathize with the people we study, recognize their pain and suffering, and attempt to alleviate it. Compassionate teaching demands no less.

The power of compassion, and the inherent passionate commitment and courageous action that it engenders, has come into greater focus for me over the past few years as I have observed how management scholars, albeit not yet the majority, find ways to investigate society's most pressing, salient, and contentious issues with the utmost integrity, even when it is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular.⁴ Observing their conviction and courage in action has forced me to reconsider how our lived definitions of professionalism, including those embedded in our most popular methodologies and academic processes, alternately support and undermine scholars in daring to care.

Conviction: A Case of Research that Matters

*If you dared to care
what would you be doing?
What would you commit to?*

Peter Drucker, 1909-2005

Several years ago, I met Rafael Bengoa in Montreal as part of the multinational faculty team launching Henry Mintzberg's (2011a, 2011b) International Masters in Health Leadership. I recently had lunch in Bilbao with Rafael, now the Minister of Health for the Basque Region of Spain. As the elegant first course was served, I remembered having been told that Rafael is now always surrounded by four armed bodyguards who protect him 24/7 from ETA,⁵ the Basque separatist movement that has threatened to kill a government minister.⁶ Although Rafael never elaborated on the inherent risks, it was immediately clear that he, similar to Senator Kennedy, believes so passionately in the importance of health and the opportunities for him to improve the well-being of his fellow Spaniards, based not only on his leadership skills

but also on the application of research-based evidence, that he is willing to risk his life on a daily basis.

What supports our academic colleagues in taking similar risks? When do we, as their colleagues, become aware of their courage, compassion, and conviction?⁷ One of the many stories hidden within the Academy of Management is that of Hans Hansen, a management scholar and assistant professor at Texas Tech University. Hans focuses his current research on death-penalty defense teams, teams whose overarching goal is to save their clients lives.⁸ In helping to design, build, and research the teams, Hans combines powerful participant-observation and ethnomethodological inquiry with narrative theory—an ethno-narrative approach (Hansen, 2006, 2011). His goal is to simultaneously enhance scholarly understanding, advance justice, and save lives. His research is literally a matter of life or death. One slip in construct definition, data collection, analysis, reasoning, presentation, or strategy implementation can cost a person his life. Hans's application of narrative-based methodologies (in this case, the enacting of newly constructed narratives) in the legal-defense process has dramatically increased the chance that death-penalty defendants will live. Prior to the shift in methodology introduced by Hans and his team, more than 90% of defendants received the death penalty in Texas capital trials. Against these odds, Hans's team has succeeded in 34 of the 35 cases they have defended.

The team's repeated pattern of success is inconceivable, including to Texas death-penalty insiders. Yet, this success has not come without exposing the entire team, including its researcher-leader, to serious risks. Beyond the normal risks involved in intensive fieldwork (including those caused by protracted data-collection processes that are frequently detrimental to standard promotion and tenure decisions), the defense team's winning streak has not been universally popular. Hans's team often discusses, and even takes playful bets on, which member of the team will next be thrown in jail as punishment for pursuing their full range of creatively conceptualized, narrative-based defense strategies.

Some of Hans's academic colleagues have fiercely chastised his work, others have misunderstood it. Even his supportive department chair labeled his work "a distraction." Whereas qualitative approaches are gaining more acceptance, such disparaging value judgments are not unfamiliar to ethnographers working in business schools. Qualitative interpretive approaches, in contrast to quantitative, positivist research, are all too often deemed illegitimate in the face of coercive and normative institutional pressures that demand publication as an end without means. Transcending the concerns that have been expressed about qualitative methodologies, the subtext within academia remains pervasive: We don't need research to matter, we just need more of it.

In court, one district attorney screamed at Hans, publicly berating him. Hans sat expressionless, continuing to take

field notes, his jottings capturing the altercation as it occurred. Hans has twice been thrown out of court, once by a sheriff and once by a district attorney who demanded his removal in an attempt to undermine Hans's role in assisting a defense team. Hans reports that he has been yelled at and prayed for more times than he can count. Just a few months ago, while writing this article, he returned home to find a shattered front door, a rock having been heaved through the glass. He unconvincingly assured me that it was probably unrelated to his work with the death-penalty defense teams, and then immediately undercut his own argument by joking that the list of suspects would be "unimaginably long."

When asked, Hans reveals that he does this work because "he can't not do it." He is compelled by the injustice he has seen, as well as by the burden of a growing sense of responsibility grounded in both his deepening understanding of how the death penalty, as an institution, consistently fails to meet even the minimum standards of justice, and by a profound awareness that, at least for individual cases, his team is capable of stopping the death penalty. At a minimum, such commitment resonates with Van Maanen's (2010) understanding that advocates must have a grievance and the desire to right wrongs, as well as with what O'Reilly and Aquino (2011) described as a moral imperative to act once one has seen injustice. However, Hans's extraordinary level of commitment, including his pattern of working to the point of exhaustion and risking his career for some of the most desperate, yet least deserving, people on the face of the earth, begs for additional explanation. Invoking his classically taciturn style, all Hans will say is that he has been there, explaining that years ago, a group of strangers showed him compassion instead of condemnation. That indelible memory drives his current commitments and research. "Being kind when it's hardest is probably when it's most important." You gotta have a grievance, but you also gotta have heart.

I often feel genuinely uncomfortable with the cavalier ways in which Hans's courage and compassion express themselves, but simultaneously realize that people who take such risks often discount the threat to continue the work they are committed to. What is clear is that in Hans's case, the question—"Would I continue conducting this research even at the risk of being thrown in jail?"—is a lived reality; it is no longer merely an academic abstraction. In a scholarly domain like this one, the line between traditional research objectivity and advocacy easily blurs.

Courageous Conversations: The Questions We Ask Ourselves

*In a conversation, there is always more than one voice,
and one of the voices must be our own or it is no conversation
at all.*

David Whyte (2001, p. 56)

As we listen to, and read about, other scholars' stories, we more consciously begin to reflect on our own research trajectory and current commitments. As a part of that reflection, ask yourself, "What do you find most difficult to face about your relationship to your own research and teaching? What forms the basis for your most profound professional commitments?"

What are the courageous conversations I am not having with myself right now about my own scholarship?

Conviction: Asking Questions that Matter

Although few researchers consciously intend to subvert their core values, all too many scholars so reduce the scope of their research that it means little to them beyond its use as a vehicle for getting published and advancing their career. What keeps so many professors from doing the research that would matter the very most to them, personally and professionally?

We know that many students enter management doctoral programs ardently desiring to address the questions that are most important to them; they do not simply seek to fill a gap in the literature identified by their advisor or others in the field (Bartunek, Rynes, & Ireland, 2006; Vermeulen, 2005). Although studies of commitment similar to those conducted on medical students have not yet been carried out on management doctoral students, it is possible that comparable dynamics apply (Adler & Harzing, 2009). Students enter medical school passionately committed to idealistic and humanitarian goals. Yet, by the time they graduate, most students have reduced their aspirations to survival in a system that they perceive to be regularly making inhuman demands on them (Becker & Geer, 1958; Greger, 1999). After graduating, many junior professors, in management as well as other disciplines, choose to believe that individual creativity, especially in the form of deviance from academia's current norms, must be delayed not only until after they have earned a doctorate and landed their first faculty position but also, most prudently, until after they receive tenure. After having worked for more than a decade perfecting their skill at adhering to academia's norms, including those that pressure professors to focus on circumscribed "doable" research agendas (rather than dedicating themselves to investigating large, messy, complex, controversial, and important societal issues), few scholars want to risk being rejected for deviating from traditional expectations, including those surrounding the definition of what are—and are not—acceptable research questions (Adler & Harzing, 2009).

Outrage: Daring Us to Care

Compassionate research requires that we empathize with the people we research.⁹ It demands that we recognize their

pain and suffering and attempt to ameliorate it. Unfortunately, given the very nature of empathy, it also implies that the researcher too will suffer. Frost's call to management scholars for compassion is a plea to all of us to be more compassionate in both our research and teaching (Frost, 1999).

What would it take for most management scholars to dare to care? What would reignite our passionate caring, even while professional norms, socialization, and reward systems act to mute or extinguish such caring and the courageous action it demands? One compass directing us back toward our most deeply held values, and thus to our most passionate caring, is outrage. Outrage almost always signals a violation of core values—an abuse of our sense of decency, equity, justice, and our general beliefs about how human beings should treat each other. When do we allow our anger at what is taking place in society, in general and specifically within organizations, to influence our scholarly inquiry? Did, for example, our witnessing of the clashes in Egypt and throughout the Middle East in 2011 ignite our desire to use our own organizational knowledge and methodological training to increase global understanding and foster democratic ideals?¹⁰ When do we allow ourselves to realize that, with the skills we have acquired as scholars, we can, in fact, help society to address some of its most pressing challenges? Professors used to matter. We are no less capable than our predecessors. Now is our time.

To reroot ourselves in our core values and commitments, perhaps one of the most important questions all of us need to ask ourselves, possibly on a regular basis, is, *What causes me to feel outraged? What hooks my passionate caring?* If I allow myself to care about the world, what would I do? What would I commit to? How might my outrage influence the questions I ask? What do I care so passionately about that I would be willing to research it even if top journals were less likely to publish my work, conferences were less inclined to invite my presentations, and my university was less likely to deem my work worthy for promotion, tenure, and annual merit increases?¹¹ Based on what I profoundly care about, what would I dare to research, even if, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, it was neither expedient, popular, safe, nor professionally advisable?

Give yourself a moment to remember a time when your own scholarship demanded courage. It might have been caused by your decision to ask a question that hugely mattered to you but was not considered relevant by mainstream scholars. Alternatively, the moment that demanded courage might have arrived when you decided to collect data that other scholars consider to be particularly controversial (such as the decision by one doctoral student to collect data on the leadership of Islamist organizations). It might have demanded courage to use a novel methodology, or to contradict in some important way the field's current research norms.¹² As you reflect on your own moments of courage, recollect what

allowed you to take the stand that you took? What made it difficult? What would have made it easier?

Within the context of making a commitment to the research that matters the most to you, ask yourself, “What would have to change in academia and in each of our individual universities for more scholars to be willing to act more consistently with compassion and courage?”

For whom (or what) would I be willing to open the door?

For what research agenda might I be willing to go to jail?

For whom or for what might I be willing to risk my life?

As you quietly explore the relationship between your work as a scholar and your own most strongly held values and convictions, ask yourself the most important “shadow” question that accompanies any discussion of compassion and commitment: *What keeps me from doing the research and teaching that matters the most to me?*

Narratives of Scholarship

*What are the stories I tell myself
that allow me to do what I do?*

Numerous scholars (Gardner, 1996; Weil, 1998, among many others) have singled out storytelling as a core leadership skill, with the best leaders using stories to answer such fundamental questions as “Who am I?” “Who are we?” “Where did we come from?” and “Where are we going?”. Gardner (1996) asserted that only leaders who embody and tell compelling stories have the power to influence. Whereas storytelling, under the label of narrative theory, forms the basis for some of academia’s most established methodologies, rarely do we seem to ask ourselves about the implicit and explicit stories guiding our own identity as scholars, and that of our profession. As management scholars, what are the stories we tell ourselves, individually and collectively, that allow us to do what we do?

By asking questions about the narratives that guide our lives as scholars, and joining in the conversations such questions inspire, the discourse within our field will be altered. We will begin to construct new narratives that support who we want to be, what we want to do, and where we want to lead the field.

Allowing Narrative Theory to Guide the Field

Our lives are defined by the narratives we construct (Bruner, 1985). They are the structures we apply in attempting to account for, attend to, and interpret experience. As such, narratives shape the ways we see and act in the world, as well as within our profession. Our discourse does not simply mirror social reality; it creates it (Hardy, Palmer, & Phillips, 2000). As

such, narratives may be seen as discursive cognitive schema (Sewell, 1992; Weick, 1979), thought patterns, or mental maps that people “go by” when making sense of events and deciding what actions to take. Constructing narratives forces us to make assumptions about reality and about how things are supposed to be. Narratives thus reflect the culture and identity of their producers.

Narratives serve as cultural, cognitive, and normative institutions (Scott, 1995) that provide meaning and structure to social life, as represented in myths and stories (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Mitroff & Kilmann, 1976). However, they often become so entrenched, widely accepted, and unquestioned that they are taken for granted (DiMaggio, 1988; Zucker, 1977). As a result, narratives not only guide us but also act to control us, imprisoning us inside specific sets of repeated actions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Similar to other people, members of academic disciplines are vulnerable to becoming trapped into particular ways of thinking, suspended in a web of norms and values of their own making (Barley & Tolbert, 1997).

In numerous areas of scholarship, all too many of us find ourselves languishing in our narrative-constructed prisons, suffocating, having long forgotten that we ourselves are the architects, builders, and guards—the long-forgotten key buried deep within our front pocket. Meanwhile others among us remain unconscious, blissfully repainting the walls.¹³

One of the aims of research on the death-penalty defense is to explore the extent to which teams of colleagues can intentionally construct a new narrative and then deliberately follow it in making sense of experience and in taking action. Counter to enormous institutional pressure, the death-penalty defense teams consciously attempt to enact their new narrative and to change not only how events are perceived but also the very actions that are taken.

We know that dominant ideas lose legitimacy as alternative interpretive schema emerge (Greenwood & Hinings, 1988; Oliver, 1992). Old ideas and ways of doing things lose their legitimacy; the associated mindsets and cognitive patterns therefore erode (Oliver, 1991, 1992). But in such change processes, schema are usually replaced, not simply extinguished (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Constructing new narratives is not enough. It is a competition, and the new narratives must beat out the old, established narratives. Academia, of course, is no exception to this pattern.

Narratives of Inaction

Narratives entail logics of action (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Sonnenstuhl, 1996) that provide a rationale for action (Giddens, 1993). Just as powerful as logics of action, however, are narratives of inaction that require just as

much, if not more, rationalization to construct. When a particular situation compels us to act, we must draw on something even more powerful to do nothing. Already years ago, psychologists identified denial as a particularly powerful mechanism for supporting inaction (see Kubler-Ross, 1969, among many others). Denial that supports inaction is visible today in the prevalent narratives proclaiming that the planet, our species, our economy, our country, and a select group of major companies and financial institutions are too big to fail (see, for example, Herbert, 2010; Hoenig, 2010; "In Climate Denial, Again," 2010; "On Climate, Who Needs the Facts?" 2011; Prottess, 2010; Taleb, 2007).

Although seemingly irrational, "doing nothing" can, all too frequently, be easy, as it allows us to remain comfortably ensconced in our habitual patterns of behavior and protects us from confronting institutional logics (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008) that are the very source of our entrapment. Or, just as easily, we can busy ourselves with rigorous attention to the wrong problems, a tactic not confined to academia (Mitroff & Silvers, 2010).

Even given the societal mechanisms that work to undermine it, caring is a human trait and moral imperative (Morse, Solberg, Neander, Bottorff, & Johnson, 1990). Indeed, it is compassion that makes us human (Dalai Lama, 1995), yet "objectivity" and other scientific norms pressure scholars not only to conduct research on topics they care little about but also to fail to develop the kind of caring that would foster most forms of advocacy. Moreover, such norms compel many scholars to act as if publishing in prestigious journals, without having any direct impact on the broader society, is sufficient in and of itself (Adler & Harzing, 2009). Narratives of inaction support the field in continuing this pattern of behavior. We therefore need to collectively ask ourselves, *What stories do management scholars tell themselves to stop themselves from conducting the research they care most about?*

What is most curious about this pattern is that it is actually easier to conduct research that matters than to conduct research that does not matter. It is hard to work, day after day, on issues that mean little to us. *What then allows us, as a profession, to sit in our office and not care?* What are the widespread, collectively held, academia-wide cultural stories—literally our narratives of inaction—that encourage us, as a profession, to research marginally important issues and topics? When we reflect on our own profession through the lens of Jung's (1959) concept of the collective unconscious, what stories do we recognize? Which narratives are we currently collectively repeating to ourselves and to each other that keep us from feeling and expressing compassion in our research and teaching—stories that keep us from passionately committing to what matters the most to us and to the world?

Stories that allow us to do nothing when faced with a compelling situation—with circumstances that outrage us—are among the hardest stories to invent. By definition, they require the most contrived narratives. It is harder, for example, for people to stay in a physically abusive relationship, than to get out. And yet most people who are battered contrive stories that allow them not to investigate either their own or the culture's logic patterns that support them in remaining with an abusive partner. Whereas few people would define the investigation of topics that are meaningless as scholarly abuse, we certainly need to ask ourselves, individually and collectively, *How do I see a societal need and yet force myself not to care? How do I convince myself that the most compelling issues are outside of my profession's scholarly domain?*

Stories of denial. Some of the most common narratives of inaction involve stories of denial or stories that keep us small. Stories of denial blind us to the part of our behavior that is inconsistent with our identity. The most searing example of denial I personally witnessed this past year was exhibited by a world-renowned physician who was attending a global leadership program. When asked to tell a story about a time when he had acted courageously, he shocked the other participants by describing a series of torture rituals (during which one initiate died) that he had first been subjected to and then led for 8 years as a part of an initiation into his country's elite medical fraternity. When asked how he could treat people in such a way, he calmly explained that, as an educator, he used torture to teach the junior physicians what commitment really means (in this case to the fraternity and their fellow physicians). Aghast at their failure to pierce the physician's blatant violation of his sworn oath to do no harm as well as the norms of human decency, the group finally asked their colleague if he would want the same type of "education" used on his own children. Engulfed in sudden horror, the physician recognized, for the first time, the contradiction between the denial story he had invented for himself and his more fundamental identity as a father, physician, and caring human being. Not only did his behavior change but he was also subsequently successful in having the initiation-by-torture rituals outlawed in his home country.

Stories that keep us small. As pervasive as stories of denial are, stories that keep us small are even more common. Such stories encourage us to aspire to less than we yearn for and to attempt to do less than we are capable of doing. One of the most pernicious forms of stories that keep us small is the type that elevates scholars who influence major societal issues into bigger-than-life superheroes, people who then appear to be unlike the rest of us.¹⁴ Education philosopher Parker Palmer (1990) illustrated this dynamic by using the example of Americans' reaction to Rosa Parks. In 1955, Parks, a black seamstress, defied the law by refusing to give

up her seat to a White man aboard a city bus in Montgomery, Alabama. Parks's arrest sparked major demonstrations that subsequently led to important advances in U.S. civil rights legislation. Palmer made it clear that if Rosa Parks's story is to support our own courage to stand up for what we care most about,

We must see her as the ordinary person she is. That will be difficult to do because we have made her into superwoman—and we have done it to protect ourselves. If we can keep Rosa Parks in a museum as an untouchable icon of truth, we will remain untouchable as well: we can put her up on a pedestal and praise her, world without end, never finding ourselves challenged by her life. (p. 35)

What are the stories that protect us from taking on the big issues? Do we tell ourselves that there are other wiser, more experienced people who can do a better job? Do we place the leaders of the field, including the editors of our top journals and the people who hold the most senior positions in academia, on pedestals, thereby allowing ourselves to assume that they, and not we, have responsibility not only for the norms that shape our profession, but also for shaping our world? Do we convince ourselves that once our family has grown up or once we have retired we will have time to address “the big stuff?” Do we pretend to ourselves that only after we have paid off the mortgage will we be sufficiently financially secure to risk taking on the more important and more controversial issues of our time?

Do we convince ourselves that once we have received tenure we will be able to commit ourselves to the issues we care the most about (Corley, 2010; Hambrick, 2005)? Interestingly, after Hans presented his work with death-penalty defense teams at the 2010 Academy of Management Meetings in Montreal, many audience members made such comments as, “Well, of course he can work to fix the justice system; he has tenure”; and “No junior faculty member would dare to do what he does”; and “He must have a very supportive dean. Using his research to advocate on such a controversial issue would instantly end any professor's career at my university.” The audience members' assumptions—the stories they had invented to keep themselves safe—were transparently false: Hans is a junior faculty member who has yet to come up for tenure. The invented stories reveal the extent to which stories that keep us small are ingrained and sanctioned within our academic culture and serve to protect us from taking on the big issues that matter the most to us. The fact that no one asked Hans, either publicly or privately, about his tenure status reveals the extent to which we, as an academic community, act to maintain the stories that keep us small in order to feel safe and remain unchallenged and unchanged. In his 1994 inaugural address, Nelson Mandela

blatantly challenged the citizens of South Africa, and all of us, not to play small:

*Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate.
Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure.
It is our light, not our darkness, that most frightens us.
We ask ourselves, “Who am I to be brilliant,
gorgeous, talented and famous?”*

*Actually, who are you not to be?
You are a child of God.
Your playing small doesn't serve the world. . . .*¹⁵

Narratives of Action: Stories that Matter.

*Experience is constantly inviting us
into much larger worlds than we ever imagined.*
David Whyte (1999)

How do we find our story and the set of scholarly commitments that will mean the most to us and to the world? Rather than searching for a commitment, many people describe their story as finding them.¹⁶ In Hans's case, he received an unexpected phone call from a defense attorney asking if he would be interested in “helping with a new type of team,” the “first of its kind.” Whereas a team specializing in death-penalty cases makes sense theoretically, the reality was that lawyers are not used to working in teams. When he received the call, Hans knew no more about the criminal justice system than did any average member of the public. But he was an expert on team building. Reality (and the beginning of what has become a commitment bordering on an obsession) only hit after the team's first meeting. It was then that Hans realized that much more than his team-building skills, his ability to weave facts into stories—that is, his experience with narrative theory—was exactly what the lawyers needed if they were to start winning cases and saving lives.

When you reflect on your own life, including your own scholarship and teaching, what are the stories that currently support you in doing what you care most about?

*What story would I have to construct to research and
teach what I care most passionately about?*

Supporting Passionate, Compassionate Scholarship

*The soul craves beauty
Yet our world languishes in ugliness*
John O'Donohue (2003)

*It doesn't have to be that way
Daring to care is the least we can do.*
Nancy J. Adler (2010)¹⁷

How can academia support scholars who dare to care? Jim Walsh, the 2010 president of the Academy of Management, chose as his program theme “Asking Questions that Matter.” He invited the 20,000 members of the Academy of Management to “Be sure to consider the most meaningful questions” and to remember that, “Just because a question has yet to be asked or answered does not mean that we need to address it. Some questions are more important than others.”¹⁸

Likewise, Anne Tsui, the 2012 president of the Academy of Management, chose “Daring to Care: Passion and Compassion in Management Practice and Research” as the program theme for the 2010 Annual Meeting. How does our profession’s approach to scholarship enhance, and at times undermine, our collective ability as scholars to “dare to care” and to be of consequence to society? How might professional organizations, such as the Academy of Management, better support “scholarship that matters” and the courage needed to conduct it? As you consider your own current research and teaching agenda, ask yourself, *What would I need to ask for (and from whom) to garner the support I most need to passionately engage with what matters most to me?*

What story would I need to tell to colleagues to gain the support I most need? How would I have to tell my story?

Already 900 years ago, the 13th-century Persian poet, theologian, and Sufi mystic, Rumi, implored the population to ask questions, rather than going back to sleep.

*The breezes at dawn have secrets to tell you
Don't go back to sleep!
You must ask for what you really want
Don't go back to sleep!
People are going back and forth
Across the doorsill where the two worlds touch,
The door is round and open,
don't go back to sleep!*¹⁹

Almost a millennium later, as we confront the intellectually imprisoning narratives of our own era and profession, we need to implore each other not to go back to sleep.

Professors used to matter, we used to be leaders, people used to listen to us—but only when we said things that mattered. We can matter again, if we want, if we have the courage to allow ourselves to care. In the words of the poet, David Whyte (1994),

*... the journey begins right here
In the middle of the road
Right beneath your feet*

*This is the place
There is no other place
There is no other time.*

The journey starts with the quietest and most personal of questions:

For whom and for what would I open the door?

Authors' Note

The article is based on, and some data were collected during, the All Academy Session “Daring to Care: Scholarship That Supports the Courage of Our Convictions” at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting on Sunday August 8th, 2011, in Montreal with Nancy J. Adler (chair), Hans Hansen and Ian Mitroff (presenters), Jim Walsh (discussant), and Troy Anderson and Christine Bataille (facilitators). The session was filmed by the British film team of Alastair Creamer (director) and Toby Falconer (technical director).

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. On July 9, 2008, Kennedy surprised the Senate by making his first post-illness public appearance to supply the vote needed to break a Republican filibuster against a bill to preserve Medicare fees for doctors (Hulse & Pear, 2008).
2. William James, American psychologist and philosopher, 1842-1910. As cited by Ian Mitroff at the Academy of Management Meetings in Montreal, August 8, 2010, and found at http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/15865.William_James
3. From the closing of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s February 6th, 1968, speech, “A Proper Sense of Priorities” in Washington, D.C., as found at http://www.aavw.org/special_features/speeches_speech_king04.html
4. C. K. Prahalad, for example, offered the field the concept of business serving the two thirds of the world’s population that lives on less than two dollars a day. Even though he was already one of the most highly respected and best known professors and management consultants in the world, it took him more than 5 years to find a publisher that would accept his book manuscript on the topic (see Prahalad, 2006, based on a private conversation between Adler and Prahalad, Milan, Italy, 2008).
5. ETA, in the Basque language *Euskadi Ta Askatasuna*, meaning Basque Homeland and Freedom. Founded in 1959, it is an armed Basque nationalist and separatist organization.
6. For years, ETA has been responsible for politically motivated murders, including, but not limited to, those of political leaders.

- There is currently extreme pressure on ETA to renounce its violent methods ("A Hint of Peace," 2011).
7. For current work by management professors on moral courage, see Comer and Vega (2011).
 8. The death-penalty defense team is The Texas Regional Capital Public Defender Office. Its overarching goal is to save the lives of its clients, all of whom the State of Texas intends to execute. Besides litigation, the defense team presents the defendant's entire life, telling the story of how the defendant's life history and experience led up to committing the crime, explaining why their culpability is reduced such that they do not deserve the death penalty.
 9. Note that researching compassion (see forthcoming special issue of *Academy of Management Review* on compassion) is not the same as compassionate research.
 10. On February 8, 2011, Egypt and the world were galvanized by Egyptian Google executive and revolutionary leader, Wael Ghonim's television broadcast as he emerged from 12 days in prison in solitary confinement and returned to Cairo's Tahrir Square. In a pitch-perfect demonstration of thought leadership, Ghonim announced, "Now our nightmare is over. Now it is time to dream." How many of us recognize management professors who have embraced equally big issues and succeeded in having an equally big impact? See Kristof (2011) among many others for descriptions of courage, conviction, and compassion in the Middle East.
 11. Peter Drucker contended that one was not really a leader unless people would be willing to work for you without being paid. In this context, daring to care is self-leadership. What would we be willing to work on if we were not paid to do so?
 12. An example of the later would include Anne-Wil Harzing's research, initially as a doctoral student (Harzing, 1995) and then as a junior untenured professor (Harzing, 2002) that reported that high expatriate failure rates were a myth, thus exposing most research on expatriate managers to be flawed because the field had uncritically accepted the false assumption (and reported it as a fact) that there was a high expatriate failure rate. The second article exposed the weaknesses and fallacies that are rampant in academic referencing, a topic that was not welcomed anywhere in academia. Harzing had to send the article to more than 12 journals before Denise Rousseau, then editor of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, recognized the importance of the topic and sent it out for review. The 1995 article, Harzing's first published article, has since been cited more than 160 times.
 13. Alvesson and Sandberg (2011) highlighted the extent to which we fail to question the assumptions underlying our theories and that we need to question the same assumptions.
 14. See Walsh (2011) for a description of what the field needs to be and how many Academy members assume that, as President, he has more influence than he has, including assuming that any of his articles will automatically be accepted for publication.
 15. The statement attributed to Mandela's May 10, 1994, Presidential inaugural speech was originally written by Marianne Williamson (1992, p. 165).
 16. "One's story" in this sense is similar to what many great religious and spiritual traditions often refer to as a calling.
 17. Presented by Adler on August 8, 2010, at Opening Plenary for the 2010 Academy of Management. See Adler (2011).
 18. From Walsh's call for articles and proposals for the 2008 Academy of Management Meeting (see http://meeting.aomonline.org/2008/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1&Itemid=1)
 19. From the poem "Don't go back to sleep!" by Jalal ad-Din Rumi as published in Roberts and Amidon (1991, p. 334).

References

- A Hint of Peace. (2011, January 11) Editorial. *New York Times*.
- Adler, N. J. (2008). I am my mother's daughter: Early childhood influences on leadership success. *European Journal of International Management*, 2, 6-12.
- Adler, N. J. (2011). *Daring to care: Passion and compassion in management practice and research* (Working paper). Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill University.
- Adler, N. J., & Harzing, A.-W. (2009). When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8, 72-95.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 247-271.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Sonnenstuhl, W. J. (1996). The organizational transformation process: The micropolitics of dissonance reduction and the alignment of logics of action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 477-506.
- Barley, S., & Tolbert, P. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organizational Studies*, 18, 93-117.
- Bartunek, J. M., Rynes, S., & Ireland, D. I. (2006). What makes management research interesting, and why does it matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 9-15.
- Becker, H. S., & Geer, B. (1958). The fate of idealism in medical school. *American Sociological Review*, 23, 50-56.
- Bruner, J. (1985). *Actual minds: Possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Comer, D. R., & Vega, G. (2011). *Moral courage in organizations: Doing the right thing at work*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Corley, K. G. (2010). Letter from a newly-tenured professor: A response to Hambrick and a call to action for my fellow associate professors. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 393-396.
- Dalai Lama. (1995). *The power of compassion*. London, England: Thorsons.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Dutton, J. E., & Morhart, F. (2010). Heartwarming as the other side of heartbreaking experiences in research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 342-344.
- Dutton, J. E., & Workman, K. (2011). Compassion as a generative force. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20, 402-406.
- Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. M. (2006). Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 59-96.
- Frost, P. J. (1999). Why compassion counts! *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8, 127-133.
- Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (pp. 25-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gardner, H. (1996). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *New rules of sociological method* (2nd ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gioia, D., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change intervention. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12, 433-448.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1988). Organizational design types, tracks and the dynamics of strategic change. *Organizational Studies*, 9, 293-316.
- Greger, M. (1999). *Heart failure: Diary of a third year medical student*. Retrieved from <http://www.just-think-it.com/heartfailure.pdf>
- Hambrick, D. C. (2005). Letter to a newly-tenured professor. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 300-302.
- Hansen, H. (2006). The ethnographic approach. *Human Relations*, 59, 1049-1076.
- Hansen, H. (2011). Managing to beat death: The narrative construction process. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24, 422-463.
- Hardy, C., Palmer, I., & Phillips, N. (2000). Discourse as a strategic resource. *Human Relations*, 53, 1227-1248.
- Harzing, A. W. K. (1995). The persistent myth of high expatriate failure rates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6 (May), 457-475.
- Harzing, A. W. K. (2002). Are our referencing errors undermining our scholarship and credibility? The case of expatriate failure rates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 127-148.
- Herbert, B. (2010, November 19). Hiding from reality. *New York Times*.
- Hoening, T. M. (2010, December 1). Too big to succeed. *New York Times*.
- Hulse, C., & Pear, R. (2008, July 10). Kennedy's surprise return helps Democrats win the day. *New York Times*.
- In Climate Denial, Again. (2010, October 17). Editorial. *New York Times*.
- Jung, C. (1959). *Archetypes and the collective unconscious*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Kristof, N. D. (2011, February 20). Watching protesters risk it all. *New York Times*.
- Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On death and dying*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Mintzberg, H. (2011a). *Developing naturally: From management to organization to society to selves*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (2011b, February). Looking forward to development. *Training & Development Journal*, 50-55.
- Mitroff, I., & Kilmann, R. H. (1976). On organization stories: An approach to the design and analysis of organizations through myths and stories. In R. H. Kilmann, L. R. Pondy, & D. P. Slevin (Eds.), *The management of organization design* (pp. 189-207). New York, NY: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Mitroff, I., & Silvers, A. (2010). *Dirty rotten strategies: How we trick ourselves and others into solving the wrong problems precisely*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mohrman, S. A. (2001). Seize the day: Organizational studies can and should make a difference. *Human Relations*, 54, 57-65.
- Mohrman, S. A. (2010). Emotions, values, and methodology: Contributing to the nature of the world we live in whether we intend to or not. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 345-347.
- Morse, J., Solberg, J., Neander, W., Bottorff, J., & Johnson, J. (1990). Concepts of caring and caring as a concept. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 13, 1-14.
- O'Donohue, J. (2003). *Beauty: The invisible embrace*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 145-179.
- Oliver, C. (1992). The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization Studies*, 13, 563-588.
- On Climate, Who Needs the Facts? (2011, March 4). Editorial. *New York Times*.
- O'Reilly, J., & Aquino, K. (2011). A model of third parties' morally motivated responses to mistreatment in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 526-543.
- Palmer, P. J. (1990). *The active life: A spirituality of work, creativity, and caring*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Prahalad, C. K. (2006). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits—Enabling dignity and choice through markets*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.
- Protess, B. (2010, November 19). No threats here, firms tell the U.S. *New York Times*.
- Roberts, E., & Amidon, E. (Eds.). (1991). *Earth prayers*. San Francisco, CA: Harper.
- Schein, E. H. (1987). *The Clinical Perspective in Field Work*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

- Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sewell, W. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1-29.
- Slouka, M. (2009). *Dehumanized: When math and science rule the school*. Retrieved from <http://www.harpers.org/archive/2009/09/0082640>
- Taleb, N. N. (2007). *The black swan: The impact of the highly improbable*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99-129). London, England: SAGE.
- Van Maanen, J. (2010). You gotta have a grievance: Locating heart-break in ethnography. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 338-341.
- Vermeulen, F. (2005). On rigor and relevance: Fostering dialectic progress in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 978-982.
- Walsh, J. P. (2011). Presidential address: Embracing the sacred in our secular scholarly world. *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 215-234.
- Weick, K. (1979). Cognitive processes in organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 41-79). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Weil, E. (1998, July). Every leader tells a story: Forget bullet points and slide shows. The best leaders use stories to answer three simple questions: Who am I? Who are we? Where are we going? *Fast Company*. Retrieved from <http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/15>
- Whiteman, G. (2010). Management studies that break your heart. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19, 328-337.
- Whyte, D. (1994). *The heart aroused: Poetry and the preservation of the soul in corporate America*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.
- Whyte, D. (1999). *Frontier conversations: The inner necessities of leadership* (Speech recorded on video). Langley, WA: Many Rivers Company.
- Whyte, D. (2001). *Crossing the unknown sea: Work as a pilgrimage of identity*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Williamson, M. (1992). *A return to love: Reflections on the principles of a course in miracles*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Zucker, L. G. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 726-743.

Bios

Nancy J. Adler is the S. Bronfman Chair in Management at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. She conducts research on global leadership, cross-cultural management, and the arts and leadership. She has authored more than 125 articles and produced the films, *A Portable Life* and *Reinventing Our Legacy*. "When Knowledge Wins," her article with Anne-Wil Harzing (2009), was named the Academy of Management's AMLE Outstanding Article of the Year. She has authored and edited 10 books, including, *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior* (5th ed., 2008), *Women in Management Worldwide, Competitive Frontiers: Women Managers in a Global Economy*, and *From Boston to Beijing: Managing with a Worldview*. In addition to her research and writing, she consults with major global companies and government organizations on projects in Asia, Africa, Europe, North and South America, and the Middle East. She is a fellow of the Academy of Management and the Academy of International Business, and was inducted into the Royal Society of Canada. She has been recognized with numerous awards including, the Prix du Quebec, the Center for Creative Leadership's Applied Research Award, the World Federation of People Management Associations' Georges Petitpas Award, ASTD's International Leadership Award, SIETAR's Outstanding Senior Interculturalist Award, and the YWCA's Woman of Distinction Award. In addition, Canada has honored her as one of the country's top university teachers. She is also a visual artist and has been an artist in residence at The Banff Centre. The opening of her 2010 art exhibition ("Reality in Translation: Going Beyond the Dehydrated Language of Management") was held in conjunction with the Academy of Management's Montreal Meetings. Her latest book, *Leadership Insight* (Routledge, 2010) includes 27 of her paintings. Her paintings and monotype prints are held in private collections in Asia, the Americas, and Europe.

Hans Hansen is an assistant professor of management at Texas Tech University and the director of the Center for Innovative Organizations.