

Advancing Research Methodologies in Management: Revisiting Debates, Setting New Grounds for Pluralism

Michael Christofi ¹, Elias Hadjielias ¹, Mathew Hughes ²
and Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki³

¹Department of Management, Entrepreneurship and Digital Business, Faculty of Tourism Management, Hospitality and Entrepreneurship, Cyprus University of Technology, 30, Archbishop Kyprianou Str, Limassol, 3036, Cyprus, ²Department of Marketing, Innovation, Strategy and Operations, School of Business, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH, UK, and ³Department of Marketing and International Business, Faculty of Business, Economics and Statistics, University of Vienna, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, Vienna, 1090, Austria
Corresponding author email: michael.christofi@cut.ac.cy

The purpose of this introduction and Special Issue (SI) is to offer a unique and timely opportunity to explore, revisit and critically examine key methodological debates and tensions with the purpose of advancing diversity and novel theorizing in the field. We join voices with the authors of the five papers of this SI to problematize taken-for-granted assumptions and research traditions and pave the way for inclusive and novel theorizing in management scholarship. We revisit four long-lasting debates that hinder methodological pluralism and diversity in management scholarship: (a) the quantitative-qualitative research divide, (b) the legitimacy of mixed-methods research, (c) the rigour versus relevance tension and (d) the lack of methodological innovation. We suggest that these debates are at least partly counterproductive because they create silos and opposing camps, thereby inhibiting an appreciation of different worldviews and collective learning. The dominance of functionalism and positivism in quantitative research and the inappropriate transfer of quantitative logics in qualitative research have led to a lack of diversity in empirical methodologies. The field's limited methodological diversity is further proliferated by a strict adherence to quality standards that have inadvertently promoted homogeneity. This introduction highlights the challenges and potential of mixed methods, which are gaining momentum owing to calls for methodological pluralism. We also call for a re-evaluation of quality standards to encourage more innovative and diverse research methodologies.

Introduction

For decades, business and management research has relied on a dominant set of methods, without much novelty in the design and empirical implementation of research methodologies. Drawing on functionalism and positivism (Donaldson, 2005; Tacq, 2011), quantitative scholars have utilized a range of research designs, including surveys, experiments, structured observations and panel studies, for testing and measuring management phenomena (Tharenou *et al.*, 2007; Zhang, Dawson and Kline, 2021). For the most part, they have depended on survey questionnaires to collect numerical data, and they have primarily used statistical techniques such as regression and path analysis to quantify their findings (Mellahi and Harris, 2016; Olobatuyi, 2006).

In turn, qualitative researchers looking for rich insights and meanings around managerial phenomena

(Cassell *et al.*, 2006; Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2020) have drawn on research designs such as case studies, ethnography, action research, and grounded theory. They have relied largely on variance-oriented theorizing and in so doing have compromised the processual, dynamic and contextual nature of management phenomena (Welch and Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, 2013). Indeed, despite its paradigmatic diversity, qualitative research has often been underpinned by positivistic logic, thereby 'stifling authors' creativity and hindering novel theorizing in management scholarship' (Plakoyiannaki and Budhwar, 2021, p. 3). Mixed methods, which are underrepresented compared with single-method studies, are increasingly gaining momentum within the management field owing to calls for methodological pluralism, multidisciplinary and triangulation (Modell, 2009; Molina-Azorin, 2011; Östlund *et al.*, 2011). Despite their promising role in illuminating different angles of

management phenomena, mixed methods impose considerable challenges to scholars, not only in terms of resource availability and allocation but also in terms of analysis and reporting. Mixed-methods research has been accompanied by a degree of ontological, epistemological and methodological confusion that seems to hinder the amalgamation of different types of data into a single theorizing effort.

Top journals in the management field have shaped, over the years, a set of expectations and standards regarding the trustworthiness and appropriateness of methodologies and tools for the collection, analysis and reporting of findings. Yet, these expectations have moved the field towards more homogeneity and, thus, less diversity in empirical management methodologies (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2017; Scandura and Williams, 2000). For instance, 'robust' quantitative work is expected to draw on large sample sizes, via the means of cross-sectional surveys, panel studies and time-series analyses that employ well-defined measures and maximize the internal and external validity of the results (Gilje and Taillard, 2016). Quantitative studies are also expected to draw on 'robust' statistical techniques, such as multiple regression, the reporting of p-values and the running of coefficient and multicollinearity tests (Julian and Ofori-dankwa, 2013). Qualitative research has experienced the inappropriate transfer of quantitative logics that 'skew the field's development in favour of quantitative methods' (Pratt, Kaplan and Whittington, 2020, p. 3). Qualitative positivism, employing traditional positivistic assumptions about the nature of reality and production of knowledge, has dominated nonquantitative methods (Prasad and Prasad, 2002). For instance, the underlying assumption of 'the more, the better' renders multiple-case-study design 'superior' to single-case design that is often met with scepticism owing to its generalizability limitations (Fletcher and Plakoyiannaki, 2010). Similarly, the emphasis on transparency rather than trustworthiness and authenticity proliferates a replication crisis that is troublesome for qualitative scholarship (Pratt, Kaplan and Whittington, 2020).

It follows that while the research questions and phenomena studied in the field of management are diverse, this promising diversity does not always translate into pluralism when it comes to paradigmatic lenses, methods, means of inference and theorizing styles. The field has been largely dominated by template thinking and disciplinary conventions that proliferate divides and dichotomies (Plakoyiannaki and Budhwar, 2021). Certain traditions and beliefs in the field have contributed to long-standing debates and tensions, which are obstructing a shift towards more advanced and diverse management research methodologies. Such traditions include the preference towards quantification over qualitative research (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2017; Morgan and Smircich, 1980; Winter, 2000), the delegit-

imization of mixed methods (Modell, 2009; Venkatesh, Brown and Bala, 2013), the value of rigour over relevance (Ashworth, McDermott and Currie, 2019; Gulati, 2007; Kelemen and Bansal, 2002), and the expectations that traditional methods are more robust and reliable than novel, innovative research designs (Davis, Golitic and Boerstler, 2011; Robinson and Kerr, 2015).

The purpose of this editorial and Special Issue (SI) is to offer a unique and timely opportunity to explore, revisit and critically examine key methodological debates and tensions with the purpose of advancing diversity and novel theorizing in the field. We join voices with the authors of the five papers of this SI to problematize taken-for-granted assumptions and research traditions and pave the way for inclusive and novel theorizing in management scholarship. The structure of this editorial is as follows. First, we revisit four long-lasting debates in management research. These include the qualitative versus quantitative research divide, the legitimacy of mixed-methods research, the rigour versus relevance tension, and the lack of methodological innovation. Echoing Abbott (2004), we stress the importance of revisiting such debates because they serve as heuristics or organizing principles on how theory is produced and how methods are employed to understand (management) phenomena. Next, we introduce and discuss the five articles featured in this SI. Finally, we conclude with the key contributions and avenues for future research.

Revisiting long-standing debates in management research

In this section, we revisit four long-lasting debates that shape methodological pluralism and diversity in management scholarship. We suggest that these debates are counterproductive inasmuch as they create silos and opposing camps, thereby inhibiting appreciation of different worldviews and collective learning. We offer pathways of rethinking these debates for advancing methodologies in management research.

Revisiting the qualitative–quantitative divide

We start with the most long-standing, dating from the mid-nineteenth century, debate in the field of management, namely the divide between qualitative and quantitative research (Morgan and Smircich, 1980). This divide emerges from the thinking that social reality cannot (should not) versus can (should) be measured. It endorses fragmentation and competition instead of the interconnectedness and complementarity of different methodological approaches. This divide is further underpinned by three key components, namely theory as interpretation versus prediction; qualitative (words) versus quantitative (numbers) data; and induction versus

deduction. We elaborate on these three components below and suggest that it is the pairing, not the contrast, between standpoints that offers opportunities to address new and existing phenomena in management.

Merton (1967, p. 39) considers theory as a term that ‘obscures rather than creates understanding’, and that ranges from a ‘minor working hypothesis’ to ‘axiomatic systems of thought’. Similarly, in his seminal commentary of ‘What theory is not’, DiMaggio (1995) unpacks three views of what theory should be. These are theory as covering laws, as enlightenment, and as narrative, which are produced by different methodological approaches. He argues that the ‘best’ theories are an act of combination of methodologies and theorizing practices (DiMaggio, 1995). Despite the diversity of the term ‘theory’, the field of management has traditionally considered scientific research as a quest for understanding the ‘objective’ world and theory in terms of prediction and generalization. Assumptions about the ‘superiority’ of objective knowledge have widened the divide between qualitative and quantitative research, reinforcing the dominance of the latter. The commitment to methodological convention and one type of theory has limited the potential of the field of management to address contemporary problems (Cornelissen, Höllner and Seidl, 2021).

Recent calls for intellectual openness and pluralism pave the way for the appreciation of different forms of theory (e.g., interpretation or prediction) in the broader field of management (Bell, Kothiyal and Wilmott, 2017; Welch *et al.*, 2011, 2022). Further attempts to bridge the qualitative versus quantitative divide are manifested in calls for combining methodological approaches and enabling synergies between qualitative and quantitative methods (Pratt, Sonenshein and Feldman, 2020). Based on the above, we argue for a pluralistic ethos that goes beyond the qualitative versus quantitative divide as a means to ensure the sustainability and evolution of the management field through the production of different types of knowledge.

The qualitative versus quantitative divide is further fuelled by the assumption that a clear distinction can be made between qualitative and quantitative data. Despite differences in the analysis, theorizing and reporting of qualitative versus quantitative data, it is often the case that management scholars are confronted with both types of data or have to switch between these types of data during fieldwork (Hammersley, 1992). We suggest that creating rich representations of investigated phenomena invites the combination rather than the fragmentation of data sources. This necessitates moving beyond universal quality criteria imposed in the research process that undermine the nature and advantages of different data sources. For instance, criteria of objectivity, representativeness or precision are relevant to generating and assessing quantitative data but are

insufficient to capture the virtues of qualitative data. Establishing ‘golden standards’ creates confusion for scholars who strive to adhere to benchmarks that potentially compromise the richness of their dataset. Instead, awareness that different forms of inquiry invite different quality criteria (contingent criteriology) for evaluating research fosters the appreciation and combination of different data sources for better explaining the surrounding world (Johnson *et al.*, 2006).

Conventionally, the divide of qualitative versus quantitative research has been underpinned by the corresponding divide of induction versus deduction, which assigns different roles to theory and empirical observation in the research process. While deductive reasoning begins with a theoretical hypothesis that is proven through empirical observation, inductive reasoning begins with empirical observation that is used to build theory. Here, too, we have an over-simplification if we conflate induction with qualitative research and deduction with quantitative research. Knight, Chidlow and Minbaeva (2022) note that the distinction between these modes of inference has become rather blurred, given the existence of inductive, quantitative data and deductive, qualitative data. To elaborate, not all quantitative research is testing hypotheses; instead, it can contribute to the description or exploration of investigated phenomena. Similarly, not all qualitative scholars reject the hypothetico-deductive approach. As discussed above, qualitative positivism emphasizes nomothetic rather than idiographic explanations and uses systematic research protocols and techniques to develop and test theoretical models or propositions (Prasad and Prasad, 2002). Aspects of induction and deduction can also co-exist in a single study. Recently, abduction – a form of scientific inference discussed by Charles Saunders Pierce – has received traction in management scholarship as a means of revisiting the strict boundaries between induction and deduction (Plakoyiannaki and Budhwar, 2021). Abductive reasoning assumes a continuous movement between theory and surprising empirical observations as a means of producing new hypotheses and theories based on these observations (Tavory and Timmersman, 2014).

Revisiting mixed methodologies in management

Mixed methodology involves a research strategy that rests on a combination of multiple methodologies to study a particular phenomenon (Denzin, 2010). While mixed-method approaches are gaining more acceptance in the management field (Brennecke, 2020; Gover, Halinski and Duxbury, 2016; Molina-Azorin, 2012), they continue to face scepticism from scholars who are more familiar to the quantitative versus qualitative divide (Berthod, Grothe-Hammer and Sydow, 2017; Modell, 2009; Venkatesh, Brown and Bala, 2013).

There is still much disbelief that quantitative and qualitative research methods, which carry conflicting onto-epistemological roots and research paradigms, can be combined to study phenomena in the field of management (Modell, 2009; Turner, Cardinal and Burton, 2017). Critics raise an incompatibility thesis, arguing that by mixing quantitative and qualitative methods, it is almost impossible to avoid methodological conflicts and safeguard the integrity of both approaches in a single study (Abro, Khurshid and Aamir, 2015; Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2012).

Notwithstanding this debate, advancing the management research field may depend on bridging the gap between quantitative and qualitative research paradigms. Mixed methods can help leverage the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research to study management issues more comprehensively (Gibson, 2017; Venkatesh, Brown and Bala, 2013). Mixed-methodology proponents in management research contend that sequential design and triangulation make this technique appropriate. Mixed methods can allow the triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods to corroborate findings (Jick, 1979; Turner, Cardinal and Burton, 2017) and generate a better understanding of management phenomena (Gibson, 2017). By employing methodological triangulation, diverse viewpoints can be collected and compared to cast light upon a phenomenon (Denzin, 2012; Olsen, 2004), which can help produce more valid results as ‘the strengths of one method can offset the limitations of another method’ (Turner, Cardinal and Burton, 2017, p. 244). Furthermore, researchers can effectively employ mixed methods in the context of a sequential research design, which rests upon the complementarity of quantitative and qualitative methods, as part of a larger research program (Cameron, 2009; Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Based in a sequential mode, qualitative and quantitative research are carried out separately, drawing on different research designs, and, essentially, one type of research data provides the basis for the collection of another type of data (Cameron, 2009; Harrison III, 2013).

While the above advantages have been advocated by mixed-methods researchers, mixed methodologies have not been sufficiently adopted in management research and are still not perceived by many as being as legitimate as the traditional mono-focal (quantitative or qualitative) research approaches (Berthod, Grothe-Hammer and Sydow, 2017; Venkatesh, Brown and Bala, 2013). We suggest that mixed methods must be revisited to improve existing approaches that combine quantitative and qualitative research or introduce new standards and methods that can enhance the rigour of mixed-methods research. One solution is to extend the metaphor of methodological bricolage (Pratt, Sonenshein and Feldman, 2020) within mixed-methods research. Methodological bricolage refers to

the deliberate mixing of methods to address a specific phenomenon (Berry, 2015; Denzin and Lincoln, 2009).

While the bricolage metaphor has been developed primarily to articulate how qualitative researchers can embrace methodological plurality in their inquiry (Denzin and Lincoln, 1999; Rogers, 2012), it can also find applicability within mixed-methods research. As highlighted by Denzin and Lincoln (1999), a methodological bricoleur engages in eclectic, creative and flexible approaches to research, which essentially ‘add rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to a given inquiry’ (p. 6). Consequently, a mixed-methods bricoleur could be one drawing on a pragmatic approach to address managerial phenomena, where the research question is given more weight than strict adherence to a certain methodological tradition (Greene, 2007, 2008). Mixed methodological bricolage can help enhance rigour in management research by promoting adaptable and more comprehensive approaches (Berry, 2015; Pratt, Kaplan and Whittington, 2020). Researchers drawing on a bi-focal lens (i.e., both quantitative and qualitative data) can be more flexible in their research approaches, suitably combining quantitative and qualitative research methods and data to better understand the complexity and multifaceted nature of the phenomena they investigate.

Adopting emerging technologies is another option to reinvent mixed methods in management and improve their rigour. By harnessing the power of artificial intelligence, big data, data visualization, and machine learning, researchers can enhance the speed and robustness of mixed data collection, analysis and interpretation. For instance, machine learning algorithms using Python can allow management researchers to collect and analyse massive data via social media (e.g., Twitter/ X), which can be obtained via the means of Python and sentiment analysis (Gupta *et al.*, 2017). At the same time, such technologies can assist in coding massive data qualitatively to uncover hidden patterns and relationships to help researchers obtain a more rounded understanding of their findings.

Revisiting relevance and rigour debate in management

A third long-standing debate in management research concentrates on the rigour–relevance tension (Bell, Kothiyal and Willmott, 2017; Cunliffe and Scaratti, 2017; Wright, 2011). The tendency to isolate rigorous from relevant studies has limited new approaches that can combine the two, thus shifting the field towards less diversity and pluralism (Ashworth, McDermott and Currie, 2019). Rigour relates to methodological soundness, while relevance centres on the relevance of findings for managers and other practitioners in management (Gulati, 2007; Latusek and Vlaar, 2015; Parry *et al.*, 2020). While many researchers in the field of manage-

ment have invested in rigorous methodologies and studies, there has been heavy criticism that the theories produced are not relevant and are thus unimportant to management practice (Latusek and Vlaar, 2015; Kelemen and Bansal, 2002). A central argument of scholars who push for relevance is that management research should be relevant at the expense of rigour (Ashworth, McDermott and Currie, 2019; Gulati, 2007), which is a source of long-lasting tension in the field.

Bridging this gap invites researchers to engage in 'bilingual interpreting' (Gulati, 2007, p. 780) and 'translating' (Mohrman *et al.*, 2001, p. 360) to effectively explain findings and communicate them to practitioner audiences. Wright (2011, p. 495) suggests a 'committed-to-participant research' perspective, which can provide a bridging role between the worlds of academia and practice. Such a perspective raises the importance of carrying out management research that has as an overarching goal the improvement of the wellbeing of targeted groups, such as employees, in organizations. While this approach can help increase researchers' sense of commitment to the research project, making it more meaningful and relevant to the actual participants (Wright, 2011), it has not been sufficiently widely adopted by management scholars (Michailova *et al.*, 2014). We suggest that national (bio)ethical committees and management schools collaborate to create new ethical standards mandating that management researchers include specific goals in their studies to improve the wellbeing of employees and other organizational stakeholders. Additionally, research participant groups could be included in the ethical review processes by bioethics committees, which could also request that research projects be modified in response to participant feedback.

Other approaches that have the potential to close the relevance gap are 'engaged scholarship', 'practice-led research' and 'community-based research'. Engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007) is a collaborative and participative research approach in which scholars draw on the advice and perspectives of all key stakeholders, such as organizational participants, clients, sponsors, communities and practitioners. This approach can help researchers to address real-world problems and enhances the likelihood of producing knowledge of relevance to both theory and practice, as well as contributing to societal improvement (Van de Ven, 2018; Whitehurst and Richter, 2018). Van de Ven (2007) considers engaged scholarship research in terms of four interrelated activities: problem formulation, theory building, research design, and problem solving informed by the input of the key stakeholders.

Practice-led research has been popular in the creative fields, such as arts and design (Sullivan, 2010), and emphasizes the integration of practice with scholarly research to generate new theories (Biggs and Büchler, 2008). This approach puts the experiential dimen-

sion at the forefront of research (Fenwick, 2010). It involves practitioners actively engaging in their professional practice throughout the research process and then reflecting upon it to generate new knowledge (Biggs and Büchler, 2008; Smith, 2018). Community-based research, in turn, is a research approach that engages local community actors in the research process with the goal of addressing community-relevant problems (Israel *et al.*, 1998; Minkler, 2005; Rodriguez Espinosa and Verney, 2021). Community actors become active partners in research and have an immediate role in crafting research questions and in collecting and analysing data (Minkler, 2005; Palmer, Pocock and Burton, 2018).

The above approaches can also help elevate 'dialogical sensemaking' in research, which is an interactive process of making sense of research findings through conversations among researchers, practitioners and/or community stakeholders (Cunliffe and Scaratti, 2017; MacIntosh *et al.*, 2017). Researchers, practitioners and community actors can all benefit greatly from the co-creation of narratives and research implications that result from a dialogical approach (Cunliffe and Scaratti, 2017). Hence, improving the methodological soundness of these approaches may lead to the development of other significant methodological alternatives for management research that can effectively help bridge rigour and relevance. The rigour of these research approaches can be enhanced in many ways. The use of mixed methodologies and the triangulation of different methods and data can help enhance the robustness of findings (Olsen, 2004; Turner, Cardinal and Burton, 2017) stemming from these approaches. Further, maintaining ongoing reflexivity while conducting research can be a way of minimizing bias and enhancing the validity and credibility of findings generated from engaged approaches (MacIntosh *et al.*, 2017) such as engaged scholarship, practice-led research and community-based research.

Revisiting innovative research methodologies in management

Conventions apply isomorphic forces that reduce the appetite for innovation (e.g., van Burg *et al.*, 2022; Robinson and Kerr, 2015). The tendency of this isomorphic pressure is to concentrate scholarly effort into a focused pool of research methods that are well established for their rigour, typically supported by standard templates that enable their ready (and rapid) evaluation. Paradoxically, this effort gives rise to calls for 'embracing rigor and diversity' (Ritala, Schneider and Michailova, 2020, p. 297). In their review of innovation in qualitative methods, Wiles, Crow and Pain (2011) found 57 claims of innovation in qualitative methods between 2000 and 2009. They found that while many claims of innovation were made for new methods or

designs, with the remainder claiming adaptations or the adoption of existing methodological innovations, the evidence pointed to few wholly new methodologies or designs, and, in several cases, claims about innovation in qualitative research methods related either to adaptations to existing method or to the transfer and adaptation of methods from other disciplines. In their study across the social sciences, Druckman and Donohue (2020) observe developments in nonlinear approaches intended to deal with the complexity of the world. These developments relate to the advent of new technologies that expand the reach of quantitative methods while increasing the efficiency of qualitative data collection and analyses. Especially of note is how Druckman and Donohue (2020) describe these developments as foreshadowing ‘a brave new world of continuing innovation in social science methodologies’ (p. 3). Indeed, outside of the management discipline, methodological innovations increasingly embrace new technologies. For instance, and concerning ‘big data’, Tomaselli *et al.* (2022) review contemporary survey research and identify a pattern in which scholars connect established methods to innovative tools and technologies such as real-time sensors, computer-assisted web interviewing, and gamification, displaying a general orientation towards a ‘computational social science approach’ (p. 994). The debate around innovative research methodologies in management therefore has two key parts: (1) the assimilation of technological innovations that unlock new ways to collect, handle, interpret and analyse data; and (2) the determination of whether subsequent adjustments and changes made as methodological innovations are incrementally adaptive or truly transformative—where they are transformative, scholars, editors and reviewers need training to enable these innovative methods to become mainstream.

Concerning the debate around the assimilation of technological innovations that unlock new ways to collect, handle, interpret and analyse data, methodological innovations are needed because new research designs, analytical approaches, technological innovations, machine learning and cognitive systems (among other breakthroughs) ‘allow scholars to address old questions in new ways and to investigate questions that were not tractable using existing methods’ (Arora *et al.*, 2016, p. 37). In the *British Journal of Management*, Plakoyianaki and Budhwar (2021) strongly advocate for work delving beyond the ‘convention’ and ‘standard’ in terms of research design, sampling, validity and measurement, transparency and accountability, data collection, and analytical approaches in the management field to prepare the ground for more novel and trustworthy research and theorizing to take hold. We suggest that this endeavour involves a call to editors, editorial review boards and reviewers to embrace novel research methods while challenging authors to establish their robustness. Put

differently, the novelty of a method shouldn’t be sufficient; authors also need to convey trust in the transparency and rigour of the method’s application, as well as good practices for future studies and sufficient detail to enable replication.

For instance, it is only recently that scholars have begun examining the potential of artificial intelligence and its derivatives, such as machine learning, as an innovative method for research and scholarship (Cabitza, Locoro and Banfi, 2018; Hain and Jurowetzki, 2020; Robledo *et al.*, 2023; Sabahi and Parast, 2020). Machine learning holds considerable potential for handling, examining, describing and evaluating large quantities of complex information (Robledo *et al.*, 2023), commensurate with the challenges that management scholars face in a discipline replete with complexity. With the rise of generative artificial intelligence, the potential gains of having a research ‘co-pilot’ by our side to help us make sense of complex data, be it quantitative or qualitative, are enormous. And yet, as a field, we are still scratching the surface of even first-generation artificial intelligence (e.g., rule-based models programmed by humans), let alone the more advanced machine learning and generative varieties.

The debate on whether subsequent adjustments and changes made as methodological innovations are incrementally adaptive or truly transformative—and where they are transformative, scholars, editors and reviewers need training to enable these innovative methods to become mainstream—is especially important when technological innovations are involved. We can envisage the potential of technologies such as artificial intelligence if scholars have guidance on how to use them in a reflective and consistent manner as well as in a manner that supports and does not substitute the researchers’ agency. To use new technologies as part of advanced management research methods requires that their tools can be used effectively, reliably and consistently, and in ways that allow others to replicate the same methods and techniques with confidence. Moreover, using new technologies as additional methods (or as a form of mixed methods) suggests that these technological innovations can help support the trustworthiness of findings by offering additional layers of transparency or confidence in the decisions of the researchers (Robledo *et al.*, 2023). Methodological innovations, especially new technologies, should be adopted *into* scholarship and not *replace* scholarship.

Articles featured in this SI

This SI sought papers that either reconsider existing standards and practices to facilitate improvements in management research and/or introduce novel empirical methodologies that delve beyond the ‘convention’ and

'standard' in the management field and set the grounds for establishing more novel and trustworthy research and theorizing. Our wide-ranging call for papers yielded 32 submissions, and five of them that demonstrated promise in advancing management research scholarship were ultimately accepted. A common thread among all accepted papers is the attempt to introduce novel management research methodologies that draw on research approaches and/or techniques from disciplines outside business and management, such as linguistics and communication, computer science, sociology, psychology, and art therapy. While delivering novel approaches in management research, the accepted articles make efforts to address the ongoing debates highlighted by this SI. Two accepted articles—one by Halme, Piekkari, Matos, Wierenga and Hall, and the other by Lehtonen—primarily address the rigour–relevance tension. Lehtonen's paper also highlights the importance of mixing different methods to facilitate a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of complex management phenomena. Two other papers add to the qualitative–quantitative research debate: one by Papadopoulou, Theoharakis, Jones and Bhaumik, and one by Benozzo, Distinto and Priola. As part of our SI, the fifth accepted article, by Valizade, Schulz and Nicoara, discusses how management research can benefit by incorporating innovative methodologies centred on emerging technologies such as machine learning and artificial intelligence.

In the article 'Analysing the macrostructure of spoken strategic communication: An application of argumentation analysis on high-technology newly public firms' earnings conference calls', Papadopoulou, Theoharakis, Jones and Bhaumik innovatively advance research methods around content analyses and discourse analyses by scrutinizing how argumentation analysis can enhance our understanding of strategic communications. Applying this technique to earnings conference calls, the authors reveal how nuances in the ways arguments are presented and structured reveal the delicate balancing act that strategic managers tread in communicating with stakeholders with the intention to persuade them and achieve goals of strategic significance.

Especially relevant to the debate about the qualitative–quantitative divide and mixed-methods research, the applications of Papadopoulou et al.'s argumentation analysis are apparent to many of the disciplines within the management field. For example, the method holds considerable promise to kickstart research on strategic issue presentation and strategic issue interpretation. Argumentation analysis promises to enable more sophisticated content and sentiment analysis of company documentation. Letters to shareholders, 10-K filings, annual reports, and IPO prospectuses have long been fertile documents for researchers to conduct analyses and extrapolate proxies pertaining to an orga-

nization's strategic choices, actions and behaviours. The authors remark that argumentation analysis enables scholars to add rich layers to text-based analyses by diving more deeply into the macrostructure of spoken or written strategic communication. However, its extension to spoken communication is especially important as it allows new data sources, such as earnings calls, to be used more fully in management research.

In the spirit of the relevance and rigour debate, in their article 'Rigour versus reality: Contextualizing qualitative research in the low-income settings in emerging markets', Halme, Piekkari, Matos, Wierenga and Hall challenge the suitability of present qualitative research methods for studying low-income settings in emerging markets. The authors point to the mistake and inherent fallacy in (wrongly) bundling low-income settings with emerging markets in a single homogenous category. Instead, Halme et al. argue that these large communities often operate in the informal economy and cut across national boundaries, facing enormous challenges in meeting even basic needs. For these reasons, among others, the authors advocate for context. The authors note that while context is often reduced to a control variable in quantitative studies and, at times, a peripheral aspect of qualitative research, decontextualized research, especially in low-income settings, risks producing distorted knowledge that does not advance societal betterment.

In response to this problem, Halme and colleagues call for replacing 'rigour-by-convention' with their alternative concept of 'rigour-within-context'. Rigour-within-context reconciles the seemingly opposing goals of rigorous and contextualized research, calling for researchers to contextualize their research, even if this means deviating from established conventions. Halme et al. conclude by recommending the means through which contextualized research on low-income settings can be conducted and the means to judge such research based on its internal logic rather than by external rules or templates not designed to capture key insights from low-income settings. Rigour-within-context is presented as a combination of technical mastery, creative crafting, reflexivity and transparency; this is in contrast to rigour-by-convention, which is judged on whether a study follows a set of methodological conventions originating from contexts developed in the West.

Tying to the theme of methodological innovation, in their article 'Towards a paradigm shift: How can machine learning extend the boundaries of quantitative management scholarship?', Valizade, Schulz and Nicoara grapple with machine learning as an analytical tool. Noting its growing popularity but lamenting its lack of systematic adoption as an alternative to canonical forms of statistical modelling, the authors discuss how machine learning can extend the boundaries of quantitative management scholarship, help

management scholars unpack complex phenomena, and improve the overall trustworthiness of quantitative research.

There is no shortage of hyperbole around machine learning or artificial intelligence in changing the world of scholarly research. The problem is not so much whether it can or will change research but how it will change the challenges of conducting good research and how scholars can make the best use of it to ensure their research is rigorous, replicable and transparent. This has been the downfall of many articles advocating for machine learning and artificial intelligence-related tools. With the methodological debate about how machine learning can be used effectively to advance management scholarship still in its infancy, Valizade et al. review existing tensions in quantitative management scholarship and situate machine learning as a solution to these tensions. The authors map out three ways in which machine learning can advance management scholarship. First, as a model-agnostic, algorithmic approach to data analysis, machine learning can enhance the explanatory power of observational data by ensuring that abductive and exploratory quantitative studies are placed on an equal footing with deductive, hypothesis-testing contributions. This method allows for theory-generating quantitative research. Second, machine learning rests on out-of-sample predictions, where an algorithm is trained on a subset of data and evaluated depending on how well it performs on previously unseen data. Machine learning then enables cross-validation and regularization in addition to the in-sample goodness of fit in canonical statistical models. Third, a wider use of procedural and generative learning algorithms with machine learning provides opportunities for scholars to unpack complex, non-monotonous and non-linear effects that canonical statistical models overlook.

In the article ‘Matter and method: the quest for a new-materialist methodology in management studies’, Benozzo, Distinto and Priola revisit the quantitative–qualitative research dichotomy to improve methodological rigour and trustworthiness in the analysis of qualitative data. Their study also addresses the need for innovative methodologies, as raised by the SI call. Building on the work of several scholars who attempted to unsettle traditional qualitative research (e.g., Brinkman, 2015; Coole and Frost, 2010; Fox and Aldred, 2017), the authors introduce a novel materialist research approach in management by revisiting the relationship between theory and data in qualitative enquiry. Their approach makes use of the assemblage approach, which is centred in comprehending the redistribution of agency to the network of people, things and discourses. Three assemblages were created by the authors to advance methodological knowledge of new materialism. These assemblages illustrate that a new materialist methodology rejects proceduralism—which is denoted by conven-

tional terms such as research design, sampling, data set and data coding—in favour of embracing knowledge’s contingency and instability in a material world that is largely relational and dynamic. The authors, by means of their assemblage approach, show how a methodology without method (Koro-Ljungberg, 2016) can be employed to study business and management phenomena such as distant work and working from home. This approach invites us to (re)imagine, (re)think forwards (Lather and St. Pierre, 2013) and to put into words the chaos that is shaped by the entanglement of material, organic, human and more-than-human elements.

The article advances management scholarship by introducing a new materialist qualitative research approach in management, which is centred on ‘turn-to-matter’ and ‘more-than-human’ entanglements and which opens up new avenues for imagining management, organizations and working lives. It also tackles philosophical considerations related to the inseparability of theory and method. The work illustrates that by dismantling the traditional separation of theory from method and data analysis, researchers can have better opportunities to study managerial phenomena in their complexity.

The article by Lehtonen, entitled ‘Visualizing embodied experiences: Drawing as a form of reflective inquiry informed by Gestalt art therapy’, addresses the calls of this SI for balancing rigour and relevance and for introducing more innovative management research methodologies. Considering the debate of rigour and relevance, Lehtonen’s work introduces a responsible research approach (Cassell et al., 2020; Michailova *et al.*, 2014; Wright, 2011) that can have an immediate and significant impact on research participants’ lives while also being sufficiently rigorous. The article emphasizes the critical significance of including participant and researcher self-reflections in qualitative research, not just for contributing to science, but also—and perhaps more importantly—for attending to the wellbeing of those studied. In terms of management research novelty, the author introduces a novel participatory visual methodology based on drawing that was motivated by Gestalt art therapy. This approach promotes self-reflection, establishes a caring relationship between researcher and participant, and allows participants to express feelings and embodied experiences that are difficult to put into words.

The study by Lehtonen offers essential contributions that advance management research methodologies. Employing Gestalt art therapy for drawing-based research, the author introduces a new approach to management research that is focused on making theoretical contributions that pay attention to the participant’s wellbeing. The study elucidates the way drawing, reflecting, and theorizing can become intertwined to serve theorizing and participatory aims but also to facilitate a shift in

focus towards the ontological and epistemological acknowledgment of bodily agency in management studies. The author argues that this approach can be particularly useful in explaining management phenomena centred on craft (Sasaki et al., 2019; Våland et al., 2021), where materiality and embodied experiences are central aspects (Harding et al., 2022). It can also help promote accountability in participatory research through an emphasis on researcher and participant self-reflections.

Conclusions

The aim of this introduction and SI is to stimulate critical thinking over the key methodological debates and tensions that have proliferated in the field of management. These debates are the qualitative versus quantitative research divide, the legitimacy of mixed-methods research, the rigour versus relevance tension, and the lack of methodological innovation. We discuss and problematize these debates and also show a way forward towards methodological pluralism in management. We echo the five articles of this SI that address at least one of these five debates.

We advance several timely contributions for the field of management. First, we holistically map the four traditional debates and divides that have caused fragmentation in management research and have hindered diversity and originality in management scholarship. These comprise (a) the qualitative versus quantitative research divide, (b) the legitimacy of mixed-methods research, (c) the rigour versus relevance tension, and (d) the lack of methodological innovation. We explicitly highlight the taken-for-granted assumptions and research traditions in these four areas that need to be challenged and re-evaluated in order to stimulate more creative and diverse research approaches in management scholarship. Second, we elaborate and problematize each of these long-lasting debates, offering recommendations that can help break down conventional silos and pave the way for more inclusive and novel theorizing in the field of management. Third, the articles in this SI advance management scholarship by introducing innovative and more relevant methodologies that incorporate methods and/or approaches from disciplines outside business and management.

Concerning future research, we call on scholars to use the innovative research methods set out by the contributions in this SI to conduct new and insightful research. Considering the rate of technological innovation and the plethora of information available to researchers, embracing new research methods allows scholars to problematize conventions and enhance theorizing practices by embracing rigour-from-richness as opposed to rigour-by-convention (Ashworth, McDermott and Currie, 2019). This can be facilitated by artificial intelligence

and machine learning (Valizade et al.); by sophisticated analysis of argument structure (Papadopoulou et al.); by greater sensitivity to context (Halme et al.), by participatory visual methodology (Lehtonen), and by new materialist empirical investigations (Benozzo et al.).

We hope that this editorial and SI will allow management scholars to reconsider our research and theorizing practices by revisiting counter-productive debates that have fragmented our community. This entails a conversation so that we can collectively reinvent our heuristics for studying management phenomena (Abbott, 2004). It is our hope and aspiration that this editorial and SI serve towards this direction.

References

- Abbott, A. (2004). *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Abro, M. M. Q., M. A. Khurshid and A. Aamir (2015). 'The use of mixed methods in management research', *Journal of Applied Finance and Banking*, **5**, p. 103.
- Johnson, P., A. Buehring, C. Cassell and G. Symon (2006). 'Evaluating qualitative management research: towards a contingent criteriology', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **8**, pp. 131–156.
- Arora, A., M. Gittelman, S. Kaplan, J. Lynch, W. Mitchell and N. Siggelkow (2016). 'Question-based innovations in strategy research', *Strategic Management Journal*, **37**, pp. 3–9.
- Ashworth, R. E., A. M. McDermott and G. Currie (2019). 'Theorizing from qualitative research in public administration: plurality through a combination of rigor and richness', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, **29**, pp. 318–333.
- Bell, E., N. Kothiyal and H. Willmott (2017). 'Methodology-as-technique and the meaning of rigour in globalized management research', *British Journal of Management*, **28**, pp. 534–550.
- Berry, K. S. (2015). Research as bricolage: Embracing relationality, multiplicity and complexity. In *Doing educational research* (pp. 77–110). Brill.
- Berthod, O., M. Grothe-Hammer and J. Sydow (2017). 'Network ethnography: a mixed-method approach for the study of practices in interorganizational settings', *Organizational Research Methods*, **20**, pp. 299–323.
- Biggs, M. and D. Büchler (2008). *A Little Book of Practice-led Research*. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.
- Brennecke, J. (2020). 'Dissonant ties in intraorganizational networks: why individuals seek problem-solving assistance from difficult colleagues', *Academy of Management Journal*, **63**, pp. 743–778.
- Brinkman, S. (2015). 'GOFQI and the phoenix of qualitative inquiry', *Qualitative Inquiry*, **21**, pp. 620–622.
- Cabitza, F., A. Locoro and G. Banfi (2018). 'Machine learning in orthopedics: a literature review', *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, **6**, pp. 1–20.
- Cameron, R. (2009). 'A sequential mixed model research design: design, analytical and display issues', *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, **3**, pp. 140–152.
- Cassell, C., A. Buehring, G. Symon and P. Johnson (2006). 'Qualitative methods in management research: an introduction to the themed issue', *Management decision*, **44**, pp. 161–166.
- Cassell, C., L. Radcliffe and F. Malik (2020). 'Participant Reflexivity in Organizational Research Design', *Organizational Research Methods*, **23**, pp. 750–773.
- Coole, D. and S. Frost (2010). 'Introducing the New Materialisms'. In D. Coole and S. Frost (eds), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, pp. 1–43. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Cornelissen, J., M. Hollerer and D. Seidl (2021). 'What theory is and can be: forms of theorizing in organizational scholarship', *Organization Theory*, **2**, pp. 1–19.
- Cunliffe, A. L. and G. Scaratti (2017). 'Embedding impact in engaged research: developing socially useful knowledge through dialogical sensemaking', *British Journal of Management*, **28**, pp. 29–44.
- Davis, D. F., S. L. Golicic and C. N. Boerstler (2011). 'Benefits and challenges of conducting multiple methods research in marketing', *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, **39**, pp. 467–479.
- Denzin, N. K. (2010). 'Moments, mixed methods, and paradigm dialogues', *Qualitative Inquiry*, **16**, pp. 419–427.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). 'Triangulation 2.0', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **6**, pp. 80–88.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. Eds. (2009). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage, United States.
- Denzin, N. K. and Yvonne S. Lincoln (1999). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.), edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonne S. Lincoln, (pp. 1–20). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- DiMaggio, P. G. (1995). 'Comments on "what theory is not"', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **40**, pp. 391–397.
- Donaldson, L. (2005). 'Vita contemplativa: Following the scientific method: How I became a committed functionalist and positivist', *Organization studies*, **26**, pp. 1071–1088.
- Druckman, D. and W. Donohue (2020). 'Innovations in social science methodologies: an overview', *American Behavioral Scientist*, **64**, pp. 3–18.
- Fenwick, T. (2010). 'Re-thinking the 'thing in itself': sociomaterial approaches to understanding and researching learning in work', *Journal of Workplace Learning*, **22**, pp. 104–116.
- Fletcher, M. and E. Plakoyiannaki (2010). 'Sampling in case study research'. In: Mills, A. J., Durepos, G. and Wiebe, E. (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Case Study Research*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, pp. 837–840.
- Fox, N.J. and P. Alldred (2017). *Sociology and the New Materialism: Theory, Research, Action*. London: Sage.
- Gibson, C. B. (2017). 'Elaboration, generalization, triangulation, and interpretation: on enhancing the value of mixed method research', *Organizational Research Methods*, **20**, pp. 193–223.
- Gilje, E. P. and J. P. Taillard (2016). 'Do private firms invest differently than public firms? Taking cues from the natural gas industry', *The Journal of Finance*, **71**, pp. 1733–1778.
- Gover, L., M. Halinski and L. Duxbury (2016). 'Is it just me? Exploring perceptions of organizational culture change', *British Journal of Management*, **27**, pp. 567–582.
- Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed Methods in Social Inquiry (Vol. 9)*. John Wiley & Sons, San Francisco, CA.
- Greene, J. C. (2008). 'Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology?' *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **2**, pp. 7–22.
- Gulati, R. (2007). 'Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: the rigour–relevance debate in management research', *Academy of Management Journal*, **50**, pp. 775–782.
- Gupta, B., M. Negi, K. Vishwakarma, G. Rawat, P. Badhani and B. Tech (2017). 'Study of Twitter sentiment analysis using machine learning algorithms on Python', *International Journal of Computer Applications*, **165**, pp. 29–34.
- Hain, D. S. and R. Jurowetcki (2020). 'The promises of machine learning and big data in entrepreneurship research'. In G. Saridakis and M. Cowling (eds), *Handbook of Quantitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship*, pp. 176–220. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Hammersley, M. (1992). 'Deconstructing the qualitative–quantitative divide'. In J. Brannen (ed.), *Mixing Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Research*, pp. 39–55. London: Routledge.
- Harding, N., S. Gilmore and J. Ford (2022). 'Matter That Embodies: Agentive Flesh and Working Bodies/Selves', *Organization Studies*, **43**, pp. 649–668.
- Harrison iii, R. L. (2013). 'Using mixed methods designs in the Journal of Business Research, 1990–2010', *Journal of Business Research*, **66**, pp. 2153–2162.
- Hennink, M., I. Hutter and A. Bailey (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage.
- Israel, B. A., A. J. Schulz, E. A. Parker and A. B. Becker (1998). 'Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health', *Annual Review of Public Health*, **19**, pp. 173–202.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). 'Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **24**, pp. 602–611.
- Julian, S. D. and J. C. Ofori-dankwa (2013). 'Financial resource availability and corporate social responsibility expenditures in a sub-Saharan economy: the institutional difference hypothesis', *Strategic Management Journal*, **34**, pp. 1314–1330.
- Kelemen, M. and P. Bansal (2002). 'The conventions of management research and their relevance to management practice', *British Journal of Management*, **13**, pp. 97–108.
- Knight, G., A. Chidlow and D. Minbaeva (2022). 'Methodological fit for empirical research in international business: a contingency framework', *Journal of International Business Studies*, **53**, pp. 39–52.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2016). *Reconceptualizing Qualitative Research. Methodologies without Methodology*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lather, P. and E.A. St Pierre (2013). 'Post-qualitative research', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, **26**, pp. 629–633.
- Latusek, D. and P. W. Vlaar (2015). 'Exploring managerial talk through metaphor: An opportunity to bridge rigour and relevance?', *Management Learning*, **46**, pp. 211–232.
- Leech, N. L. and A. J. Onwuegbuzie (2009). 'A typology of mixed methods research designs', *Quality and Quantity*, **43**, pp. 265–275.
- MacIntosh, R., N. Beech, J. Bartunek, K. Mason, B. Cooke and D. Denyer (2017). 'Impact and management research: exploring relationships between temporality, dialogue, reflexivity and praxis', *British Journal of Management*, **28**, pp. 3–13.
- Mellahi, K. and L.C. Harris (2016). 'Response rates in business and management research: An overview of current practice and suggestions for future direction', *British Journal of Management*, **27**, pp. 426–437.
- Merton, R. K. (1967). *On Theoretical Sociology*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Michailova, S., R. Piekkari, E. Plakoyiannaki, T. Ritvala, I. Mihailova and A. Salmi (2014). 'Breaking the silence about exiting fieldwork: a relational approach and its implications for theorizing', *Academy of Management Review*, **39**, pp. 138–161.
- Minkler, M. (2005). 'Community-based research partnerships: challenges and opportunities', *Journal of Urban Health*, **82**, pp. ii3–ii12.
- Modell, S. (2009). 'In defence of triangulation: a critical realist approach to mixed methods research in management accounting', *Management Accounting Research*, **20**, pp. 208–221.
- Mohrman, S. A., C. B. Gibson and A. M. Mohrman (2001). 'Doing research that is useful to practice a model and empirical exploration', *Academy of Management journal*, **44**, pp. 357–375.
- Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2011). 'The use and added value of mixed methods in management research', *Journal of mixed methods research*, **5**, pp. 7–24.
- Molina-Azorin, J. F. (2012). 'Mixed methods research in strategic management: impact and applications', *Organizational Research Methods*, **15**, pp. 33–56.
- Morgan, G. and L. Smircich (1980). 'The case for qualitative research', *Academy of Management Review*, **5**, pp. 491–500.
- Olobatuyi, M. E. (2006). *A user's guide to path analysis*. University Press of America.
- Olsen, W. (2004). 'Triangulation in social research: qualitative and quantitative methods can really be mixed', *Developments in Sociology*, **20**, pp. 103–118.

- Östlund, U., L. Kidd, Y. Wengström and N. Rowa-Dewar (2011). 'Combining qualitative and quantitative research within mixed method research designs: a methodological review', *International journal of nursing studies*, **48**, pp. 369–383.
- Palmer, J., C. Pocock and L. Burton (2018). 'Waiting, power and time in ethnographic and community-based research', *Qualitative Research*, **18**, pp. 416–432.
- Parry, E., E. Farndale, C. Brewster and M. J. Morley (2021). 'Balancing rigour and relevance: The case for methodological pragmatism in conducting large-scale, multi-country and comparative management studies', *British Journal of Management*, **32**, pp. 273–282.
- Plakoyiannaki, E. and P. Budhwar (2021). 'From convention to alternatives: rethinking qualitative research in management scholarship', *British Journal of Management*, **32**, pp. 3–6.
- Prasad, A. and P. Prasad (2002). 'The coming of age of interpretive organizational research', *Organizational Research Methods*, **5**, pp. 4–11.
- Pratt, M. G., S. Kaplan and R. Whittington (2020). 'Editorial essay: the tumult over transparency: decoupling transparency from replication in establishing trustworthy qualitative research', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **65**, pp. 1–19.
- Pratt, M. G., S. Sonenshein and M. S. Feldman (2020). 'Moving beyond templates: a bricolage approach to conducting trust-worthy qualitative research', *Organizational Research Methods*, **25**, pp. 211–238.
- Ritala, P., S. Schneider and S. Michailova (2020). 'Innovation management research methods: embracing rigor and diversity', *R&D Management*, **50**, pp. 297–308.
- Robinson, S. and R. Kerr (2015). 'Reflexive conversations: constructing hermeneutic designs for qualitative management research', *British Journal of Management*, **26**, pp. 777–790.
- Robledo, S., A. M. G. Aguirre, M. Hughes and F. Eggers (2023). "'Hasta la vista, baby" – will machine learning terminate human literature reviews in entrepreneurship?' *Journal of Small Business Management*, **61**, pp. 1314–1343.
- Robledo, S., A. M. Grisales Aguirre, M. Hughes and F. Eggers (2023). "'Hasta la vista, baby"–will machine learning terminate human literature reviews in entrepreneurship?', *Journal of Small Business Management*, **61**, pp. 1314–1343.
- Rodriguez Espinosa, P. and S. P. Verney (2021). 'The underutilization of community-based participatory research in psychology: a systematic review', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **67**, pp. 312–326.
- Rogers, M. (2012). 'Contextualizing theories and practices of bricolage research', *Qualitative Report*, **17**, p. 7.
- Sabahi, S. and M. M. Parast (2020). 'The impact of entrepreneurship orientation on project performance: a machine learning approach', *International Journal of Production Economics*, **226**, pp. 1–14.
- Sasaki, I., D. Ravasi and E. Micelotta (2019). 'Family Firms as Institutions: Cultural reproduction and status maintenance among multi-centenary shinise in Kyoto', *Organization Studies*, **40**, pp. 793–831.
- Scandura, T. A. and E. A. Williams (2000). 'Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research', *Academy of Management journal*, **43**, pp. 1248–1264.
- Smith, H. (2018). *Practice-Led Research, Research-Led Practice in the Creative Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stang Våland, M., S. Svejenova and R. T. J. Clausen (2021). 'Renewing creative work for business innovation: Architectural practice in the trading zone', *European Management Review*, **18**, pp. 389–403.
- Sullivan, G. (2010). *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts*. Sage Publications.
- Tacq, J. (2011). 'Causality in qualitative and quantitative research', *Quality & Quantity*, **45**(2), pp. 263–291.
- Tavory, I., and S. Timmermans (2014). *Abductive analysis: Theorizing qualitative research*. University of Chicago Press.
- Teddle, C. and A. Tashakkori (2012). 'Common "core" characteristics of mixed methods research: a review of critical issues and call for greater convergence', *American Behavioral Scientist*, **56**, pp. 774–788.
- Tharenou, P., R. Donohue and B. Cooper (2007). *Management research methods*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tomaselli, V., S. Battiato, A. Ortis, G. G. Cantone, S. Urso and R. Polosa (2022). 'Methods, developments, and technological innovations for population surveys', *Social Science Computer Review*, **40**, pp. 994–1013.
- Turner, S. F., L. B. Cardinal and R. M. Burton (2017). 'Research design for mixed methods: a triangulation-based framework and roadmap', *Organizational Research Methods*, **20**, pp. 243–267.
- Van Burg, E., J. Cornelissen, Stam, W. and S. Jack (2022). 'Advancing qualitative entrepreneurship research: Leveraging methodological plurality for achieving scholarly impact', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **46**, pp. 3–20.
- Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Van de Ven, A. H. (2018). 'Academic-practitioner engaged scholarship', *Information and Organization*, **28**, pp. 37–43.
- Venkatesh, V., S. A. Brown and H. Bala (2013). 'Bridging the qualitative–quantitative divide: guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems', *MIS Quarterly*, **37**(1), pp. 21–54.
- Welch, C. and E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki (2013). 'Putting process (back) in: research on the internationalization process of the firm', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **16**, pp. 2–23.
- Welch, C., E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki, R. Piekkari and E. Plakoyiannaki (2022). 'Reconciling theory and context: how the case study can set a new agenda for international business research', *Journal of International Business Studies*, **53**, pp. 4–26.
- Welch, C., R. Piekkari, E. Plakoyiannaki and E. Paavilainen-Mäntymäki (2011). 'Theorising from case studies: towards a pluralist future for international business research', *Journal of International Business Studies*, **42**, pp. 740–762.
- Whitehurst, F., and P. Richter (2018). 'Engaged scholarship in small firm and entrepreneurship research: Grappling with Van de Ven's diamond model in retrospect to inform future practice', *International Small Business Journal*, **36**, pp. 380–399.
- Wiles, R., G. Crow and H. Pain (2011). 'Innovation in qualitative research methods: a narrative review', *Qualitative Research*, **11**, pp. 587–604.
- Winter, G. (2000). 'A comparative discussion of the notion of validity in qualitative and quantitative research', *The qualitative report*, **4**(3), pp. 1–14.
- Wright, T. A. (2011). 'And justice for all: our research participants considered as valued stakeholders', *Management and Organization Review*, **7**, pp. 495–503.
- Zhang, M. F., J. F. Dawson, and R. B. Kline (2021). 'Evaluating the use of covariance-based structural equation modelling with reflective measurement in organizational and management research: A review and recommendations for best practice', *British Journal of Management*, **32**(2), pp. 257–272.

Michael Christofi is a Faculty Member in Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the Department of Management, Entrepreneurship and Digital Business at Cyprus University of Technology. He currently serves as Associate Editor for *International Marketing Review* and as Senior Editor at *Information Technology & People*. His research spans across the fields of marketing innovation, digitalization, technological innovation, digital transformation and entrepreneurship. His research work has been published in premier publication outlets, such as in *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *British Journal of Management*, and *Journal of World Business*, among others.

Elias Hadjielias is an Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship and Family Business with the Cyprus University of Technology, Limassol, Cyprus. His research interests include entrepreneurship and sustainability in family businesses and SMEs, drawing on interdisciplinary perspectives, in addition to technological innovation. Apart from publishing widely in prominent business and management journals, he has guest edited more than 10 special issues of prestigious journal outlets.

Mathew (Mat) Hughes is Schulze Distinguished Professor and Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the University of Leicester School of Business, UK. His research expertise lies in entrepreneurship and innovation and their intersection with strategy and management. He has published widely in leading journals. Mat is an Associate Editor of the *Journal of Family Business Strategy* and Senior Editor of the leading practitioner website familybusiness.org.

Emmanuella Plakoyiannaki is Chair of International Business at the University of Vienna, Austria. She serves as Associate Editor at the *British Journal of Management*. Her research interests include qualitative research and philosophy of science, as well as SME and family firm internationalization. She has published in the *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of World Business*, *Journal of Management Studies*, and the *British Journal of Management* among others. She received the *British Academy of Management* (BAM) Medal for Research in 2023 and the *Journal of International Business Studies* (JIBS) Decade Award in 2021.