ARTICLES

CO-PRODUCTION OF MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE IN/FROM EMERGING COUNTRIES AND SOCIETIES

Coprodução de conhecimento em gestão em (a partir de) países e sociedades emergentes

Co-producción de conocimiento en gestión en/desde países y sociedades emergentes

Alexandre Faria¹ | alex.faria@fgv.br | ORCID: 0000-0001-9095-725X

¹ Fundação Getulio Vargas, Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

ABSTRACT

In an era of decolonization and empire, the management field embraced the US-led neoliberal counterrevolution and challenged the Eurocentric theory-practice hierarchy to produced relevant knowledge through managed learning theories. This contested reformist and market-centric management revolution (MR) against the threat of "reverse relevance" fostered by emerging/resurging barbarians subalternizes Southern theories-practices of the multifaceted field of development administration-management (DA) and de-develops the global majority by privileging large corporations and transnational elites. MR expanded in the 1990s through a post-Washington Consensus social perspective based on re-Westernalizing whitening appropriation-containment dynamics of developmental neoliberalisms and Southern counter-hegemonic movements informed by dewesternization and decolonial dynamics which challenge-reaffirm racial capitalism structures. In an Age of Development, MR was re-organized in the 2000s in response to "irresponsible" hybridisms in emerging countries and societies triggered by Southern learning-unlearning-relearning dynamics. This article investigates the Southern co-production of relevant knowledge in Brazil through subversive complicity, focused on a privileged organization-school nexus. Analysis shows how managers and researchers (re)mobilize Southern theories-practices to co-produce relevant knowledge from a transformational-reformist perspective. In the end, the article presents discussions and suggestions for collectively re-appropriating Southern relevant knowledge engaged with the 'other' in emerging/resurging societies in both the South and North.

KEYWORDS: learning, neoliberalism, decoloniality, racism, relevance.

RESUMO

Em uma era de descolonização e império, o campo da gestão abraçou a contrarrevolução neoliberal liderada pelos EUA e desafiou a hierarquia eurocêntrica teoria-prática para produzir conhecimento relevante por meio de teorias de aprendizagem gerenciada. Contra a ameaça de "relevância reversa" promovida por bárbaros emergentes/ressurgentes essa contestada revolução gerencial (RG) reformista e mercadocêntrica subalterniza teorias-práticas sulistas do multifacetado campo de administração do desenvolvimento (AD) e "desdesenvolve" a maioria global ao privilegiar grandes corporações e elites transnacionais. A RG é expandida nos anos 1990 por meio de uma perspectiva social pós-Consenso de Washington baseada em dinâmicas reocidentalizantes branqueadoras de apropriação-contenção de neoliberalismos desenvolvimentistas e movimentos contra-hegemônicos sulistas informados por dinâmicas desocidentalizantes e decoloniais que desafiam-reafirmam estruturas do capitalismo racial. Em uma Era do Desenvolvimento, a RG é rearticulada nos anos 2000 em resposta a hibridismos "irresponsáveis" em países e sociedades emergentes impulsionados por dinâmicas sulistas de aprendizagem-desaprendizagem-reaprendizagem. Este artigo investiga coprodução de relevância sulista do conhecimento no Brasil por meio de cumplicidade subversiva a partir de um nexo organização-escola privilegiado. A análise mostra como gestores e pesquisadores (re)mobilizam teorias-práticas sulistas para coproduzir relevância sob uma perspectiva transformacional-reformista. No final, apresentamos discussões e sugestões para reapropriação coletiva da relevância sulista engajada com o outro em sociedades emergentes/ressurgentes no Sul e Norte.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: aprendizagem, neoliberalismo, decolonialidade, racismo, relevância.

RESUMEN

En una era de descolonización e imperio, el campo de la administración abrazó la contrarrevolución neoliberal liderada por Estados Unidos y desafió la jerarquía eurocéntrica teoria-práctica para producir conocimiento relevante a través de teorías del aprendizaje administrado. Contra el riesgo de la 'relevância inversa', esta contestada revolución gerencial (RG) reformista y centrada en el mercado contra la amenaza de "relevancia inversa" fomentada por los bárbaros emergentes/resurgentes subalterniza las teorías-prácticas del sur del campo multifacético de la administración del desarrollo (AD) y de-desarolla a la mayoría global al privilegiar a las grandes corporaciones y las élites transnacionales. RG se expande en la década de 1990 a través de una perspectiva de giro social posterior al Consenso de Washington basada en las dinámicas blanqueadoras reocidentalizadoras de apropiación-contención de los neoliberalismos desarrollistas y los movimientos contrahegemónicos del sur informados por dinámicas desoccidentalizadoras y decoloniales que desafian y reafirman las estructuras del capitalismo racial. En una Era de Desarrollo, RG se rearticula en la década de 2000 en respuesta a hibridismos 'irresponsables' en países y sociedades emergentes impulsados por dinámicas sureñas de aprender-desaprender-reaprender. Este trabajo investiga la coproducción de la relevancia del conocimiento en Brasil desde una perspectiva sureña de complicidad subversiva a partir de un e un nexo organización-escuela privilegiado. El análisis muestra cómo gestores e investigadores (re)mobilizan teorías-prácticas del sur para coproduzir relevancia desde una perspectiva transformacional-reformista. Al final presentamos discusiones y sugerencias para la reapropiación colectiva de relevancia del sur comprometida con el 'otro' en las sociedades emergentes/resurgentes del Sur y Norte.

PALABRAS CLAVE: aprendizaje, neoliberalismo, decolonialidad, racismo, relevancia.

INTRODUCTION

In an era of decolonization and empire embodying a threatening emergence/resurgence of developmentalist "Third World" and "darker" societies (Prashad, 2012), the field of management studies reproduced in the 1960-70s the neoliberal counterrevolution championed by the US global white supremacy and challenged the Eurocentric theory-practice hierarchy to produce relevant knowledge using managed learning theories (Fiol & Lyles, 1985) and academic-practitioner engagement (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014; Kieser, Nicolai, & Deisl, 2015; Millar & Price, 2018). In response to Southern "threats" from emerging countries and societies in the South and North (Bello, 1994; Dawson, 2007) embodying the threat of "reverse relevance", this reformist and market-centric management revolution (MR) is driven by postmodern principles of the global learning society (Jarvis, 1983) which conceal and radicalize lasting colonial structures of racial capitalism (Gonzalez, 2020; Robinson, 2020). MR renews colonial-racial dynamics of appropriation-containment of Southern theories-practices of learning-unlearning-relearning, in the South and the North, led by the neoliberal university of inequality (colonial/patriarchal/capitalist) and intolerance to academic freedom (Melamed, 2016; Santos, 2018). Business schools reaffirm hegemonic whiteness through multicultural racism (McLaren, 1997; Melamed, 2006) and renew counterinsurgent theories of managed learning created in the 1940s by Kurt Lewin (Schein, 1996) by promising freedom of choice for pacified students violently transformed into depoliticized and individualized consumers (Cotroneo & Costa, 2010).

In response to counter-hegemonic movements in both North and South during the first wave of market-centric fundamentalism (Steger & Roy, 2010), the managerialist face of MR was challenged by its progressist face in the 1990s post-Cold War and then renewed with the social turn of inclusive neoliberalism (Porter & Craig, 2004) and institutionalization of "soft managerialism" within academia and in domestic and international politics (Trow, 1993). Associated with the populist ideal of the conformist learning organization (Senge, 1994), this second wave of neoliberal/racial/colonial capitalism responds to the supremacist "third-worldization" of the US. This process is connected to (neo)developmentalist advances in Asia and Latin America (Fine, Lapavitsas, & Pincus, 2003) which increase the "threat" of reverse discrimination and relevance in both South and North (Dawson, 2007; Moura, 2019). This wave is supported by third-way colour-blind ideas (Giddens, 1998) and liberal policies with a social face of post-Washington Consensus neoliberalism (Porter & Craig, 2004).

A postmodern/poststructural critique of managerialism emerges within a context of multiple dynamics around "reverse relevance". It is a critique led by Anglo-American Critical Management Studies (CMS) that denies the colonial/racial face of postmodern and critical theories (Bhambra, 2021). It proposes a new color/colonial-blind and universalist critique (Prasad, 2021) for micro-emancipation of managers and academics who can critically learn in post-colonialist/racist business schools (Alvesson & Willmott, 1992). This critique challenges-reaffirms the theory-practice hierarchy while denying and appropriating-containing Southern theories-practices and movements contrary to the neo-imperial face of whitening neoliberal managerialism in the South

and North (Cotroneo, 2013). In the early 2000s, in the context of the Asian Century of allegedly anti-Western development (Pieterse, 2012) and the global war on terror led by the George W. Bush administration, this expansionist MR was reorganized in the face of the rise of capitalist-socialist emerging countries in the Global South in transition to a multipolar globe (Pieterse, 2004) or pluriversal world that challenges-confirms racial capitalism structures of Western modernity/coloniality (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Moura, 2019). This context is marked by de-Westernization and decolonization forces responded with US-led radical re-Westernization (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) and Southern learning-unlearning-relearning dynamics (Lipton, 2017) that support top-down and bottom-up developmental neoliberalisms (Cox & Nilsen, 2014; Stöhr & Taylor, 1981). Also, de-Westernization and decolonization forces are responded by a renovation of hybridist theories-practices from the multifaceted field of development administration-management (DA) (Dwivedi, Khator, & Nef, 2007; Santos et al., 2018) that confirm the rise of "Southern threat" on a global scale (McEwan, 2019). In the early years of the global war on terror, the whitening face of managed learning was magnified with the ascension of a patriotically correct neoconservatism perspective, "an ideology that privileges conformity over critical learning and that represents dissent as something akin to a terrorist act" (Giroux, 2010, p. 93). This radicalization against the growing risk of "reverse relevance" is overshadowed by corporate scandals and self-correcting critiques of MR, which advocate more theories of managed learning as a global solution to the resumption of moral responsibility in business schools (Ghoshal, 2005).

A socially responsible MR emerges in this context. It targets "irresponsible" management and teaching practices, especially in emerging/resurgent countries and societies in the South and East immersed in "threatening" developmentalist neoliberalism (Antal & Sobzack, 2004; Porter & Kramer, 2011). This turn deepens the dynamics of subalternation of DA contested by scholars engaged with multifaceted DA (Gulrajani, 2010; Santos, Santos, & Braga, 2015) through the radicalization of the colonialist face of racial capitalism denounced by southerners in both South and North (Dar, Liu, Dy, & Brewis, 2021; Ibarra-Colado, 2006). This anti-development MR becomes increasingly developmentalist/"de-developmentalist" (Jamali, Karam, & Blowfield, 2015) by appropriating-containing theories-practices mobilized by the dispossessed darker "other" who resists and re-exists in emerging Southern societies in both South and North (Gantman, Yousfi, & Alcadipani, 2015).

In dialogue with a heterogeneous community of scholars committed to multifaceted DA (Cooke & Faria, 2013; Costa & Teodósio, 2011; Dar & Cooke, 2008; Gulrajani, 2010; Nkomo, 2015; Santos & Meneses, 2020; Saraiva & Enoque, 2019; Wanderley, Celano, & Oliveira, 2018) and engaged with researchers from the progressive face of MR – who prescribe relevance through northern intellectual activism and social justice (Contu, 2020; Rhodes, Wright, & Pullen, 2018) – this study explores the co-production of relevant Southern knowledge in management in (and from) Brazil through a transmodern perspective of subversive complicity that moves beyond the North-South binarism of Eurocentric modernity/coloniality (Dussel, 2015). Focusing on the dynamics of denial and appropriation-containment of multifaceted DA by an expansionist MR, this action-driven investigation seeks to answer the following question: How to co-produce

relevant Southern knowledge engaged with "the other" through subversive complicity in emerging countries and societies?

THE REVOLUTION FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EMERGING COUNTRIES/SOCIETIES

Understanding the management Revolution (MR) from a transformational perspective from emerging/resurgent countries and societies requires a Southern engagement that goes beyond imperialist, essentialist, nationalist, third-world, Latin American, sexist, and extractivist structures we internalize (Grosfoguel, 2020; Santos & Meneses, 2020) with a vast and heterogeneous body of Southern theories-practices committed to colonial/racial matters in both South and North (Cusicanqui, 2020; Gonzalez, 2020; Maldonado-Torres, 2020; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Santos, 2018; Spivak, 2009). Southern darker epistemes denied and appropriated-contained by such expansionist-cumulative-whitening MR focused on the growing threat of reverse relevance/discrimination are mobilized in this paper from a decolonizing-recolonizing perspective (Jammulamadaka, Faria, Jack, & Ruggunan, 2021) via subversive complicity (Grosfoguel, 2005) and transmodernity (Dussel, 2015) in response to the radicalization of North-South binarism. This counterrevolutionary radicalization is promoted by preponderant re-Westernizing literature that classifies emerging countries/ societies/peoples as threats to the benevolent Western civilization and prescribes reformist assimilationism via managed learning on a global scale (Laïdi, 2011). It is also promoted by minor literature engaged with the "other," which, in this order, values revolutionary emergents that delink from Eurocentrism (Mignolo, 2011) and hybridist emergents (transmodern or transcultural) who obey-transcend domination through the praxis of subversive complicity (Grosfoguel, 1996, 2005) and encourage insurgent transmodern co-construction of interconnected pluriversal worlds embodying hope, tension, and tolerance of everyday ambivalence and contradictions (Sandoval, 2000; Santos, 2018).

For the co-construction of relevant Southern knowledge, southern theories-practices are hence mobilized to understand the development of expansionist MR via counterrevolutionary dynamics of denial and appropriation-containment of Southern epistemes-materialities in the South and North through the underdevelopment of the majority and colonization of multifaceted development administration-management (DA). We embrace the definition of praxis as "the process of acting upon the conditions one faces in order to change them" (Freire, 1970, p. 33). Inspired by the work of Santos, Santos, and Braga (2018), DA is understood as a vast and heterogeneous spectrum of top-down and bottom-up subalternized practices and theories of development administration-management. These practices and theories occur inside and outside organizations – called, among other denominations, private, public, non-governmental, social, and international – which reproduce and transform a heterogeneous and stratified predominantly capitalist/racist/sexist/Eurocentric system.

In an era of decolonization and empire embodying the "threatening" rise of developmentalism in the South and North, US business schools in the 1960s mobilized none or very little criticism of

the Eurocentric theory-practice hierarchy contested by emerging/resurgent and darker Southern societies, which historically learn-unlearn-relearn colonial/racist knowledge reproduced by the white Westernized university embodying the dehumanizing logic of the capitalist slave plantation (Wynter, 1968). Unlike Southern theories-practices that challenge the supremacist developmental design of underdevelopment in the "Third World" (Freire, 1970) and in the US (Woodson, 1933), the mainstream theory claims that problems of relevance arise from the poor transfer of theories to Southern students in (neo)colonial states (Cooke, 2004) and the metropolis (Hooks, 1994). Southern theories-practices of transformational learning-unlearning-relearning in the South and North (Rodney, 1972; Spivak, 1988) continue to challenge this assimilationist meta-theory of integration of the oppressed, racialized, "de-developed" to the logic of the dominant system "threatened" by reverse relevance and mobilizing the praxis of subversive complicity and liberating theories-practices – elitist or popular. This praxis enables those in a subaltern position to deal with reality critically and creatively and discover how to participate in and transform their worlds through top-down and bottom-up development that both reproduce and overcome the colonial matrix we internalize/epidermize (Fanon, 1965; Freire, 1970; Woodson, 1933).

Neoliberal capitalism counterrevolution creates and takes advantage of the deadlock in the multifaceted field of development (McEwan, 2019; Saldaña-Portillo, 2003) to appropriate-contain corresponding Southern epistemes and materialities in the South and North, in the name of individual freedom to choose, and command the hyper-managed learning society (Hughes & Tight, 1995) within a darker postcolonial world supposedly threatened by transnational reverse colonialism (Dawson, 2007; Moura, 2019; Robinson, 2020). The counterrevolutionary neoliberal capitalist university democratizes the absence of academic freedom (Marens, 2004) and expands, whitening South-North differentiations in the South and North (Santos, 2018). Academic freedom granted to privileged individuals of the predominantly white-masculine university who historically controlled the universalist theories stemming from the slave plantation (Wynter, 1968) is "defensively" targeted after being "threateningly" appropriated by darker Southern subalterns in the 1960s-70s through learning-unlearning-relearning theories-practices born of liberation struggles and insurgent movements of decolonization, de-racialization, and development inside and outside the university in the South and North (Grosfoguel, 2020, 2005). In this context, Walter Rodney (1972), a Guayanian black historian, political activist, and anti-colonialism academic assassinated in 1980 advocated the reappropriation of the multifaceted fields of development and DA by the Southern "de-developed" majority in the South and North, emphasizing that "if 'underdevelopment' were related to anything other than comparing economies, then the most underdeveloped country in the world would be the US, which practices external oppression on a massive scale, while internally there is a blend of exploitation, brutality, and psychiatric disorder" (p. 14). The managerialist counterrevolution radically targets darker organizations and societies of the increasingly interconnected "Third World" (Prashad, 2012), which mobilize Southern theories-practices based on the liberating idea that "the wretched of the earth – people of color at home [the US] and abroad – would have to be at the center if the world was to be transformed" (Elbaum, 2002, p. 13).

The self-deconstruction of the "myth of the well-educated manager" enunciated in the pages of the Harvard Business Review (Livingston, 1972) materializes US-led white supremacist managerial counterrevolution (Allen, 2001). This North-South struggle is promoted transnationally by corporate executives who "had united to an unprecedented degree to direct the power of government in their interests, influence the public agenda, and roll back the power of unions" (Marens, 2004, p. 71) by advocating coalitions, flexibility, and radical managed (un)learning in the contested neoliberal "post-industrial society" that overtly colonizes an increasingly heterogeneous, dark, and "threatened" (and "threatening") First World (Bello, 1994).

The managerial face of MR embraces and renews the counterinsurgent face of the 'official' field of DA created in the post-war US, with renewed support from Third World elites, through whitening dynamics of appropriation-containment of a heterogeneous and darker body of Southern theories-practices around the notion of "development" (Saldaña-Portillo, 2003) aimed to contain radical social transformations in the South and North connected to an increasingly multifaceted DA (Dwivedi et al., 2007) and the growing threat of "reverse relevance." The a-historicist and counterinsurgent science of management established in the 1950s (Khurana, 2007) was challenged, reaffirmed, and expanded with new Northern theories-histories of managed learning and conformist academic-practitioner engagement (Argyris & Schon, 1978; Fiol & Lyles, 1985; Susman & Evered, 1978). Together, US-led teaching/learning theories-histories promote the depoliticization/individualization/eliticization of managers and academics contested by progressive academics engaged with the transformational face of MR who deny multifaceted DA.

In the post-Cold War 1990s, the darker face of MR was again challenged-reaffirmed (Clarke & Newman, 1993). It was supported by socially inclusive policies of post-Washington Consensus neoliberalism and color/colonial-blind ideology of the Third Way radical center (Giddens, 1998) that deny and appropriate-contain top-down and bottom-up Southern third ways (Padovani, 2008) driven by "threatening" socialism, developmentalism, and communitarianism throughout both South and North (Sklair & Miller, 2010). This expansionist MR is promoted by neo-imperial policies of neoliberal white supremacy (Allen, 2001; Steger & Roy, 2010) that renew the fear of reverse discrimination in a "borderless world" through the racist/multicultural "clash of civilizations" thesis (Huntington, 1993), radical denial and appropriation-containing of Southern hybridisms in the South and North, and particularly bottom-up and top-down multifaceted developmentalism (Grosfoguel, 1996) connected to neoliberalism with Southern (Prashad, 2013) and Chinese (Harvey, 2007a) characteristics.

Embracing populist mantras from management gurus, the third-way neoliberal university (Boden & Nedeva, 2010) performs moralistic, assimilationist, and civilizational appropriations (Rose, 2000) of progressive agendas "associated with political parties of the democratic left" in the North (Steger & Roy, 2010, p. 50), socialist and communitarian alternatives in the South (Sklair & Miller, 2010). It also appropriates-contains hybridisms of developmentalism/neoliberalism, state/market, and capitalism/socialism in emerging countries (Chase-Dunn & Boswell, 2009) driven by an increasingly heterogeneous body of Southern theories-practices (Grosfoguel, 2005) and complex dynamics of re-Westernization and de-Westernization/decoloniality (Lipton, 2017; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Stuenkel & Taylor, 2015).

From within an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous, and discriminatory Global North (Boatca, 2016), a "new managerialism" (Clarke, Gewirtz, & McLaughlin, 2000), or new public management (Kaboolian, 1998), promotes/promises a "(wide) liberation for managers (at least those who keep the faith) from their current oppressions" (Clarke & Newman, 1993, p. 433) that is learned-unlearned-relearned by academic, social, and governmental organizations in search of relevance for the right management of developmentalism-neoliberalism and market-state hybridisms in Latin America and Asia (Christensen, Lisheng, & Painter, 2008). In emerging countries, hybrids of DA from the 1960s-70s that were appropriated and subalternized (but not defeated) by MR are renewed and hence play a leading role in top-down and bottom-up compliance-resistance dynamics in government organizations (Ibarra-Colado, 2011), private organizations (Yousfi, 2014), and academic institutions (Wanderley, Alcadipani, & Barros, 2021). They reconfigure a "threatening" Development Era connected to Southern non-capitalist, post-capitalist, and anti-capitalist alternatives (Cusicanqui, 2020) mobilized by a growing majority of "undeveloped others" via subversive complicity (Grosfoguel, 2005) embodying decolonial transmodernity (Dussel, 2015).

"Good hybridism" is celebrated by a radicalized reformist/developmentalist MR, while "bad hybridism" is framed as an "irresponsible" threat mobilized by anti-Western populist oligarchies (Hoskisson, Eden, Lau, & Wright, 2000; Patrick, 2010). This expanding MR we internalize also targets Southern "irresponsibility" in management and teaching (Millar & Price, 2018) through an ethical-imperialist perspective of responsible learning with a declared focus on reducing inequalities, injustices, and asymmetries (Antal & Sobczak, 2004). Such institutionalized whitening radicalization is fostered by the United Nations (Global Compact, 2007), the US Department of Commerce (Abramov, Johnson, & Abramov, 2004), and the IMF – which publicly acknowledged in 2016 the ineffectiveness of neoliberal policies and the effectiveness of hybridisms "responsible" in emerging developmentalist countries (Ostry, Loungani, & Furceri, 2016) – together with large corporations (Van Elteren, 2003), elite business schools, think tanks (Harvey, 2007b), consulting oligarchies (Peters, 1987), and communication and media sectors (Hall, 2011). In parallel, Southern theories-practices mobilized daily by darker bodies in increasingly interconnected South and North subsidize the Latin American decolonial critique in organization and management studies (Ibarra-Colado, 2006), racial capitalism critique reproduced by business schools in the North (Dar et al., 2000), and the resumption of academic interest in multifaceted DA in emerging countries (Santos et al., 2018; Wanderley & Faria, 2012).

In the Northern academia, the transformational face of MR reaffirms the practical side of (un)learning (Gherardi, 2000, p. 212) through appropriation-containment of Southern transformational theories-practices of collective learning in the South and North in anti-racism/colonialism research and education (Hooks, 1994; Moura, 2019). Authors argue that knowing in management and organizations is (no longer) separated from doing; practice is not theorized as the implementation of universalist theories by actors without agency but rather as a "product of specific historical conditions resulting from previous practice and transformed into present practice" (Gherardi, 2000, p. 215). Practitioners and students engaged with critical reflexivity and

with 'the other' (individuals, societies, communities, and the environment) (Cunliffe, 2016) not only acquire and develop knowledge-in-action but also resist (Fleming & Spicer, 2008) to "change or perpetuate such knowledge and to produce and reproduce society" (Gherardi, 2000, p. 215). In sum, depoliticized and disempowered managers and academics must transgress/unlearn to co-produce knowledge that challenges "good neoliberal governance."

Authors of this reformist-progressive MR in expansion describe researchers and managers as both compatible and incompatible individuals who live in similar and different worlds (Bartunek & Rhynes, 2014) and should mutually (un)learn to overcome dichotomies that separate and hierarchize theory and practice and block learning in terms of, for example, language and knowledge (Hodgkinson & Starkey, 2011), goals and values (Gulati, 2007), or status and incentives (Stern & Barley, 1996). Since theory and practice are independent worlds and, therefore, eventually complementary (Weick, 2001) or contradictorily irreconcilable (Donaldson, 2002), academics stand for the valuing of those who know the practice (Statler, 2014) via lateral dialogues (Knights, 2008) and academic-practitioner cooperation for (un)learning (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011) through mutual learning and responsible debates about "how the tensions are being managed" (Bartunek & Rhynes, 2014, p. 1189). This reformist-progressive-conformist literature based on specific fixed categories and strong, recursive assumptions over decades (Hodgkinson & Starkey, 2011) is hence expanded by a poststructuralist perspective that denies and appropriates-contains Southern theories-practices (Sandoval, 2000) through colonization/racialization dynamics in the North and South (Kieser et al., 2015). The main problem is not that MR reaffirms the idea that management learning is a "good thing for all" (Contu, Grey, & Örtenblad, 2003, p. 931) and the radical impossibility of dissent and academic freedom (Rhodes et al., 2018) as highlighted by colleagues in the North, but how to overcome low research scientificity (Kieser et al., 2015). Reformers and progressive individuals in dynamics of conflict-coalition hence ignore and reaffirm the counterrevolutionary dynamics of development of this expansionist MR aimed to protect us all from reverse relevance via denial and appropriation-containment of the multifaceted Southern DA and the corresponding practices of co-production of relevant knowledge in emerging/resurgent countries-societies within a Development Era marked by the radicalization of expansionist/inclusive dynamics of racial/colonial capitalism that we internalize as whitened/whitening professional academics (Dar et al., 2021).

METHODOLOGY

In the context of radical aversion to qualitative research put forward by "threatening" southerners also in the North (Denzin, 2017), this investigation materializes action research that transits between the reformist (Greenwood, Whyte, & Harkavy, 1993) and transformational versions that dominate the northern literature (Bradbury & Reason, 2003). In conditions of the virtual impossibility of decolonizing the expansionist MR we internalize, this investigation challenges the Northern pattern of extractive/assimilationist and increasingly inclusive/diversified action research (Kemmis, 2006). This pattern is a result of historical dynamics of whitening appropriation of popular and

elitist southern traditions (Borda, 2006; Woodson, 1933) formally inaugurated by Kurt Lewin's counterinsurgent work produced in the 1940s (Cooke, 2006) and radically expanded in the troubled 1990s by the neoliberal counterrevolutionary university (Glassman & Erdem, 2014). By challenging/reaffirming the privileges of the predominantly white colonizing academia that reproduces the slave plantation (Wynter, 1968), a decolonizing-recolonizing praxistical method is developed in two steps in this study aimed to enhance "the capacity of the system being studied to study and change itself" (Elden & Chisholm, 1993, p. 127) with a focus on the organization-school nexus (in here), not only on individual organizations in the 'the world out there'.

The first part of this collective investigation predominantly focused on a privatized development organization purchased by a European multinational corporation operating in the telecommunications sector in Brazil (Alpha). That part co-produced with a master's student/researcher-manager (R-M) whom I supervised at School (Menezes, 2012) became a major focus of this retrospective action research grounded on live archives silenced by global raciality/coloniality we internalize/epidermize, with authorization from R-M and the organization's managers carried out when I was in transformational investigations focused on other development organizations in Brazil which encouraged the praxis of subversive complicity at School. Alpha was selected based on two criteria: representativeness – responsible market leadership-centrism in the sector, also recognized abroad; and accessibility – R-M became a manager trainee at Alpha months before I started this research.

This praxistical method of (self-)investigation results from and constitutes learning-unlearning-relearning dynamics in the privileged organization-school nexus investigated, which main challenge was to transform assimilationist complicity into subversive complicity through dynamics of academic decolonization-recolonization (Jammulamadaka et al., 2021). A first task was to "un-cover" the hybrid identities of colonized-privileged who reproduce-challenge the matrix of coloniality of knowledge, being, and power (Quijano, 2000) championed by the whitening counterrevolutionary Northern academia, in which academics in the North become "increasingly alienated from *themselves*" (Fleming, 2019, p. 4), in dealing with the darker "threat" of reverse discrimination/colonization in emerging societies in the South and North. Managers and researchers were re-signified as Southern obedient and privileged people who mobilize the praxis of subversive complicity in the organization-school nexus partially transformed into refuge (Grosfoguel, 2005) by transpiring Southern theories-practices of DA appropriated-contained-silenced by expansionist MR (Dwivedi et al., 2007). In other words, in accordance with Northern literature, we viewed ourselves as competent disciplined agents (Schön, 1983) and connoisseurs of theory-practice dialogues (Statler, 2014) who mobilize critical reflexivity and (un)learning in everyday practices (Cunliffe, 2016) for the co-production of relevant Southern knowledge from within the expansionist whitening MR we internalize.

Next, we attempted to overcome a double pattern of corporeal-epistemic-material violence R-M experienced. R-M felt oppressed by managerialist Alpha and by School and its privileged academics subordinated to masculinist/capitalist rankings and re-Westernizing Northern canons. Supervised by a privileged-oppressed darker-skinned scholar cautiously engaged with

the increasingly surveilled, co-opted, and contested decolonial option in the South and North (Cusicanqui, 2020; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018), PG started to practice the everydayness of subversive complicity. With this insurgent praxis, we sought to overcome the Northern preference of R-M and other master's students for traditional qualitative research – with the appearance of reformist Northern action research – and corresponding rejection of Southern transformational research to avoid losing privileges by reproducing identity-driven conformity within academia and organization. By attempting to identify and overcome our whitening fear of co-producing reverse relevance at School, we learned that researchers and other academic-managers reproduce and challenge the more obscure side of racial capitalism embodying Eurocentric modernity – i.e., coloniality, its constitutive and inseparable dimension (Mignolo, 2011). We also (re)learned that we can collectively transform this design of epistemic coloniality/racialization that we internalize (Ibarra-Colado, 2006) through cautious and subversive mobilization of double/multiple consciousness championed by the northern privileged-oppressed self and the "de-developed" – but not defeated – other (Cusicanqui, 2020; Sandoval, 2000).

After R-M obtained the academic degree at School and held a job at Alpha, I was able to expand the praxis of subversive complicity by investigating R-M's research, my notes about praxistical experiences that I systematically forget/erase/silence, together with various sources of unwanted data and literature on Alpha and the telecommunications-media sector (which do not freely circulate within white business schools). Therefore, I mobilized a transmodern dialogue between the Northern method of triangulating data, theories, and researchers (Gibbert et al., 2008) and the Southern method-as-praxis that challenges the privilege of capitalist academia as the "responsible" holder of (extractive) methods aimed to defend ourselves from the transnational syndromes of (fear of) reverse relevance/discrimination/colonialism all over that we internalize/epidermize (Cusicanqui, 2020; Grosfoguel, 2020).

During the first nine months of the study, I interviewed, interacted, observed, (un)learned, and critically reflected with 12 managers working at Alpha in marketing, sales, social responsibility, and regulation divisions. From the very beginning, I observed that narratives reported by R-M were accompanied by occasionally spoken manifestations of mimicry and mockery, typical experience of silenced and privileged colonized who obey-resist through cautious mobilization of double consciousness in emerging societies in the South (Bhabha, 1984) and North (Sandoval, 2000). These co-produced, polyphonic, and silenced narratives materialize the praxis of subversive complicity in the organization-school nexus incrementally turned into an unstable refuge. They embody a pattern of reproduction of Northern relevance via reformist action research in written form and transpiration of Southern relevance via transformational action research in oral form. Within the nexus-refuge, I learned that the "first narrative" in written form of the MR ruled by Northern postmodern theory and its whitening and ever-expanding 'qualitative' methods (Czarniawska, 1997) silences and appropriates-contains Southern and darker theories-practices-methods (Grosfoguel, 2020) which are orally reappropriated by threatening Southerners embodying decolonizing-recolonizing

dynamics of insurgent reproduction-subversion (Santos, 2018). These potentially "threatening" second narratives, which are oppressed/silenced, not defeated, by this ambivalent MR and its academic methods, materialize not only the conformist emancipation of the Northern postmodern subject within capitalist organizations and academia (Czarniawska, 1997) but also express the "threatening" double/multiple or mestiza consciousness of non-white Southern bodies (Cusicanqui, 2020; Sandoval, 2000). Through transmodernity I learned that this insurging consciousness is triggered by the contemporary global-scale radicalization of racial/colonial capitalism and by liberating-emancipatory forces of resistance and re-existence in emerging societies that we mobilize through subversive complicity. These forces allow for "threatening" reappropriations of the Southern transformational face of MR through recovery-renewal of Southern theories-practices from the multifaceted field of DA.

This fugitive/clandestine method historically mobilized by black people in the Americas (Moura, 2019; Woodson, 1933) materializes our relearning that academics and managers who co-produce relevant Southern knowledge mobilize "threatening" theories-practices, which are denied and appropriated-contained – but not defeated – by an ambivalent anti-development MR which expansion depends on DA and the "de-developed" other. This method came to material life when we relearned that researchers and managers engaged with the co-production of relevant Southern knowledge challenging the racism/sexism/coloniality matrix that is internalized/epidemized (Gonzalez, 2020), experience restricted and (self)supervised agency in a similar way to enslaved/abolished black people in the Americas historically condemned by the whitening syndrome of fear experienced by Southern privileged-oppressed bodies of dependent racial capitalism in Brazil and throughout the region (Moura, 2019).

With this praxistical method, we relearned that Northern MR literature, in its reformist and transformational versions, transpires the multifaceted and "threatening" field of DA. Engaged with transformational MR researchers who argue that "those in positions of power also resist" (Fleming & Spicer, 2008, p. 304) I learned that privileged actors in Alpha and School both foster and resist counterrevolutionary dynamics of appropriation-containment of Southern theories-practices of multifaceted DA, while "threatening"/"potentially threatening" managers and academics are (self-)restrained by the syndrome of (fear of) "reverse relevance" on a global scale. From within the nexus-refuge where we speak more than write with this method, we attempt to write and speak as Southern accomplices who cautiously subvert to overcome the dynamics of racial/colonial/dependent capitalism in the privileged organization-school nexus. We hence reappropriate and resignify the reformist-progressive-conformist argument that researchers and managers live in different worlds (Bartunek & Rhynes, 2014) and that both can reproduce or challenge existing knowledge (Gherardi, 2000) to fight against the syndrome of "reverse relevance" that we internalize in the South and the increasingly darker North. Written and oral narratives co-produced by R-M, managers, and myself express such transformational dynamics that inform and constitute the main results and analyses presented in the next section.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The main results address two patterns of findings on learning-unlearning-relearning dynamics in the co-production of relevant knowledge in emerging societies from a Southern transformational perspective: (a) dynamics of denial and appropriation-containment; and (b) reappropriation dynamics. Random names for privacy purposes identify the participants.

Dynamics of denial and appropriation-containment

Alpha, a subsidiary of a large European conglomerate, was established in the 1990s with the contested privatization of the telecommunications sector in Brazil, which was led by state-market hybridisms of contemporary neoliberalism-developmentalism (Saad-Filho & Boito, 2016) and reformist, counter-hegemonic, and counterrevolutionary dynamics of emerging countries where development administration-management (DA) and managerial revolution (MR) coexist (Lipton, 2017). Alpha stars in Brazil a "strategic" perspective of corporate social responsibility (CSR) via dispossession of state-society and de-development of the majority (Faria & Sauerbronn, 2008) that appropriates-contains state developmentalisms/socialisms and (post)developmental communitarianisms to produce counterrevolutionary reformist development in the name of protection of the "marginalized, disadvantaged, and poor" (Jamali et al., 2015, p. 3). These strategies against the threat of reverse discrimination/relevance reaffirm populist-neo-imperial-progressive dynamics of the Global Compact's inclusive neoliberalism (Thérien & Pouliot, 2006) fostered by a transnational capitalist complex comprising telecommunications, media, and business schools complex (Runhaar & Lafferty, 2009). Alpha hence challenges-confirms the elitism of mobile telephones in Brazil and the imperialist pattern of the management of large Western corporations in the Global South (Prahalad & Lieberthal, 1998) through MR socially responsible discourses that "liberate" by individualizing/depoliticizing/fragmenting a society potentially "threatening" to workers, managers, students, consumers and growing diversity of privileged 'others' (Schiller, 2011).

Alpha managers transpire Southern transformational relevance as they narrate in Northern MR language how Alpha challenges/confirms territorial, racial, and class hierarchies in the sector and country through CSR strategies. Defined as "multifaceted" by the Northern literature of expansionist MR that performs the "de-development" of the majority (Jamali & Karam, 2018), this strategy denies and appropriates the Southern, multifaceted field of DA (Dwivedi et al., 2007; Santos et al., 2018) to expand a counterrevolutionary system of white cooptation grounded on the pay-per-call concept, charging a fixed price per "on-net" call – i.e., the same rate for local or long-distance calls and data and SMS transmission.

> [...] people no longer worry about call time. My housekeeper now talks to her family in the Northeast using Alpha. Before it was almost impossible. Now they talk almost every

day. Yes, there are many complaints and lawsuits in court [...] *All this is revolutionary for us too, you know?* (Diana, Marketing Specialist) [oral part of the narrative in italics]

These narratives co-produced in the organization-school nexus embodying mimicry and mockery virtually silenced by reformist MR transpire transformational MR embodying the praxis of subversive complicity experienced by managers and R-M within and outside capitalist organizations and academia. R-M narrates managers' oral interrogations about the consumerist rise of the new middle class celebrated by managers and researchers educated by reformist MR and influenced by elitist academic discourses focused on the manageable new developmentalism in Brazil (Bresser- Pereira, 2006) which fight against reverse relevance from below. R-M tries to regain Southern transformational relevance by expressing a pattern of subversive complicity regarding this managerial social strategy focused on the 'market' of underprivileged chiefly black housekeepers who resist everyday racial-colonial capitalism with everyday insurgent self-development movements (Teixeira, 2021) in the context of growing criticism, within and outside corporations, of the extraordinary accumulation of colonial/racial privileges and corporate abuse of the post-privatization transnational telephony sector.

Advertising campaigns persuaded customers with the liberating idea of unlimited calling [...] All over the world, people talk much more than in Brazil. Before Alpha, mobile telephony in Brazil was a luxury... With the rise of underprivileged [people], housekeepers, we are all middle class... *In Alpha, everyone is a manager, there are no more privileges.* (Pimentel, Marketing Manager) [oral narrative in italics]

[This strategy] makes people bring their groups and communities to Alpha. It is a mobilization strategy. Talking cheaper is one thing; talking for free is another world. Who doesn't want it? When they discover it is possible, communities begin to desire it, you know? *We also had to buy into that idea, you know?* (Campomar, Commercial Manager) [oral narrative in italics]

We learned that Alpha and the MR's literature deny and appropriate globalizing counter-movements throughout Latin America driven by the technological revolution in communication that began in the 1970s (Sklair & Miller, 2010) in continuity with the anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism revolutions of the 1960s (Alea, 1990; Fanon, 1965). I Alpha and MR re-join the 1970s New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) created by UNESCO shortly after the darker "world revolution" of 1968 (Elbaum, 2006), which resurges in the 1990s by the transmodern decolonial Zapatista Revolution in Chiapas, in Mexico (Grosfoguel, 2005; McCaughey & Ayers, 2013). Alpha mobilizes a transnational strategy of development-driven social responsibility, which renews the whitening and counterrevolutionary face of AD to co-construct public policies in emerging countries that respond to the threatening fall of Northern hegemony in information communication (Thussu, 2015) and the equally threatening rise of reverse discrimination in the South and North (Dawson, 2007). In Brazil, the telecommunications-media-education complex

appropriates counter-hegemonic languages mobilized by bottom-up neoliberalism (Cox & Nilsen, 2014) and by moderate or radical leftist governments in Latin America (Gago, 2017) to reaffirm the oligarchic-racial populist face of this US-led strategic whitening sector that we internalize (Frank, 2002).

In this multifaceted context of dependent racial capitalism (Moura, 2019) Alpha triggers the reformist leftist turn in the region that emancipates the "new middle class" in Brazil grounded on the racist/economist myth of "medianization" of society via consumption. These contested reformist hybrids neo-liberalize AD theories-practices (Saad-Filho & Boito, 2016) and consolidate the whitening project of conversion of DA academics and development administrators into 'new managers' and 'new academics' depoliticized and coopted by expansionist MR.

As a privileged organization that learns/unlearns through counterrevolutionary dynamics through which RG and nurtures and is nurtured by transformational RG, Alpha appropriates/contains Southern theories-practices of counter-hegemonic and non-capitalist movements by launching socially responsibility-driven services that promise individualistic economic advantages to "communities of customers" served by privatized development organizations that learn to accumulate capital via managed dispossession with multiple privileged stakeholders (Freeman & Velamuri, 2006). Through theories of managed learning engaged with this privileged "other", organizations and academia appropriate-contain political-collective dynamics associated with bottom-up Southern development (Stöhr & Taylor, 1981), such as those mobilized by the working class in large corporations (Pochmann, 2014) connected with anti-colonialism/racism/patriarchy/capitalism everyday struggles within and outside capitalist organizations and academia (Santos, 2018).

These counter-revolutionary strategies that de-develop the oppressed majority are academically re-signified as "social" while anti-systemic Southern anti-imperialism counter-movements illustrated by the Zapatista Revolution of the 1990s and the Arab Spring of 2011-12 (Mason, 2012) are theorized as isolated "social movements" by MR literature in its mainstream and critical versions (Grey, 2002). With support from the oligarchic-populist-inclusive telecommunications-media-education complex (Hallin, 2008), this neo-imperial design for combating the threat of "reverse relevance" all over and informs transformational learning dynamics through which southern darker theories-practices are continuously appropriated by "activist" CEOs of large corporations (Branicki, Brammer, Pullen, & Rhodes, 2021) and of equally autocratic/racist business schools (Dar et al., 2021; McCann, Granter, Hyde, & Aroles, 2020) who shape the co-production of relevant knowledge for "responsible" accumulation of privileges by established powers under increasing threat by emerging Southern and darker societies in both South and North. In a counterrevolutionary response to the NWICO and the Zapatista Revolution, the Northern electronic-digital hegemony "resists", in the North and South, the "counter-hegemonic challenges on the Internet and related media" (Sklair & Miller, 2010, p. 478) to combat the threat of reverse colonization/relevance through cooptation of (self-)restrained managers and researchers disciplined by expansionist MR knowledge. Through the counterrevolutionary neoliberal university and its business schools, collective rights are

structurally converted into individualized services via depoliticizing commodification and socially "responsible" learning.

We learned that organizations and academy appropriate languages and theories-practices of "communities" and "social movements" challenge-reaffirm the counterrevolutionary face of racial/colonial capitalism to activate resistance and hybridisms in DA, which feed back and justify 'defensive' dynamics of racial/colonial capitalism carried out by this expansionist MR we internalize. Through the recovery of praxistical methods, we also unlearned dominating whitening lessons and relearned that academics and managers in the South can challenge this material-epistemic design through subversive complicity and consequent recovery-renewal of learning-unlearning-relearning dynamics that enable the collective reappropriation of the transformational face of MR and DA, as shown below.

Dynamics of reappropriation of the transformational face

In narratives embodying double/multiple consciousness (Sandoval, 2000), managers and R-M transpired mimicry-mockery expressions of reformist postcolonialism (Bhabha, 1984) and insurgent decoloniality (Santos, 2018). These narratives constitute the praxis of subversive complicity for the co-construction of Southern relevance in emerging/resurgent societies. They embody everyday dynamics of reappropriation that recover-renew Southern ways of knowing/learning/being/managing (Santos, 2018) that constitute the multifaceted DA in the South and North (Pieterse, 2012; Saldaña-Portillo, 2003).

Tavares, a darker-skinned manager working in the regulatory area of Alpha and an experienced DA practitioner since before neoliberal-developmental privatizations, championed the most relevant experience of transformational reappropriation during the research. Tavares encourages us to co-produce Southern transformational relevance by suggesting that our investigation demands theories-practices of an enduring past that the whitening syndrome of fear and the expansionist MR we internalize help to deny and appropriate-contain:

> the so-called market has changed a lot, and so have our strategies [...] basically, the main issue is that the telecommunications sector in Brazil is not for amateurs... *It never was... You know that, right? Without a historical perspective, it is virtually impossible to talk about relevance here, you know?* [in italics, the oral part by R-M, collected after the researcher completed the master's degree]

This narrative reported orally by PG after completion of the master's research reactivates subversive complicity in our nexus-refuge that informs Southern DA theories-practices based on insurgent learning-unlearning-relearning. This transformational fissure manifested by Tavares and silenced by our fear of co-producing reverse relevance encouraged and morally obliged me to recover/subvert the colour-blind historical-deductive method prevalent in DA (Bresser-Pereira,

2009) as an alternative to the hypothetical-deductive method dominant in MR challenged/ reaffirmed by the Euro-British postmodernist historicism driven by the transformational and appropriating/whitening face of MR (Cummings et al., 2017). Therefore, I engage Southern researchers in the management field promoting resistance and re-existence of multifaceted DA in Brazil through nationalist/Latin Americanist (Santos et al., 2015; Wanderley et al., 2018) and transmodern/pluriversal (Wanderley & Faria, 2012) perspectives of decolonization-recolonization.

In the 1950s, within a context increasingly unmanageable to the imperial North, hundreds of companies offered telecommunications services in Brazil. First World imperial corporations, growingly "threatened" by emerging darker societies (Dawson, 2007; Moura, 2019), imposed the development pattern of underdevelopment of Third World telecommunication, information-communication, and education systems on a global scale (Masha, 1982). This counterrevolutionary turn (Carlsson, 2003, p. 196) responds to Southern movements in the US led by the Black Power Civil Rights Movement (Joseph, 2013), connected to bottom-up and top-down DA theories-practices mobilized by heterogeneous and unequal and increasingly interconnected emerging/ resurgent societies increasingly interconnected. Resisting organizations and academia mobilize the praxis of subversive complicity and foster the transmodernization of theories-practices of multifaceted DA (Farazmand, 2002), offering a collective response to racist/colonialist modernization/development projects supported by these counterrevolutionary systems and new AD theories and policies in Latin America/"*América Ladina*" (Gonzalez, 2020). Mobilized by the Truman administration from the 1940s-50s, these theories are supported by ethno-elites in Brazil, who renew modernizing dynamics of late slavery (1850-1888) inaugurated in 1492 with the discovery/conquest of the "Americas" (Moura, 2019). The counterrevolutionary face of development and DA hegemonic theories is radically reproduced by MR from the 1970s onward through appropriation-containment dynamics of Southern theories-practices of bottom-up and top-down development (Saldaña-Portillo, 2003), which reproduce the capitalist regime of dehumanization of the black population by the white population fearing the emergence of inferiorized barbarians (Woodson, 1933). MR expanded through the colonial matrix of development of underdevelopment experienced by darker bodies in the Americas since the sixteenth century and denounced/confirmed in Latin America by scholars of the dependency theory in the 1960s-70s (Frank, 1969) and later reaffirmed by Latin Americanist decolonial post-development theorists-activists (Escobar, 2011).

After the Cuban Revolution and the rise of former Southern colonies in Africa and Asia, leading to the contested constitution of the "Third World" as an economic-political-cultural-elitist anti-imperialism/racism project (Prashad, 2012), the United Nations appropriate Southern theories-practices born with revolutionary-reformist liberation struggles of emerging darker societies. This counterrevolutionary appropriation informs lasting dynamics of domination in this mega-system of telecommunications-media and education in Brazil mentioned and lived by Tavares.

Tavares refers to the present past lived by DA and MR professionals who mobilize hybridisms resulting from everyday transformational dynamics of learning-unlearning-relearning and

subversive complicity and top-down and bottom-up Southern theories-practices. These artefacts embody multiple movements in a heterogeneous *Améfrica Ladina* (Gonzalez, 2020) connected to anti-colonial struggles and liberation wars in Africa and Asia and top-down and bottom-up anti-imperialism and anti-racism movements in the US (Elbaum, 2002) appropriated-contained in the South and North – but not defeated – by members of white elites of the academia-media-communications complex (Carlsson, 2003; Sinclair, 1990).

The Brazilian National Telecommunications Council (Contel) established the Brazilian Code of Telecommunications on August 27, 1962 (Law 4117) from an imperial-racial perspective of national developmentalism. This perspective was contested by organization-school nexuses of a predominantly elitist-nationalist and revolutionary DA, such as Ibesp and ISEB (Bresser-Pereira, 2004; Lynch, 2015), which absorb Afro-Brazilian movements and societies embodying a "too threatening" praxis of subversive complicity (Gomes, 2017; Gonzalez, 2020). These heterogeneous nexuses are internally imploded by whitening elitist disputes (Moura, 2019), which inform an anti-blackness counterrevolutionary configuration of business schools in Brazil (Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015) connected to a radical whitening scientification in the US (Khurana, 2007). This colonial/racial pattern rules lasting dynamics of denial-appropriation-containment between the field of management and the "potentially threatening" field of multifaceted DA (Patel, 2020).

Amid the strong bottom-up and top-down nationalist campaign against the corporate groups Light, Amforp, and ITT and tense disputes over the use of satellites by Cold War imperial powers, this counterrevolutionary configuration was radically reaffirmed in Brazil during the progressive government by President João Goulart. It was triggered by the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement (MAN) 1961 within the scope of the United Nations (Prashad, 2012). Supported by the perspective of the "Third World," whitening nationalism promoted by the transnationalization of capital and militarism in a "threatening" Era of decolonization and empire in the South and North (Santos et al., 2018), in which "for the first time, the countries of the South – albeit the richest of them – were acting together in a way that could seriously disturb the economy in the North" (Rist, 2014, p. 142), powerful organizations in media-communications and academia rearticulate development-administration hybrids in Brazil. The myth of racial democracy in an emerging society of global racial capitalism and the increasingly intellectualized university (Moura, 2019) helps to promote the ideology of dependent industrial development embodying anti-blackness dynamics of appropriation-containment and a diversity of academic and non-academic versions of the dependency theory (Wanderley et al., 2021). These development-administration hybridisms that have been colonized, but not defeated, by the expansionist RG are assessed as progressive by academics and predatory or reformist by revolutionary voices and silenced darker peoples silenced by color-blind history/historiographies (Evans, 1995, 2018).

It was created by Embratel, a major outcome of the plan for national integration informed by the US-inspired whitening Doctrine of National Security. It underpins the National Telecommunications System (SNT) and the National Telecommunications Council (Contel), commanding the National Telecommunications Plan. As the central organizer of

the communication-media-education complex in Brazil, Embratel hence turned into "the most extraordinary achievement of Brazil's Superior War College (Escola Superior de Guerra – ESG), in association with the Institute for Research and Social Studies (IPES), the National Information Service (SNI), and other institutions sympathetic to the political ideology of the military corporation" (Felipe, 2005, p. 32, our translation).

With the Chinese Cultural Revolution, the assassination of Che Guevara in Bolivia in 1967, the anti-imperialism movement in Europe, and the apex of the Black Power movement simultaneously with the assassination of Martin Luther King in the USA in 1968, tensions grew within the universities and media communications. Southern darker theories-practices informed by subversive complicity were hence appropriated-contained by official policies based on the discourses of freedom of information flow, human rights, and education established by the United Nations. In response to heterogeneous counter-movements for sovereignty and racial justice after the US defeat in Vietnam and increasing and orchestrated attacks on transnational corporations in the South and North embodying theory-practices for (self-)development, Unesco consolidated as a counterrevolutionary forum for the anti-imperialist project of decolonization of information communication systems and education in the South and North (Carlsson, 2003) lived by Tavares.

In response to the growing threat of reverse discrimination in both South and North triggered by Southern development theories-practices (Alea, 1990; Carlsson, 2003; Faure et al., 1972), of managed learning are institutionalized in the US and mobilized by the expansionist MR against "reverse relevance" generated by multifaceted DA.

MR is triggered by radical dynamics of denial-appropriation-containment of cultural imperialism focused on "emerging threats" (Bello, 1994) – a "defensive" response to "Third-World" dynamics of reverse imperialism in the US (Sinclair, 1990). This response was mobilized by the great structural offensive of transnational racial capitalism and US militarism (Ahmad, 1995) and supported by the counterrevolutionary face of DA and the appropriation-containment dynamics of its Southern transformational face. The DA field embodying dynamics of reappropriation was thus radically demobilized (Rist, 2014) by transnational elites that pushed expansionist MR toward more effective control of the organization-school system on a global scale through the counterrevolutionary neoliberal university and its business schools.

In Brazil, amidst attacks against big corporations protected by the CIA, the dictatorial military government created the Telebrás system in the late 1970s – a Federal State monopoly consisting of a network of 27 companies and an interconnected long-distance operator. With the growing importance of the information-communication-education system for the expansion of counterrevolutionary neoliberalism supported by nationalist-military projects in the "Third World," the Telebrás System mobilizes "Third-World" movements for whitening national sovereignty when it launches in 1980 its Research and Development Center (CPqD) in Campinas-SP. These transformations are contested-supported by nationalist/Third-World theories-practices which go beyond the syndrome of whitening fear. The anti-racism/colonialism work by Ramos (1983) deserves to be highlighted. It promotes an intercultural dialogue between the fields of

northern management and southern DA from a nationalist perspective (Santos et al., 2015) that fosters hybridisms within a multifaceted field of DA that resists and re-exists in Brazil through contemporary dynamics of insurgent learning/unlearning/relearning (Paula, 2007; Santos et al., 2018).

In response, counterrevolutionary hybridisms focused on heterogeneous and "threatening" emerging/resurgent societies are hence mobilized by the national-developmentalist military dictatorship with partial support from the population, university, and transnational capital. The hyperviolent Condor Operation sponsors market-centric discourses to stop emerging theories-practices generated by the mobilization of the mass media and education by "leftist forces" (McSherry, 2005) allegedly subordinated to developmental-populist statisms and global imperial communism (Krasner, 1985).

Transnational liberal capital championed a front of ultra-offensive dynamics supported by an expansionist MR that informs the extraterritorial experiment of the neoliberal counterrevolution in Chile. The experiment helps to simultaneously dismantle the successful insurgent university-communications system in the South and North and the growing threat of "reverse relevance" through violent imposition of individualist-elitist-consumerist managerialism (Cotroneo & Costa, 2010). In the 1980s, the counterrevolutionary economic recession in/against the Third World and Black America is engineered by Paul Volcker at the head of the Federal Reserve reinforced divisive/fragmenting disputes and capitalist coalitions carried out by emerging countries of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and by the US financial supremacist oligarchy (Allen, 2001). Ronald Reagan, the "master of television," radically revolutionized the post-1968 telecommunications-media system with the supremacist Star Wars project (Boyer, 1998) and institutionalized the counterrevolution carried out by the white neoliberal university and its business schools. (Davies et al., 2006) to appropriate-contain darker emerging movements on a global scale, and suppress the Southern praxis of subversive complicity courageously re-membered by Tavares.

In the early 1990s, in parallel with the radical re-organization of the telecommunications-media system in the US, led by financial populism oligarchies (Frank, 2002; Hallin, 2008) that enables the emergence of private/privatized development organizations such as Alpha, the Telebrás System was privatized and deregulated. It was encouraged by the Washington Consensus principles and extractive dynamics of de/re-territorialization of transnational racial capitalism on a global scale. In this context of multiple emergencies and appropriations against the "threatening" clash of civilizations in a "world without borders," the radical appropriation of the multifaceted DA by the expansionist MR is championed by "a privileged minority in all of these 'worlds' [who] has accumulated wealth and power at an unprecedented rate'" (Dwivedi et al., 2007, p. 109). Counter-hegemonic movements for racial justice, anti-imperialism democracy, and corresponding collectivist theories-practices mobilized by a DA, fostered by Tavares and comrades, that was subalternized – but not defeated – are treated by the neoliberal university and the telecommunications-media-education complex (Hallin, 2008) as isolated social movements for the promotion of the radical conversion of revolutionary opposition to a renewed reformist order in the South and North (Higgins, 2004) with growing support from the expansionist MR.

Triggered by hyperaggressive deregulation of the financial sector and renewal of supremacist expansionism during the inclusive administration of Bill Clinton, privatizations in Latin America (also in Eastern Europe) redesigned the political economy of the telecommunications-media sector with the creation of transnational conglomerates predominantly from the North and expanding the privileges of elitist local groups and families connected to the transnational capitalist oligarchy (Zon, 2016). One year after the Telecommunications Reform in the US, which concentrated more privileges in the hands of the supremacist minority (Frank, 2002), the General Telecommunications Law was approved in Brazil in 1997, consolidating the sector's new governance structure. Through an anti-development perspective supported by expansionist MR and whitening elites, the "independent" national regulatory agency, Anatel, was created, following the US design of regulating the structures of racial capitalism by fighting reverse discrimination/relevance all over. The agency embraced market-centric populism and promoted the regulated commodification of the sector in Brazil through the white reformist MR that denied and appropriate-contained a heterogeneous range of bottom-up and top-down "threatening" transformational Southern theories-practices that, together with and encouraged by Tavares and other Southern comrades, I partially reappropriate for the co-production of relevant knowledge engaged with the "de-developed" other.

DISCUSSION AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This action-research on co-production of Southern relevant knowledge in conditions of (im) possibility in emerging/resurgent countries and darker societies embraces a perspective of subversive complicity engaged with the de-developed 'other' in both North and South. From within a privileged organization-school nexus partially transformed into unstable refuge, this collective project challenges the counterrevolutionary dynamics of the Northern managerial revolution (MR) triggered by radical combat against the threat of reverse relevance from the South on a global scale and the "de-development" of the multifaceted field of development administration-management (DA). We learned that DA theories-practices mobilized in the everyday of privatized development organizations of telecommunications-media-education complex in both South and North are appropriated-contained – but not defeated – by mainstream and critical academics like me who internalize the colonial matrix of racial capitalism and the whitening fear of producing 'reverse relevance'. While members of the transnational elite foster and resist DA "de-development" dynamics, academics and oppressed/privileged practitioners driven by double consciousness, subversive complicity, and forces of resistance and re-existence embodying decolonization/recolonization dynamics promote Southern transformational reappropriations from the perspective of the "de-developed" majority in the South and North.

The investigation of these forgotten and often oralized dynamics of co-production has become particularly relevant for the majority of the global population and the planet as a whole in

the context of the dual pandemic – i.e., COVID-19 and colonial white supremacy (Stovall, 2020). The dual pandemic has given visibility to the counterrevolutionary "de-development" dynamics of the "threatening" darker majority and has profoundly destabilized the contested relevance of the Northern anti-development field of management on a global scale. The Global North is putting forward a new MR with a socio-developmentalist face based on renewed dynamics of appropriation-containment of the multifaceted field of DA. This ultimate counterrevolution is a 'responsible' re-Westernizing response to a "threatening" expansion of Southern anti-racism and decolonial movements in the South and North interconnected with de-Westernizing forces led by developmentalist China and Greater Eurasia expanding and reaching all regions, including Afro-Latin America and Africa.

We live in a rather complex Age of Development driven by non-capitalist, post-capitalist, and anti-capitalist alternatives denied and appropriated/contained by an expansive MR, but not defeated, constituted by everyday dynamics of subversive complicity and decolonial transmodernity inside and outside the capitalist counter-revolutionary academia in multiple transitions. This new MR embodies a radical anti-China developmentalist turn led by elites of the G7 countries and institutions who offer radicalized neoliberalism or democratic authoritarianism on a global scale. It is being mobilized by a system of "too big to fail" whitened business schools that embody radical dynamics of "de-development" of the growing darker Southern emerging/resurging majority in the South and North.

We learned also that the co-production of relevant Southern knowledge in emerging societies can be carried out, even under conditions of the virtual impossibility of decolonization of racial/neoliberal capitalism that we internalize/epidermize. The insurgent praxis of recovery-renewal of multifaceted DA is not a Southern, nationalist, or Latin American particularity. In search for collectivities and allies, this action research engages progressive colleagues of the transformational face of MR who mobilize Southern theories-practices to challenge structures of depoliticization and individualization within the counterrevolutionary neoliberal university from within an increasingly unequal, heterogeneous, and authoritarian Global North (Santos, 2018). Encouraged by the praxis of subversive complicity from the perspective of the "de-developed" other, I reaffirm this engagement for the co-production of relevant knowledge for all.

Transmodern dialogues with the North are imperative for Southern decolonial, anti-colonial, and anti-racism unfinished projects that move beyond 'reverse' essentialisms such as Latin Americanism, nationalism, and nativism that we internalize/epidemize (Fanon, 1967; Freire, 1970; Sandoval, 2000). Through collective dynamics of colonization/recolonization for epistemic reappropriations around the multifaceted and unfinished field of DA, we might constitute a growing and heterogeneous community of potentially "relevant" scholars for all, despite being ruled by the counterrevolutionary rankings of Northern geopolitics of capitalist knowledge and corresponding structures of political economy within the context of radical resumption of whitening manageability against reverse discrimination/relevance/colonialism. The community of privileged Northern colleagues with whom I have interacted asymmetrically

for many years ignores this expansionist development of MR in the mainstream, critical, reformist, and transformational versions faced from the 1960s-70s by a growing majority of darker Southern people and by many colleagues in Brazil and elsewhere who resist this continuous subalternization of multifaceted DA. In a complex Age of Development potentially moving beyond racial capitalism and Eurocentric modernity, MR radicalizes the invisibility of the long-lived dynamics of denial and appropriation-containment of multifaceted DA. This MR, dependent on the South, becomes increasingly ambivalent and insurgent within a multilateral/pluriversalist darker world that is becoming increasingly Southern.

Such threatening/insurgent ambivalence embodies multiple insurgent possibilities of co-production of transformational relevance through the collective recovery-renewal of Southern theories-practices that inform such multifaceted and unfinished DA in the South and North. This study regains, materializes, and redistributes hopes and tolerance to contradictions and ambivalences, which continue to be practiced-theorized by Southern bodies in the South and North since 1492 inside and outside capitalist academia and organizations. I hope this research will encourage both academics and non-academics engaged with expansionist MR to challenge our complicity with the "de-development" of the "other" in the name of managed relevance and learning and the excluded, surveilled, and co-opted – but not defeated – individuals/collectives bodies to co-produce more relevant Southern knowledge for all through more subversion and less complicity.

The co-production of southern relevance, with its contradictions and ambivalences, through praxistical methods and insurgent oralities is more urgent than academic writing about Southern relevance in this context of dehumanizing radicalizations against the planet and the life of a majority of the world population. This modest research recovers might encourage us to continue transforming assimilationist complicity into subversive complicity in conditions of (im)possibility from within privileged organization-school nexus and respective fissures that we dwell and partially transform in refuges in the South and North through everyday learning/unlearning/relearning dynamics.

The insurgent and cautious co-production of relevant Southern knowledge from the perspective of the "other" requires the radical expansion of collective methods that transform the internalized conditions of (im)possibility. This specific investigation might be relevant by recovering a retrospective perspective of action research that enables us to challenge structural silencing and forgetting of our insurgent capabilities of co-producing daily transformation, a phenomenon fostered by expansionist MR mobilized by established supremacist powers to combat all over the threat reverse relevance/discrimination/colonialism.

As a transformational response to Brazil's radical "de-development" through radical deindustrialization commanded by whitening elites "based on conservatism, classicism, and authoritarianism" (Pochmann, 2022, p. 37, our translation), this Southern action research embodying everyday insurgent transformations and institutionally doomed to be silenced and forgotten by me and the pervasive anti-black history that we internalize in the whitening academia (Moura, 2019; Woodson, 1933) embodies a regenerative embodiment of a multifaceted DA carried out by several academic and non-academic groups and collectives in Brazil, through which I have

learned to unlearn/relearn/remember. Some of them are the Organizational Reality Observatory (UFSC), Political Administration (UESB), Organizations and Liberating Praxis (UFRGS), Center for Organizational Studies and Society/NEOS (UFMG), and Center for Studies on Brazilian Administration/Abras (UFF).

This investigation will achieve more substantive and responsible goals from the perspective of the 'other', if it also encourages the collective promotion of material reparations that enable our everyday transformational praxis from within the cracks, fissures, and ambivalences of capitalist counterrevolutionary academia. I hope this action research that I eloquently oralize while cautiously write as a Brazilian mulatto privileged academic who wears white masks to survive help the whitening fields of administration-management and development, in general, and DA, in particular to recover-renew material conditions for managers, researchers, and other members of emergent/resurgent societies in the South and North to co-produce relevant Southern insurgent theory-practices radically engaged with the darker "other" of the "de-developed" majority (Faria et al., 2021), beyond racial capitalism embodying Eurocentric modernity/coloniality we internalize/epidermize.

REFERENCES

Abramov, I., Johnson, K., & Abramov, I. (2004). *Business ethics: A manual for managing a responsible business enterprise in emerging market economies*. Washington, USA: US Department of Commerce.

Ahmad, A. (1995). The politics of literary postcoloniality. *Race & Class*, 36(3), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/030639689503600301

Alea, T. (1990). *Memories of underdevelopment*. New Brunswick, USA: Rutgers University.

Allen, R. L. (2001). The globalization of white supremacy: Toward a critical discourse on the racialization of the world. *Educational Theory*, 51(4), 467. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00467.x

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992). On the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 432-464. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1992.4281977

Antal, A., & Sobczak, A. (2004). Beyond CSR: Organisational learning for global responsibility. *Journal of General Management*, 30(2), 77-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/030630700403000207

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, USA: Addison-Wesley.

Bartunek, J., Rynes, S. (2014). Academics and practitioners are alike and unlike the paradoxes of academic–practitioner relationships. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1181-1201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314529160

Bello, W. (1994). *Dark victory: The US, structural adjustment and global poverty*. Oakland, USA: Institute for Food and Development Policy.

Bhabha, H. (1984). Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse. *October*, 28, 125-133. https://doi.org/10.2307/778467

Bhambra, G. K. (2021). Decolonizing critical theory? Epistemological justice, progress, reparations. *Critical Times*, 4(1), 73-89. https://doi.org/10.1215/26410478-8855227

Boatcă, M. (2016). *Global inequalities beyond occidentalism*. London, UK: Routledge.

Boden, R., & Nedeva, M. (2010). Employing discourse: universities and graduate 'employability'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(1), 37-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903349489

Borda, O. F. (2006). Participatory (action) research in social theory: Origins and challenges. In: Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* (pp. 27-37). London, UK: Sage.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University.

Bradbury, H., & Reason, P. (2003). Action research: An opportunity for revitalizing research purpose and practices. *Qualitative Social Work*, 2(2), 155-175. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325003002002003

Branicki, L., Brammer, S., Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. (2021). The morality of "new" CEO activism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 170(2), 269-285. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04656-5

Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2004). O conceito de desenvolvimento do ISEB rediscutido. *Dados-Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 47(1), 49-84. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0011-52582004000100002

Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2006). Novo desenvolvimentismo e ortodoxia convencional. *São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 20(3), 63-96. Recuperado de http://www.bresserpereira.org.br/papers/2007/06.3.NovoDesenvolv-Mai26.2007.Eli.p.pdf

Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2009). *Developing Brazil: Overcoming the failure of the Washington Consensus*. Boulder, USA: Lynne Rienner.

Carlsson, U. (2003). The rise and fall of NWICO. *Nordicom Review*, 24(2), 31-67.

Chase-Dunn, C., & Boswell, T. (2009). Semi-peripheral development and global democracy. In C. Chase-Dunn & T. Boswell (Eds.), *Globalization and the 'new' semi-peripheries* (pp. 213-232). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Christensen, T., Lisheng, D., & Painter, M. (2008). Administrative reform in China's central governmen: How much learning from the West? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 74(3), 351-371. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852308095308

Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S., & McLaughlin, E. (Eds.). (2000). *New managerialism, new welfare?* London, UK: Sage.

Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1993). The right to manage: A second managerial revolution?. *Cultural Studies*, 7(3), 427-441. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502389300490291

Contu, A. (2020). Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference as business schools schoherelars. *Human Relations*, 73(5), 737-757. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719827366

Contu, A., Grey, C., & Örtenblad, A. (2003). Against learning. *Human Relations*, 56, 931-952. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267030568002

Cooke, B. (2004). The managing of the (third) world. *Organization*, *11*(5), 603-629. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508404044063

Cooke, B. (2006). The Cold War origin of action research as managerialist cooptation. *Human Relations*, *59*(5), 665-693. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726706066176

Cooke, B., & Faria, A. (2013). Development, management and North Atlantic Imperialism: For Eduardo Ibarra Colado. *Cadernos Ebape.Br, 11*, I-XV. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-39512013000200001

Cooke, B., & Alcadipani, R. (2015). Toward a global history of management education: The case of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of Business Administration, Brazil. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *14*(4), 482-499. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2013.0147

Costa, D., & Teodósio, A. (2011). Desenvolvimento sustentável, consumo e cidadania: um estudo sobre a (des)articulação da comunicação de organizações da sociedade civil, do estado e das empresas. *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, *12* (3), 114-145. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1678-69712011000300006

Cotroneo, M. (2013). Management education in Chile: From politics of pragmatism to (im)possibilities of resistance. *Universitas Psychologica*, *12*(4), 1087-1100. https://doi:10.11144/Javeriana. UPSY12-4.meic

Cotroneo, M., & Costa, P. (2010). Chilean management education: Rhetoric of pragmatism, consumerism, individualism and elitism. *Cadernos Ebape.Br*, *8*, 370-387. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1679-39512010000200012

Cox, L., & Nilsen, A. (2014). *We make our own history*. London, UK: Pluto.

Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., Hassard, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2017). A *New History of Management*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Cunliffe, A. (2016). Republication of "On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner". *Journal of Management Education*, *40*(6), 747-768. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562916674465

Cusicanqui, S. (2020). *Ch'ixinakax utxiwa on practices and discourses of decolonization*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Czarniawska, B. (Ed.). (1997). *A narrative approach to organization studies*. London, UK: Sage.

Dar, S., Liu, H., Dy, A., & Brewis, D. (2021). *The business school is racist: Act up!. Organization*, 28(4), 695-706. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420928521

Dar, S., & Cooke, B. (Eds.). (2008). *The new development management: Critiquing the dual modernization*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Dar, S., Liu, H., Dy, A. M., & Brewis, D. N. (2021). The business school is racist: Act up! *Organization*, *28*(4), 695-706. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420928521

Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P. (2006). The rise and fall of the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, *41*(2), 305-319. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2006.00261.x

Dawson, A. (2007). *Mongrel nation: Diasporic culture and the making of postcolonial Britain*. Michigan, USA: University of Michigan.

Denzin, N. (2017). Critical qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(1), 8-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416681864

Donaldson, L. (2002). Damned by our own theories: Contradictions between theories and management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *1*(1), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2002.7373701

Dussel, E. (2015). *Filosofías del Sur: Descolonización y transmodernidad*. Madrid, España: Akal Editores.

Dwivedi, O., Khator, R., & Nef, J. (2007). *Managing development in a global context*. London, UK: Springer.

Elbaum, M. (2002). What legacy from the radical internationalism of 1968?. Radical History Review, 82(1), 37-64.

Elbaum, M. (2006). *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Che, and Mao*. London, UK: Verso.

Elden, M., & Chisholm, R. (1993). Emerging varieties of action research. *Human Relations*, *46*(2), 121-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600201

Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University.

Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformations*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University.

Evans, P. (2018). *Dependent development: The alliance of multinational, state, and local capital in Brazil*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University.

Fanon, F. (1965). *A dying colonialism*. New York, USA: Monthly Review.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York, USA: Grove.Farazmand, A. (Ed.). (2002). *Administrative reform in developing nations*. London, UK: Greenwood Publishing.

Faria, A., Abdalla, M., & Guedes, A. (2021). Can we co-construct a field of management/administration engaged with the majority?. *Organizações & Sociedade*, *28*(98), 549-581. https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-92302021v28n9804EN

Faria, A., & Sauerbronn, F. (2008). A responsabilidade social é uma questão de estratégia? Uma abordagem crítica. *Revista de Administração Pública*, *42*(1), 7-33. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0034-76122008000100002

Faure, E.; Herrera, F.; Kaddoura, A.; Arthur, H.; Rahnema, V. & F. Ward(1972). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. London, UK: Unesco.

Felipe, J. M. (2005). *Embratel, história e cultura: Efeitos da política nacional de telecomunicações no desenvolvimento sócio-econômico do Espírito Santo (1980-1989)* (Tese de doutorado, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, ES).

Fine, B., Lapavitsas, C., & Pincus, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Development policy in the twenty-first century: Beyond the post-Washington consensus*. London, UK: Routledge.

Fiol, C., & Lyles, M. (1985). Organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(4), 803-813. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279103

Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2008). Beyond power and resistance: New approaches to organizational politics. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *21*(3), 301-309. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907309928

Fleming, P. (2019). Dark academia: Despair in the neoliberal business school. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(6), 1305-1311. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12521

Frank, A. G. (1969). *Latin America and Underdevelopment*. New York, EUA: New York University.

Frank, T. (2002). *One market under God*. London, UK: Vintage.Freeman, R., & Velamuri, S. (2006). A new approach to CSR: Company stakeholder responsibility. In A. Kakabadse, & M. Morsing (Eds.), *Corporate social responsibility: Reconciling aspiration with application* (pp. 9-23). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Gago, V. (2017). *Neoliberalism from below*. Durham, USA: Duke University.

Gantman, E., Yousfi, H., & Alcadipani, R. (2015). Challenging Anglo-Saxon dominance in management and organization. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 55(2), 126-129. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020150202

Gherardi, S. (2000). Practice-based theorizing on learning and knowing in organizations. *Organization*, 7(2), 211-223. https://doi.org/10.1177/135050840072001

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), 75-91. https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2005.26768

Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B. (2008). What passes as a rigorous case study?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(13), 1465-1474. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473915480.n46

Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way*. Cambridge, USA: Polity.

Giroux, H. (2010). Higher education after September 11th: The crises of academic freedom and democracy. In S. Best, A. Nocella, & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Academic repression: Reflections from the academic industrial complex* (pp. 93-112). Oakland, USA: AK Press.

Glassman, M., & Erdem, G. (2014). Participatory action research and its meanings: Vivencia, praxis, conscientization. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 64(3), 206-221. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713614523667

Global Compact (2007). The principles for responsible management education. New York, USA: UN Global Compact.

Gomes, N. (2017). *O movimento negro educador*. São Paulo, SP: Vozes.

Gonzalez, L. (2020). *Por um feminismo afro-latino-americano*. São Paulo, SP: Editora Schwarcz-Companhia das Letras.

Greenwood, D., Whyte, W., & Harkavy, I. (1993). Participatory action research as a process and as a goal. *Human Relations*, 46(2), 175-192. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600203

Grey, C. (2002). What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 26(5), 496-511. https://doi.org/10.1177/105256202236723

Grosfoguel, R. (1996). From cepalismo to neoliberalism: A world-systems approach to conceptual shifts in Latin America. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 19(2), 131-154. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40241359

Grosfoguel, R. (2005). Hybridity and mestizaje: Sincretism or subversive complicity? Subalternity from the perspective of the coloniality of power. In A. Isfahani-Hammond (Ed.). *The masters and the slaves* (pp. 115-129). New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grosfoguel, R. (2020). Epistemic extractivism. In B. Santos, & M. Meneses (Eds.), *Knowledges born in the struggle: Constructing the epistemologies of the Global South* (pp. 203-218)London, UK: Routledge.

Gulati, R. (2007). Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 775-782. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279170

Gulrajani, N. (2010). New vistas for development management: Examining radical–reformist possibilities and potential. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 30(2), 136-148. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.569

Hall, S. (2011). The neo-liberal revolution. *Cultural Studies*, 25(6), 705-728. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2011.619886

Hallin, D. C. (2008). Neoliberalism, social movements and change in media systems in the late twentieth century. In D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The Media and Social Theory* (pp. 57-72). London, UK: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2007a) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.

Harvey, D. (2007b). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610(1), 21-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00211.x

Higgins, N. (2004). *Understanding the Chiapas Rebellion*. Austin, USA: University of Texas.

Hodgkinson, G., & Starkey, K. (2011). Not simply returning to the same answer over and over again: Reframing relevance. *British Journal of Management*, 22(3), 355-369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00757.x

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hoskisson, R., Eden, L., Lau, C., & Wright, M. (2000). Strategy in emerging economies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(3), 249-267. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556394

Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (1995). The myth of the learning society. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 43(3), 290-304. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.1995.9974038

Huntington, S. P. (1993). The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22-49. Recuperado de https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1993-06-01/clash-civilizations

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking otherness from the margins. *Organization*, 13(4), 489-508. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508406065851

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2011). Critical approaches to comparative studies in organizations: From current management knowledge to emerging agendas. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28(2), 154-159. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.212

Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 32-61. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12112

Jamali, D., Karam, C., & Blowfield, M. (2015). Introduction: Corporate social responsibility in developing countries: a development-oriented approach. In D. Jamali, C. Karam, & M. Blowfield (Eds.), *Development-oriented corporate social responsibility: Multinational corporations and the global context* (pp.1-12). London, UK: Routledge.

Jammulamadaka, N., Faria, A., Jack, G., & Ruggunan, S. (2021). Decolonising management and organisational knowledge (MOK): Praxistical theorising for potential worlds. *Organization*, 28(5), 717-740. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211020463

Jarvis, P. (1983). *Adult and continuing education: Theory and practice*. London, UK: Croom Helm.

Joseph, P. E. (2013). Introduction: Toward a historiography of the Black Power Movement. In P. Joseph (Ed.), *The Black Power Movement: Rethinking the civil rights-black power era* (pp. 13-38). London, UK: Routledge.

Kaboolian, L. (1998). The new public management: Challenging the boundaries of the management vs. administration debate. *Public Administration Review*, 58(3), 189-193. https://doi.org/10.2307/976558

Kemmis, S. (2006). Participatory action research and the public sphere. *Educational Action Research*, 14(4), 459-476. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790600975593

Kieser, A., Nicolai, A., & Deisl, A. (2015). The practical relevance of management research: Turning the debate on relevance into a rigorous scientific research program. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 143-233. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2015.1011853

Khurana, R. (2010). From higher aims to hired hands. In *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands*. Princeton, US: Princeton University Press.

Knights, D. (2008). Myopic rhetorics reflecting epistemologically and ethically on the demand for relevance in organizational and management research. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 7(4), 537-552. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.35882194

Krasner, S. (1985). *Structural conflict: The third world against global liberalism*. Berkeley, USA: University of California.

Laïdi, Z. (2011). The BRICS against the West ? *Centre d'études et de Recherches Internationales* [Paris, CERI Strategy Paper No. 11].

Lipton, M. (2017). Are the BRICS reformers, revolutionaries, or counter-revolutionaries? *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 24(1), 41-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2017.1321039

Livingston, J. (1972). Myth of the well-educated manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 49(1), 33-49. Recuperado de https://hbr.org/1971/01/myth-of-the-well-educated-manager

Lynch, C. (2015). Teoria pós-colonial e pensamento brasileiro na obra de Guerreiro Ramos: O pensamento sociológico (1953-1955). *Caderno CRH*, 28(73), 27-45. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0103-49792015000100003

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2020). El Caribe, la colonialidad, y el giro decolonial. *Latin American Research Review*, 55(3), 560-573. https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.1005

Marens, R. (2004). Wobbling on a one-legged stool: The decline of American pluralism and the academic treatment of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2(1), 63-87. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:jaet.0000039008.46810.32

Masha, F. L. (1982). Decolonizing information: Toward a new world information and communication order (NWICO). *Political Communication*, 1(4), 337-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1982.9962738

Mason, P. (2012). *Why it's kicking off everywhere: The new global revolutions*. London, UK: Verso Books.

McCann, L., Granter, E., Hyde, P., & Aroles, J. (2020). 'Upon the gears and upon the wheels': Terror convergence and total administration in the neoliberal university. *Management Learning*, 51(4), 431-451. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620924162

McCaughey, M., & Ayers, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Cyberactivism: Online activism in theory and practice*. London, UK: Routledge.

McEwan, C. (2019). *Postcolonialism, decoloniality and development*. London, UK: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. London, UK: Routledge.

McSherry, J. (2005). *Predatory states: Operation Condor and covert war in Latin America*. New York, USA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Melamed, J. (2006). The spirit of neoliberalism from racial liberalism to neoliberal multiculturalism. *Social Text*, 24(4), 1-24. https://10.1215/01642472-2006-009

Melamed, J. (2016). Being together subversively, outside in the university of hegemonic affirmation and repressive violence, as things heat up (again). *American Quarterly*, 68(4), 981-991. https:// 10.1353/aq.2016.0075

Menezes, V. C. D. (2012). *Marketing e responsabilidade social corporativa: Estudo de caso no setor de telecomunicações no Brasil* (Dissertação de Mestrado em Administração, EBAPE-FGV, Rio de Janeiro, RJ).

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity*. Durham, USA: Duke University.

Mignolo, W., & Walsh, C. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Durham, USA: Duke University.

Millar, J., & Price, M. (2018). Imagining management education: A critique of the contribution of the United Nations PRME to critical reflexivity and rethinking management education. *Management Learning*, 49(3), 346-362. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507618759828

Moura, C. (2019). *Sociologia do negro brasileiro*. São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva.

Nkomo, S. M. (2015). Challenges for management and business education in a "Developmental" state: The case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2), 242-258. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0323

Ostry, J., Loungani, P., & Furceri, D. (2016). Neoliberalism: Oversold? Instead of delivering growth, some neoliberal policies have increased inequality, in turn jeopardizing durable expansion. *Finance & Development*, 53(2), 38-41. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513549118.022

Padovani, C. (2008). New world information and communication order (NWICO). In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication* (pp. 3214-3219) Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Patel, K. (2020). Race and a decolonial turn in development studies. *Third World Quarterly*, 41(9), 1463-1475. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2020.1784001

Patrick, S. (2010). Irresponsible stakeholders? The difficulty of integrating rising powers. *Foreign Affairs*, 89(6), 44-53. Recuperado de https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/south-africa/2010-11-01/irresponsible-stakeholders

Paula, A. P. (2007). Guerreiro Ramos: Resgatando o pensamento de um sociólogo crítico das organizações. *Organizações & Sociedade*, 14(40), 169-188. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1984-92302007000100010

Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a managerial revolution*. New York, USA: Harper Row.

Pieterse, J. P. (2004). Neoliberal empire. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(3), 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276404043623

Pieterse, J. P. (2012). Twenty-First Century globalization: A new development era. *Forum for Development Studies*, 39(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/08039410.2012.688859

Pochmann, M. (2014). *O mito da grande classe média*. São Paulo, SP: Boitempo.

Pochmann, M. (2022). *A grande desistência histórica e o fim da sociedade industrial*. São Paulo, SP: Ideias e Letras.

Porter, D., & Craig, D. (2004). The third way and the third world: Poverty reduction and social inclusion strategies in the rise of 'inclusive' liberalism. *Review of International Political Economy*, 12(2), 226-263. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290420001672881

Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2011). Strategy and society: The link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78-92. Recuperado de https://hbr.org/2006/12/strategy-and-society-the-link-between-competitive-advantage-and-corporate-social-responsibility

Prahalad, C., & Liberthal, K. (1998). The end of corporate imperialism. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(8), 109-117. Recuperado de https://hbr.org/2003/08/the-end-of-corporate-imperialism

Prasad, P. (2021). True colors of global economy: In the shadows of racialized capitalism. *Organization*, 13505084211066803. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084211066803

Prashad, V. (2012). Dream history of the global South. *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements*, 4(1), 43-53. Recuperado de http://www.interfacejournal.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Interface-4-1-Prashad.pdf

Prashad, V. (2013). Neoliberalism with Southern characteristics. *The rise of the BRICS*. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, New York Office. Recuperado de https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/sonst_publikationen/prashad_brics.pdf

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, *1*(3), 533-580. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005

Ramos, A. G. (1983). *Administração e contexto brasileiro* (2a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: FGV.

Rhodes, C., Wright, C., & Pullen, A. (2018). Changing the world? The politics of activism and impact in the neoliberal university. *Organization*, 25(1), 139-147. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508417726546

Rist, G. (2014). *The history of development*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Robinson, C. (2020). *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition*. Chapel Hill, USA, University of North Carolina.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London, UK: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Rose, N. (2000). Community, citizenship, and the third way. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *43*(9), 1395-1411. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027640021955955

Runhaar, H., & Lafferty, H. (2009). Governing corporate social responsibility: An assessment of the contribution of the UN Global Compact to CSR strategies in the telecommunications industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(4), 479-495. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9720-5

Saad-Filho, A., & Boito, A. (2016). Brazil: The failure of the PT and the rise of the 'New Right'. *Socialist Register*, 52, 213-230. Recuperado de https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/25598

Saldaña-Portillo, M. (2003). *The revolutionary imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development*. Durham, USA: Duke University.

Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 338-360. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.59330942

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota.

Santos, B. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Durham, USA: Duke University.

Santos, B., & Meneses, M. (2020) (Eds). *Knowledges Born in the Struggle*. London, UK: Routledge.

Santos, E., Santos, R., & Braga, V. (2015). Administração do desenvolvimento na perspectiva guerreirista: Conceitos, contribuições e implicações. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, *13*(3), 12-28. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395115511

Santos, E., Santos, R., & Braga, V. (2018). *Administração do desenvolvimento: História, teorias e perspectivas*. Vitória da Conquista, BA: Appris.

Schein, E. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems Practice*, 9(1), 27-47. https://doi.org/10.1162/152417399570287

Saraiva e Enoque, 2019

Schiller, D. (2011). Power under pressure: Digital capitalism in crisis. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 18-29. Recuperado de https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1226

Schön, D. (1983). *Reflective practitioner*. New York, USA: Basic Books.

Senge, P. (1994) *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York, USA: Random House.

Sinclair, J. (1990). Neither West nor Third World: The Mexican television industry within the NWICO debate. *Media, Culture & Society*, 12(3), 343-360. https://doi.org/10.1177/016344390012003005

Sklair, L., & Miller, D. (2010). Capitalist globalization, corporate social responsibility and social policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 30(4), 472-495. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018310376804

Spivak, G. (2009). *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak?. In L. Grossberg & C. Nelson (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana, USA: University of Illinois.

Statler, M. (2014). Developing wisdom in business school? Critical reflections on pedagogical practice. *Management Learning*, 45(4), 397-417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507614541198

Steger, M., & Roy, R. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.

Stern, R., & Barley, S. (1996). Organizations and social systems: Organization theory's neglected mandate. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 146-162. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393989

Stöhr, W., & Taylor, D. (1981). *Development from above or below? The dialectics of regional planning in developing countries*. In R. Misra & A. Mabogunje (Eds.), *Regional Development Alternatives: International Perspectives* (pp. 9-26). Nagoya, Japan: Maruzen Asia.

Stovall, D. (2020). On knowing: Willingness, fugitivity and abolition in precarious times. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 16(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039x.2020.1843969

Stuenkel, O., & Taylor, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Brazil on the global stage: Power, ideas, and the liberal international order*. London, UK: Springer.

Susman, O., & Evered, R. (1978). An assessment of the scientific merits of action research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 582-603. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392581

Teixeira, J. (2021). *Trabalho doméstico*. São Paulo, SP: Jandaíra.

Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) (2008). A global initiative, a global agenda: *The principles for responsible management education*. New York: United Nations Global Compact Office.

Thérien, J., & Pouliot, V. (2006). The Global Compact: Shifting the politics of international development. *Global Governance*, 12, 55-75. https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-01201006

Thussu, D. K. (2015). Digital BRICS: Building a NWICO 2.0? In K. Nordenstreng, & D. K. Thussu (Eds.), *Mapping BRICS media* (pp. 242-263). London, UK: Routledge.

Trow, M. (1993). Managerialism and the academic profession: The case of England. *Studies of Higher Education and Research*, (4), 2-23. https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.1994.13

Van Elteren, M. (2003). US Cultural Imperialism Today. *SAIS Review (1989-2003)*, 23(2), 169-188. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26996481

Wanderley, S., Alcadipani, R., & Barros, A. (2021). Re-centering the Global South in the making of business school histories: Dependency ambiguity in action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20(3), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2020.0156

Wanderley, S., Celano, A., & Oliveira, F. (2018). EBAP e ISEB na busca por uma administração brasileira: Uma imersão nos anos 1950 para iluminar o século XXI. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR, 16*, 64-80. https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395161917

Wanderley, S., & Faria, A. (2012). The Chandler–Furtado case: A de-colonial re-framing of a North/South (dis) encounter. *Management & Organizational History, 7*(3), 219-236. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744935912444355

Weick, K. (2001). Gapping the relevance bridge: Fashions meet fundamentals in management research. *British Journal of Management, 12*, S71-S75. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12.s1.9

Woodson, C. (1933). *The mis-education of the negro*. San Diego, USA: Book Tree.

Wynter, S. (1968). We must learn to sit down together and talk about a Little Culture: Reflections on West Indian writing and criticism, part one. *Quarterly of the Institute of Jamaica, 2(4)*, 23-32. Recuperado de https://www.peepaltreepress.com/books/we-must-learn-sit-down-together-and-talk-about-little-culture-decolonising-essays-1967-1984

Yousfi, H. (2014). Rethinking hybridity in postcolonial contexts: What changes and what persists? The Tunisian case of Poulina's managers. *Organization Studies, 35*(3), 393-421. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613499751

Zon, H. van. (2016). *Globalized finance and varieties of capitalism*. Houndmills, UK:Palgrave Macmillan.

AUHTOR CONTRIBUTION

Alexandre Faria: Project Administration; Formal Analysis; conceptualization; Data Curation; Writing – First Writing; Writing – Proofreading and Editing; Investigation; Methodology; Obtaining Financing; Resources; Supervision; Visualization.