

Call for Papers: ICMD 2021
(International Conference for Markets and Development, 2021)
Trichy, India.
(Online CFP available at <https://ismd2020.iimtrichy.ac.in/Tracks.html>)

Submission link: <https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=ismd2021>

***Rethinking Marketing, Growth, and Development: Contesting and
Contextualizing Knowledge***

Extant research in marketing is Eurocentric and marginalizes non-Western perspectives and experiences (Ellis et al. 2011, Eckhardt, Dholakia, and Varman 2013). A limited worldview has resulted in the marketing knowledge and practices rooted in the majority world (settings such as Africa, Asia, and South/Central America) being under-examined (Varman and Saha 2009, Varman and Sreekumar 2015). Even in an ostensibly “globalized” domain such as international marketing, the West remains the key referent against which “the Rest” are compared and understood. Moreover, as Türkdoğan (2019) points out, even with the increasing recognition of the variegated consumption and marketing practices in the majority world, knowledge production, and conceptualization continue to be driven by Western assumptions (see also Alcadipani 2017). In such a context, it becomes important for scholars to move beyond a monochromatic Western lens, and oversimplified dichotomies such as East and West, to contextualize and particularize knowledge creation and practices.

While globalization has resulted in greater intercultural contact, it has also led to the spread of neoliberalism. The neoliberal ideology has proven remarkably hardy, and has not only survived, but flourished in the aftermath of the financial crises and recession in the first decade of the 21st century. Crouch (2011) attributes the resilience of neoliberalism to the enormous power wielded by corporations, and places a mild hope on civil society and social movements acting as countervailing forces on such power. The onward march of neoliberalism has exacerbated Bauman’s (2000) somewhat dystopian vision of liquidity, accompanied by consumer precarity and helplessness. An unabashedly neoliberal thinking has infiltrated even academic institutions, leading to identity crises and insecurity (see Knights and Clarke 2014). On the other hand, somewhat paradoxically, nativism appears to be on the rise in countries across the world, with populist governments pandering to at times xenophobic tendencies. Neoliberalism seamlessly glides over this apparent contradiction of a globalized world order administered through populist

governments. Taking social Darwinism to the extreme, neoliberal world views force consumers to be in perpetual competition with each other, and lead precarious existences, while corporations can continue amassing wealth and power (see Verhaeghe 2014). Marketing and its allied functions have often served to buttress some of these problematic ideologies. For example, Eckhardt, Varman, and Dholakia (2019) point out that marketing concepts such as branding, customer relationship management, and consumer intimacy serve to function as a soft veneer that masks the hard financial and economic interests driven by corporations. Such masking perpetuates problematic relationships among marketers, corporations, and consumers.

There is an urgent need to critique and deconstruct the key nodal points of Eurocentric neoliberal discourse centered around the West, markets, marketing, growth, and development. Scholarship has to move beyond its oversimplified dichotomies and exclusionary tendencies for any effective critique of neoliberalism to emerge. Specifically, scholars in marketing need to engage with some important questions: How are the hierarchies of knowledge in the discipline structured? How do we subvert the existing hierarchies of knowledge to create a more participatory, inclusive, and socially just disciplinary agenda? Whose purposes do marketing and markets serve? What do we mean when we talk and write on issues such as growth and development? How are power relations embedded in markets, growth and development discourse? As academics, how can we strive for marketing and growth that caters to the needs of the most vulnerable sections of the global population? How can we contextualize marketing knowledge and understanding, and ensure that marketing discourse does not get homogenized and blindsided by focusing on specific geographies such as the West?

To this end, we invite paper submissions under the following tracks:

Tracks and track descriptions

1. Management education under neoliberalism (Track Chair: Dr. Devi Vijay)

Higher education institutions are sites for the production of a public good by creating politically conscious, critically engaged, and responsible citizens (Giroux, 2013). While higher education is a social technology of power and control that mediates and legitimates cultural capital (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990), it can become a liberating moral and political practice that prepares students to interrogate their embeddedness in the world. Education thus serves as an instrument for democratic citizenship and social transformation (Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2002). In

India, educational institutions have served as democratizing spaces through the implementation of reservations and as sites for the transformation of gender relations (Nair, 2016; Teltumbde, 2018).

Under neoliberalism, higher educational institutions are subjected to marketization, privatization and financialization, in order to deregulate the education sector in the name of economic efficiency, greater ‘freedoms’ and individual choice (Harvey, 2007). The neoliberal logic shifts attention from systemic political and economic problems to autonomous, rational individuals, responsabilized for their life ‘choices’ (Rose, 1990). Neoliberalization of higher education diminishes the capacity for humanistic values, critical thought and social and civic agency, rendering instead, enterprising consumer citizens, skilling themselves for corporations (Giroux, 2013). Knowledge is stripped of ethical and political considerations associated with participation in the public sphere and instead morphs into a form of financial capital for investment in the market economy (Giroux, 2002). Moreover, the language of tuition debt shapes career choices and world views, as students are prematurely conscripted into the marketplace, and freedom is reduced to a freedom to consume and invest. In this University as a transnational corporation, academic disciplines gain status based on their exchange value in the global market, with subordination of learning to market diktats (Giroux, 2002; Nussbaum, 2016). Academic labor is driven by managerial imperatives of efficiency, comparability, and standardization, measured through global journal rankings and accreditation processes (Parker, 2014). Rendered particularly precarious in this knowledge economy, are contractualized academic workers and doctoral students (Gupta and Nair, 2019; Jagannathan and Packirisamy, 2019). Business schools in particular become a sacred site for the production and reproduction of neoliberal orthodoxy, erasing critical thought and social concerns (Fotaki and Prasad, 2015; Varman, Saha and Skalen 2011; Vijay and Varman, 2018).

More recently, studies have investigated the Hindutva-neoliberal ideology link (Chacko, 2019; Gopalakrishnan, 2006; Williams, 2016), with higher educational institutions becoming political flashpoints. The state has steadily retreated from funding of higher education, increased fees in public institutions and under the rhetoric of sedition and anti-nationalism, sought to sanitize educational institutions of political activity (Williams, 2016). Importantly, these forces have not been uncontested. Academic writing on these issues in today’s political milieu is an act of resistance, an act of writing for change. Most saliently, in the last few months in India, students

have claimed and re-claimed university spaces to protest against recent legislations, often despite brutalities by the police and organized political factions (Sen, 2020; Sharma, 2019).

It is in this context that this track encourages new empirical and conceptual perspectives on the marketization, corporatization and financialization of higher education. We invite papers from diverse methodological and disciplinary perspectives engaged with (but not limited to) the following illustrative themes and questions:

- Inquiries into logics, values, practices of neoliberal higher education. How does neoliberalism shape the future of the university?
- How does marketization of higher education shape student subjectivities? How does it influence academic research?
- In higher education, how are prevailing inequalities along vectors of gender, caste, ethnicity, religion and class transformed (mitigated, amplified, morphed) as they intersect with neoliberal forces?
- Relationship between fundamentalist forces and neoliberal ideology in higher educational institutions.
- How do we decolonize higher education? What are the different sites and spaces of decolonization in higher education? What are the limits placed on decolonization in contemporary neoliberal educational institutions?
- Critical reflections on alternative pedagogies.
- Studies of students' resistance within higher educational institutions against tuition fees, state policies, colonial pedagogies, gender, caste or class relations. How do we resist through our academic writing?

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Devi Vijay: devivijay@iimcal.ac.in

2. Hegemony of markets and consumer resistance (Track Chair: Prof. Andreas Chatzidakis)

We are in the midst of an unprecedented crisis for both people and planet: from The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) severe warning that we need to cut annual global emissions by half in the next 11 years, to the ongoing refugee crisis, to the rise of authoritarian governments across the globe. Largely to blame for this crisis are neoliberal capitalism and the hegemony of market logics. This track welcomes topics focused on forms of collective and individual activism that attempt to address this multi-faceted crisis head on. What is the role of consumer resistance and how fit-for-purpose are our prior understandings of it? What

is the role of care and solidarity in consumer movements and social movements more broadly? And how can we begin to avow, and work with (rather than against) our multiple interdependencies and vulnerabilities?

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Professor Andreas Chatzidakis: Andreas.Chatzidakis@rhul.ac.uk

3. Marketization and development (Track Chair: Prof. Fuat Firat)

This track will focus on the impact of marketization on development. In exploring this, both concepts, ‘marketization’ and ‘development’ require deeper articulation. The construction and institutionalization of the market, specifically as part of the modern project, its entrenchment across capitalist economies originally and its contemporary global diffusion, along with a culture of neoliberalism, provide multiple avenues for observation, exploration, and study. So does the nature and definition of development. If expanded beyond an economistic conceptualization of development many alternative futures and visions of organizations of life become possible to propose and present.

Presenters for this track are encouraged to investigate all the above mentioned avenues along with the potential contradictions and synergies between the different conceptualizations of ‘marketization’ and ‘development’ proposed.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Professor Fuat Firat: fuat.firat@utrgv.edu

4. Poverty, markets, and vulnerable consumers (Track Chairs: Dr. Ramendra Singh and Dr. Apoorv Khare)

“The poor will be always with us, but what it means to be poor depends on the kind of ‘us’ they are with ... If ‘being poor’ once derived its meaning from the condition of being unemployed, today it draws its meaning primarily from the plight of a flawed consumer.”

(Bauman, 2005; p.1)

Although poverty affects more than two-thirds of our planet world, yet management literature has got interested in poverty research only in the past few decades. Popularized as base

of the pyramid (BoP) by Prahalad (2009), the concept of poverty affects not only responsible consumptions, but also the nature of our markets, which are skewed towards high income consumers. According to Mahajan and Banga (2005), 86% of our population is untouched by the reach of formal markets. The poor face income deprivations, material deprivation, homelessness, low literacy. In general they have faced very poor access to several other resources, which are available to other consumers having higher purchasing power. Across the globe, the popularization of the consumer culture has further led to discrimination and marginalization of the poor in the society. People living in poverty thus feel socially excluded, marginalized, and stigmatized from the market (Bauman, 2005). But tensions arise since, ‘being poor does not obviate socio-cultural aspirations to consume’ (Hamilton et al, 2014, pp 1834).

In the light of this context, this track welcomes submissions on various dimensions of poverty, markets and consumption that weaves in the realities of consumers’ income inequalities, marginalization, vulnerabilities, low-literacy, disadvantaged positions, and disabilities among others. Both theoretical and empirical works from a broad range of perspectives are encouraged.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Ramendra Singh and Dr. Apoorv Khare: ramendra@iimcal.ac.in, apoorv@iimtrichy.ac.in

5. The connected era, consumer subjectivity, and well-being (Track Chair: Prof. Russell Belk)

Rural India and Africa offer good examples of places that have rapidly become connected to each other and the rest of the world thanks to adoption of cheap cell phones and internet access (e.g., Tenhunen, *A Village Goes Mobile*, 2018). Thanks to leapfrogging technologies, this connectivity and access have even preceded electrification. They have also provided access to television, music and film downloads, pornography, digital currency, and much more.

These changes have also brought about social changes and disrupted traditional authority as the young and educated gain power through their mastery of these technologies. Gender hierarchies and orientations have sometimes been disrupted as well. More love marriages and marriages to partners from more distant places have resulted. Access to jobs, crop price

information, transportation, and health care have also improved and affected incomes, education, migration patterns, infant mortality and maternal deaths.

Besides the more obvious effects on health, wealth, and social connectivity, becoming connected also likely affects the way people think about themselves. These technologies are generally seen as empowering, although these benefits are not uniformly distributed within a given locale. Moreover, there are potential costs and dangers, just as there are in the more economically developed world. Problems in areas such as internet addiction, security, and privacy may be compounded by what has been called “leaping luxuries” (Belk, 1999), in which “necessities” like food are foregone in order to afford “luxuries” like internet access.

In this track we are interested in case studies, conceptual treatments, and other assessments or demonstrations of the effects of becoming connected on subjectivities and feelings of well-being. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches are welcome. While macro treatments are invited, we are especially interested in micro treatments in developing economies and cultures.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Professor Russell W. Belk: rbelk@schulich.yorku.ca

6. Rethinking consumer culture and development (Track Chair: Dr. Pia Polsa)

The first United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) is “no poverty” (<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/poverty/>). The measure of extreme poverty according to the UN is in dollars. If a person lives on less than \$1.25 a day the person is extremely poor (ibid). Even if it is acknowledged that poverty is multifaceted and not always only economical (Banerjee and Duflo, 2011) research focus has been on economic terms and particularly in business studies the economic well-being has been emphasized and market potential of the less affluent stressed (e.g. Prahalad and Lieberthal, 1998; Prahalad, 2004). The aim of this track is to ask: What is development? Whose development? What is the relationship between consumer culture and development? Namely, if the basic needs of sufficient shelter and nutrition is met then frugal lifestyles are also the most sustainable as the global statistics of ecological footprints shows (<https://worldmapper.org/maps/grid-ecologicalfootprint-2019-population/>). So, shouldn't the development rather go from consumption culture towards frugal? Shouldn't global North learn

from global South how to live sustainably and how to find well-being in frugality? Without idealizing poverty this track seeks papers that discuss critically if in the name of development consumer culture is preached to the less affluent. The track also welcomes papers that identify sustainability among the poor that can be brought as development to the rich. Additionally, the track welcomes papers addressing and investigating the silencing of global south in Consumer Culture Theory (CCT).

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Pia Polsa: pia.polsa@hanken.fi

7. Alternative imaginations of markets and development (Track Chair: Prof. Finola Kerrigan and Dr. Emily Ngan Luong)

This track invites papers which report on alternative models of ‘development’ from that which dominate the mainstream within the context of globalisation and international markets. In the face of the climate emergency, the ongoing COVID19 pandemic and social and political turmoil, calls for new ways to think about markets and development are required. Where liberalisation of global markets and economies of scale dominate discussions on stimulating economic growth, there are alternative visions of development being enacted around the world. This track calls for submissions which highlight how these alternative communities have come about in order to offer a chance for collective reflection on alternative visions for the future.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Professor Finola Kerrigan and Dr. Emily Ngan Luong : f.kerrigan@fashion.arts.ac.uk, ngane@lsbu.ac.uk

8. Decolonization and the Global South (Track Chair: Dr. Hari Sreekumar)

In his seminal analysis of the East-West relationship, Said (1978) argues that knowledge and understanding of the Orient are inexorably shaped by the specific positions occupied by Europeans as colonizers, which placed them in highly asymmetrical power relations with colonized subjects. Subsequent scholars have critiqued these power relations, highlighting notions such as postcolonial mimicry, hybridity (Bhabha, 1994), the psychological trauma wrought by colonialism (Fanon, 1952), and even the futility of launching a critique of power, when such a critique in itself gets constrained by the discourses of colonization (Nandy, 2009). Grand narratives apart, the long

shadow of colonialism can be seen in the quotidian production of knowledge and practices occurring in postcolonial societies. For example, as Ellis et al (2011) suggest, academic disciplines such as marketing are permeated by Eurocentrism, with values such as individualism, and rationalism getting emphasized. Such emphases result in these values being seen as ontological “givens” rather than the products of specific cultures and time periods. In much of the global South, the establishment of educational institutions, and the use of western pedagogical devices in these institutions has resulted in local forms of knowledge getting elided (e.g., Varman and Sreekumar, 2015).

The terminology “Global South” is used to refer to developing or poor countries in general (Arrighi, 2001; Alcadipani et al., 2012). Other terms such as countries of the “periphery,” and “Third World” are also used to refer to these countries, all indicative of a subordinate position (Alcadipani et al., 2012). These writings inform us that the “Global South,” far from being self-evident and natural, is very much a constructed category. Such references point to the presence of neo-imperialism in our political discourse. Such a view translates to management, and has consequences for knowledge production and dissemination. Knowledge emanating from the so-called Third World is often exoticized, “othered,” and seen as the product of specific circumstances, whereas western knowledge is seen as universal. Moreover, as Alcadipani (2017) points out, research and pedagogy that is borrowed from the West do not fit in neatly in many non-Western contexts. Further, challenging Western hegemony in knowledge is a difficult task, given that such challenges themselves have to be posed through the frameworks and discourses invented by the West (see Alcadipani et al., 2012). This conference track is an attempt to decolonize extant knowledge on management, and encourage contributions and perspectives from the Global South. We invite papers under the following broad themes. The list provided is indicative, and not exhaustive; submissions need not be limited to these themes.

- Markets and development in the context of the Global South
- Postcolonial perspectives on markets and development
- Critiques of Eurocentrism in knowledge and pedagogy
- Alternatives to Eurocentric perspectives
- Challenges faced by scholars in giving voice to perspectives from the Global South

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Hari Sreekumar: hari@iimtrichy.ac.in

9. Online and Physical Retailing in Emerging Economies: Promises, Patterns and Polemics (Track Chairs: Prof. Ruby Roy Dholakia and Prof. Nikhilesh Dholakia)

As late developers, emerging economies often skip many stages of development that advanced economies have gone through. This happens in physical and online retailing also. Also, as late developers, emerging economies are not wedded to 'legacy' ways of doing things; they experiment and innovate on multiple dimensions such as transacting, communicating, payments, delivery and service. A countervailing force is the weight of tradition in the emerging, sometimes several centuries old. In retailing, in many emerging economies, this means entrenched, traditional, and micro-scale retailers represent a significant social, economic and -- importantly -- political force. This session invites papers that examine the ongoing retail transitions in emerging economies: traditional to modern, domestic to multinational, physical to online, real to virtual, rural-to-urban and vice versa, re-seeking of traditions, and so on. Papers that examine tensions, histories, behaviors, conflicts, innovations, experimentation, influences, impacts, patterns -- especially at levels above individual enterprises -- are welcome. Of course, we seek geographic variety also, including comparisons and contrasts; including with advanced economies.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Professor Ruby Roy Dholakia and Professor Nikhilesh Dholakia: rrdholakia@uri.edu, nikdholakia@gmail.com

10. Enacting resilience towards sustainable outcomes (Track Chair: Dr. Stefanie Beninger)

Many agree that resilience is important, including for marketing (Trim and Lee, 2000), for communities (Bene et al., 2014), and for sustainable development (UN Habitat, 2019). Resilience as a concept gained attention in the 1960s, becoming a central focus for academic fields such as ecology (Bene et al., 2014). It has since become a lens employed when discussing social systems across various levels, including at the individual, organizational, and community level, and beyond (Westley, 2013). Publications focusing on resilience have seen an exponential increase since 2000 (Linnenluecke, 2017) and over 80 percent of organizations are concerned about resilience of, for example, their supply chains (World Economic Forum, 2013).

However, despite its increasing importance, business scholarship has paid less attention (van der Vegt et al., 2015), where resilience discussions have largely been focused on supply chain systems (Pereira and de Silva, 2015). In particular, resilience is under-theorized and under-researched in marketing (Hutton, 2016). As a result, there has been calls for increased attention to resilience in business (e.g. van der Vegt et al., 2015), where “many (if not all) avenues are open for future research in resilience” (Vogus and Sutcliffe, 2007, p. 3420).

What is resilience, however? Some define resilience as the ability to bounce back or return to a steady state (the so-called ‘engineering resilience’ (Holling, 1973). However, other work has argued that “resilience of complex adaptive systems is not simply about resistance to change and conservation of existing structures” (Folke, 2006, p. 7), rather it is also about making changes to structures and functions (van der Vegt et al., 2015). In either case, resilience requires a holistic and systematic view (Meadows, 2008), and thus dovetails with systematic enquiries of marketing.

This track welcomes topics focused on the concept of resilience, especially as it relates to marketing system actors, structures, and relationships and their role in supporting or constraining resilience and links to sustainable development. Both theoretical and empirical works from a broad range of perspectives are encouraged.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Stefanie Beninger: Stefanie.Beninger@ie.edu

11. Climate change, markets, and consumption (Track Chair: Dr. Delphine Godefroit-Winkel)

Climate change is maybe one of the most important issues in development, and marketing today (Dholakia and Atik 2016; Hall 2018). Climate change is a long-term shift in global or regional climate patterns. It refers to the rise in global temperatures from the mid 20th century to the present and is attributed largely to the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide and the presence of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Climate change is threatening our climate, life on earth, and the planet itself. In response, many countries, companies and consumers become increasingly concerned by climate change issues.

Climate change concerns regulate many consumer behaviors (Schill et al., 2019), even among younger consumers (Schill, Godefroit-Winkel, and Hogg In press). Countries, companies, and consumers who aim to combat climate change might develop two kinds of strategies, namely mitigation and adaptation strategies (Kolk and Pinske, 2004; Nilsson et al., 2004). Climate change mitigation aims to limit the increases in global temperatures by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Adaptation seeks to adjust natural and human systems in response to climate change. In other words, individuals and institutions may decide to act against the causes of climate change (mitigation) or to adapt to the consequences (adaptation).

We invite papers based on research and/or lessons from practice around the following, but not limited, themes:

- Exploring development plans at the macro and meso levels that aid combating climate change
- Examining consumer relations to innovative development programs that aid, adapt or mitigate climate change
- Identifying collaborative models to combat climate change
- Examining partnerships among NGOS, governments and businesses for environmental practices against climate change
- Investigating consumer behaviors at the BoP that aim to mitigate or adapt to climate change
- Tracing the impacts of climate change on the lives of consumers in developing countries
- Utilizing social systems to combat vulnerability related to climate change
- Identifying the initiatives of children and the younger generation to combat climate change

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Delphine Godefroit-Winkel: d.godefroit-winkel@tbs-education.ma, delphinegodefroit@yahoo.com

12. Marketing and Agnotology (Track Chair: Dr. Prabhir Vishnu Poruthiyil)

A key feature of contemporary societies is the role of disinformation (and hate speech) in skewing of policy goals away from equality and secularism towards a fusion of neoliberal and ethno-nationalist agendas (Banaji and Bhat, 2019). Disinformation intentionally confuses the public, fractures social solidarities essential for progressive transformation of societies, and thereby provides a smokescreen for elites to entrench the lucrative structural inequalities (Slater, 2014). Scholars of a relatively new field that study ignorance – agnotology – trace the origins of

this serious malaise afflicting contemporary democracies to the field of marketing (Proctor and Schiebinger, 2008; Proctor, 2012).

Agnotology scholars state in no uncertain terms: “Marketing has always involved persuasion bordering on deception...” (Proctor and Schiebinger, 2008). The paradigm case is the tobacco industry which for decades manufactured ignorance in order to deflect and scuttle policies that might have adversely affected their profit margins (ibid.). Rather shrewdly, the industry pumped money into pliant scholars (in fields that included history and health) who generated “knowledge” intended for confusing regulators by preventing a consensus on the harmful effects of tobacco. Similar more recent instances of the use of disinformation are revealed in efforts to deny climate change and sell faulty products by Volkswagen and at Boeing; the latter resulting in tragic consequences (Gardiner, 2019; McGill, 2019; McIntyre, 2018).

The pernicious impacts of marketing on vulnerable consumers and counterstrategies have received attention from marketing scholars (Andreasen, 1993; Brekert, 1995). However, serious analysis of the role of marketing strategies in the development and perfecting of the mechanisms of disinformation is yet to begin. Contributors to this track are encouraged to submit empirical and theoretical work that deals with questions such as the following: (1) How have marketing strategies manufactured ignorance? (2) How are the pure sciences (such as in medicine, or climate change) used or distorted to suit marketing strategies? (3) Can the counter-strategies to unethical marketing be translated into the public sphere? (4) Can agnotology contribute to marketing research and theorizing?

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Prabhir Vishnu Poruthiyil: vishnup@iitb.ac.in

13. Organizing radically: Alternatives to corporate capitalism (Track Chairs: Dr. George Kandathil and Dr. Rama Mohana Turaga)

The wide recognition of the accumulating adverse economic, environmental, social, and political impacts of businesses - the ever-widening income inequality, environmental degradation, exploitative labour practices, undermining of democracy and local governance to name a few - has led to calls for businesses acting more responsibly (e.g., Sukhdev, 2012). Responding to the call, one stream of studies showcase some possibilities for the businesses to be responsible such as the

creation of new legal organizational forms (e.g., benefit corporations), for-profit social enterprise organizations (e.g., hybrid organizations), multi-stakeholder partnerships or private regulatory governance models (e.g., Global Reporting Initiative, Forest Stewardship Council), and shared capitalism (e.g., ESOP-based cooperatives) (Kruse et al. 2010; Parker et al., 2014; Stubbs 2017). A more critically oriented stream of research, however, highlights that such possibilities fail to question the very ideological underpinnings and organizing structures and processes of corporate capitalism (Banarjee, 2011; Fleming 2012) which lead to the harmful externalities (Reynolds, 2018). This stream, hence, calls for exploring organizing that is radically different from these forms (Barin et al., 2017; Vijay and Varman, 2017). Heeding to these calls, a third stream of literature explores alternatives to corporate capitalism that are largely rooted in democratization, emancipation, justice, and ecological sustainability (Vijay and Varman, 2018; Parker et al., 2014; Wright, 2010; Kothari and Joy, 2017).

Following this footprint, we are particularly interested in the struggles that the alternative forms of organizing encounter to emerge and sustain within the hegemonic domination of corporate capitalism that increasingly normalizes and institutionalizes neoliberal order as the reality of (colonized) lifeworlds. The sites of the struggle could be any of the following: workspaces, social movements, the state, and the civil society. The following are some thematic examples.

- A variety of forms of cooperatives has been explored as alternative ways and forms of organizing that range from producer cooperatives to worker cooperatives. Many such extant studies consider them as alternatives mostly based on sharing of legal and economic ownership with workers (Kandathil and Varman, 2007). In the spirit of workplace democratization, we are, however, more interested in the issues of worker governance (Varman and Chakraborty, 2004) such as strategic and operational decision-making, policy making bodies of workplaces, mechanisms of representations and attendant political tensions in worker-owned and governed cooperatives (Webb and Cheney, 2014).
- In the context of the rise of philanthropic capitalism and the increasing corporatization of civil society organizations, we are interested in studies that consider civil society as sites of struggles, where the state, the people and the market interact and the people wage

emancipatory battles against the hegemony of the market and the state (Gramsci and Hoare, 1971).

- What is the role of state, both as a form of governance and public policy making system, in creating and organizing alternatives in the context of the consolidation of neoliberal 1 regime? Some examples in this direction include works on solidary economy (Eid et al., 2001) and ecologically sustainable policies and practices which the state promotes and helps sustain (Escobar 2011).
- Another theme of interest is the initiatives and struggles related to the self-organizing attempts of the communities, particularly indigenous and marginalized communities. Some examples include works on radical ecological democracy (Kothari and Joy, 2017), self-organizing of de-notified tribal communities (Shah et al., 2017), and critical works on food sovereignty (Dunford, 2015). In addressing these themes, we encourage studies that deploy conceptual stories and representations that inform alternative organizational forms and processes of organizing. Such theories, for example, could be based on works of Escobar (2011), Gandhi (2001), Ambedkar (Naik, 2003; Zene, 2013), Freire (1996) and Ibarra-Colado (2006) or/and could relate to communiting (e.g., Bollier, 2014), radical eco-feminism (e.g., Tessman, 2009), social movement theories and histories (Snow et al., 2008; Shah, 2004). We are also open to the critical examination of the forms of organizing that have been popularly acclaimed as alternatives - political corporate social responsibility (Whelan, 2012), multi-stakeholder initiatives (Pichler, 2013), and social enterprises (Dey and Steyaert, 2012; Muntean et al., 2016).

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. George Kandathil and Dr. Rama Mohana Turaga: gmk@iima.ac.in, mohant@iima.ac.in

14. Gender, markets, and the Global South (Track Chair: Dr. Srinath Jagannathan)

Following Butler (1988), it is useful to explore a performative lens of gender and understand how markets in the global south structure performances of gender. In contrast to the performative perspective on gender, perspectives based on psychological beliefs work with attributes such as confidence, assessment of self and others, willingness to collaborate with people from the other gender and the internalisation of stereotypes (Bordalo, Coffman, Gennaioli, and Shleifer, 2019).

Perspectives based on psychological beliefs assume the a priori existence of stereotypes or differences in confidence. On the other hand, performative perspectives on gender contend that stereotypes need to be repetitively and discursively performed for them to be tenable. Consequently, stereotypes are never absolute and there are multiple discursive gaps where intervention is possible.

Issues of gender must be considered in the light of democratic deficits in global governance regimes, particularly in institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (Soederberg, 2006). Powerful countries in the global north dominate the shareholding structure and voting rights in these institutions which shape the nature of markets in the global south. Corporate engagement emerging from global governance mechanisms have been described as embodying gendered forms of neocoloniality (Ozkazanc-Pan, 2019). Corporate engagement with policy in the global south has the potential to enact state capture exacerbating issues of job losses, inequality and erosion of citizenship rights (Plageron, Patel, Hochfeld and Ulriksen, 2019). The current global policy consensus has produced a large category of disposable workers, most of whom are women working in precarious conditions in the informal economy in the global south (Fagertun, 2017).

In the context of gendered forms of inequality in the global south, Byatt (2018) argues that neoliberal capital has appropriated feminism to advance the extraction of surplus. Byatt contends that neoliberal capital relies on the indebtedness of women in the global south to propose their access to financial markets through microfinance institutions to increase their purchasing power. Neoliberal capital uses the fetish of female empowerment to advance discourses of female entrepreneurialism to introduce women to networks of production and consumption which rely on notions of an enterprising capitalist self. In the process, other alternatives based on feminist solidarity and articulating a stance of resistance against neoliberal capital are interrupted. Feminist solidarity, coloniality and neoliberal capital stand in a relationship of complex ethical and cultural tension in many marketplaces in the global south such as that of surrogate motherhood where women in the global south are willing to act as surrogates for parents in the global north (Deckha, 2015).

While women's participation in markets in the global south signifies several ethical tensions and social relations of inequality, there are several attempts by women to resist neoliberal capital. Chandrasekara (2009) outlines how Sri Lankan women resist forces of global finance by

participating in traditional communities of finance and solidarity that create social wealth. Womens' resistance against neoliberal capital takes complex turns as a range of factors such as spatial mobility, cultural and economic independence and access to resources inform the outcomes of resistance (Temudo, 2018). In Philippines, womens' movements have taken militant turns to contest the globalisation of neoliberal capital and target the national state to ensure that the market based marginalisation of women is reversed (Lindio-McGovern, 2007). Womens' movements have contended that neoliberal capital has led to a stratified political economy where the global south is subordinated to the interests of the elite in the global north, and women occupy the lowest rung of the hierarchy in the markets in the global south.

In the light of the marginalisation of women in markets in the global south, and womens' resistance against marginalisation, contributions can explore a range of issues. Some indicative issues are provided below. These are by no means exhaustive, and contributors can make interventions that touch upon other issues that are central to the theme.

- How do intersections of caste, race, class and gender inform women's participation in markets in the global south?
- What are the different forms in which neoliberal capital transforms markets in gendered ways in the global south?
- What are different marketplaces that have opened up with the advancement of technology that structure ethical and political tensions related to the incorporation of women's bodies in these marketplaces?
- How has neoliberal capital structured inequality for women in the context of markets in the global south?
- How has the discourse of women's empowerment been discursively co-opted by neoliberal equality to insert women in unequal ways in markets in the global south?
- What are new organisational and institutional forms through which neoliberal capital incorporates women into markets in the global south?
- How do women construct social relations of solidarity to resist neo-colonial forms of inequality that prevail in markets in the global south?
- How do womens' resistance discursively construct agendas to resist multiple forms of inequality that marginalise them?

- How can gender and markets in the global south understood in terms of space, economic and cultural autonomy?
- How do womens' movements engage with other social movements to democratise markets in the global south?

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Srinath Jagannathan: srinathj@iimidr.ac.in

15. Historical perspectives on markets and development (Track Chair: Dr. Rajesh Bhattacharya)

Markets have existed for millennia, but a society organized largely—though, never exclusively— around markets is only three centuries old. One of the cultural conditions of existence of a “market society” is *developmentalism*— i.e. the belief that there are unending possibilities to “improving” economic life. Markets derive their legitimacy from the claim that they work better than any other institution at enabling expanded production and consumption of more and better commodities. However, “development” remains a vexed philosophical notion, which has deep implications for political choices any society makes—e.g. the rising clamour of the “degrowth” campaign in the wake of heightened awareness and concerns about climate change).

Historicizing markets requires us to recognize a) that all societies rely, to varying degrees, on market *and* non-market institutions (government, community, civil society associations etc.) for production, distribution and consumption of goods and services, and b) that specific political, economic and cultural conditions of existence (property rights, contract enforcement, law and order, trust, belief system, economic and political rights etc.) must exist for markets to emerge in a society. In short, markets are neither universal nor permanent social institutions and they are not self-reproducing, self-regulating and self-stabilizing. Hence, markets must be understood in terms of processes of their social reproduction—cultural representations, political articulations and economic transactions. Throughout history, markets have seen rises and falls in specific spheres of the economy. A historical approach to markets is thus integral to history of societies.

We invite studies—both theoretical and empirical—which contribute to historical understandings of the processes of (contingent) reproduction of markets as social institutions and their “framing” as privileged institutions of development. Specifically, we welcome studies that connect markets to economic inequalities, distribution of property, gender norms, social discrimination, human-nature interactions, local or global politics, discursive interventions, epistemes and doxas etc.

Queries related to this track may be addressed to Dr. Rajesh Bhattacharya: rb@iimcal.ac.in

Important dates:

Submissions open: 16 March 2021

Deadline for paper submissions: 30th November 2021

Notifications to authors of accepted papers: 15 September 2021 onwards

Conference registration opens: 15 September 2021

Registration closes: 15 December 2021

Conference dates: 16 to 18 December 2021

Submission guidelines:

Papers are to be submitted through the Easy Chair conference management portal. The submission link for the ICMD 2021 conference is: <https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=ismd2021>

- As an author/reviewer/track chair, you will need to create an account on Easy Chair, if you do not have one.
- We invite submissions of short papers as well as full papers.
- All papers should be submitted via the submission system to one (and only one) of the conference tracks.

- If you are unsure about the track your paper will fit into, submit it to the “Other topics” track.
- The submission deadline is **October 31, 2021**.
- Please make sure you remove ALL identifying information from the paper.
- Papers should be submitted in pdf format.
- Papers must conform to the style guidelines provided below.

Style

- 12p Times New Roman font
- Double line spacing
- A4 paper size
- Margins: 25mm on all sides
- Please keep footnotes to a minimum
- Tables, figures, and appendices should be placed at the end of the document after references. In the text indicate the place for tables and figures (e.g., Insert Table 1 about here)
- Include page numbers centered at the bottom of each page.
- Heading 1: centered, bold, capitalized
- Heading 2: left justified, bold
- Heading 3: left justified
- Citations in text and referencing: style and guidelines from **Journal of Macromarketing** are to be used: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/journal-of-macromarketing/journal200954#submission-guidelines>

Length

- Short Papers: 1500-2000 words, excluding references, figures, tables, and appendices
- Full Papers: 2000-3000 words, excluding references, figures, tables, and appendices

References

Alcadipani, R. (2017). Reclaiming Sociological Reduction: Analyzing the Circulation of Management Education in the Periphery. *Management Learning*, 48(5), 535-51.

Alcadipani, R., Khan, F.R., Gantman, E., and Nkomo, S. (2012). Southern Voices in Management and Organization Knowledge. *Organization*, 19(2), 131-43.

Andreasen, A. R. (1993). Revisiting the disadvantaged: Old lessons and new problems. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 12(2), 270-275.

Arrighi, G. (2001). Global Capitalism and the Persistence of the North-South Divide. *Science and Society*, 65(4), 469-77.

Banaji, S. and R. Bhat (2019). WhatsApp Vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India, <http://www.lse.ac.uk/media-and-communications/assets/documents/research/projects/WhatsApp-Misinformation-Report.pdf>

Banerjee A.V. and Duflo E. (2011), *Poor Economics, Rethinking Poverty and The Ways to End It*, Noida: Random House India.

Banerjee, S. B. (2010). Governing the global corporation: A critical perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(2), 265-274.

Bauman, Z. (2005). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Béné, C., Newsham, A., Davies, M., Ulrichs, M., and Godfrey-Wood, R. (2014). Resilience, poverty and development. *Journal of International Development*, 26(5), 598-623.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bollier, D. 2014. *Think Like a Commoner: A Short Introduction to the Life of the Commons*. New Society Publishers.

Bordalo, P., Coffman, K., Gennaioli, K. and Shleifer, A. (2019). Beliefs about gender. *American Economic Review*, 109(3), 739-773.

Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture (Vol. 4)*. London: Sage.

Brenkert, G. G. (1998). Marketing to inner-city blacks: Powermaster and moral responsibility. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(1), 1-18.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40, 519-531.

Byatt, B. (2018). The case of Kiva and Grameen: towards a Marxist feminist critique of 'smart economics'. *Capital and Class*, 42(3), 403-409.

Chacko, P. (2019). Marketizing Hindutva: The state, society, and markets in Hindu nationalism. *Modern Asian Studies*, 53(2), 377-410.

Chandrasekara, I. (2009). Why is finance critical? A dialogue with a women's community in Sri Lanka. *ephemera*, 9(4), 300-317.

Deckha, M. (2015). Situating Canada's commercial surrogacy ban in a transnational context: A postcolonial feminist call for legalization and public funding. *McGill Law Journal*, 61(1), 31-86.

Dey, P., and Steyaert, C. (2012). Critical reflections on social entrepreneurship. In *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business* (pp. 255-275). Gabler Verlag.

Dholakia, Nikhilesh and Atik, Deniz (2016). A Journal for a Fast-Changing World. *Markets, Globalization and Development Review*. 1 (2).

Dunford, R. (2015). Human rights and collective emancipation: The politics of food sovereignty. *Review of International Studies*, 41(2), 239-261.

Eid, F. and A. E. Bueno Pimentel. 2001. Solidary Economy: Challenges of Cooperative Agrarian Reform in Brazil. *Journal of Rural Cooperation* 29 (886-2016-64601): 141-152.

Ellis, N., Fitchett, J., Higgins, M., Jack, G., Lim, M., Saren, M. and Tadjewski, M. (2011). *Marketing: A Critical Textbook*. New Delhi: Sage.

Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World* (Vol. 1). Princeton University Press.

Fagertun, A. (2017). Localising globalisation: gendered transformations of work in emergent economies. *Journal of Development Studies*, 53(3), 311-315.

Fleming, P. (2012). *The end of corporate social responsibility: Crisis and critique*. Sage.

Fotaki, M., and Prasad, A. (2015). Questioning neoliberal capitalism and economic inequality in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 14(4), 556-575.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. UK: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (revised). New York: Continuum.

Gandhi, M. K. (2001). *The complete works of Mahatma Gandhi CD-ROM*. New Delhi: Publications Division, Government of India.

Gardiner, B. (2019). Dirty lies: how the car industry hid the truth about diesel emissions, *Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/mar/22/dirty-lies-how-the-car-industry-hid-the-truth-about-diesel-emissions>.

Giroux, H. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425-464.

Giroux, H. A. (2013). *America's Education Deficit and the War on Youth: Reform beyond Electoral Politics*. New York: NYU Press.

Gopalakrishnan, S. (2006). Defining, constructing and policing a 'new India': Relationship between neoliberalism and Hindutva. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2803-2813.

Gramsci, A., and Hoare, Q. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (p. 350). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gupta, P., and Nair, V. G. (2019). From “research in management” to “management of research”: Changing nature of doctoral programme at Indian management schools. *Decision*, 46(2), 169-175.

Hall, C M. (2018). Climate Change and Marketing: Stranded Research or a Sustainable Development? *Journal of Public Affairs*, 18 (4), e1893.

Hamilton, K., Piacentini, M. G., Banister, E., Barrios, A., Blocker, C. P., Coleman, C. A. and Saatcioglu, B. (2014). Poverty in consumer culture: towards a transformative social representation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(17-18), 1833-1857.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual review of ecology and systematics*, 4(1), 1-23.

<https://thewire.in/rights/jnu-violence-protests-abvp-students-teachers>

Hutton, M. (2016). Neither passive nor powerless: reframing economic vulnerability via resilient pathways. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(3-4), 252-274.

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: thinking otherness from the margins. *Organization*, 13(4), 463-488.

Jagannathan, S., and Packirisamy, P. (2019). Love in the midst of precariousness: Lamenting the trappings of labour in de-intellectualized worlds. *Decision*, 46(2), 139-150.

Kandathil, G. M., and Varman, R. (2007). Contradictions of employee involvement, information sharing and expectations: a case study of an Indian Worker Cooperative. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 28(1), 140-174.

Kolk, Ans, and Jonatan Pinkse (2004) “Market Strategies for Climate Change,” *European Management Journal*: Vol. 22: No. 3, 304-14.

Kothari, A. and Joy, KJ. 2017. *Alternative Futures: Unshackling India*. Authors Upfront: Delhi.

Kruse, D. L., Freeman, R. B., and Blasi, J. R. (Eds.). (2010). *Shared capitalism at work: Employee ownership, profit and gain sharing, and broad-based stock options*. University of Chicago Press.

Lindio-McGovern, L. (2007). Neo-liberal globalization in the Phillipines: its impact on Filipino women and their forms of resistance. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 23(1-2), 15-35.

Linnenluecke, M. K. (2017). Resilience in business and management research: A review of influential publications and a research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(1), 4-30.

Macgills,A. (2019). The case against Boeing, The Newyorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/11/18/the-case-against-boeing>

Mahajan, V., and Banga, K. (2005). *The 86 percent solution: How to succeed in the biggest market opportunity of the next 50 years*. Pearson Education.

McIntyre, L. (2008). *Post-Truth*, MIT Press.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

- Muntean, S. C., and Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2016). Feminist perspectives on social entrepreneurship: critique and new directions. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(3), 221-241.
- Naik, C. D. (2003). *Thoughts and philosophy of Dr. BR Ambedkar*. Sarup and Sons.
- Nair, J. (2017). The Provocations of the Public University. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 52(37), 34-41.
- Nandy, A. (2009). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi: Oxford.
- Nilsson, Andreas, Chris von Borgstede, and Anders Biel (2004) "Willingness to Accept Climate Change Strategies: the Effect of Values and Norms," *Journal of Environmental Psychology*: Vol. 24, 267-277.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2016). *Not for Profit: Why Democracy needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2019). CSR as gendered neocoloniality in the global south. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(4), 851-864.
- Parker, M. (2014). University, Ltd: Changing a business school. *Organization*, 21(2), 281-292.
- Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., and Land, C. (Eds.). (2014). *The Routledge companion to alternative organization*. Routledge.
- Pereira, C. R., and Da Silva, A. L. (2015). Key Organisational Factors to Building Supply Chain Resilience: a Multiple Case Study of Buyers and Suppliers. *Journal of Operations and Supply Chain Management*, 8(2), 77-95.
- Pichler, M. (2013). "People, planet and profit": consumer-oriented hegemony and power relations in palm oil and agrofuel certification. *The Journal of Environment and Development*, 22(4), 370-390.
- Plagerson, S., Patel, L., Hochfeld, T. and Ulriksen, M. S. (2019). Social policy in South Africa: navigating the route to social development. *World Development*, 113, 1-19.
- Prahalad, C. K. (2009). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid, revised and updated 5th anniversary edition: Eradicating poverty through profits*. FT Press.
- Prahalad, C.K. and Lieberthal, K. (1998), "The End of Corporate Imperialism," *Harvard Business Review*. 76 (4): 68-79.
- Prahalad, C.K. (2004), *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty through Profits*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.
- Proctor, R. N. (2012). The history of the discovery of the cigarette–lung cancer link: evidentiary traditions, corporate denial, global toll. *Tobacco control*, 21(2), 87-91.
- Proctor, R. N., and Schiebinger, L. (2008). *Agnotology: The making and unmaking of ignorance*. Stanford University Press.
- Reynolds, B. (2018). *The Coming Revolution: Capitalism in the 21st Century*. John Hunt Publishing.
- Rose, N. 1990. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge.

Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Schill, M. Godefroit-Winkel, D. and Hogg, K. H. (2020), “Young Children’s Consumer Agency: The Case of French Children and Recycling,” *Journal of Business Research*, 110, 292-305.

Schill, Marie, Delphine Godefroit-Winkel, Mbaye Fall Diallo, and Camilla Barbarossa (2019) “Consumers’ Intentions to Purchase Smart Home Objects: Do Environmental Issues Matter?” *Ecological Economics*: Vol. 161, 176-85.

Sen, J. (6th January 2020). ‘They Were Banging the Door With an Iron Rack’: Students, Teachers describe JNU Violence. Accessed on 25th January 2020. Retrieved from

Shah, G. (2004). *Social movements in India: a review of literature*. Sage Publications India.

Shah, P., Kandathil, G., and Kapoor, A. (2018). *Acting for Change. Alternative Organisations in India: Undoing Boundaries*, 183.

Sharma, B. (12th December 2019). *Widespread Protests Against BJP’s Communal Citizenship Amendment Bill*. Huffington Post. Accessed on 25th January 2020. Retrieved from https://www.huffingtonpost.in/entry/protest-citizenship-amendment-bill-lok-sabha_in_5ded544de4b05d1e8a5365ec

Slater, T. (2014). The myth of “Broken Britain”: welfare reform and the production of ignorance. *Antipode*, 46(4), 948-969.

Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A., and Kriesi, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The Blackwell companion to social movements*. John Wiley and Sons.

Soederberg, S. (2006). *Global Governance in Question: Empire, Class and the New Common Sense in Managing North-South Relations*. London: Pluto Press.

Stubbs, W. (2017). Sustainable entrepreneurship and B corps. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(3), 331-344.

Sukhdev, P. (2012). *Corporation 2020*. Penguin UK.

Teltumbde, A. (2018). *Republic of Caste: Thinking Equality in the Time of Neoliberal Hindutva*. New Delhi: Navayana.

Temudo, M. P. (2018). Men wielding the plough: changing patterns of production and reproduction among the Balanta of Guinea-Bissau. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 18(2), 267-280.

Tessman, L. (Ed.). (2009). *Feminist ethics and social and political philosophy: Theorizing the non-ideal*. Springer Science and Business Media.

Trim, P. R., and Lee, Y. I. (2008). A strategic marketing intelligence and multi-organisational resilience framework. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(7/8), 731-745.

UN Habitat (2019), *Resilience*, Retrieved from <https://oldweb.unhabitat.org/resilience>.

Van Der Vegt, G. S., Essens, P., Wahlström, M., and George, G. (2015). Managing Risk and Resilience: From the Editors, *Academy of Management Journal*. 58, (4), 971-980.

Varman, R., and Chakrabarti, M. (2004). Contradictions of democracy in a workers' cooperative. *Organization studies*, 25(2), 183-208.

Varman, R., and Sreekumar, H. (2015). Locating the Past in its Silence: History and Marketing Theory in India. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 7(2), 272-79.

Varman, R., Saha, B., and Skålén, P. (2011). Market subjectivity and neoliberal governmentality in higher education. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(11-12), 1163-1185.

Vijay, D., and Varman, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Alternative Organisations in India: Undoing Boundaries*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

Vijay, D., and Varman, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Alternative Organisations in India: Undoing Boundaries*. Cambridge University Press.

Vogus, T. J., and Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Organizational resilience: towards a theory and research agenda. In 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 418-3422.

Webb, T., and Cheney, G. (2014). Worker-owned-and-governed co-operatives and the wider co-operative movement: challenges and opportunities within and beyond the global economic crisis. In *The Routledge companion to alternative organization* (pp. 88-112). Routledge.

Westley, F. (2013). Social innovation and resilience: how one enhances the other. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 11(3), 28-39.

Whelan, G. (2012). The political perspective of corporate social responsibility: A critical research agenda. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22(4), 709-737.

Williams, T. (2016). Higher education is not 'for sale': Thought as sedition in a neoliberal nationalist paradigm. *South Asian History and Culture*, 7(3), 319-321.

World Economic Forum (2013), *Building Resilience in Supply Chains*, Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_RRN_MO_BuildingResilienceSupplyChains_Report_2013.pdf

Wright, E. O. (2010). *Envisioning real utopias* (Vol. 98). London: Verso.

Zene, C. (Ed.). (2013). *The political philosophies of Antonio Gramsci and BR Ambedkar: Itineraries of Dalits and subalterns*. Routledge.