Deviant scrutiny methodology: Applications in the war against inequality

Evandro Bocatto, PhD
Associate Professor
MacEwan University
Canada

Eloisa Perez-de-Toledo, PhD
Associate Professor
MacEwan University
Canada

Abstract

We argue that research methodologies in management sciences often neglect the negative impact businesses may have on societies. To mitigate this problem, we suggest a deliberate integration of adjacent effects in the data collection of any topics under study. We call this approach to data sampling and collection, deviant scrutiny methodology. Deviant scrutiny can be defined as research methodology that emphasizes an integrative data collection that actively incorporates a variety of externalities into the dataset. The methodology shares three characteristics with Thomas Kuhn's view: 1. an identified conception, metaphysics and values, viz., the approach includes externalities (i.e., sense of purpose); 2. an historical consideration focusing on emerging topics, or social facts, that affects society and organizations (i.e., sense of context); and, 3. the compulsory, by protocol, integration of evidences that challenge taken for granted assumptions and theories, and confronts the biases affecting scientific communities-of-practice (i.e., sense of awareness).

Keywords: mixed methods, epistemology, deviant scrutiny, paradigm

1. Introduction

The term deviant comes from the Latin words: *de* meaning "from" and *via* meaning "road", so deviant means "off-road or off-path". It has been used in several fields of study (e.g., Law, Medicine, Psychology, Pedagogy, Sociology) and has been transformed into an oxymoron when associated with the word "positive", that is, positive deviant, or positive deviance. In Psychology, the construct 'positive deviance' is defined normatively as intentional behaviours that depart from the norms of a referent group in honourable ways (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004). In management sciences, in special under the field of positive organizational scholarship, positive deviant has been related to individuals or mechanisms that move beyond the normal and towards the extraordinary (K. S. Cameron & Caza, 2003; K. S. Cameron & Dutton, 2003). Freeman (1999) uses the term "divergent stakeholder theory" to postulate the necessity of bringing together theories and methods for understanding organizations that are divergent from the stockholder model and thus helping the creation of a convergent stakeholder theory. Arnold and Hartman suggest that 'positive deviance' may be instrumental for positive social change (2005). Parkin (2010) integrates the notion of sustainability and defines the term as a person who does the right thing for sustainability, despite being surrounded by the wrong institutional structures, processes, and uncooperative people. Such definitions and usage of the term poses one caveat, however. There are judgments *a priori* of the analyses and interpretations of the individual and social issues (i.e., "honourable"; "extraordinary"; "positive change"; "right thing"). In other words, the research assesses what the researcher had already preconceived as positive. Moreover, the attempt to consider successful deviation as a parameter for

"positive deviation" (Sternin & Choo, 2000) falls short on controversial situations. While, for example, terminating child labour in developing countries seems a correct social change, much more controversy may be found in the debate for a universalization of the health care system.

In management science research, emergent debates are frequent. In the above-mentioned quotation, Paul Krugman, the recipient of the 2008 Nobel Prize in Economics, highlights an intriguing recent phenomenon: social inequality. What seemed to be a result of years of application of social science to orient governmental policies, at least on the majority of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, has failed. In 2014, although in these countries stock markets have recovered to the same level they were before the 2008 financial crisis, the social recovery in terms of jobs, income, and social protections did not follow. According to the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, CEO pay for Canadian public companies listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange has ballooned by 73 per cent between 1998 and 2012. In contrast, the average Canadian full-time worker's annual salary has only grown by six per cent during the same period.One may check the GINI Index to quickly verify these trends worldwide. Even in the European Union, where more Keynesian economics has always taken place, inequality growth and the disconnection between markets and wages is a fact. So, which are the reasons for the disconnect between stock markets and the rest of societies?

A possible explanation, and here is where the concept of positive deviance becomes ambiguous, is when another Nobel Prize in Economics (in 1976), Milton Friedman, argues that such disconnection is not worrisome,as poverty is an externality that eventually will be corrected by market forces of supply and demand, "the invisible-hand", and thus the stockholder is not responsible for the contemporary growing inequality. What seems central to the dominant narrative in business in the US is the reduction of the multiple claims of ownership to financial ownership. In other words, the non-financial investments made by other stakeholders are overlooked while capital investment is made central (Freeland, 2012; Kempf, 2008; Klein, 2007; Pilger, 2003).

The interests of the societies are equalized to what is interesting for their economies, which is represented by corporations as entities, and managers as decision-makers. The interests of other stakeholders like workers, suppliers or host communities are irrelevant because differently from the 'real' owner (i.e., the stockholder), they have no, or little, say in the decision-making process. The dominant model rationale is parsimonious: the free markets are more efficient and a greater efficiency would translate into more development (Freeman, 2010; Stiglitz, 2002). The typical narrative is: "The market did (or did not) react well to this decision…" and no coercion is needed in the process of manufacturing this consent (Herman and Chomsky 2008).In our view, among several instruments that are inadvertently, or strategically, used to produce consent are theory building and research methodology. This paper constructs its narrative from this controversial social fact (i.e., the social inequality) and the resultant difficulty in establishing an operational construct of "positive" deviance able to address the fact. Hence, the paper reflects on the purposes and procedures of management sciences and related research methodologies and research practice. It defines deviant scrutiny as a research methodology with a particular data collection protocol, then describes the process of sampling and data collection, and provides examples of its application.

2. The Discovery of a Research Methodology

By mid-2016, political analysts who dared to suggest that Donald J. Trump had any chance to become the nominee of the Republican Party were laughed at. Those analysts were probably capturing, through intuition, perception, and/or interviews, neglected needs and desires of whom later became the focus of the presidential campaign, "the forgotten American middle class". In other words, the attention to social inequality in the US may have elected a potential disruptor of a decades old trend, at least that was the Trump's campaign thesis. This mistake is extremely relevant as three days before the general election, institutes like the Princeton Election Consortium projected Hillary Clinton had 99 per cent chances of winning the election, the failed data analysis by probability statistic was found by the university's statistical Bayesian model (Wang, 2016).

In terms of science evolution, Thomas Kuhn (1996) on his sociology of science work "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" described findings that invited the scientific community to rethink previous beliefs, especially the Vienna's Circle. While the fallibility hypothesis of Karl Popper (1972) addresses scientific changes within a micro historic viewpoint, considering instantaneous process of experimental rejection of a theory, the conception of the scientific revolutions of Kuhn demonstrates the complexity of these processes, considering a historical

scale, and also, a micro sociological context opening the idea of historic epistemology. For Kuhn, the science is based on a paradigm acquired that provides conceptual elements, experimental applications, and some deeper scientific conceptions, metaphysics and values (i.e., purpose).

New conceptions and values will obligate the renovation of the paradigm eventually while maintaining the rigorous scientific practices. This process is the scientific revolution that permits re-establishing the loss of precision in the previous paradigm and the need for a new theoretical-experimental coherence. This epistemology, in confrontation to the logical positivism, presents a clear historical character (i.e., emergent and contextual) that could not be conceived without historical perspective. Interesting is the fact that the revolutions do not come from ignorance of science, but the change takes place from a rigorous science to an even more rigorous one (i.e., more inclusive explanation while still parsimonious), which is very close to Popper's concept of conjectures and refutations. However, it defers from Popper when it presents the science's social character as an essential part of science. It is a community of specialists who accepts the paradigm as the state of the art of the specific science, besides they are the ones who will accept the revolution or will fight against it.

The deviant scrutiny (henceforth DS) shares three characteristics with Kuhn's view: 1. an identified conception, metaphysics and values, viz., the approach includes externalities and issues often neglected by the dominant narrative (i.e., sense of purpose); 2. an historical consideration focusing on emerging topics, or social facts, that affects society and organizations (i.e., sense of context); and, 3. the compulsory, by protocol, integration of evidences that challenge taken for granted assumptions and theories, and confronts the biases affecting scientific communities-of-practice (i.e., sense of awareness).

The compulsory data collection of externalities suggested by the methodology permits the discovery of new facts that may impair the 'supreme' institutions, weakening their authority as these new facts remain unexplained. The crisis opens space for inventing an alternative theory. As Kuhn argues, the new paradigm may not be a continuum of the last one, it often defers conceptually. DS may disrupt the *status quo* as new information hardly fits mainstream explanation.

As an approach to sampling and data collection, there are criteria to be developed, a protocol. The paper builds on the considerations of Bazeley (2003), Brannen (2005), and Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010) who reviewed and treated issues, controversies and challenges research methods in general, and mixed methods in specific, encounter. R. Cameron (2011) summarizes and develops them into five Ps: paradigms, pragmatism, praxis, proficiency, and publishing. This paper introduces two new ones: Purpose and Presence.

The challenges of paradigm (i.e., Paradigm) relates to the influences epistemological and philosophical bases may bring to derivate research methodology. As DS inverts the process looking at emerging social facts first, it is a priori non-paradigmatic. Such aspect of the method must be interpreted in two ways. First, emergent means narratives that come out from the social context and imaginary, from curiosities and interests of the researcher, and yet from rediscoveries about longstanding issues.

Second, to avoid a fake detachment, in other words, the problematic belief that the scientist is neutral on his/her sampling and analysis, DS actively pursuit besides the conventional, unconventional sources of data and narratives from different societal stakeholders presented on unconventional media that are dealing with the topic under investigation and its surroundings (i.e., adjacent phenomenon). Such inclusive operation reignites the hope for a rational and reflective agent as Alvesson and Deetz (2006) understand it but who is now well-informed by the complementary sources of data.Also, the inclusiveness of this methodology avoids the epistemological relativism and short-sighted practicalism (i.e., Pragmatism) as unconventional information cannot be simply disregarded.

The methodology invites the researcher to take a conscious stance on the epistemological and philosophical approach to be chosen to analyse and interpret the data. The data may be explained by, for instance, Habermas'(1972)epistemology of empiric-analytical, historic-hermeneutical, or critical-emancipatory frameworks. Hopefully, the new data collected through the criterion of inclusiveness will reveal that mainstream approaches may not explain the phenomenon under study with an ease and, therefore, new concepts, metaphysics and values may take place. As per the conjunction of theory and practice (i.e., Praxis), DS suffers the same challenges as most of the methodologies, that is, the researcher tries to determine how appropriate is the methodological tools utilized (e.g., data bases, interviews, surveys) to the epistemology and theories used to

explain the phenomenon. Research practice shows that often researchers follow and enhance methods demonstrated on seminal works. DS may demonstrate that new tools are necessary.

As per the capacity of the researcher to perform and integrate different qualitative and quantitative methods (i.e., Proficiency), DS simply reminds the researcher that methods, and integration of methods, that may reduce dropping off existing information should be taken into consideration. For the probability of publishing (i.e., Publishing) research under the label of Deviant Scrutiny, it is expected that the methodology will be able to bring about more convincing narrative of findings and conclusions. DS is not better or worse than other methods, it just covers some methodological lacunas of inclusiveness as its starting point is the source of data.

In that sense, it introduces two new Ps, purpose and presence. Purpose means the methodology's endorsement for an active search for deviant information in breadth and depth.Finally, presence meaning the being and existence of a researcher capable of assessing the social reality in depth and thus making recommendations to its improvement. Instead of what a postmodern approach would label the social scientist as another social actor influenced by his or her preferred group of interest, presence facilitates a core distinction between academic freedom and intellectual honesty. There is no academic freedom without a responsible exercise of intellectual honesty. In that sense, DS methodology's compulsory search for new data from unconventional sources may change the deepest beliefs of the scientist him/herself after profound analysis of a phenomenon.

3.Methodology definition and description

The deviant scrutiny is a research methodology that emphasizes an integrative kind of data collection, which actively incorporates a variety of externalities into the dataset. The dataset incorporates thus conventional and unconventional sources of information. By sources of information, we mean: 1. Theories from the mainstream and/or emerging from/conflicting with it; 2. Qualitative and quantitative methods both extensively used and/or new developments; 3. Data from traditional (or conventional) sources but also non-traditional (or unconventional). The approach transforms the researcher epistemologically into a discoverer of facts and an inventor/developer of theories. Like an investigative reporter, the researcher at first engages on an attitude of open-minded in search for deviant information. In that sense, the investigative researcher starts to find inconvenient, which may be defined as data that may affect negatively, and thus change, positively reported business' performance. Subsequently, the researcher becomes a data analyst confirming or adding new aspects for existent theory or proposing new theory.

Deviant Scrutiny starts with a problem (i.e., the phenomenon under study) but goes beyond. The methodology explores potential discourses, issues and data sources that are absent to the phenomenon under scrutiny. The purpose is to be deviant from the mainstream thinking (i.e., "think outside of the box") and, eventually, find neglected information. The methodology objective is to actively search and, in case of being found, include them, and then, chose a framework for explanation. In that sense, the sequence of events, or the DS protocol, suggested is:

1. Choose a research topic;
2. Review "conventional" literature (i.e., from an induced paradigm's publications);
3. Active seek for information about the research topic chosen on unconventional sources;
4. Compare conventional and unconventional data (i.e., are them similar, partially similar, with new nuances, in contradiction or deviant?); and,
5. Choose consciously the epistemological, philosophical and theoretical framework to analyse or interpret the findings. Otherwise, build new theory.

Whereas, traditional literature review guarantees the legitimation and scientific accuracy of an article due to due processes like blind reviews. It seems clear that from the identification of an emerging topic to its appearance on a scientific journal there is inevitably a delay. The delay often exists because researchers need time to investigate or because paradigm prison pushed way the symptomatic data. By actively searching for unconventional data, DS addresses both reasons of delay. To the former new evidences may be quickly incorporated to the researcher who is now amplifying the range of his/her radar and, to the later, as an attitude of open-minded is consequential paradigm becomes flexible by trying to assimilate new data.

4.Unconventional sources

The issue of searching information from unconventional sources is both an opportunity and a threat to DS methodology. Up to this point in the paper, it must be clear the DS forces the inclusion in the research sample of all the stakeholders who seem somehow relevant to the understanding of the phenomenon. For example, let us take an adjacent phenomenon of poverty in the United States of America: homelessness. After some interviews with homeless people, it does not take long for an interviewer to connect the effect homelessness with the plausible cause of personal bankruptcy after a personal illness or accident of an individual not covered, or thought to be covered, by a health insurance plan(Neumann, 2015). Yet, recent data in this same country shows a great number of war veterans who had little or no support to transition to the civilian life, and thus ended up on the streets(Ijadi-Maghsoodi, 2017).

Now, the same interviewer with a more in-depth understanding about the phenomenon of homelessness may recommend, among other things, policies for more affordable healthcare and support for the vets. Nevertheless, we would like to highlight a more controversial source. Information present in the content of newspapers, business magazines, documentaries, music, and new social media (e.g., YouTube videos, Twitter messages, blogs, actions caught by smartphones' cameras, and so on) are deemed untrustworthy, non-factual based, for most of the scholars, despite of the fact that this content often shapes social beliefs, values and interests, that is, the social imaginary that becomes part of daily conversations. These new beliefs may help to elect politicians who are able to institutionalize laws, policies and create institutions. In other words, they were a covert source of information to the researcher discarded unnecessarily. We want to make clear the distinction between, "facts" and "social facts". In the same lines of Searle (1995, p.1) who postulates "…there are portions of the real world, objective facts in the world, which are only facts by human agreement", to us, social facts are facts with interpretation. DS may help reduce biases in this interpretation. Untreated unconventional information may create biases, positive or negative, in the mind of the social actors, researchers included, exactly because they are untreated. The problem lays with all the social facts and sources that are not investigated by a matter of prejudice originated from the present academic *modus operandi* in favour of the dominant model, on one hand, and conventional sources on the other. In our own experience, a PhD program 101 rule would: "In your papers, quote mainly top journals, if you want to publish it", as if these interpreted as "top" were the recipients of definitive truth. DS protocol may facilitate the differentiation between the fabrication of consent, as the above-mentioned Herman and Chomsky argue, and conversely the deeper exploration of an issue and the creation of a convincing scientific explanation. There are, however, several ways to deal with this issue, the following example will serve as an illustration.

5.Illustrative case

In 2006, a documentary called "An Inconvenient Truth" directed by David Guggenheim and bringing the former Vice President of the United States Mr. Al Gore as the main character came out. The documentary became unusually a blockbuster, a "must see" movie. An Inconvenient Truth presents for the first time to the public evidences about the relationship between burning fossil fuels and global warming. Al Gore gives his own testimony on his attempt to take scientific data to the American Congress suggesting steady and considerable raise of emissions since first measured. The congress committee for the environment disregarded the information. The documentary becomes an Academy Award Winner, and subsequently, in the same year Al Gore receives the Nobel Peace Prize (joint award with environmental researchers of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change from the United Nations). In September 2013, the Panel reinforced, with greater level of confidence, the fact that the Earth is warming at an accelerated rate and humans are responsible for more than half of that change. During the years since the success of the documentary, members of the society (politicians and citizens) started a heated conversation about the topic, while members of the business world started to invest heavily on sustainability. This world market is growing by "5% a year and is expected to triple by 2030" (Szabó, 2017, p.425).Following this trend represented in the documentary, research on the management of sustainability is booming. Conferences, journals, academic curriculum and programs, and research centres are evident institutionalizations of this new social fact.

It is known that An Inconvenient Truth was not the only source of information about the environment but its brutal impact (in society and academy) cannot be denied. The example shows a whole process of social validation and narrative construction of the documentary. From an Aristotelian framework on rhetoric assessment (e.g.,Demirdöğen 2010), both, the problem and the presenter, have ethos, or reputation, the argumentation that is

based, partially, on scientific data but also on speculation still maintains its logos, or logic, and, the argument can awake emotions, or pathos, on the kind of audiences that attended Al Gore lectures or watched the movie.

Not all sources of deviant information are presented by known people. Besides, documentaries are on different stages of making their way towards social recognition. There is thus a mixed form of validation. The "Inconvenient Truth" is an example of mature validation, that is, the documentary per se brings scientific evidences regarding its main thesis and other sources of similar conclusions that are used in the process of triangulation of sources. In that sense, documentaries and other sources, may be classified in three different momentum:

1. Early stage: source just launched; emerging topic with local interest;
2. Developmental stage: source starts getting attention, and other sources and studies corroborate conclusions; and,
3. Mature stage: source, and its additional triangulations, forces change in society including the scientific and business communities.

DS argues that management sciences would benefit with the integration of unconventional sources despite of their stage of validation. The strength of the narrative grows from stage 1 to 3, but it must be a researcher decision to courageously bring the information to front or simply abandon the deviant "noise". The researcher is an early adopter of information who understands the risk of taking a lead to nowhere.

A stage 2 example would be the documentary Sicko by Michael Moore which added information to the public regarding the universalization, or not, of the health care system and the "lethal" behaviour of Health Insurance Companies in the United States. Likewise, the "Inside Job" by Charles H. Ferguson that brings awareness about the regulation of the financial market and executive compensation would be on stage 2. "Inside Job" won the 2010 Academy Award for Best Documentary Feature. "Food, Inc." by Robert Kenner, and "Hungry for Change" by James Colquhoun and Laurentine Ten Bosch which examines corporate farming and concludes that agribusiness produces unhealthy food would be still on stage one.

As examples of other sources, concerning the frustration of younger generations presented on the "Occupy Movement", we portrait any kind of music disclosing the life conditions of the less fortunate or minorities, like the 2014 top hit "Royals", a song recorded by singer-songwriter Lorde that brings on its lyrics: "*And we'll never be royals. It don't run in our blood. That kind of luxe just ain't for us*." Such lyrics become sources of narratives that eventually may be taken into consideration by researchers, policymakers and business people, who may take actions and solve or minimize the problem. Yet, content can be captured from new technology platforms such as YouTube videos or Twitter messages, which often go viral on such social networks and make known the voice of unsatisfied customers/citizens. Same sources in different idioms may be an interesting triangulation (of languages) as competitive explanatory views may be taking place on different social imaginaries.

The legitimation of a source built on its ethos, logos and pathos and the observation of its stages (and thus strength) are forms of validation focused on the source. In the following, the article discusses traditional forms of validation applied to the DS.

6.DS incorporating traditional criteria for research validation

Among the criteria traditionally used to validate research, sampling, triangulation, saturation, consistency, reliability and generalization are applied to DS methodology.

Onwuegbuzie and Collins (2007, p.304) refer to four major crises to mixed methods research – representation, legitimation, integration, and politics – and indicate how each of these crises can inform considerations of sampling design. DS is an additional option to cope with these crises. One approach for sampling the unconventional sources is based on Pettigrew (1990). Pettigrew suggests that if the phenomena to be observed must be contained within a single or relatively small number of cases, extreme situations, critical incidents and social dramas may be considered. For example, management scientists dedicate sometimes their entire careers to explain why organizations as successful (e.g., profitability; stock value). They apply theory, define constructs and create models to be tested. Apple computers is often in focus as a successful case. Recently, however, a critical incident occurred. News on different media present the company as a "poor" taxpayer. "So, how much tax did Apple pay?" Forbes Magazine asks on January 11th, 2012. Such extreme incident led authorities in United States

and Europe to consider taking actions against the company and, management scientists to consider tax evasion and/or loopholes as a possible explanation of the company's success, even if partially. Another, approach to sampling called theoretical sampling is described by Glaser and Strauss (2009). In the case of DS, different sources may provide similar or different information about the topic. In other words, unconventional sources may provide:

1. similar information to the mainstream belief; 2. different information from the mainstream; or, 3. the level of difference between them (i.e., new highlights of existing knowledge vs. total disagreement). Cases 2 and 3 suggest discovery of new facts different from the mainstream.

We have highlighted the matter of data inclusion or compulsory triangulation of different sources of data. As legitimation is also a concern, we rely in the idea that triangulation is also defined as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon" (Denzin, 1973, p.291), and, in that sense, DS welcomes quantitative and qualitative methodological tools and analyses.

In relation to sampling saturation, DS resembles Glaser and Strauss (2009) criterion, that is, the saturation of the data collection occurs when no new information is obtained from new collection and initial analysis. The findings become repetitive or saturated.

For research consistence, it is proposed the idea of "multiple operationism" developed by Campbell and Fiske (1959) to whom more than one method should be used in the validation process to ensure that the discrepancy reflected refers to the trait assessed and not to the methodology. Consistence criteria resemble the triangulation strategy, which in the case of DS, besides different methodological tools, different sources provide the additional effect. Thus, DS guarantees what Eisenhardt proposes, a "stronger substantiation of constructs and hypotheses" (1989, p.538) and "constant juxtaposition of conflicting realities [that] tends to 'unfreeze' thinking, and so the process has the potential to generate theory with less researcher bias than theory built from incremental studies or armchair, axiomatic deduction" (Eisenhardt 1989, p.546).

In terms of generalization, the paper refers to Churchill and Wertz (2001, p.254) who advocate that "the attainment of various levels of generality, as well as knowledge of what is unique in a particular case, requires qualitative comparisons of different individual cases, real and imagined, in which the researcher strives to intuit convergences and divergences and, thereby, gains essential insight into relative levels of generality" (i.e., a structural understanding of individual, typical, or universal features). Different and unconventional sources facilitate latter assessment of convergences and divergences.

Regarding research reliability, the article refers (Giorgi, 1985, p.96): "Thus, the chief point to be remembered with this type of [qualitative] research is not so much whether another position could be adopted (this point is granted beforehand) but (rather) whether a reader, adopting the same viewpoints as (those) articulated by the researcher, can also see what the researcher saw, whether or not he/she agrees with it." In other words, from the initial inclusion of deviant data to the choice of epistemological position and methodological tools (e.g., interviews, surveys, statistical models), if the researcher is able to convince the reader about the accuracy and completeness of the data collected, the application of DS methodology will be considered reliable.

7.Conclusion

The deviant scrutiny is a methodology anti-ideology as it abandons *a priori* choice of epistemological, philosophical and theoretical positions. The forced inclusion of unconventional sources of data and the suspension of concepts, metaphysics and values may allow the research findings and conclusions to represent virtually all those affected by the topic under investigation. For this reason, DS may address the challenge of finding collective explanations of social facts by stakeholders holding contested preferences initially. New information often benefits cooperative learning processes, which take place in the dimension of moral insight, practical knowledge, communicative action, and the consensual regulation of conflict (Habermas, 1972).

The researcher who dismisses critical information for the sake of maintaining harmony, and status quo, in a specific community of practice loses the opportunity of discovering facts and inventing new theory. It seems inevitable that deviant data starts to be integrated into the researcher radar. Take the example of the well stablished Sustainalytics data base from Thomson Reuters, besides the self-reported and transformed into numeric scores of specific areas such as environment, corporate social responsibility, and governance, the Sustainalytics is

open to include, although still in a lesser amount, reports of controversies and incidents often from court decisions, ongoing lawsuits, and ethical scandals affecting companies present in the its base. Such reports add unconventional sources to conventional data, opening opportunities for discovery and for a better description of reality.

The deviant scrutiny methodology does not aim to discover positive deviances but its broader scope for data collection may facilitate such discovery. Metaphorically, the article concludes that the deviant scrutiny makes sure that "visible minorities" and their issues and conditions, like poverty, are incorporated into the mainstream research agenda in management sciences.

References

Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. A. (2006). *Critical Theory and Postmodernism Approaches to Organizational Studies*.

Arnold, D. G., & Hartman, L. P. (2005). Beyond sweatshops: positive deviancy and global labour practices. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 14*(3), 206-222.

Bazeley, P. (2003). Teaching mixed methods. *Qualitative Research Journal, 3*(Special issue), 117-126.

Brannen, J. (2005). *Mixed methods research: A discussion paper*: ESRC National Centre for Research Methods.

Cameron, K. S., & Caza, A. (2003). Contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship. *American Behavioral Scientist*.

Cameron, K. S., & Dutton, J. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cameron, R. (2011). Mixed methods research: the Five Ps framework. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 9*(2), 96-108.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychol Bull, 56*(2), 81-105.

Churchill, S. D., & Wertz, F. J. (2001). An introduction to phenomenological research in psychology: Historical, conceptual, and methodological foundations. In K. J. Schneider, J. F. T. Bugental, & J. F. Pierson (Eds.), *The handbook of humanistic psychology: Leading edges in theory, research and practice* (pp. 247-262). London: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. (1973). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*: Transaction publishers.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review, 14*(4), 532-550.

Freeland, C. (2012). *Plutocrats: The New Golden Age*: Random House Digital, Inc.

Freeman, R. E. (1999). Divergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of management review, 24*(2), 233-236.

Freeman, R. E. (2010). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*: Cambridge university press.

Giorgi, A. (1985). *Phenomenology and psychological research*: Duquesne Univ Pr.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*: Transaction Books.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and human Interests (paperback)*: Beacon Press, USA.

Ijadi-Maghsoodi, R. (2017). Homeless vets with families: An untold part of veterans' struggles [Press release]. Retrieved from http://theconversation.com/homeless-vets-with-families-an-untold-part-of-veterans-struggles-77539

Kempf, H. (2008). *How the rich are destroying the earth*: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*: Macmillan.

Krugman, P. (2014, January 8th, 2014). On Fighting the Last War (On Poverty). *New York Times,* p. n.d.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions*: University of Chicago press.

Neumann, J. (2015). Health problems can lead to loss of home [Press release]. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-finances-foreclosure/health-problems-can-lead-to-loss-of-home-idUSKBN0KG2D420150107

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The Qualitative Report, 12*(2), 281-316.

Parkin, S. (2010). *The positive deviant: Sustainability leadership in a perverse world*: Earthscan.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1990). Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. *Organization science, 1*(3), 267-292.

Pilger, J. (2003). *The new rulers of the world*: Verso.

Popper, K. R. (1972). *Objective knowledge: An evolutionary approach*: Clarendon Press Oxford.

Searle, J. (1995). *The social construction of reality*. London: Allen Lane.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Sonenshein, S. (2004). Toward the construct definition of positive deviance. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*(6), 828-847.

Sternin, J., & Choo, R. (2000). The power of positive deviance. *Harvard Bus Rev*, 14-15.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents* (Vol. 500): New York Norton.

Szabó, A. (2017). Green SMEs in the European Union. *Management, Enterprise and Benchmarking in the 21st Century*, 413.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*: Sage.

Wang, S. (2016, November 6th, 2016). All estimates point toward HRC>50% probability. What determines the exact number? *Princeton Election Consortium.* Retrieved from http://election.princeton.edu/2016/11/06/is-99-a-reasonable-probability/