Introduction to the Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization

Nicolas Bencherki, Joëlle Basque, and Timothy Kuhn

A more recent version of this introduction is available as:

Bencherki, N., Basque, J., & Kuhn, T. R. (2022). Introduction. In J. Basque, N. Bencherki, & T. R. Kuhn (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the communicative constitution of organization* (pp. 1–23). Routledge.

https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003224914-1/

Abstract

The time is ripe for a Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization (CCO). Because this body of thought is rich, diverse, and continually developing, this introductory chapter pursues several aims. It begins by locating the emergence and institutionalization of CCO theorizing in space and time, and outlines what it means to approach the social world with a CCO sensibility. It then moves to the overarching themes and key questions that drive CCO scholarship today. It demonstrates how these questions—of ontology, agency (which implies authority and the situation), and (dis)organization—are the axes around which CCO's three primary schools of thought revolve. From there, the introduction takes up some of the vectors of division across the CCO community: Contrasting conceptions of communicative events, agency, and materiality. Finally, it sketches several areas for the field's future development and delineates the contributions made by the chapters comprising the Handbook's four sections. If this is the moment to mark the significance of CCO thinking and to set an agenda for its future, the set of chapters to follow are more than up to the task.

Because CCO is far from being a homogeneous theory or a clearly defined object of interest, editing a handbook on the Communicative Constitution of Organization (CCO) presents quite a challenge. Linda Putnam and Anne Nicotera (2010) suggest that CCO is not a single stance, but a "collection of perspectives" that are united by a single central question: *what is the role of communication in the ontology of an organization?* For Taylor and Van Every (2000), the question that became the quest of CCO research is even broader: it is *What is an organization?* Whichever way the question is posed, though, "the closer one looks at the literature, the less evident the answer to the question becomes" (p. ix). This frustration with traditional theorizing unites CCO scholars, though their own answers to it also diverge greatly.

Such apparent disagreement may have to do with the fact that the two key terms--communication and organization--are very differently understood. "Organization" can be taken as a noun: an organization is a thing out there that we may study. It may, however, also be taken as a verb: organiz*ing* is something that we do together, a process through which we coordinate and control activity to "get organized." Or, it may also be an adjective: "organization*ality*" is a feature that different collectives, from a crowd to a social movement, might exhibit to varying degrees (Schoeneborn et al., 2019).

The way we understand communication also varies greatly. Communication looks rather different across the "schools" that are usually distinguished in CCO scholarship – the Montréal School, the Luhmannian perspective, and the Four Flows – but important distinctions also occur within each of them (Schoeneborn et al., 2014). Communication has been variously understood as an action (for instance, following speech act theory à la Austin, 1962; or American pragmatism, see Lorino, 2018; Misak, 2013), as the synthesis of information, utterance and understanding (according to Luhmann, 1992), a linking (Cooren & Caïdor, 2019), or as a symbolic interaction (McPhee, 1998), to name a few. It may take the empirical form of narratives (Robichaud, 2003), conversations (Cooren, 2007), sensemaking activities (Taylor & Robichaud, 2004), social media posts (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; Etter & Albu, 2021), internal magazines (Basque & Langley, 2018) or any other kind of "communication episode" (Blaschke et al., 2012).

Such variability in how it understands its own core concepts has led some to question whether CCO actually knows what it is studying (Sillince, 2009). In response, we could say that CCO is not defined by an object, as is the case for some fields of study. In the same way as William James (1904/1977) said of pragmatism that it is the "attitude" of looking at consequences and effects rather than at categories, in the same way CCO is perhaps better understood as a sensibility: An attention attuned to asking, for each facet of our collective life, how it came to exist in the first place, and how it continues to sustain itself and to change. In that sense, although CCO scholars have been accused of lacking a critical

agenda (an issue we'll return to in a moment; see also Del Fa and Kärreman's chapter in this volume), it shares with critical studies the reflex of not taking things for granted, of looking beneath the surface at how beliefs and realities that might appear "normal" are in fact constituted and maintained through what we say and do (Deetz, 1982).

The diversity of issues CCO scholarship has taken on – as is reflected by the chapters in Part 3 of this Handbook – should not, then, be understood as a lack of focus, but rather as a desire to unscrew the idols of management and organization theory. CCO shows that an organization is not made up of discrete features that can be dealt with independently, such as authority (Benoit-Barné & Fox, 2017), collaboration (Koschmann, 2016), diversity (Trittin & Schoeneborn, 2017), identity (Chaput et al., 2011), social responsibility (Christensen et al., 2013) or strategy (Aggerholm et al., 2012; Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2011). Instead, CCO highlights the fluidity between these issues, as they all materialize through communication and implicate each other. For instance, strategizing involves the performance of authority (Bencherki, Sergi, et al., 2019; Vásquez et al., 2018), and collaboration supposes the creation of a collective identity (Koschmann, 2013). Corporate social responsibility, for its part, supposes listening to (and thus the competition among) a diversity of voices (Cooren, 2020; Schoeneborn & Trittin, 2013) and collaborating with outside stakeholders (Christensen et al., 2011). Adopting a CCO sensibility thus avoids dealing with issues in silos – which often follow the hermetic distinction between disciplines and university departments – and encourages a more integrative view of organizational reality.

Such holistic thinking, though, still has some difficulty finding its way in some journals and conferences. Organization and management journal editors and reviewers at times fall short of understanding that communication is a mode of explanation that can illuminate organizational phenomena, rather than an object in itself. In other words, CCO papers are rarely *about* communication: instead, they adopt a communication *perspective* on a variety of questions. Alternatively, organization and management scholars may have difficulty recognizing their own concepts when they are described as communicative performances. This is exactly what CCO is about: shaking up traditional ways of describing things and showing, for instance, that Max Weber did not say all there is to know about authority (Bourgoin et al., 2020), that project management is far more than what the standard "body of knowledge" claims it to be (Sergi et al., 2020), or that strategizing is far more pervasive than it is usually believed to be (Bencherki, Sergi, et al., 2019; Cooren et al., 2015). That being said, more and more CCO papers are published in journals beyond the discipline of communication, and CCO-minded scholars sit on those journals' editorial boards, suggesting a growing embrace of a CCO sensibility.

Towards Intellectual Institutionalization

The idea that communication constitutes organizations is still presented as 'new' at academic conferences and in articles, even though it is nearly 35 years old. It can be traced back to 1988, when James R. Taylor published, in French, a collection of essays collectively titled *An Organization is but a Fabric of Communication* (Taylor, 1988, our translation). However, it took nearly another decade for this idea to reach a wider, English-speaking audience, with a *Communication Theory* paper by Taylor and then-PhD students François Cooren, Nicole Giroux and Daniel Robichaud, where they suggest looking for organization "between the conversation and the text" (Taylor et al., 1996). The second half of the 1990s saw a multiplication of similarly-minded publications, such as Jeffrey Ford and Laurie Ford's famous piece on the way organizational change is produced through conversation (Ford & Ford, 1995). The year 2000, though, is often described as a turning point, with the publication of Taylor and Van Every's (2000) *The Emergent Organization* and Cooren's (2000) *The Organizing Property of Communication*, which both offered a systematic overview of communication's constitutive power, but also of Robert D. McPhee and Pamela Zaug's (2000) article "The communicative constitution of organizations," which was the first to make use of the term that became the perspective's name and a rallying cry for a rich and diverse community.

Whichever birthdate we assign to the CCO perspective, at anywhere between 22 and 35 years of age, it is mature enough today to fully participate in academic deliberations over communicating and organizing, and the pressing social issues that surround the intersection of the two. CCO has witnessed increasing "institutionalization" (Boivin et al., 2017), with volumes and special issues systematically laying out its foundations and materializing it (e.g., Cooren et al., 2011; Robichaud & Cooren, 2013), as well as events bringing together its representatives throughout the world. For instance, Schoeneborn and Vásquez (2017) identify the 2002 preconference organized by Linda Putnam and Ann Nicotera at the National Communication Association convention, and the 2008 preconference of the International Communication Association conference, organized by Cooren, Robichaud and Giroux, in honor of Taylor, as two key structuring events. In addition, the funding that Steffen Blaschke and Dennis Schoeneborn received between 2010 to 2013 from the German National Science Foundation was also instrumental in establishing CCO as a research community (see also Blaschke & Schoeneborn, 2016). In particular, it led to the creation of the "Organization as Communication" network, which later engendered a standing working group of the same name at the European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS) – and its successor, the "Communication, Performativity and Organization" standing working group – and stimulated conversations between Luhmann-inspired researchers and their peers from around the world.

Despite these important milestones, CCO had been lagging in at least one important respect. While even more recent perspectives or phenomena have had handbooks published to inventory their respective state of the art, such an effort had yet to be made for CCO. The important edited book by Putnam and Nicotera (2009) has played a pivotal role for legitimating the subfield, but its chapters mostly consist in elaborations by North American authors regarding McPhee and Zaug's (2000) pivotal article (which is reprinted as the book's second chapter), thus centering its scope around the Four Flows perspective. Since then, the constitutive perspective has diversified in an important manner, a diversity this Handbook attempts to better capture. In addition to its founding geographical poles – Montréal, Québec; Tempe, Arizona; Boulder, Colorado – it now includes researchers from across the globe, although, regretfully, CCO (and social science research more broadly) still has to pay better attention to research conducted, for instance, in Latin America, Africa or some parts of Asia. Authors within this Handbook live and work in the US and in Canada, but also in Austria, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, and Switzerland. They are in departments and schools of communication, education, management, organization, sociology, or work outside of academia. The typical distinction between "schools" within CCO – The Montréal School, the Luhmannian approach, and the Four Flows – only partly accounts for the diversity of ways in which research is conducted and how it leads to a myriad of theoretical proposals with equally diverse axiological agendas (Schoeneborn et al., 2014; Winkler & Bencherki, 2020). Yet, despite this diversity, this handbook of course only includes a portion of the research being conducted within and around the CCO umbrella today. Our hope, however, is that this Handbook serves to spark conversations and help isolated researchers realize they are, in fact, part of a rich community.

Key Questions Animating CCO Scholarship

What unites this diverse community? To answer this question, we must start by pointing out some of the key differences that adopting the CCO sensitivity makes. To begin, we can distinguish CCO from its older cousin, the interpretive tradition that began much earlier in organizational communication research and with which it is regularly confused (Putnam & Pacanowsky, 1983). Indeed, CCO scholarship is sometimes accused of not bringing anything new to the table, given that interest for the way people talk has been around for a while. A key distinction between interpretive and constitutive research is that the latter locates the organization in individual or social cognition: it is what people *understand* that interests the researcher. These understandings may be shared or even imposed upon others (this is, for instance, how Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991, understand the notion of sensemaking). In contrast, CCO researchers hold that communication *does* things, with or without the mediation of human interpreters. Stories connect different events together and present the organization as their author, signs continue to warn

against danger, tables participate in calculations, conversations weave time and space together, etc. (Cooren & Bencherki, 2010; Cooren & Matte, 2010; Vásquez, 2016).

The matter is made more complex by the fact that some research adopts a constitutive lens, without necessarily drawing from CCO literature or labeling itself as such. This is the case, for instance, of organizational researchers adopting an ethnomethodological approach (e.g., Clark & Pinch, 2010; Kwon et al., 2014; Samra-Fredericks, 2010), of studies that look at how discourse intertextually weaves the organization into new configurations, or which use Boden's (1994) notion of lamination to look at the way talk recursively refers to yet other talk (Grant et al., 2005; Oswick & Richards, 2004). Boje's (1991, 2003) and Gabriel's (1991, 1995) views of narratives have also had a deep influence on CCO. Similarly, the critical stance of Mumby (2000, 2018) and Deetz (1992) feeds CCO's aspirations to this day. We can consider these studies as "CCO-friendly," as they also pay attention to what communication concretely does to constitute organizational reality, beyond the sum of individual interpretations (see Ashcraft et al., 2009).

Besides this commitment to the tangible effects of communication, it is not entirely clear that CCO has a core credo or single method on which all would agree, although different attempts to delineate shared theoretical and methodological commitments have been formulated. François Cooren, Timothy Kuhn, Joep Cornelissen and Tim Clark (2011) suggested that CCO scholarship is based on "six premises:"

1. It studies communicational events;
2. It should be as inclusive as possible about what we mean by (organizational) communication;
3. It acknowledges the co-constructed or co-oriented nature of (organizational) communication;
4. It holds that who or what is acting always is an open question;
5. It never leaves the realm of communicational events;
6. It favors neither organizing nor organization.

Kuhn (2012) offers a more succinct characterization of CCO research, and more broadly of what it means to "take communication seriously," consisting of four "tenets": portraying communication as constitutive of social realities, seeing organizations not as containers for communication, but intrinsically *as* communication, staying in the realm of communicational events both conceptually and methodologically, and, finally, not reducing communication to "meaning convergence." In 2013, during a pre-colloquium development work of the European Group for Organizational Studies conference, Cooren also suggested that CCO has a common "origin" and named a few "precursors," including Chester

Barnard (1938/1968), Mary Parker Follett (1940), Gabriel Tarde (1893/2012), and Karl Weick (1979), who each contributed defining some of its defining features (see also Cooren & Robichaud, 2019).

Yet CCO scholars are well aware that creeds, origin stories and other rituals, if they are important in constituting an organization – or a research subfield – are communicatively constituted themselves and are resources for action rather than entrenched paths (see Basque & Langley, 2018, as well as Basque, Hirsto & Wagnac, this volume). Being aware of their role in our community can help us build upon them, but also move ahead without fearing to appear ungrateful to our predecessors.

Moving past such conventional ways of describing and dividing CCO scholarship, though, some common theoretical, methodological and empirical issues are raised from the moment we suppose that organizing takes place through communicating. For instance, Schoeneborn and Vásquez (2017) identify three issues that animate CCO studies: the ontological question (what is an organization?), the composition problem (how can singular events assemble into an organization?), and the question of agency (how does an organization act when people act on its behalf?). Other scholars have also identified the issue of authority as a key concern for CCO research (see in particular Taylor & Van Every, 2014, and the interview with Taylor in this volume). While all of these issues are intimately interconnected, based on the chapters included in this handbook, we can reorganize the themes that have been identified before, and distinguish at least four questions that cut across current CCO investigations.

An Expanded Ontological Question

The question pursued by Taylor and Van Every (2000) over two decades ago—"What is an organization?—has since been stretched to include a broader concern for the way organizing processes and features of organizationality can be detected even beyond conventional organizations. In this sense, CCO—in particular through the contribution of its the Luhmannian branch—has incorporated the work of Arhne and Brunsson (2011) on partial organizations to develop new analytical insights (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; Schoeneborn et al., 2019). This new intellectual equipment has allowed CCO to answer some of its most stringent critics, including Sillince (2009), who argued that CCO was unable to distinguish between organizations and other forms of collective entities.

Rather than attempting an impossible definition, CCO scholarship has justified its interest in the diversity of ways in which collective endeavors unfold, by pointing out that being an organization is a matter of degree rather than a clear distinction. To be able to produce such an answer, CCO did not only draw from McPhee and Zaug's (2000) four flows—membership negotiation, reflexive self-structuring, activity coordination, and institutional positioning—but also incorporated "membership, hierarchy, rules,

monitoring and sanction," but also decisions, as key features of the constitution of organizations to look for in its empirical investigations (Ahrne & Brunsson, 2011, p. 86).

CCO has also expanded its reach by never hesitating to graft onto its intellectual tree new theories and perspectives, thus freeing itself from its origin story. In addition to regular engagement with management and organization theory, among other such expansion projects, it has dipped its toes in the fields of ethics and law (Brummans et al., 2021; Cooren, 2015, 2016; Denault & Cooren, 2016; Laasch, 2021; Matte & Bencherki, 2019), shown its relevance for public relations (Buhmann & Schoeneborn, 2021), forayed into linguistics (Asmuß, 2012), caught the attention of sociologists (Donges & Nitschke, 2018), and has entered a dialogue with philosophers such as Étienne Souriau, Gilbert Simondon, and Gilles Deleuze to highlight the organization's ontological plurality and the continuous nature of its individuation (Bencherki & Elmholdt, 2018; Bencherki & Iliadis, 2019; Mease, 2021) .

By drawing from outside its traditional theorizing, CCO was thus able to explore new organizational forms, such as clandestine and anonymous organizations (Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015; Schoeneborn & Scherer, 2012), social media communities (Dawson, 2018; Dawson & Bencherki, in press; Etter & Albu, 2021), art collectives (Cnossen & Bencherki, 2018), entrepreneurial projects (Kuhn, 2017; Kuhn & Marshall, 2019) or even scientific and social controversies (Porter et al., 2018). However, as we'll see next, these expansions have also helped CCO clarify its key concepts and better understand the issues it holds most dear.

A Richer View of Agency

A key issue animating CCO research across all of its perspectives is the notion of agency (Brummans, 2018). While authors working in each of its schools might disagree on crucial facets of what agency means—an issue we will return to shortly—it is undeniable that CCO supposes questioning taken-for-granted assumptions about agency. Indeed, communication has long been associated with people's ability to act (Bencherki, 2016), but this relationship takes on a particular shade with CCO theorizing. Indeed, it is concerned with how an *organization* might act, which relates to notions of organizational action and actorhood (Bencherki & Cooren, 2011; Grothe-Hammer, 2019). These notions have traditionally been addressed in management and organization theory through an emphasis on decision-making, rule following, and ecological adaptation, with issues of ambiguity and interpretation throwing some confusion in the mix (see March, 1996). Agency is all the more important, since it connects with the very existence and status of the organization: in other words, depending on how we suppose it acts, we also question whether it *exists* – and if so, how – or whether it is "mere" fiction (Savage et al., 2018)?

Conventional views have often limited the role organizations play in their own action, making organizational theory "a theory without a protagonist" (King et al., 2010, p. 290).

Such pronouncements ignore the contribution CCO scholars had already been making. Indeed, for CCO scholars, the organization is a *metaconversation* (Robichaud et al., 2004). This means that it consists in a mesh of conversations that recursively incorporate prior conversations, and in doing so reify them as texts available for collective scrutiny (Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor & Van Every, 2000). The Luhmannian perspective puts the emphasis on a particular set of texts: decisions, which are iteratively based on prior decisions, at once confirming them and opening up the possibility of alternatives (Schoeneborn, 2011). For the Four Flows perspective, reflexive monitoring is a key aspect of (human) agents' ability to reproduce the structures that, in turn, constrain them, as they account for their own actions and ask for other to explain theirs, thus embedding them into a structure (Iverson et al., 2018).

In a CCO view, organizational action consists, then, in the communicative embedding of prior conversations, decisions, and descriptions into other descriptions that position the organization as the author of action. In this sense, trough communicative practices, some aspects of the organization – a rule, a way of doing things, a budget, etc. – may be positioned as co-authoring what people (and other beings) do and say, making them "authoritative" texts (Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Vásquez et al., 2018). Such sharing of agency between people and the organization may take place through nested narratives (Robichaud, 2003) or through attributive practices (Bencherki & Snack, 2016), but also through communication's inherent *ventriloquial* property (Cooren, 2010; Cooren et al., 2013). Ventriloquism refers to the fact that any actor may also be described as a *passer*, as what they do or say can be positioned as a being motivated by someone or something else that speaks or acts through them, thus blurring authorship and allowing to consider these words and deeds as the organization's (Cooren & Sandler, 2014; Nathues et al., 2020; Wilhoit, 2016).

Authority. CCO's view of agency is intimately related to its treatment of authority (see Benoit-Barné & Fox, as well as Caronia & Nasi, this volume). A key question of authority – who speaks and acts for the organization? – may indeed be rephrased as an issue of shared agency between the organization and its spokesperson. Rather than formal positions and organizational charts, such a construal of authority invites us to look at the many ways in which the organization is *presentified* and made to express its wishes (Benoit-Barné & Cooren, 2009; Benoit-Barné & Fox, 2017). Authority, then, is not the property of some individuals, but rather a feature of each situation that may require people to act in a certain way all the while they are contributing to shaping it (Bourgoin et al., 2020; see also Follett, 1940). This also means that authority is not the prerogative of human beings alone, as contracts, tools, principles and other "non-humans" may also contribute to guiding collective action, a reality captured both through the

notions of “textual agency” and that of “authoritative text”, illustrating the proximity between agency and authority (Brummans, 2007a; Cooren, 2004a; Cooren & Matte, 2010; Hollis, 2018; Koschmann & Burk, 2016).

Situation. The notions of agency and authority help CCO scholars understand organizations, organizing and organizationality because they help it analyze how *situations* are assembled through what people and things do and say, and in return direct these actions and words. In that sense, the notion of situation is CCO’s response to the “composition problem” that Schoeneborn and Vásquez (2017) and Kuhn (2012) identified, as isolated communication events include so many attempts at shaping the situation that, as the definition of the situation is stabilized, it gradually constrains further communication events. Inasmuch as people “obey” what the situation requires from them, it gains *authority* over their actions (Benoit-Barné & Cooren, 2009; Bourgoin et al., 2020; Cooren, 2010).

“Composing” the organization from diverse communicative events, thus, is not something done outside of the concrete interactions that take place in each of these events. As people and things communicate, they also attribute those same actions to the situation in which they find themselves, i.e., to an organizational “third,” thus presenting it as defining and guiding what they do and say (Bencherki & Cooren, 2011; Bencherki & Snack, 2016; Kuhn, 2012). They may also appropriate communicative events that took place elsewhere and at another time, to *presentify* them into their situation (Cooren, 2004b; Cooren et al., 2008; Vásquez, 2013). As particular ways of defining the situation gain autonomy, for instance through (authoritative) texts, the organization emerges as a constraining actor of its own.

Though it emerged in interactional literature, and in particular in Goffman’s (1959) work, Taylor and Van Every (2011) extend the notion of situation to make it key in understanding the organization’s role as “thirdness,” as that to which people and things both contribute and co-orient as they define their ongoing relationship. They thus recognize the “fundamental role of framing a situation” (p. 14), as it is the situation that defines roles and identities, dictates what can and cannot be done, and how people should behave relative to one another. The organization, thus, is always “situated.”

(Dis)organization

A last issue that animates CCO research is that of the relationship between organization and disorganization, or between order and disorder. Researchers’ inclination to look for coherence has led them to attend to organization and order, and to consider disorder as a mere backdrop (Kuhn, 2012). In doing so, they have tended to ignore the messiness that cohabitates with organization. However, adopting a constitutive view of communication stresses the fact that order is “a local, emergent, and transitory phenomenon” (Bauman, 1992, p. 189; cited in Kuhn, 2012, p. 550).

For Four Flows researchers, while some communicative practices can lead to organizing, other may lead to disorder (Bisel, 2009), and other conditions besides communication may also affect whether it can engender order (Bisel, 2010). For their part, the Montréal School and Luhmannian perspective agree that a same communicative event can be at once organizing and disorganizing, as (dis)organization is a property of communication itself, and both order and disorder are present at once in any situation. (Dis)organization results from language's ability to escape its author's control and the possibility of other meanings to "haunt" what is said or written, thus making communication always susceptible to surprise (Vásquez et al., 2016). A similar argument is made by Grothe-Hammer and Schoeneborn (2019) using a Luhmannian lens. They note that communicating a decision always paradoxically also communicates the existence of alternatives to that decision, thus at once reproducing the organization the decision supposes, but also raising the possibility of disorganization (see also Schoeneborn, 2008).

The simultaneous existence of organization and disorganization, finally, may be seen as a matter of perspective. A same situation may promote the existence and interests of some people or things, while hinder those of others: Cooren and Caïdor (2019) give the example of a lumberjack following instructions to cut down trees in a particular area—thus displaying orderliness—causing havoc for animals and ecosystems, or possibly even leading competitors to experience disorganization if they counted on that contract.

Current Conversations in the Community

While CCO scholars broadly share a common sensitivity, adhere broadly to similar principles and are animated by the above issues, different ways of understanding and addressing these issues co-exist within the research community. Without reflecting the rich conversations and debates that take place during conferences and in the pages of journals, we can summarily identify two fundamental areas around which research perspectives branch out. Indeed, CCO scholars do not entirely agree on what counts as a meaningful communicative event, and—as we have hinted above—they theorize agency in diverging ways. While below we caricature the positions of each of the CCO "schools," these conversations do not always neatly follow these demarcation lines.

What Counts as a Meaningful Communication Event?

The first of the "premises" suggested by Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen and Clark (2011) is that CCO studies communication events, and already researchers are debating what unit of analysis should be object of study. The various understandings of what a communication event is leads to equally various methodological choices. For Montréal School researchers, the tendency has been to prioritize naturally-

occurring communication events, which are usually recorded, such as meetings and other formal or casual conversations (Bencherki et al., 2016; Cooren, 2007; Cooren et al., 2008; Robichaud, 2003).

This definition of communication events rests, to some extent, on the Montréal School's roots in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, which similarly favor naturally occurring events. Yet, it is also justified by the school's view of communication as action, and its extension of agency to non-human actants (as we will see in the next section), which, when combined, require paying attention to what language concretely *does* and how it relates to other situated actions. In that sense, traditional qualitative investigation tools such as interviews, rather than collecting "facts" or individual interpretations, would be viewed as interactional episodes between the interviewer and the interviewee, during which organizational realities are co-constructed (but interviews are also much more; see Alvesson, 2003).

That being said, the Montréal School has also been criticized for over-privileging interactions and, in particular, talk, at the expense of other forms of communication (Wilhoit, 2016). Perhaps as a testament to a generational shift and an extrication from its ethnomethodological roots, a growing number of researchers do not hesitate to explore Montréal School concepts using interviews (Jahn, 2016), visual elicitation (Wilhoit, 2017), archival methods (Basque & Langley, 2018) and other approaches, thus also broadening its definition of what counts as a communication event.

The Luhmannian perspective, which had initially introduced the notion of communication event (Schoeneborn, 2011), shares with the Montréal School its tendency to explore naturally occurring events. While Luhmannian theory would target communication events surrounding *decisions*, which it views as the ones specific to organizing (see Grothe-Hammer, this volume), the fact is that empirical studies have observed a range of communicative phenomena. Research in the Luhmannian perspective has also been inclusive when it comes to the tangible form communication episodes might take and how to study them. That is why, for instance, the Luhmannian perspective comprises quantitative and network analysis of collaboration between people (Blaschke et al., 2012), interviews about how decisions are "programmed" (Grothe-Hammer & Berthod, 2017), as well as the study of documents such as presentation slides (Schoeneborn, 2013). Contrary to the Montréal School's conceptualization of communication as action, for Luhmann communication includes *understanding,* which lies in subsequent communication's uptake of preceding ones, meaning that communication can only be understood as a string of events rather than as isolated moments (as Seidl explains in Schoeneborn et al., 2014; see also Luhmann, 1995).

Finally, the Four Flows perspective is not as explicit as the others on what it identifies as a relevant communication event, which may result from the fact its being based on structuration theory, though "Giddens was notoriously brief in his discussion of communication" (McPhee & Iverson, 2009, p.

52). For Four Flows researchers, not all communication leads to organizational constitution (Bisel, 2009). Indeed, "speech does not in itself, or even mainly, constitute an organization, and can be delusional or involve unusual registers" (McPhee in Schoeneborn et al., 2014, p. 301). The perspective focuses on communication that relates to a) membership negotiation, b) activity coordination, c) reflexive self-structuring and d) institutional positioning. Each of these flows, in turn, is an assemblage of communicative processes, such as, in the case of membership negotiation, "role learning, power accumulation, identification and disidentification" (McPhee in Schoeneborn et al., 2014, p. 294). In the case of activity coordination, McPhee gives the example of mutual adjustment as an example of underlying communicative process. Reflexive self-structuring would rely on creating membership boundaries, while institutional positioning concerns relations between the organization and others surrounding it.

In that sense, the Four Flows perspective can be described as "meta-theoretical" to the extent that it directs the attention of scholars interested in organizational constitution to relevant communication processes, without these processes being themselves germane to the Four Flows approach. For instance, identification, which McPhee suggests is crucial to membership negotiation, has been studied by Montréal School researchers (Chaput et al., 2011). The same goes for the creation of membership boundaries, which has been shown to be a communicative achievement using both the Montréal School and the Luhmannian perspective (Bencherki & Snack, 2016; Dobusch & Schoeneborn, 2015). Much work has also been devoted to the way organizations present themselves online or to inter-organizational collaboration, thus addressing institutional positioning (e.g., Dawson, 2015; Koschmann, 2013). As for activity coordination, it arguably represents the bulk of CCO research, for instance through work about the coordination of resistance online or about (strategic) planning (Albu, 2019; Bencherki, Sergi, et al., 2019; Etter & Albu, 2021; Grothe-Hammer & Berthod, 2017). Thus, it appears that the Four Flows' segmentation of communication events is the most widely accepted in CCO theorizing, although it is rarely explicitly referred to as such.

An important distinction between the Four Flows approach and the two others, though, is its restriction to communication to human beings, in line with its view of agency, as we will see below. Indeed, for McPhee, communication depends on human beings' interpretive resources, and it is important to recognize—if we seek to explain organizational constitution—"that human agents' interpretive systems include resources that lead an individual to think of himself or herself as able to (fallaciously) speak for, or even to be, an organization" (Schoeneborn et al., 2014, p. 301). This contrasts with the Montréal School's desire to "open up the scene" of communication to other-than-humans (Cooren, 2008), as well

as with Luhmann's provocative suggestion that "[h]umans cannot communicate [… o]nly communications can communicate (2002, p. 169; cited in Seidl & Becker, 2006, p. 20).

Who (or What) "Has" Agency and What Place to Give to Materiality?

As already partly covered earlier (also see Putnam's Foreword, this volume), a key concern for CCO scholars is the question of agency, and each school's different take on the notion is crucial for understanding its theorizing, as well as its conception of relevant communication events and the methods it adopts in studying them. The Four Flows perspective's restriction of communication to humans, due to their interpretive capacity, is paralleled by an equal restriction of agency to humans. This restriction is justified by Giddens' definition of agency as "to be able to 'act otherwise'" (Giddens, 1984, p. 14), which is understood to mean that agents should also possess the "ability to account for and reflect on actions in meaningful ways" (Iverson et al., 2018, p. 44). Indeed, the ability for non-humans to act is mediated by the interpretation humans make of their role, and is conceptualized in terms of resources and constraints on human agency (McPhee & Iverson, 2011). Most importantly, even if it might grant some role to technology and other non-human actors, the Four Flows perspective rejects the "minimization of the difference between human agents (who alone can understand communications) and other elements and systems" (McPhee in Schoeneborn et al., 2014, p. 299).

Although some of its authors have similarly questioned the Montréal School's apparent conflation of human and non-human agency (Jansen, 2016), the Luhmannian perspective has a radically different perspective on agency. To begin with, Luhmannians consider human agency to be at the intersection of different systems: a human being is "made up," for instance, of organic and psychic systems, which constitute it and its ability to act (Seidl & Becker, 2006), a point echoed by some Montréal School theorizing that sits somewhat outside its canon (e.g., Bencherki & Iliadis, 2019; Brummans, 2007b). However, it also agrees with the Montréal School in "de-centering" agency from human beings to the extent that it focuses on communication itself as productive of systems and of further communication events, which "gain agency in their own right" (Schoeneborn et al., 2014, p. 306).

The Four Flows and the Luhmannian perspectives have often formulated their views of agency in reaction to the Montréal School's liberal extension of the notion to non-human entities, which is largely a result of its borrowing from actor-network theory, and in particular from Bruno Latour (Bencherki, 2017; Cooren, 2010; Latour, 2013). This extension of agency is instrumental in the Montréal School's proposal that conversations gain endurance through their inscription in texts, such that what people say and do can move through time and space, "scaling up" to constitute an organization (Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor & Van Every, 2000). This key idea has led Montréal School researchers to

develop the notion of textual agency (Brummans, 2007a; Cooren, 2004a), and to recognize that an organization is a “plenum of agencies” (Cooren, 2006).

More recently, though, and perhaps under the influence of Luhmannian thinking (see Cooren & Seidl, 2020), Montréal School researchers have begun considering communication itself as material (rather than resting on non-human agents), and to position communication’s materiality as participating in a relational ontology view of organizing (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren, 2018; Kuhn et al., 2017). In other words, relationality is substantiated in communication (Cooren et al., 2012). This seemingly slight shift in the way the Montréal School views agency and materiality is consequential, in the sense that it allows viewing communication not only as constitutive of organizations within which human beings live and work, but also as constitutive of humans themselves, with a growing number of researchers interested in notions such as affect and performativity, and connecting the Montréal School with different philosophical approaches (e.g., Ashcraft, 2020; Del Fa, 2017).

Future Trajectories: Ensuring the Practical and Academic Relevance of CCO

These conversations have kept CCO scholarship on its toes, always looking to renew and refine their theorizing of the communication–organization relationship. In exploring new avenues, CCO is opening up exciting future trajectories, but is also faced with potential challenges.

As discussed in Del Fa and Kärreman’s chapter in this volume, a first important area of development for CCO concerns its ability to articulate a critical posture. Indeed, CCO has been at times accused of limiting itself to describing organizational phenomena as they takes place, without positioning itself regarding what constitutes good and/or ethical organizing (Reed, 2010). This lack of critical engagement is all the more surprising given that CCO, in revealing the communicative underpinnings of organizing, parallels the efforts of many critical authors (e.g., Clegg, 1987; Deetz, 1992). In developing its own critical voice, CCO can build on the efforts of “friendly” research that has pointed out, for instance, how communication enables resistance and submission (Mumby, 2005), how “ideal” professional identities are constituted (Ashcraft, 2016, 2017), how gender and class intersect in “dirty work”(Tracy & Scott, 2006), how particular forms of organizing are rendered invisible (Cruz, 2015, 2017), or how brands gain agency to reproduce capitalism (Mumby, 1998, 2018). It can also count on CCO research that has already touched upon some of the central themes of critical theory, albeit not from a critical stance as such, in particular power and authority (Bencherki, Matte, et al., 2019; Benoit-Barné & Cooren, 2009; Benoit-Barné & Fox, 2017), diversity (Trittin & Schoeneborn, 2017), (Cooren, 2016; Matte & Bencherki, 2019). Genuine CCO critical research is still in its nascent stage, with studies on the way alternative organizations are constituted (Del Fa, 2017; Del Fa & Vásquez, 2019), calls to decolonize the epistemologies that underpin constitutive approaches (Vásquez et al., 2021), and the proposal that

communicative relationality might allow escaping capitalism's position as the overarching and deterministic framework within which organizing unfolds (Kuhn et al., 2017). More efforts are still needed, though, to unpack CCO's critical potential.

A second area of development for CCO is for it to find its full relevance for practitioners, as van Vuuren and Knoers explain in their chapter in this volume. Indeed, while CCO can pride itself in conducting quality empirical work, few research projects truly employ its rich theorizing to reach out to practitioners and respond to their concerns (exceptions include rare action-research work; see Vásquez et al., 2018). While CCO's relevance for practice has been the topic of at least two workshops held prior to the 2014 and 2017 colloquiums of the European Group for Organizational Studies, engaging with practitioners and working with them on making theory actionable for them remains an underexplored area (not unlike CCO pedagogy, incidentally; see Kuhn & Schoeneborn, 2015).

As CCO researchers explore these avenues, however, they also face the challenge of losing their specificity. Indeed, the strength of CCO has been, so far, its ability to pinpoint the communicative processes in practices through which organizing takes place; its descriptivist stance was its distinctive trait. By developing its critical reach or its relevance to practitioners, it will need in both cases—albeit differently—to adopt instead a normative or prescriptive vocabulary, and in doing so risk diluting its distinctiveness. CCO scholars will therefore be careful to make sure to reflect on how they can formulate critique or guidance that builds on their unique analytical ability and remains a distinctive voice in the concert of organizational (communication) studies.

That being said, CCO probably has more to gain than to lose in reaching out to neighboring research communities. As, until recently, CCO scholars have been busy building and legitimating their original approach, they have also somewhat neglected their engagement with broader debates and conversations, leading some to perceive them as somewhat of a clique. In that sense, we have perhaps missed some opportunities to better explain our perspective(s) to other researchers and to demonstrate our relevance to them. Toning down the impression that CCO is an exclusive club would therefore allow us to show what we can do, but also to enrich ourselves, as we help address the challenges that preoccupy organization studies and management, other fields of communication studies, as well as other disciplines.

Outline of the Handbook

Since the beginning of this handbook project, a constant preoccupation for us as co-editors has been to include authors reflecting the diversity of our community, as witness it during the academic conferences and events that bring us together. In particular, we wanted to reflect diversity in terms of *generations* of CCO scholars. Indeed, given the maturity of our research tradition, we see emerging young

scholars representing what is now the fourth generation of CCO scholars, who bring along new concerns and new theoretical vistas, and are unburdened with some older intellectual traditions and cleavages. From early on, CCO scholars have been inspired by their students (as illustrated in Chaput and Basque's interview with James R. Taylor, in this volume) and have never hesitated to collaborate with young researchers from around the world (e.g., Nathues et al., 2020; Taylor & Virgili, 2008). In our desire to capture this vivacity, we chose to give a voice not only to the established scholars who defined the field, but also to mid-career and early-career scholars who are active contributors to our research community, as well as PhD students who enrich CCO thinking.

Roughly speaking, the different sections of this book can be understood as corresponding to the concerns of these different "generations." While early on, CCO was preoccupied with establishing theoretical basis—as is the case in our first section, with many first- or second-generation researchers—it has since moved on to seeking to diversify its methods (second section) and to engage with the concerns of its sister fields of study, in particular management and organization studies (third section), and now seeks to find resonance with partitioners in new territories and applications (fourth section). At each step, and in each section, a greater number of younger scholars join their voice to the conversation. In that sense, 7 of the handbook's 33 chapters (21%) include a student or postdoc author, and the number would be greater if we counted recent graduates with either faculty or out-of-academia positions.

Another preoccupation for us, the co-editors, was to make a conscious effort to achieve gender parity among the books' authors. In 2021, gender parity may seem like something one may take for granted, but recent research has shown that gender equality is still challenge in the academic world (Blithe & Elliott, 2020; Munar et al., 2017). A constant effort is thus needed to make sure women's voices are heard and given the same importance. For these reasons, authors were asked to do their best, in their teams, to accomplish both generational and gender parity. They have responded well to our call: of this handbook's 33 chapters, 26 include at least one woman among their authors (79% of all chapters), 23 include at least 50% of women among their authors (70% of chapters), and 13 are written entirely by women (40% of chapters).

Geographical parity was also a challenge in the co-editors' mind from the initiation of the project. The handbook reflects that CCO remains concentrated in North American, with Americans representing 28% of authors, and Canadians 23%, for a total of 51%. Denmark follows at 18%, and all other Europeans combined reach 26%. Non-Europeans—all three of them—only represent 5% of authors. While this lack of geographical diversity could be blamed on a variety of reasons, the fact is that it does represent our community, and points to the need to continue recent efforts to "de-Westernize" CCO

thinking and draw inspiration from other parts of the world, as suggested by Vásquez, Guillén & Marroquín (2021), in the case of Latin America.

The first section of the handbook offers an overview of the key theoretical debates that animate our research community. As indicated above, CCO scholarship has developed in conversation with a wide array of thinking in social theory, philosophy, and allied academic disciplines. Although the story of this engagement is often told as revolving around the three schools of CCO thought (as we've done in this Introduction), the vectors of intellectual lineage are more complicated. The field's theoretical influences are the central concern of François Cooren and David Seidl's chapter on the roots of CCO, which explores the multiple sources of inspiration undergirding the three of CCO thought, displaying areas of convergence as well as differentiation. Following this is Geneviève Boivin and Boris Brummans's chapter on the value that the notion of ambiguity has played in the development of CCO scholarship by turning the spotlight on the very scholars mentioned in the pages of this Handbook: the social collective of CCO researchers themselves. Far from navel-gazing, this chapter examines discourse at relevant conferences to consider how ambiguity participates in the creation of this vibrant and growing scholarly community. The third chapter in this section, by Veronica Dawson, considers how the conversation-text dialectic has served as a key conceptualization of the communicative event for CCO scholarship, particularly the line of work associated with the Montréal School. Next is Joel Iverson, Karen Myers, and Robert McPhee's explication of the Four Flows framework, which employs the compelling example of Trump University to illustrate the communicative flows and their intersections. The ensuing chapter introduces the Luhmannian school of thought, as Michael Grothe-Hammer cogently presents Luhmann's theorizing and describes how decisions can take center stage as the foundational communicative events in CCO thinking.

After considering the grounding of the field and its main conceptual traditions, the remaining chapters in the first section take up core theoretical concerns that cross the schools of thought. In Elizabeth Wilhoit Larson and Jeanne Mengis's chapter, the authors outline four approaches to the study of materiality in studies of organizing, with particular attention to CCO engagements with this complex notion. Next, Consuelo Vásquez, Timothy Kuhn, and Mie Plotnikof pursue the insights to be gleaned from rejecting any opposition between order and disorder and, instead, framing dis/organization as a heuristic vision of the social practice CCO scholars study. A further exploration into the complexity of organizing is offered by Dennis Schoeneborn, Blagoy Blagoev, and Leonhard Dobusch's chapter on organizationality. The notion of organizationality was introduced above, but this chapter deepens understandings of this novel concept through two case studies, which also display organizing to be more fluid than conventionally understood. Then, because authority is at issue for all the authors in this section, Letizia Caronia and Nicola Nasi unpack the notion by distinguishing between epistemic and deontic

authority, illustrating these types (and their junctures) with a detailed analysis of episodes of interaction associated with antibiotic use in a hospital ward. The next chapter, by Sophie Del Fa and Dan Kärreman, is a provocation, challenging CCO scholarship to more fully embrace a critical orientation, one that entails a thoroughgoing critique of the neoliberal capitalism that serves as the foundation upon which organizing and communicating unfolds. And, finally, Jamie McDonald's chapter continues the critique of CCO's theoretical foundations, providing a model for how scholars might interrogate heteronormative conceptions of organizing by building on queer theorizing to center difference; in so doing, argues McDonald, new vistas for organization studies will emerge. Taken together, then, the 11 chapters in this first section not only display CCO scholarship's central theoretical tenets, but also demonstrate the field's willingness to challenge its fundaments in the pursuit of continuing growth.

In the second section, chapters address the burgeoning methodological diversity and the many ways in which CCO research is conducted. While CCO research regularly expresses its commitment to studying communication episodes, it has only rarely reflexively examined its own methodological choices (Nathues et al., 2020; Wilhoit, 2016). To remedy this, Theresa Castor first offers a thorough review of the many ways in which discourse has been conceptualized, and how CCO has engaged with the variety of discourse analysis. Ellen Nathues and Mark Van Vuuren then offer a hands-on approach to analyzing discourse data in a CCO perspective, and more specifically using François Cooren's ventriloquial perspective (Cooren, 2010; Cooren et al., 2013). In a third chapter in this section, Helly Kryger Aggerholm, Birte Asmuß, Leo Feddersen Smith and Henrik Ladegaard retrace CCO's root in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, and present readers with fruitful avenues to conduct EM/CA analysis in search for organizing. Joëlle Basque, Heidi Hirsto and Régine Wagnac then move past a focus on language as such, to invite CCO scholars to engage with organizing's temporality through the use of archival methods. Finally, Boris H.J.M. Brummans and Camille Vézy offer a poignant plea for a more "adventurous" engagement with ethnography, to capture the processuality and eventfulness of communication. Through these many chapters, this handbook's second section thus constitutes a rare opportunity to review the different strategies available to observe communication's constitutive power.

As the third section reveals, CCO theorizing, combined with appropriate methods, sheds a different light on crucial managerial and organizational notions. Chantal Benoit-Barné and Stéphanie Fox address one of CCO's key concerns, authority, which finds resonance in Ryan Bisel, Gail Fairhurst and Matthew Sheep's treatment of leadership among each of the three schools of CCO. Mathieu Chaput and Joëlle Basque, for their part, engage with another crucial theme, identity, by introducing the notion of "identity matters" as CCO's unique contribution to scholarship on the topic. Then, Viviane Sergi and Paul See each bring to our attention key evolutions in the way organizations are managed: Sergi shows how

CCO can fruitfully converse with literature on project-based organizing, and Spee offers an overview of literature intersecting CCO and strategic management. The next two chapters hint at CCO's potential for more responsible organizing: Lars T. Christensen, Visa Penttila and Neva Štumberger review the important work that has been conducted so far in connecting a constitutive view of communication with corporate social responsibility, reveling how talk may produce responsible organizational action; Shiv Ganesh, Cynthia Stohl and Samantha James, for their part, suggest the term "lenticulation" to address the role of visibility in the way we have been studying globalization. Continuing on the project of making organizations better places, Matthew Koschmann then reviews the ways in which a constitutive approach to communication can help understand collaboration between civil society organizations, and Hannah Trittin-Ulbrich and Florence Villesèche show how CCO can contribute to, but also learn from, literature on organizational diversity. Finally, the section's two last chapters engage with areas of research that CCO has overlooked for the moment: the first is that of digital media, which has only been recently started to catch the attention of a new generation of scholars, even though, as Jean Saludadez argues, CCO is well equipped to shed a new light on technology; the second is organizational memory, for which Salla-Maaria Laaksonen and François Lambotte offer a rich theorizing that goes beyond simple information storage and retrieval.

Lastly, in the fourth section, chapters reveal how CCO can illuminate concrete, day-to-day practice in a variety of organizational settings. This last section is all the more important given that—as we have already mentioned—CCO scholarship has regularly been accused of falling short on formulating useful advice for managers and for the other people who, everyday, make their organizations thrive. First, Mark van Vuuren and Peter Knoers, in a very original and provocative chapter, explain how the CCO view can help practitioners understand the problems they face in their work. Relying on their experience as both academic and consultants and on the many occasions they had to build bridges between theory and practice, they challenge the CCO community to engage more closely with professionals to equip them with CCO's particular lens to overcome naiveté about communication and start questioning the "taken-for-grantedness" of organizations. In the following chapter of this section, Boukje Cnossen offers a thorough examination of organizational research in the arts, and reveals how both a theorizing of the art organization, and of the impact of the artwork on it, is mostly absent from this literature. She explains how a relational view, informed by a CCO perspective, can bring a unique contribution to address this omission, and provide a better comprehension of the role of artistic practices in organizing for researchers and artists alike. Using CCO to study difficult and unusual settings, Oana Albu and Neva Štumberger examine spatial assemblages in refugee camps through the work of humanitarian organizations. They explain the volatility of agencies in these contexts, and explain how a communicative understanding of space can help volunteers consider political and ethical aspects of humanitarian organizing. Also

demonstrating the variety of research contexts that inspire CCO authors, Colleen Mills brings us to a very different setting where spatiality is also prominent: a food processing factory. Through this chapter, she shows the relevance of one feature of CCO – namely the rejection of the language / materiality dualism – for practitioners. In a similar vein, Jody Jahn and Rebecca Rice engage with the high reliability organizing (HRO) literature to identify its shortcomings in theorizing the role of materiality in organizing and sensemaking in these risky contexts. They show how a CCO approach can reveal how material objects orient the construction of the tactical possibilities HRO members see as available to them when they consider various courses of action. Last but not least, Stephanie Fox and Jody Jahn propose a CCO perspective to address a very concrete problem faced by practitioners in multidisciplinary work teams, especially in the healthcare system: how to navigate status asymmetry while deciding on action.

In addition to the agenda each chapter set for itself, this Handbook also aims at a purpose beyond its value as a pedagogical tool to introduce students to CCO: we hope it helps both delineate and galvanize the community of researchers interested in the communicative power of communication. That is why, among other reasons, we include in lieu of a postface, an interview with James R. Taylor, whom many consider to be the father of CCO. His interview, in addition to telling the tale of CCO's early days, also reveals some of the values central to our community, such as intellectual curiosity, eclecticism, collaboration across generations and individual projects, and, most importantly, kindness to each other. In shaping this publication project the way we did, we recognize that handbooks have often played a *performative* role, in the sense that they have not so much reflected the prior existence of a community around a research topic, but rather rallied scattered research efforts and made individuals aware of their shared trajectory. By considering this performative role, the CCO community can reflexively apply its own theorizing to its own efforts to structure itself as legitimate academic field (Boivin et al., 2017).

Of course, the limited number of chapters in this handbook means that it cannot include, as authors, all the diverse people who make up our community. However, many more people will be present as their work is ventriloquized and as each chapter incorporates multiple voices in an effort to offer a broad overview of the debates taking place around its specific topic (Cooren et al., 2013; Cooren & Sandler, 2014).

References

Aggerholm, H. K., Asmuß, B., & Thomsen, C. (2012). The role of recontextualization in the multivocal, ambiguous process of strategizing. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *21*(4), 413–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492611430852

Ahrne, G., & Brunsson, N. (2011). Organization outside organizations: The significance of partial organization. *Organization*, *18*(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508410376256

Albu, O. B. (2019). Dis/ordering: The use of information and communication technologies by human rights civil society organizations. In C. Vásquez & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Dis/organization as communication: Exploring the disordering, disruptive and chaotic properties of communication* (pp. 151–171). Routledge.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*(1), 13–33. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2003.8925191

Ashcraft, K. L. (2016). Resistance through consent?: Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*(1), 67–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276560

Ashcraft, K. L. (2017). ‘Submission’ to the rule of excellence: Ordinary affect and precarious resistance in the labor of organization and management studies. *Organization*, *24*(1), 36–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508416668188

Ashcraft, K. L. (2020). Communication as constitutive transmission? An encounter with affect. *Communication Theory*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtz027

Ashcraft, K. L., Kuhn, T., & Cooren, F. (2009). Constitutional amendments: “Materializing” organizational communication. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *3*(1), 1–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903047186

Asmuß, B. (2012). Conversation analysis and meetings. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0210

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.

Barnard, C. (1968). *The functions of the executive*. Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1938)

Basque, J., & Langley, A. (2018). Invoking Alphonse: The founder figure as a historical resource for organizational identity work. *Organization Studies*, *39*(12), 1685–1708. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618789211

Bauman, Z. (1992). *Intimations of postmodernity*. Routledge.

Bencherki, N. (2016). Action and agency. In K. B. Jensen & R. T. Craig (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of communication theory and philosophy*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect030

Bencherki, N. (2017). Actor–network theory. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc002

Bencherki, N., & Cooren, F. (2011). Having to be: The possessive constitution of organization. *Human Relations*, *64*(12), 1579–1607. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711424227

Bencherki, N., & Elmholdt, K. T. (2018). *The organization's synaptic mode of existence*. European Group for Organizational Studies, Tallinn, Estonia.

Bencherki, N., & Iliadis, A. (2019). The constitution of organization as informational individuation. *Communication Theory*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtz018

Bencherki, N., Matte, F., & Cooren, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Authority and power in social interaction*. Routledge.

Bencherki, N., Matte, F., & Pelletier, É. (2016). Rebuilding Babel: A constitutive approach to tongues-in-use. *Journal of Communication*, *66*(5), 766–788. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12250

Bencherki, N., Sergi, V., Cooren, F., & Vásquez, C. (2019). How strategy comes to matter: Strategizing as the communicative materialization of matters of concern. *Strategic Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127019890380

Bencherki, N., & Snack, J. P. (2016). Contributorship and partial inclusion: A communicative perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *30*(3), 279–304. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318915624163

Benoit-Barné, C., & Cooren, F. (2009). The accomplishment of authority through presentification: How authority Is distributed among and negotiated by organizational members. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *23*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909335414

Benoit-Barné, C., & Fox, S. (2017). Authority. In C. R. Scott & L. Lewis (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of organizational communication* (pp. 1–13). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc011

Bisel, R. S. (2009). On a growing dualism in organizational discourse research. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*(4), 614–638. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318908331100

Bisel, R. S. (2010). A communicative ontology of organization? A description, history, and critique of CCO theories for organization science. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 124–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909351582

Blaschke, S., & Schoeneborn, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Organization as communication: Perspectives in dialogue*. Routledge.

Blaschke, S., Schoeneborn, D., & Seidl, D. (2012). Organizations as networks of communication episodes: Turning the network perspective inside out. *Organization Studies*, *33*(7), 879–906. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612443459

Blithe, S. J., & Elliott, M. (2020). Gender inequality in the academy: Microaggressions, work-life conflict, and academic rank. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *29*(7), 751–764. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1657004

Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action*. Polity Press.

Boivin, G., Brummans, B. H. J. M., & Barker, J. R. (2017). The institutionalization of CCO scholarship: Trends from 2000 to 2015. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(3), 331–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318916687396

Boje, D. M. (1991). The Storytelling Organization—A Study of Story Performance in an Office-Supply Firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*(1), 106–126.

Boje, D. M. (2003). Using narrative and telling stories. In D. Holman & R. Thorpe (Eds.), *Management and Language: The Manager as Practical Author* (pp. 41–53). Sage.

Bourgoin, A., Bencherki, N., & Faraj, S. (2020). "And who are you?": A performative perspective on authority in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *63*(4), 1134–1165. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.1335

Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2007a). Death by document: Tracing the agency of a text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(5), 711–727.

Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2007b). Travels of a Buddhist Mind. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *13*(8), 1221–1226. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800407308225

Brummans, B. H. J. M. (Ed.). (2018). *The agency of organizing: Perspectives and case studies*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315622514

Brummans, B. H. J. M., Higham, L., & Cooren, F. (2021). The work of conflict mediation: Actors, vectors, and communicative relationality. *Human Relations*, 0018726721994180. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726721994180

Buhmann, A., & Schoeneborn, D. (2021). Envisioning PR research without taking organizations as collective actors for granted: A rejoinder and extension to Hou. *Public Relations Inquiry*, *10*(1), 119–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/2046147X20987337

Chaput, M., Brummans, B. H. J. M., & Cooren, F. (2011). The role of organizational identification in the communicative constitution of an organization: A study of consubstantialization in a young political party. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*(2), 252–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318910386719

Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2011). The polyphony of coporate social responsibility: Deconstructing accountability and trasparency in the context of identity and hypocrisy. In G. Cheney, S. May, & D. Munish (Eds.), *Handbook of communication ethics* (pp. 457–474). Routledge.

Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2013). CSR as aspirational talk. *Organization*, *20*(3), 372–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508413478310

Clark, C., & Pinch, T. (2010). Some major organisational consequences of some ‘minor’, organised conduct: Evidence from a video analysis of pre-verbal service encounters in a showroom retail store. In N. Llewellyn & J. Hindmarsh (Eds.), *Organisation, interaction and practice Studies of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 140–171). Cambride University Press.

Clegg, S. R. (1987). The Language of Power and the Power of Language. *Organization Studies*, *8*(1), 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068700800105

Cnossen, B., & Bencherki, N. (2018). The role of space in the emergence and endurance of organizing: How independent workers and material assemblages constitute organizations: *Human Relations*, *72*(6), 1057–1080. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718794265

Cooren, F. (2000). *The organizing property of communication*. J. Benjamins.

Cooren, F. (2004a). Textual agency: How texts do things in organizational settings. *Organization*, *11*(3), 373–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508404041998

Cooren, F. (2004b). The communicative achievement of collective minding: Analysis of board meeting excerpts. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *17*(4), 517–551. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318903262242

Cooren, F. (2006). The organizational world as a plenum of agencies. In F. Cooren, J. R. Taylor, & E. J. Van Every (Eds.), *Communication as organizing: Practical approaches to research into the dynamic of text and conversation* (pp. 81–100). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cooren, F. (Ed.). (2007). *Interacting and organizing: Analyses of a management meeting*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cooren, F. (2008). The selection of agency as a rhetorical device: Opening up the scene of dialogue through ventriloquism. In E. Weigand (Ed.), *Dialogue and Rhetoric* (pp. 23–37). John Benjamins.

Cooren, F. (2010). *Action and agency in dialogue: Passion, ventriloquism and incarnation*. John Benjamins.

Cooren, F. (2015). In the name of law: Ventriloquism and juridical matters. In K. McGee (Ed.), *Latour and the passage of law* (pp. 235–272). Edinburgh University Press.

Cooren, F. (2016). Ethics for Dummies: Ventriloquism and responsibility. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *24*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2016.1113963

Cooren, F. (2018). Materializing communication: Making the case for a relational ontology. *Journal of Communication*, *68*(2), 278–288. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqx014

Cooren, F. (2020). A communicative constitutive perspective on corporate social responsibility: Ventriloquism, undecidability, and surprisability. *Business & Society*, *59*(1), 175–197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650318791780

Cooren, F., & Bencherki, N. (2010). How things do things with words: Ventriloquism, passion and technology. *Encyclopaideia, Journal of Phenomenology and Education*, *28*, 35–61.

Cooren, F., Bencherki, N., Chaput, M., & Vásquez, C. (2015). The communicative constitution of strategy-making: Exploring fleeting moments of strategy. In D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, & E. Vaara (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of strategy as practice* (pp. 370–393). Cambridge University Press.

Cooren, F., Brummans, B. H. J. M., & Charrieras, D. (2008). The coproduction of organizational presence: A study of Médecins Sans Frontières in action. *Human Relations*, *61*(10), 1339–1370. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708095707

Cooren, F., & Caïdor, P. (2019). Communication as dis/organization: How to analyze tensions from a relational perspective. In C. Vásquez & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Dis/organization as communication: Exploring the disordering, disruptive and chaotic properties of communication* (pp. 36–59). Routledge.

Cooren, F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2009). Dislocation and stabilization: How to scale up from interactions to organization. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *The communicative constitution of organization: Centering organizational communication* (pp. 117–152). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cooren, F., Fairhurst, G. T., & Huët, R. (2012). Why matter always matters in (organizational) communication. In P. M. Leonardi, B. A. Nardi, & J. Kallinikos (Eds.), *Materiality and organizing: Social interaction in a technological world* (pp. 296–314). Oxford University Press.

Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, *32*(9), 1149–1170. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840611410836

Cooren, F., & Matte, F. (2010). For a constitutive pragmatics: Obama, Médecins Sans Frontières and the measuring stick. *Pragmatics and Society*, *1*(1), 9–31. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.1.1.02coo

Cooren, F., Matte, F., Benoit-Barné, C., & Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2013). Communication as ventriloquism: A grounded-in-action approach to the study of organizational tensions. *Communication Monographs*, *80*(3), 255–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2013.788255

Cooren, F., & Robichaud, D. (2019). Les approches constitutives. In S. Grosjean & L. Bonneville (Eds.), *La communication organisationnelle: Approches, processus et enjeux* (pp. 140–175). Chenelière.

Cooren, F., & Sandler, S. (2014). Polyphony, ventriloquism, and constitution: In dialogue with Bakhtin. *Communication Theory*, *24*(3), 225–244. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12041

Cooren, F., & Seidl, D. (2020). Niklas Luhmann's radical communication approach and its implications for research on organizational communication. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(2), 479–497. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0176

Cruz, J. (2015). Dirty work at the intersections of gender, class, and nation: Liberian market women in post-conflict times. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *38*(4), 421–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2015.1087439

Cruz, J. (2017). Invisibility and visibility in alternative organizing: A communicative and cultural model. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(4), 614–639. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917725202

Dawson, V. R. (2015). “Who are we Online?” Approaches to Organizational Identity in Social Media Contexts. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, *4*(2), Article 2. https://www.thejsms.org/tsmri/index.php/TSMRI/article/view/102

Dawson, V. R. (2018). Fans, friends, advocates, ambassadors, and haters: Social media communities and the communicative constitution of organizational identity. *Social Media + Society*, *4*(1), 205630511774635. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117746356

Dawson, V. R., & Bencherki, N. (in press). Federal employees or rogue rangers: Sharing and resisting organizational authority through Twitter communication practices. *Human Relations*.

Deetz, S. (1982). Critical interpretive research in organizational communication. *Western Journal of Communication*, *46*(2), 131–149.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. State University of New York.

Del Fa, S. (2017). The embodiment of the alternative: A communicational and constitutive approach of an “alternative university.” *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, *15*(3–4), 219–236.

Del Fa, S., & Vásquez, C. (2019). Existing through differantiation: A Derridean approach to alternative organizations. *M@n@gement*, *Vol. 22*(4), 559–583.

Denault, V., & Cooren, F. (2016). La personnalisation des témoins lors de procès: Rhétorique et ventriloquie lors des questions introductives. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, *2*(30), 321–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-016-9496-3

Dobusch, L., & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). Fluidity, identity, and organizationality: The communicative constitution of anonymous. *Journal of Management Studies*, *52*(8), 1005–1035. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12139

Donges, P., & Nitschke, P. (2018). Political organizations and their online communication. *Sociology Compass*, *12*(2), e12554. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12554

Etter, M., & Albu, O. B. (2021). Activists in the dark: Social media algorithms and collective action in two social movement organizations. *Organization*, *28*(1), 68–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508420961532

Follett, M. P. (1940). *The Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. Routledge.

Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 541–570. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080330

Gabriel, Y. (1991). Turning Facts into Stories and Stories into Facts: A Hermeneutic Exploration of Organizational Folklore. *Human Relations*, *44*(8), 857–875.

Gabriel, Y. (1995). The Unmanaged Organization: Stories, Fantasies and Subjectivity. *Organization Studies*, *16*(3), 477–501. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069501600305

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Polity Press.

Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *12*(6), 433–448. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120604

Goffman, Erving. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.

Grant, D., Michelson, G., Oswick, C., & Wailes, N. (2005). Guest editorial: Discourse and organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *18*(1), 6–15. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810510579814

Grothe-Hammer, M. (2019). Organization without actorhood: Exploring a neglected phenomenon. *European Management Journal*, *37*(3), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2018.07.009

Grothe-Hammer, M., & Berthod, O. (2017). The programming of decisions for disaster and emergency response: A Luhmannian approach. *Current Sociology*, *65*(5), 735–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116640592

Grothe-Hammer, M., & Schoeneborn, D. (2019). The queen bee outlives her own children: A Luhmannian perspective on project-based organizations (PBOs). In C. Vásquez & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Dis/organization as communication: Exploring the disordering, disruptive and chaotic properties of communication* (pp. 60–79). Routledge.

Hollis, D. J. D. (2018). *"It's the Secret to the Universe": The Communicative Constitution and Routinization of a Dominant Authoritative Text within a UK Cosmetics Company* [Phd, The Open University]. http://oro.open.ac.uk/56164/

Iverson, J., McPhee, R. D., & Spaulding, J. A. (2018). Being able to act otherwise: The role of agency in the four flows at 2-1-1 and beyond. In B. H. J. M. Brummans (Ed.), *The agency of organizing: Perspectives and case studies* (pp. 43–65). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315622514

Jahn, J. L. S. (2016). Adapting safety rules in a high reliability context: How wildland firefighting workgroups ventriloquize safety rules to understand hazards. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *30*(3), 362–389. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318915623638

James, W. (1977). What pragmatism means. In J. J. McDermott (Ed.), *The writings of William James. A comprehensive edition* (pp. 376–390). Chicago University Press. (Original work published 1904)

Jansen, T. (2016). Who is talking? Some remarks on nonhuman agency in communication. *Communication Theory*, *26*(3), 255–272. https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12095

King, B. G., Felin, T., & Whetten, D. A. (2010). Perspective—Finding the Organization in Organizational Theory: A Meta-Theory of the Organization as a Social Actor. *Organization Science*, *21*(1), 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0443

Koschmann, M. A. (2013). The communicative constitution of collective identity in interorganizational collaboration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *27*(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318912449314

Koschmann, M. A. (2016). The communicative accomplishment of collaboration failure. *Journal of Communication*, *66*(3), 409–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12233

Koschmann, M. A., & Burk, N. R. (2016). Accomplishing Authority in Collaborative Work. *Western Journal of Communication*, *80*(4), 393–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2016.1159728

Kuhn, T. (2008). A Communicative Theory of the Firm: Developing an Alternative Perspective on Intra-organizational Power and Stakeholder Relationships. *Organization Studies*, *29*(8–9), 1227–1254. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840608094778

Kuhn, T. (2012). Negotiating the Micro-Macro Divide: Thought Leadership From Organizational Communication for Theorizing Organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *26*(4), 543–584. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318912462004

Kuhn, T. (2017). Communicatively constituting organizational unfolding through counter-narrative. In S. Frandsen, T. Kuhn, & M. Lundholt (Eds.), *Counter-narratives and organization* (pp. 17–42). Routledge.

Kuhn, T., Ashcraft, K. L., & Cooren, F. (2017). *The work of communication: Relational perspectives on working and organizing in contemporary capitalism*. Routledge.

Kuhn, T., & Marshall, D. (2019). The Communicative Constitution of Entrepreneurship. In J. J. Reuer, S. F. Matusik, & J. Jones (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship and Collaboration* (pp. 81–113). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190633899.013.15

Kuhn, T., & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). The Pedagogy of CCO. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *29*(2), 295–301. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318915571348

Kwon, W., Clarke, I., & Wodak, R. (2014). Micro-level discursive strategies for constructing shared views around strategic issues in team meetings. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(2), 265–290. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12036

Laasch, O. (2021). *Principles of management: Practicing, ethics, sustainability, responsibility* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publishing.

Latour, B. (2013). “What’s the Story?” Organizing as a Mode of Existence. In D. Robichaud & F. Cooren (Eds.), *Organization and Organizing: Materiality, Agency and Discourse* (pp. 37–51). Routledge.

Lorino, P. (2018). *Pragmatism and organization studies*. Oxford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1992). What is communication? *Communication Theory*, *2*(3), 251–259. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1992.tb00042.x

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (2002). How can the mind participate in communication? In *Theories of distinction: Redescribing the descriptions of modernity* (pp. 169–184). Stanford University Press.

March, J. G. (1996). Continuity and change in theories of organizational action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(2), 278–287.

Matte, F., & Bencherki, N. (2019). Materializing ethical matters of concern: Practicing ethics in a refugee camp. *International Journal of Communication*, *13*, 5870–5889.

McPhee, R. D. (1998). Giddens' conception of personal relationhips and its relevance to communication theory. In R. Conville & E. Rogers (Eds.), *The meaning of "relationship" in interpersonal communication* (pp. 83–106). Praeger.

McPhee, R. D., & Iverson, J. (2009). Agents of constitution in Communidad: Constitutive processes of communication in organization. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 49–87). Routledge.

McPhee, R. D., & Iverson, J. (2011). Materiality, structuration, and communication. In T. Kuhn (Ed.), *Matters of communication: Political, cultural, and technological challenges to communication theorizing* (pp. 101–122). Hampton Press.

McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, *10*(1–2).

Mease, J. J. (2021). Techniques and forces and the Communicative Constitution of Organization: A Deleuzian approach to organizational (in) stability and power. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *35*(2), 226–255.

Misak, C. J. (2013). *The American Pragmatists*. Oxford University Press.

Mumby, D. K. (1998). Organizing Men: Power, Discourse, and the Social Construction of Masculinity(s) in the Workplace. *Communication Theory*, *8*(2), 164–183.

Mumby, D. K. (2000). Power and Politics. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory , Research, and Methods* (pp. 585–623). Sage.

Mumby, D. K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organization studies: A dialectical approach. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *19*(1), 19–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318905276558

Mumby, D. K. (2018). Targeting Alex: Brand as agent in communicative capitalism. In B. H. J. M. Brummans (Ed.), *The agency of organizing: Perspectives and case studies* (pp. 98–122). Routledge.

Munar, A. M., Khoo-Lattimore, C., Chambers, D., & Biran, A. (2017). The academia we have and the one we want: On the centrality of gender equality. *Anatolia*, *28*(4), 582–591. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2017.1370786

Nathues, E., van Vuuren, M., & Cooren, F. (2020). Speaking about vision, talking in the name of so much more: A methodological framework for ventriloquial analyses in organization studies: *Organization Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840620934063

Oswick, C., & Richards, D. (2004). Talk in organizations: Local conversations, wider perspectives. *Culture and Organization*, *10*(2), 107–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759550420002533404

Porter, A. J., Kuhn, T. R., & Nerlich, B. (2018). Organizing Authority in the Climate Change Debate: IPCC Controversies and the Management of Dialectical Tensions. *Organization Studies*, *39*(7), 873–898. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617707999

Putnam, L. L., & Nicotera, A. M. (2009). *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Putnam, L. L., & Nicotera, A. M. (2010). Communicative Constitution of Organization Is a Question: Critical Issues for Addressing It. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 158–165. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909351581

Putnam, L. L., & Pacanowsky, M. E. (1983). *Communication and organizations, an interpretive approach*. Sage Publications.

Reed, M. (2010). Is communication constitutive of organization? *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 151–157. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909351583

Robichaud, D. (2003). Narrative institutions we organize by: The case of a municipal administration. In B. Czarniawska & P. Gagliardi (Eds.), *Narratives we organize by: Advances in organization studies* (pp. 37–54). John Benjamins.

Robichaud, D., & Cooren, F. (Eds.). (2013). *Organization and organizing: Materiality, agency and discourse*. Routledge.

Robichaud, D., Giroux, H., & Taylor, J. R. (2004). The metaconversation: The recursive property of language as a key to organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4), 617–634. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2004.14497614

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2010). The interactional accomplishment of a strategic plan. In N. Llewellyn & J. Hindmarsh (Eds.), *Organisation, interaction and practice: Studies of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 198–217). Cambride University Press.

Savage, P., Cornelissen, J. P., & Franck, H. (2018). Fiction and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, *39*(7), 975–994. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617709309

Schoeneborn, D. (2008). *Alternatives considered but not disclosed: The ambiguous role of PowerPoint in cross-project learning*. Deutscher Universitätsverlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8350-5528-5

Schoeneborn, D. (2011). Organization as communication: A Luhmannian perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*(4), 663–689. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318911405622

Schoeneborn, D. (2013). The pervasive power of PowerPoint: How a genre of professional communication permeates organizational communication. *Organization Studies*, *34*(12), 1777–1801. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613485843

Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S., Cooren, F., McPhee, R. D., Seidl, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). The three schools of CCO thinking: Interactive dialogue and systematic comparison. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *28*(2), 285–316. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318914527000

Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T. R., & Kärreman, D. (2019). The communicative constitution of organization, organizing, and organizationality. *Organization Studies*, *40*(4), 475–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618782284

Schoeneborn, D., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Clandestine organizations, al Qaeda, and the paradox of (in)visibility: A response to Stohl and Stohl. *Organization Studies*, *33*(7), 963–971. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840612448031

Schoeneborn, D., & Trittin, H. (2013). Transcending transmission: Towards a constitutive perspective on CSR communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *18*(2), 193–211. https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281311319481

Schoeneborn, D., & Vásquez, C. (2017). Communicative constitution of organizations. In C. R. Scott, J. R. Barker, T. Kuhn, J. Keyton, P. K. Turner, & L. K. Lewis (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication* (pp. 1–21). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc030

Seidl, D., & Becker, K. H. (2006). Organizations as distinction generating and processing systems: Niklas Luhmann's contribution to organization studies. *Organization*, *13*(1), 9–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508406059635

Sergi, V., Crevani, L., & Aubry, M. (2020). Process studies of project organizing. *Project Management Journal*, *51*(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972819896482

Sillince, J. A. A. (2009). Can CCO theory tell us how organizing is distinct from markets, networking, belonging to a community, or supporting a social movement? *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 132–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909352022

Spee, A. P., & Jarzabkowski, P. (2011). Strategic planning as communicative process. *Organization Studies*, *32*(9), 1217–1245. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840611411387

Tarde, G. (2012). *Monadology and Sociology* (T. Lorenc, Trans.). re.press. http://re-press.org/book-files/9780980819724-Monadology_and_Sociology.pdf (Original work published 1893)

Taylor, J. R. (1988). *Une organisation n'est qu'un tissu de communication: Essais théoriques*. Université de Montréal.

Taylor, J. R., Cooren, F., Giroux, N., & Robichaud, D. (1996). The communicational basis of organization: Between the conversation and the text. *Communication Theory*, *6*(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00118.x

Taylor, J. R., & Robichaud, D. (2004). Finding the Organization in the Communication: Discourse as Action and Sensemaking. *Organization*, *11*(3), 395–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508404041999

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2000). *The emergent organization: Communication as its site and surface*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2011). *The situated organization: Studies in the pragmatics of communication research*. Routledge.

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2014). *When organization fails: Why authority matters*. Routledge.

Taylor, J. R., & Virgili, S. (2008). Why ERPs Disappoint: The Importance of Getting the Organisational Text Right. In B. Grabot, A. Mayère, & I. Bazet (Eds.), *ERP Systems and Organisational Change* (pp. 59–84). Springer, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84800-183-1_5

Tracy, S. J., & Scott, C. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers: Getting down and dirty with "America's heroes" and the "scum of law enforcement." *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*(1), 6–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318906287898

Trittin, H., & Schoeneborn, D. (2017). Diversity as polyphony: Reconceptualizing diversity management from a communication-centered perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *144*(2), 305–322. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2825-8

Vásquez, C. (2013). Spacing Organization: Or How to be Here and There at the Same Time. In D. Robichaud & F. Cooren (Eds.), *Organization and Organizing: Materiality, Agency and Discourse* (pp. 127–149). Routledge.

Vásquez, C. (2016). A spatial grammar of organising: Studying the communicative constitution of organisational spaces. *Communication Research and Practice*, *2*(3), 351–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2016.1221686

Vásquez, C., Bencherki, N., Cooren, F., & Sergi, V. (2018). From ‘matters of concern’ to ‘matters of authority’: Reflecting on the performativity of strategy in writing a strategic plan. *Long-Range Planning*, *51*(3), 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.01.001

Vásquez, C., Marroquín Velásquez, L., & Guillén Ojeda, G. (2021). Décoloniser les perspectives CCO : écouter les voix des traditions critiques latino-américaines en communication. *Communication & Organisation*, *59*.

Vásquez, C., Schoeneborn, D., & Sergi, V. (2016). Summoning the spirits: Organizational texts and the (dis)ordering properties of communication. *Human Relations*, *69*(3), 629–659. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715589422

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing* (2d ed.). Addison-Wesley.

Wilhoit, E. D. (2016). Ventriloquism’s methodological scope. *Language Under Discussion*, *2*(1), 45–49.

Wilhoit, E. D. (2017). Photo and video methods in organizational and managerial communication research. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(3), 447–466. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917704511

Winkler, P., & Bencherki, N. (2020, July 2). *Axiological tensions of CCO: What is the value of giving a voice?* 67th colloquium of the European Group of Organizational Studies, Hamburg.