

This is a repository copy of *The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/193438/>

Article:

Fan, Ziyun orcid.org/0000-0003-1480-8361 and Christensen, Lars Thøger (2022) The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency. *Human Relations*. ISSN 0018-7267

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221139457>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

human relations**The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency**

Journal:	<i>Human Relations</i>
Manuscript ID	HR-2021-0610.R3
Manuscript Type:	Standard Manuscript
Keywords:	Secrecy, Transparency, Secrecy-transparency dynamics, Dialogics, Performativity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency**The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency****Ziyun Fan¹****University of York, UK****Lars Thøger Christensen****Copenhagen Business School, Denmark**

The dialogic principle allows us to maintain duality at the heart of unity. It associates two terms that are at the same time complementary and antagonistic (Morin, 2008, p.49).

Knowing and not knowing, transparency and the lack of it are not rigid and mutually incompatible opposites. Rather they appear as “symbiotic” moments that depend on each other and complement one another. Transparency and secrecy can have similar and even the same functions and consequences, and they can overlap and merge with one another (Owetschkin & Berger, 2019, p.6).

Abstract

How does the pursuit of transparency and insight have a tendency to produce secrecy? And vice versa? In popular and political discourse, secrecy and transparency are usually depicted as mutually exclusive practices. At the same time, we know from extant research that the two are closely related, that they each have performative effects, and tend to encroach on each other. The inseparability and performative dynamics between the two, however, remains to be unfolded. This critical essay revisits the secrecy-transparency relationship through the lens of Edgar Morin’s dialogical principle. From this perspective, we argue that secrecy-transparency dialogics perform as a complex whole, involving both complementary and

¹ Corresponding author:

Ziyun Fan, School for Business and Society, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5ZF, UK.
Email: Ziyun.fan@york.ac.uk

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 antagonistic forces. As an illustration of dialogic performativity, we draw on the phenomenon
4 and practice of ‘open meetings’ in public sector organizations. Specifically, we argue that the
5
6 and practice of ‘open meetings’ in public sector organizations. Specifically, we argue that the
7
8 ambiguous fascination with knowing and not knowing create conditions for simulated insight
9
10 and self-imposed conformity in ways that recalibrate the relationship between transparency
11
12 and secrecy. On this background, we call for renewed critical and reflexive engagement with
13
14 the transparency ideal and its presumed antipode, secrecy.
15

16
17 Keywords: Secrecy, Transparency, Secrecy-transparency dynamics, Dialogics,
18
19 Performativity
20

21 Introduction

22
23 Although the academic literature has recognized that transparency goes hand in hand with
24
25 secrecy (e.g., Albu & Flyverbom, 2019; Birchall, 2021; Cronin, 2020; Fenster, 2017;
26
27 Owetschkin & Berger, 2019; Ringel, 2019; see also Simmel, 1906/1950), popular and political
28
29 rhetoric continues to depict the two as opposing and antagonistic forces (Lord, 2006; Oliver,
30
31 2004; Rawlins, 2009; Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2016; Tapscott & Ticoll, 2003). Fuelled
32
33 by still more frequent disclosures of corporate and political misconduct, the notion that secrecy
34
35 and transparency are mutually exclusive is gaining further ground. Critical attention attracted
36
37 by secrecy has been intensified in contemporary society directing, for example, the focus of
38
39 inquisitive journalists and NGOs towards the hidden and invisible, sharpening the anti-secrecy
40
41 rhetoric of politicians, and engaging regulators in setting and managing new standards for
42
43 openness and accountability. The assumption seems to be, as Ringel (2019, p.707) critically
44
45 observes, that “[t]he more thorough disclosure practices are implemented, the less secrecy
46
47 prevails” (see also Fan & Liu, 2022).
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Yet, while such efforts may be driven by genuine intentions to increase public insight,
55
56 they often fail to recognize how secrecy is embedded in all transparency efforts and vice versa.
57
58 When, for example, meetings in public sector organizations are *public by decree* and – in the
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 name of transparency – recorded or otherwise documented for public consumption, new
4
5 secrecy practices tend to emerge (Ringel, 2019; see also Piotrowski & Borry, 2010). In order
6
7 to, for example, discuss confidential or person-sensitive material that cannot be aired in
8
9 conventional meetings, decision makers in public organizations may convene informally
10
11 outside workplace premises or under the banners of “non-meetings”. Such secrecy practices,
12
13 engendered by the transparency rule itself, can only work organizationally if it is itself
14
15 transparent to (at least some) organizational members. At the same time, the potential for such
16
17 practices to become known to outsiders can result in both intensified transparency demands
18
19 and new circles of secrecy practices. The phenomenon of open meetings in public sector
20
21 organizations, where transparency is officially mandated and celebrated but nonetheless
22
23 intimately related to secrecy, will be used to illustrate our points throughout the paper.
24
25
26
27

28
29 That said, such secrecy-transparency relationship is not necessarily confined to public
30
31 sector organizations, although it is likely to attain a specific intensity in that particular context.
32
33 Transparency and secrecy are related in all types of organizations not only because full
34
35 transparency can be counterproductive and prevent important information from being aired or
36
37 considered (e.g., Bok, 1982) or because organizations necessarily have something to hide (cf.
38
39 Eisenberg, 1982), but also because transparency is inherently selective, illuminating certain
40
41 practices while leaving others in the dark (Christensen & Cheney, 2015). Increasing
42
43 transparency may not simply decrease secrecy or the other way around. Rather, as we shall
44
45 argue, they depend on each other to achieve their respective goals. Understanding such
46
47 interdependency is critical in today's world where the increased social premium on
48
49 transparency continuously reshapes and redefines what are considered illegitimate forms of
50
51 secrecy and, accordingly, determines what is relevant or necessary to know.
52
53
54
55

56
57 Attempts to understand the complexities of the secrecy-transparency relationship
58
59 ought to consider both its epistemological and social dimensions – epistemological, because
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 the searchlight of transparency endeavors inevitably is limited; and social, because any
4
5 ambition to expose simultaneously stimulates a desire to pretend, pose, and idealize. Because
6
7 of these tendencies, many transparency practices produce secrecy in new shapes (Baudrillard
8
9 1988). In this paper, we draw on the phenomenon of open meetings to argue that secrecy and
10
11 transparency are performative practices that not simply oppose each other, but also – and
12
13 simultaneously – produce their presumed antipodes. By *performativity* we refer to the view
14
15 that organizational and social realities are continuously enacted and constituted through
16
17 discourse, rituals, and other social practices. Describing such practices as performative, in other
18
19 words, means to acknowledge that they are *doing* and accomplishing something with potential
20
21 consequences for social life (Butler, 1997, 1999; Gond et al., 2016; Taylor & van Every, 2000).
22
23
24
25

26
27 The performativity of secrecy and transparency has been noted in previous works,
28
29 describing how transparency measures and rituals produce new types of opacity (Albu &
30
31 Flyverbom, 2019; Christensen & Cornelissen, 2015; Fenster, 2006; Ringel, 2019), how secrecy
32
33 involves revelation (Fan & Grey, 2021; Fan & Liu, 2022) and keeps reappearing in new guises
34
35 (Owetschkin & Berger, 2019), and how both secrecy and transparency are needed to
36
37 compensate for each other's deficiencies (Bok, 1982). Yet, the performative dynamics of the
38
39 secrecy-transparency relationship remains unspecified. In this paper, we set out to expand on
40
41 the observation that secrecy and transparency not simply impinge on each other but perform
42
43 with and through each other in several different ways.
44
45
46

47
48 To this purpose, we draw on Morin's (1992) discussion of *dialogic* and his observation
49
50 that complex systems are constituted by an interplay between logics that are at once
51
52 antagonistic and complementary. By bringing attention to such dynamics, our contribution to
53
54 the existing literature is twofold. First, we extend existing understandings of the secrecy-
55
56 transparency relationship by discussing and illustrating how secrecy and transparency perform
57
58 with and through each other. 'Secrecy-transparency performativity', we argue, is a system that
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 performs as a complex whole, rather than through its constitutive parts. Second, by
4
5 investigating the secrecy-transparency relationship through the lens of dialogic, the paper
6
7 draws attention to Morin's insightful work that, while powerfully explaining how
8
9 contradictions contribute to systemic dynamism (see also Morin, 1984), remains to be explored
10
11 in organization studies.
12
13

14
15 By engaging with the dialogic performativity of secrecy and transparency and
16
17 developing the paper in an essay style, we hope to inspire renewed critical engagement among
18
19 politicians, regulators, journalists, and public audiences with the revered ideal of transparency
20
21 and its presumed antipode, secrecy. In doing so, our focus is not organizations deliberately
22
23 designed to operate in the dark (see Scott, 2013). Rather, given the growing social and political
24
25 significance of the topic, we find it important to focus on organizations and social actors that
26
27 come across in everyday life as being most open and candid about their practices. Such focus
28
29 is particularly pertinent when we recognize that transparency practices inevitably cultivate
30
31 opacity (Christensen & Cornelissen, 2015; Fenster, 2006; Ringel, 2019) and tend to offer more
32
33 power to social actors who are able to operate opaquely within current transparency regimes
34
35 (e.g., Birchall, 2021; Cronin, 2020).
36
37
38
39
40
41

Secrecy, Transparency, and the Nexus Between Them*Secrecy: A process of informational and social (re)organization*

42
43
44
45
46 The growing, yet limited, scholarship on secrecy has differentiated secrecy from 'secrets',
47
48 defining the latter as information that is unknown to others. As there are things secret that are
49
50 not deliberately concealed (Derrida & Ferraris, 2011), what is unknown is not necessarily
51
52 equivalent to what is *kept* secret. Secrecy usually refers to processes of *intentionally* blocking
53
54 information about something from reaching particular parties (Bok, 1982; Simmel, 1906/1950).
55
56 Secrecy, thus, might be considered "a method for handling concealed information" (Bellman,
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 1981, p.8) that sets apart keepers of particular knowledge from those who are excluded from it
4
5 (Simmel, 1906/1950). When something is intentionally kept secret, it becomes clear that there
6
7 is more to it than its informational content.
8
9

10 Through the structuring of concealment, secrecy infuses and shapes informational and
11
12 social interactions. As a case in point, Gusterson's (1998) ethnographic study of the Lawrence
13
14 Livermore nuclear weapons laboratory shows how such structuring is employed strategically
15
16 in intelligence and military policies. Specifically, Gusterson illustrates how secrecy was
17
18 organized on a 'need to know' basis that categorized individuals at work: "without a green
19
20 badge, a scientist is not a full adult member of the laboratory...Scientists without green badges
21
22 cannot visit their green-badged colleagues in their offices, unless chaperoned" (1998, p.71).
23
24 Being certified as 'needing to know' involves access to otherwise concealed knowledge. This
25
26 example, which equally applies to participants in unofficial meetings or "non-meetings"
27
28 mentioned previously, illustrates an inherent paradox at the core of secrecy: while insiders
29
30 might be told that the secret is not to be revealed and are trusted to keep the secret, they are
31
32 themselves being told the hidden information (Bellman, 1981; Fan, Costas & Grey, 2017; Fan
33
34 & Dawson, 2022). Such a double frame is embedded in the practices of secrecy as it is
35
36 communicatively organized and yet protected from communication. What makes secrecy
37
38 vulnerable or 'impure' (Birchall, 2021; Fan & Liu, 2022) is therefore secrecy itself.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Consequently, serving as a boundary-drawing mechanism for secrecy, the organizing
46
47 character of the 'need to know' basis indicates a profound ambivalence of the boundary itself:
48
49 how do we know if we need to know something? And, if we do not know what we need to
50
51 know, how do we get to know it; yet, once we know something that we do not need to know,
52
53 we cannot 'unknow' it (Costas & Grey, 2016, p.81). Secrecy organizes relational and possibly
54
55 ambiguous maps, only known to insiders, that constitute "pathways through which information
56
57 is exchanged and interaction occur every day" (Courpasson & Younes, 2018, p.284; see also
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 Liu & Fan, 2022). The organization of secrecy, in other words, marks an affirmational identity
4 and membership that essentially involves insight for members. As such, secrecy in this way is
5 inherently performative (Herzfeld, 2009), even though the transparency it produces is only for
6 the few.
7
8
9
10

The idea and promise of transparency

11
12
13
14
15
16
17 In contemporary society, transparency is presented as a necessary antidote to illegitimate forms
18 of secrecy (Henriques, 2007; Lord, 2006; Oliver, 2004; Rawlins, 2009; Schnackenberg &
19 Tomlinson, 2016). Associated with practices such as information accessibility, labeling,
20 auditing, and open meetings (Fung, et al., 2007; Garsten & de Montoya, 2008; Heald, 2006a;
21 Power, 1997), transparency has become one of the most powerful and seductive concepts in
22 contemporary public discourse (Owetschkin & Berger, 2019). In the context of organization,
23 transparency is celebrated for its ability to facilitate knowledge sharing, accountability, and
24 due diligence. As such, it is expected to lead to better and more acceptable organizational
25 practices (Strathern, 2000; see also Tapscott & Ticoll, 2003).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Transparency's modernist promise is to illuminate and reveal what used to be hidden.
39 As such, it is regarded as an indispensable source of insight, knowledge, and eventually,
40 emancipation (Vattimo, 1992). While this promise has ancient roots (Hood, 2006), modernity
41 explicitly celebrates transparency as a critical dimension of reason, rationality, and good
42 governance, especially in public organizations (e.g., Florini, 2007; Garsten & de Montoya,
43 2008; Piotrowski, 2010). The ideal of modern thought is to enhance the capacity to understand
44 what goes on behind the façade in order to liberate the individual from the superstitions and
45 repressions of authoritative regimes. Weber's (1968) idealized description of modern society
46 as 'disenchanted', for example, depicted a secularized society in which insight, achieved via
47 rational practices and scientific principles, replaces faith and superstition (Nisbet, 1966).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 While transparency has become an undisputed value in and of itself, a value that is
4 “more often preached than practiced, more often invoked than defined” (Hood, 2006, p.1; see
5 also Tsoukas, 1997), recurrent critique of transparency has revealed it as an equivocal and
6 perhaps even misguided ideal (e.g., Birchall, 2021; Han, 2012; Lessig, 2009). Still, the
7 confidence in transparency as a mechanism for insight and knowledge continues to be on the
8 rise (Owetschkin & Berger, 2019). The same discrepancy is at play in the context of
9 organization. Critical organization scholars, thus, have problematized the organizational
10 transparency pursuit, pointing out its questionable ontological and epistemological
11 assumptions, its tensions with other organizational practices, and its inadvertent consequences
12 for organizations and the larger society (e.g., Albu & Flyverbom, 2019; Albu & Ringel, 2018;
13 Christensen & Cheney, 2015; Fenster, 2006; Garsten & Montoya, 2008). Nonetheless,
14 transparency is continually employed as an ethical practice and path necessary to cure the
15 mistrust faced by many contemporary organizations. As we shall argue below, this elevated
16 status of transparency is performative in several different ways that link its pursuit to secrecy.
17 While secrecy and transparency seem to point in opposite directions – one unethical, the other
18 ethical – they are mutually constituted and more closely related than generally considered. It
19 is, in other words, theoretically and practically meaningless to address one without considering
20 the other.

The nexus between secrecy and transparency

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 More than a century ago, Simmel (1906/1950) outlined the social significance of secrecy and
50 its potential relationship to publicity, which was the term he used for transparency. Arguing
51 that secrecy is a “universal sociological form” (p.463) that channels and facilitates human
52 interaction, Simmel (1906) pointed out that knowing inevitably involves a mixture of insight
53 and ignorance, revelation and concealment. Human associations, he emphasized, “require a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

definite ratio of secrecy which merely changes its objects” (1906, p.467). Thus, while increased transparency may reduce certain types of concealment, secrecy is likely to reappear elsewhere or in a different shape such that the space between the two is constantly “recalibrated”, as Owetschkin and Berger (2019, p.6) put it. Secrecy, in other words, cannot be eliminated by increasing transparency as the borders between the two are constantly shifting. Simmel not only depicted secrecy as inevitable, but also considered it indispensable in enriching our social reality, arguing that it “produces an immense enlargement of life: numerous content of life cannot even emerge in the presence of full publicity” (Simmel, 1906/1950, p.330). Several recent writings have applied this understanding of secrecy to organizational life.

In her book *Secrets: On the ethics of concealment and revelation*, Bok (1982) explains how secrecy and transparency are necessary to counterbalance each other in democratic societies. Although each can be harmful in their side effects, they are both likely to be more manipulative without some influence from the other. Thus, while secrecy without transparency allows those in power to uphold unfair practices and limit popular participation, transparency without some secrecy tends to reduce the quality of policy-making in administrative practices (see also Dufresne & Offstein, 2008; Eisenberg, 1984). If, for example, public policymakers, advisors, and contributors are required to do everything in the open, they might display more established and less controversial views aligned with dominant political and public rhetoric (see also Heald, 2006b). This, Bok argues, could result in the premature closure of creative but tentative ideas, and thereby reduce the potential for learning and innovation.

- While Bok’s (1982) discussion focuses on administrative and governmental secrecy, Costas and Grey (2014; 2016) argue more generally that complex organizational structures as well as new forms of organizing might promote secrecy to the same extent as they promote knowledge sharing. Specifically, they emphasize the political and social nature of information (Costas & Grey,

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

2014) that makes the relationship between transparency and secrecy “more intricate than commonly assumed” (Costas & Grey, 2016, p.54). They, however, do not address further what such intricate relationships might be. Along the same lines, Fan and Liu (2022) draw on archival stories to discuss how information concealment as the site and process that sustains secrecy can simultaneously become the site where secrecy is *revealed*. While they emphasize that concealment and revelation are mutually constitutive through their ongoing oppositions, they draw no explicit link to the issue of transparency.

A number of writings have explicitly addressed the mutual constitution of secrecy and transparency. Albu and Flyverbom (2019), for example, argue that transparency measures and practices are simultaneously practices of opacity because they affect what can be seen and known (see also Christensen & Cornelissen, 2015; Fenster, 2006). While they mention that secrecy and transparency can co-exist and have paradoxical relations (2019, p.279), the intricacies of that particular relationship are left unspecified. Ringel (2019) provides a more specific analysis of the transparency-secrecy relationship with his study of the German Pirate Party, a political party that celebrated and practiced open meetings in the early phases of its election. Specifically, Ringel discusses the transparency-secrecy interplay as a frontstage-backstage dynamic. This vocabulary, borrowed from Goffman (1959), suggests that social actors engage in impression management when operating frontstage, that is, whenever they are exposed to the gaze of others. Backstage, by contrast, is where they can relax and drop their fronts. This implies, as Goffman (1959) pointed out, that backstage is an arena where the frontstage performance is “knowingly contradicted” (p.114). Ringel (2019) uses this insight to discuss the performative nature of secrecy and transparency and to suggest that new forms of secrecy emerge in reaction to transparency measures.

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 Cronin (2020) approaches the relationship between secrecy and transparency in the
4 domain of public relations. Describing secrecy and transparency as a “composite entity” (p.226)
5 or as “conjoined twins” (p.230), Cronin (2020) centrally argues that the shifting dynamics
6 between the two are not merely situated in *existing* social relations, but actively contribute to
7 their constitution. Suggesting that public relations play an active role in mediating the secrecy-
8 transparency dynamics and that this role may protect the rules of the capitalist game, she
9 emphasizes that neither secrecy nor transparency should be presumed as positive or negative
10 in their social and political impact. While acknowledging that the mutual constitution between
11 secrecy and transparency is significant and under-investigated, Cronin’s specific focus on the
12 public relations domain reveals only a singular dimension of the complexity.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Elaborating on the image of secrecy and transparency as “conjoined twins” (p.3),
27 Birchall (2021) describes each of them as “singular and unique, but essentially connected,
28 sharing vital functions, and only severable by extreme measures and at some considerable risk”
29 (p.4). Both “fail to stay pure”, as Birchall (2021, p.9) puts it, and might even encroach on each
30 other in ways that confuse the observer to think that one is the other. Acknowledging in line
31 with Simmel’s work that secrecy is unavoidable, Birchall is critical especially of transparency
32 practices that promote types of knowledge creation useful to the preservation of the status quo.
33 A radical approach, she argues, involves questioning whether “the opposition between secrecy
34 and transparency is sustainable” (2021, p.54; see also Birchall, 2011a, 2011b).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 These insights are all highly significant as they disrupt the one-dimensional thinking
48 that dominates public and political discourse on secrecy and transparency. Acknowledging the
49 mutual impingement and constitution of secrecy and transparency, however, is only a first
50 important step toward a reconceptualization of these significant dimensions of social life. The
51 next step is to elaborate on the performative dynamics involved when secrecy and transparency
52 not only co-exist and encroach on each other but perform with and through each other.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency**Dialogic Performativity**

Claiming that the secrecy-transparency relationship is performative means to adopt a “non-representational view of discourse”, that is, to acknowledge that the use of these terms and their interconnections not simply describe, but accomplish or constitute social reality (Gond et al., 2016, p.441; see also Ashcraft, et al., 2009; Taylor & van Every, 2000). As Gond et al. (2016) point out, understandings of performativity in the context of organization and management theory often take their point of departure in Austin’s (1962) Speech Act Theory and its notion of doing things with words. As Austin and later Searle (1969) made clear, utterances have potential to accomplish things, provided the circumstances or ‘felicity conditions’ such as procedures, participants, and intentions are right. In contemporary society where transparency is considered a necessary antidote to illegitimate forms of secrecy, the call for transparency is a significant speech act that is very difficult to ignore or resist (Vogelmann, 2019).

To fully capture its organizational and social dynamics, however, this view on performativity needs to be expanded. With its primary focus on speech acts in conventional settings where felicity conditions are clear-cut and participants have fairly well-defined roles (e.g., McKinlay, 2011), Austin’s version tends to neglect performativity’s temporal, social, and systemic complexities (e.g., Christensen, Morsing & Thyssen, 2021). Moreover, it reduces performativity to explicit and singular speech acts realized by speaking subjects. Yet, the productive force (or “social magic”) of performativity, as Butler (1999, p.124) formulates it, is “extra-linguistic”. Performativity, Butler argues, must be rethought as ambiguous social rituals that are repeatedly re-enacted: “There need be no subject who initiates or enunciates the performative process, only a reiteration of a set of social relations within which theory emerges with limited performative agency” (Butler, 2010, p.152). Specifically, she draws on Derrida to suggest that communicative constitution (of gender) is unstable and takes place only gradually

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 through numerous reiterations. Emphasizing the provisional nature of performativity, the
4 significance of Butler's insights extends beyond gender studies to social dynamics more
5 broadly. Although communication often "misfires" (Austin, 1979, p.238), that is, fail to
6 perform as intended, the repeated iteration of particular values or ideals has "socially binding
7 consequences" (Butler, 2011, p.147). While such consequences may involve reinforcing
8 existing practices and understandings, others become 'counterperformatives' (MacKenzie,
9 2004) that contradict or undermine the presumed intentions of the performative.

19 In this critical essay, we build upon this notion of performativity as a ritualized, yet
20 ambiguously re-enacted, practice with potential to add unexpected dynamics to social systems.
21 Such understanding allows us to unpack the inherent ambiguity of the secrecy-transparency
22 relationship and challenge the one-dimensional juxtaposition of secrecy and transparency as
23 antagonistic forces. To extend this view, we draw on the French sociologist and philosopher
24 Edgar Morin's writings on dialogics to analyze how secrecy and transparency simultaneously
25 constitute, challenge, and contradict each other as a form of 'dialogic performativity'.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

The Dialogic Principle

38
39
40 Morin (1992) uses his notion of *dialogic* to describe the nature of complex systems, including
41 societies and organizations. Such systems, Morin argues, are characterized by multiple logics
42 that are at once complementary and antagonistic with respect to one another. The terms
43 'dialogic' or 'dialogism' are often associated with the work of Bakhtin (1981, 1986) and his
44 description of the dynamic, interactive, and essentially polyphonic relationship between
45 authors, characters, and texts. Problematizing understandings of language use as unified
46 ('monoglotic'), Bakhtin emphasized the open-ended and diverse ('heteroglot') nature of
47 utterances and their meaning (see also Holquist, 2002). While Morin's notion of dialogic holds
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 the potential to encompass such characteristics of language use, he developed his particular
4 understanding of dialogic without focusing specifically on linguistics (Kofman, 1996).
5
6

7
8 What Morin seeks to understand is how two or more logics that seem to rule out each
9 other can contribute to systemic unity without losing their distinct qualities. His complexity
10 theory characterizes dialogic as “the complete (complementary/concurrent/antagonistic)
11 association of logics which are collectively needed for the existence, functioning, and
12 development of an organized phenomenon” (Morin, 1986, p.98; translated in Kofman, 1996,
13 p.60). His examples of dialogics in living systems include unity/diversity, wisdom/madness,
14 openness/closure, order/disorder, chance/necessity, and individuality/collectivity (Morin,
15 2008). While these logics seemingly contradict and preclude each other, they serve the system
16 as a whole (Morin, 1986). In his book *Penser l'Europe*, Morin explains how the European
17 culture is influenced and shaped by complementary and antagonistic dynamics derived from
18 its Jewish, Christian, Greek, Roman (etc.) elements, each of which operates according to its
19 own logic (Morin, 1987). Organizations too are shaped by multiple, coexisting logics that are
20 at once antagonistic and complementary to organizational functioning. Examples of such
21 dialogics are integration/differentiation (e.g., Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967), control/flexibility
22 (e.g., Achrol, 1991), and centralization/decentralization (e.g., Weick, 1987). Importantly, such
23 dialogics cannot be eliminated by imposing control and order.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Morin's point of departure and primary reference is the Hegelian and Marxian notion
45 of dialectics, which he finds too deterministic and rationalistic and therefore unable to account
46 for the performative complementarities of seemingly antagonistic logics (Kofman, 1996).
47 Whereas dialectics implies that opposing forces are dissolved (at least temporarily) in synthesis,
48 Morin's notion of dialogics suggests that different and opposing logics *continue* to co-exist as
49 they neither alternate, replace, or annul each other (Morin, 2008), and that such co-existence
50 in turn serves and sustains the system as a whole (Morin, 1992). The unity of complex
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 phenomena, in other words, does not require an amalgamation of its constitutive elements and
4 their particular logics. The mutual interdependence of such involved logics, shaped by
5 complementary and opposing forces, ritualizes their persistence over time and gradually
6 (re)defines the system. Even though conflicting logics subject a system to multiple tensions,
7 crises, and sometimes, setbacks, they simultaneously serve the performativity of the system by
8 allowing it to stay vibrant and adaptive to different situations.

9
10 Specifically, Morin argues that systemic dynamism is generated by organizational
11 recursion. Recursion or recursivity, he points out, “is a process where the products and the
12 effects are at the same time causes and producers of what produces them” (Morin, 2008, p. 49).
13 Morin illustrates such effects with the image of a whirlpool in which opposite forces meet and
14 generate a self-organizing entity. We briefly illustrated such recursivity up front when talking
15 about how open meetings tend to create new secrecies that produce new transparency initiatives,
16 new secrecy efforts and so forth. In the remainder of the paper, we unfold this point further by
17 adopting Morin’s dialogical perspective.

The Performativity of Secrecy-Transparency Dialogics: The Case of Open Meetings

18
19 If secrecy and transparency are inseparable and mutually constituted, as extant research has
20 pointed out, how can we further characterize their antagonistic complementarity? While the
21 dialogic performativity between secrecy and transparency is carefully manufactured and
22 exploited in some cases, in others it emerges unwittingly behind the backs of social actors in
23 their efforts to reveal or conceal. In the following, we use the example of open meetings to
24 discuss and illustrate how the secrecy-transparency dialogic performs in organizational practice.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 *Knowing and not knowing in open meetings*
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 Open meetings were initiated as part of the transparency ambition of democratic societies and
4
5 became a legal practice in the United States under the label of ‘sunshine laws’ (Crowder, 2006;
6
7 Piotrowski, 2010). As a mechanism for ‘transparency inwards’ (Heald, 2006a) that allows the
8
9 general public to look inside from the outside, the notion of open meetings has become a
10
11 widespread ethical principle for public organizations in democratic societies and, as such, a
12
13 proxy for general participation in the decision-making of public organizations. Emphasizing
14
15 that ‘we’ open up because ‘we’ have nothing to hide from ‘you’ reinforces the anti-secrecy
16
17 mindset. At the same time, however, the ethical and even legal obligations of open meetings
18
19 cultivate different formats of secrecy acts, such as ‘non-meetings’, as ‘legitimate reasons’ for
20
21 certain not-to-disclose agendas, until the next revelation of a public organization scandal.
22
23
24
25

26 To understand how transparency and secrecy practices perform through each other in
27
28 the context of open meetings, it is important first to acknowledge that demands for (more)
29
30 transparency depend on secrecy, or at least on the supposition that some sort of illegitimate
31
32 secrecy is at play. Such suspicion may be enough to justify new transparency initiatives and
33
34 measures. Legitimizing the meaning and practices of transparency, secrecy may therefore be
35
36 considered transparency’s “condition of possibility” (Birchall, 2011b, p.143; Phillips, 2011,
37
38 p.160). At the same time, the type of transparency made possible by open meetings as well as
39
40 the growing calls for information accessibility may themselves cultivate suspicions that
41
42 something problematic remains to be unearthed (e.g., Christensen & Cheney, 2015). The
43
44 assumed antagonism between secrecy and transparency, thus, defines and reinforces their
45
46 complementarity. What stimulates such complementarity is a seductive, yet ambiguous,
47
48 fascination with knowing and not knowing (see Baudrillard, 1990; Brown, 2001; Han, 2015;
49
50 Schmitt, 1996). Such fascination is recursively performative, especially in the context of open
51
52 meetings where knowing and not knowing continuously produce and justify each other.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

Another ambiguous aspect of such fascination concerns the value and importance ascribed to, respectively, concealed and revealed information. Intentionally concealed information has a particular social status as it is perceived as more valuable and more true than other types of information: If the concealed information were not particularly interesting or attractive, then why would it be intentionally hidden? Having exclusive access to such information can increase one's status and power and strengthen one's belongingness to a social group, thereby contributing to a grammar of 'us'. As Simmel (1906/1950, p.332) pointed out, "For many individuals, property does not fully gain its significance with mere ownership, but only with the consciousness that others must do without it". Possession, in other words, provides a sense of privilege and status upheld by the recognition that one has access to a hidden realm that others do not. As such, it can generate an aristocratic sensation that one is more relevant and important to a social network than the 'knowing less' others (e.g., Courpasson & Younes, 2018; Fan & Grey, 2021).

When such information becomes generally accessible – for example, through open meetings – it may lose its particular allure. Openness without an air of secrecy is likely to produce indifference and apathy (Baudrillard, 1990; Han, 2015). The aristocratic sensation of ownership, however, can be (re)established if the topics addressed in open meetings are highly complex and difficult to fathom for laypersons (Henriques, 2007; see also Fung et al., 2007). Being in the know in such contexts can generate in-groups and associated feelings of superiority. The antagonistic complementarity of the secrecy-transparency dialogic, thus, performs and stimulates processes of social and informational differentiation.

Strategic information use in open meetings

The increased social premium on transparency force decision makers, especially in public organizations, to produce and display convincing signs of insight. Open meetings may serve

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 such purpose. Yet, the ambiguous fascination with secrecy and transparency and their intricate
4 relationship can be exploited by organizations, politicians, and other actors to merely create an
5
6
7 *impression* of insight. Such practices may include, for example, careful selection and
8
9 scheduling of released information, as well as strategic uses of informational comparisons,
10
11
12 ambiguity, and complexity.
13

14
15 It has been demonstrated that organizations selectively disclose or leak information
16
17 through ‘competitive signalling’ (e.g., Heil & Robertsen, 1991) and shrewdly manage the
18
19 timing of such disclosures, sometimes with the intention of deflecting critique or handling
20
21 potential issues (see also O’Neill, 2006). In addition, many organizations deliberately use
22
23 ambiguity to simultaneously reveal *and* conceal (Eisenberg, 1984; see also Etzioni, 2010). In
24
25 the context of open meetings, public officials often make long, time-wasting speeches with
26
27 jargons and self-evident statistics for the purpose of ‘saying and revealing’, instead of
28
29 facilitating sensemaking (e.g., Piotrowski & Borry, 2010). Such practices employed to simulate
30
31 transparency without providing real insight are sometimes called “pseudo transparency”
32
33 (Vujnovic & Kruckeberg, 2016, p.122), “zombie transparency” (Birchall, 2021, p.2), or “false
34
35 clarity” (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1987/2002, p.xvii), as their promise to offer insight “fails to
36
37 deliver anything more than ready-made enlightenment” (Jarosinski, 2009, p.160).
38
39
40
41

42
43 Even when complexity and ambiguity are avoided, the *volume* of information flow
44
45 can itself be a source of secrecy. While information access and availability are often considered
46
47 proxies for transparency, information overload – sometimes described as “data bombing” or
48
49 “snowing” (Cronin, 2020, p.223) – may hide the object of inquiry in plain sight (Stohl, et al.,
50
51 2016). As Lacan argued in his seminar on Poe’s ‘Purloined Letter’, “the best way to hide
52
53 something was to display it ostentatiously” (Phillips, 2011, p.161). As an extreme case of
54
55 publishing documents of open meetings such as minutes, comments, and records, the US
56
57 Security and Exchange Commission’s publicly documented database lists 200 gigabytes of
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 filings each year between 1996 and 2005 – amounting to roughly 15 million pages of text – a
4
5 number that went up from 35 gigabytes a decade earlier (Roth, 2009, cited in Birchall, 2011b,
6
7 p.145). Even with a generally accessible language, it is not likely for the public to digest such
8
9 an amount of information. In such cases, transparency measures can be regarded as strategies
10
11 for opacity through which secrecy reemerges in new shapes.
12
13

14
15 This observation is radicalized in the writings of Baudrillard (1988; 1990). With his
16
17 notion of communication ecstasy, he depicts a society in which the availability of information
18
19 is ‘obscene’, because it illuminates objects in ways that resemble close-up photos in
20
21 pornography. As he explains, “It is no longer the obscenity of the hidden, the repressed, the
22
23 obscure, but that of the visible, the all-too-visible, the more visible-than-visible; it is the
24
25 obscenity of that which no longer contains a secret and is entirely soluble in information and
26
27 communication” (1988, p.22). The obscenity of information availability, Baudrillard argues,
28
29 does not mean that secrecy is disappearing. What disappears are the objects we seek to
30
31 understand. By illuminating them through rituals of transparency they “plunge back into the
32
33 secret” (1988, p.35). This observation, which we shall further unfold below, illustrates the
34
35 antagonistic complementarity between secrecy and transparency as a complex and recursive
36
37 rhythm of emergence and disappearance.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Self-imposed conformity in open meetings

45
46 Meetings may be regarded as transparent as long as important discussions and decisions are
47
48 made accessible to outside publics. In principle, this can be done retrospectively, that is, after
49
50 the event. Yet, the notion of open meetings suggests that meetings are accessible in *real time*,
51
52 for example through the use of videotaping or other types of recordings (cf. Heald, 2006a). The
53
54 attraction of open meetings may, in fact, lie exactly in the possibility of observing processes of
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 deliberations and decision makings in the very moments they unfold. From a transparency
4
5 perspective, however, this possibility is simultaneously the Achilles heel of open meetings.
6
7

8 When decision makers know that everything they say and do – including not only
9
10 their accounts of prior decisions and their lines of argumentation but also their bodily gestures
11
12 and their facial expressions – is observable to the public, they may be inclined to put on a show
13
14 or “massage the truth”, as O’Neill (2002) puts it (cited in Heald, 2006b, p. 62). Such propensity
15
16 is likely to be pronounced especially in open meetings involving “preliminary” discussions
17
18 where meeting participants may be unwilling to share too much information about their
19
20 preferences. Since open meetings, like other types of real time transparency, cannot be edited
21
22 before they are publicized, they tend to encourage conformity to norms and expectations
23
24 (Christensen & Cheney, 2015). Increasing transparency in such settings, for example by
25
26 installing more cameras and microphones and otherwise increasing the technical quality of
27
28 recordings, is likely to formalize meetings and normalize behaviors in ways that recreate
29
30 secrecy in new shapes. Drawing on Foucault (1977) who explained how the condition of being
31
32 closely watched instills self-discipline among those observed, Butler (2005) points out that
33
34 official performances hide more than they reveal. Specifically, she argues that individuals when
35
36 officially called upon to account for their choices and behaviors tend to submit to a narrative
37
38 modus that can be recognized and accepted by others. Because such modus is not of the
39
40 person’s own making, but a reflection of prevailing norms, it will tend to obscure the very
41
42 subject that provides the account. Even with the best intentions to be open and honest,
43
44 participants in open meetings are social actors to the extent of generating layers of secrecy that
45
46 overshadow the initial transparency pursuit (see also Baudrillard, 1983).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Open meetings, then, shift the emphasis from information provision to social
55
56 performance and reproduction. As a specific type of synopticon (Mathiesen, 1997) – a notion
57
58 describing ‘the many watching the few’ as opposed to Bentham’s panopticon where the few
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 are watching the many – open meetings create a system of self-control cloaked as audience
4 control. One result may be, as Piotrowski and Borry (2010) argue, that agendas discussed in
5 open meetings tend to remain more or less the same. Consequently, and more problematically,
6 the public who is granted access to the meetings will have to figure out themselves what is
7 going on under the veil of openness. As Birchall (2021) points out, any forms of open access
8 transfers the responsibility to make sense of and use the revealed information to the now
9 involved citizens. Citizens who gain access, she points out, are expected to be auditors, analysts,
10 and translators without having any real power and real insight.

21
22 There are several reasons why transparency practices such as open meetings are
23 upheld despite their limitations. Firstly, openness signals that power is being transferred from
24 the inside to the outside and that the boundary between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ is being
25 rearranged. This allows the public to perceive itself as part of the ‘in-group’ for knowledge
26 possession, even if such perception is mistaken. Secondly, acts of revelation – sometimes used
27 strategically by politicians and other public figures to admit missteps and personal
28 shortcomings – can generate a sense of authenticity necessary to generate trust in cases where
29 real insight is difficult to achieve (Power, 1997). In between the giving away and the giving
30 off, the antagonistic complementarity of secrecy and transparency suggests that the more open
31 and candid one seems to be, the more murkiness might be embedded within. The secrecy
32 dimensions of transparency practices, however, may be difficult to detect in practice.
33 Transparency measures have become ‘performative statements’ (Cabantous, et al., 2016;
34 Cabantous & Gond, 2011) of insight that not only constitute social reality, but rationalize
35 themselves as reality *per se*. Such rationalization in turn becomes an isomorphic normative
36 logic that institutionalizes specific transparency practices across organizational settings, as
37 exemplified by the use of open meetings and open reporting systems (e.g., Flyverbom, et al.,
38 2015).

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

Concluding Discussion

Secrecy and transparency are usually presented as antipodes, that is, as forces and practices that counteract and abolish each other. Even though several studies have noted that the relations between the two are more intricate than commonly assumed, the presumption that secrecy and transparency are mutually exclusive continues to dominate public and political discourse. This paper is derived from the concern about such one-dimensional understanding of the transparency-secrecy nexus and its associated practices.

The predominance of such one-dimensional understanding is harmful to many societal processes, including the functioning of democracy, participation, and education, because it ignores how secrecy and transparency are enveloped within and produced through each other. While a growing number of academic writings are recognizing this, pointing out that secrecy and transparency are performative forces that encroach on each other, the intricacies of *how* they do so have been left unspecified. In this paper, we expand existing research of the secrecy-transparency relationship by discussing and illustrating how secrecy and transparency operate with and through each other. To that purpose, we draw on Morin's dialogic principle that describes how complex systems are constituted and shaped by logics that are simultaneously complementary and antagonistic to each other. This perspective makes it possible to center stage and theorize the performative interactions between tendencies that are usually regarded as incompatible (Morin, 1984). By discussing the performativity of the secrecy-transparency dialogic, we foreground questions of what secrecy reveals and transparency conceals.

With this paper, we hope to contribute to an integrated view on the secrecy-transparency nexus that acknowledges its multidimensional performativity. This, we believe, is a meaningful engagement with the concept and practical impact of 'performativity', as it does not simply ask what transparency and secrecy expose or hide, but what their intricate

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 dialogics ‘do’ together in terms of organizing and knowing. Only through an integrated view
4
5 that acknowledges how one can be produced through the other, can we understand their
6
7 complex and conflicting outcomes. With this perspective, we suggest moving beyond Ringel’s
8
9 (2019) otherwise interesting discussion of how the German Pirate Party came to reorganize its
10
11 open meetings as a balance between frontstage and backstage practices. Associating
12
13 transparency with frontstage and secrecy with backstage tends to reproduce the common-sense
14
15 distinction between the two and overlook their intricate and performative complementarity (cf.
16
17 Meyrowitz, 1985). Organizations may, for example, deliberately reveal certain dimensions of
18
19 otherwise backstage behavior, thereby giving off the impression that nothing is hidden. Since
20
21 norms for “proper” frontstage behavior (including disclosures and other transparency measures)
22
23 are open-ended and sometimes ambiguous, they can be co-created by social actors (e.g.,
24
25 organizations) engaging in selective frontstaging (cf. Oliver, 1992). This possibility is in line
26
27 with Simmel’s observation that secrecy, if reduced in some areas, tends to reappear elsewhere.
28
29 Frontstage behavior, in other words, is not only managed and performed as Goffman suggested,
30
31 but may eventually define or constitute the situation and the performer.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Practically speaking, where do we go from here? Bok’s (1982) solution to the
39
40 inevitable tension between secrecy and transparency is to ensure openness about the moral
41
42 choices that lead to secrecy. While some level of secrecy is inevitable in deliberative processes
43
44 and may be necessary to protect individuals against centralized powers and intrusive media
45
46 (see also Birchall, 2021; Heald, 2006), Bok argues that principles for secrecy, at least in public
47
48 administration, need to be subject to open debate and critique. This, of course, presupposes a
49
50 high level of public (self)-reflection as to how secrecy and transparency are produced and
51
52 performed through each other. Specifically, it requires an ability to make the unwitting
53
54 production of secrets that inevitably accompanies transparency efforts apparent to all relevant
55
56 parties. The same is true when it comes to the moral choices that lead to transparency. In both
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 public and private sectors, transparency measures include questions about what transparency
4
5 rules should be followed, how to follow such rules, what specific activities should be
6
7 considered, and what controls are needed to exercise those activities within the set rules. The
8
9 question of *how* transparency is incorporated into regulatory regimes, for example, involves
10
11 pressing issues of its own accountability (Power, 1997). As Lodge (2004, p.125) puts it, the
12
13 dimensions *within* transparency implementations “differ greatly in terms of who holds whom
14
15 accountable for what type of activities and type of consequences”. Any ambiguity about
16
17 transparency rules enables an unwitting concealment within its implementation.
18
19

20
21 For further research, we suggest looking beyond open meetings in public sector
22
23 organizations. The boundary conditions under which transparency practices produce secrecy
24
25 and vice versa are not limited to this particular phenomenon but are likely to be similar in all
26
27 cases where strict transparency practices or standards are mandated. One such example is the
28
29 dialogic performativity of transparency requirements for publicly traded companies that
30
31 publish financial and, increasingly so, ESG reports. A relevant question here might be how the
32
33 detailed criteria or metrics for reporting on environmental, social, and governance topics tend
34
35 to hide specific organizational practices and how the new/renewed secrecies emerged
36
37 recursively shape what is being published and disclosed.
38
39
40

41
42 Moreover, the dialogic performativity discussed in this paper is not confined to cases
43
44 where transparency is legally or regulatorily mandated. Secrecy may arise out of transparency
45
46 efforts also in situations where the transparency ideal is zealously pursued without proper
47
48 attention to its limitations. Morin’s complexity theory expounds how *a dogmatic engagement*
49
50 *with any ideal or a principle* tends to produce its assumed antipode. He describes, for example,
51
52 how a rigid pursuit of rationality – a pursuit that remains ignorant and impervious to its own
53
54 limitations – tends to produce blind knowledge. Such knowledge, he argues, is akin to the
55
56 mythical thinking that rationality claims to eradicate (Morin, 1986). This insight is relevant
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 also to our specific purpose. Thus, while secrecy and transparency, as we have seen, are
4 essentially and inevitably co-dependent as “conjoined twins” (Birchall, 2021; Cronin, 2020),
5 their tendency to overpower the other is likely to be pronounced especially in contexts where
6 each is pursued single-mindedly and credulously, assuming that the other will disappear or be
7 significantly reduced.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Such contexts are multiple these days where transparency is celebrated as a panacea
16 to many evils of contemporary society without openly considering its limitations and
17 unintended consequences (Owetschkin & Berger, 2019). While public sector organizations –
18 facing many different stakeholder demands – are especially prone to be confronted with such
19 naïve transparency ideal, private organizations and NGOs may equally find it difficult to fully
20 recognize and admit how their own transparency ideals and endeavors may themselves be
21 sources of secrecy. Thus, in our efforts to depict the antagonistic complementarity of the
22 secrecy/transparency dialogic we should be sensitive especially to contexts where either are
23 pursued most ardently.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Recognizing the antagonistic complementarity of secrecy and transparency, thus, does
37 not imply that the whole idea of transparency is itself a failure and should be scratched out.
38 Even though many transparency practices, as we have argued, are problematic and seem to
39 counteract the ideal, the foundational promise of modernity to move behind the ‘curtain’ by
40 raising awareness and deepening insight is still highly relevant today. Because of its democratic
41 significance, we ought to sharpen our awareness of transparency to critically see through and
42 beyond its current practices and manifestations. Following Christensen and Cheney’s (2015)
43 call to apply transparency to itself, we therefore suggest updating the transparency ideal by
44 intensifying it through reflexive measures. While remaining ultrasensitive to the social,
45 political, and epistemological limitations and absurdities associated with transparency
46 practices (e.g., Baudrillard, 1988; Han, 2015; Wilensky, 2015), such intensification implies a
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

growing awareness of what we know and, especially, *how* we know it (Morin, 1986). As Morin has pointed out on multiple occasions (e.g., Palais des beaux-arts de Bruxelles, 2020), such awareness needs to be developed in research, education, journalism, and public debate. In the classroom, for instance, it is possible to raise a dialogic awareness of secrecy and transparency by having students – at any academic level – identify and discuss examples recognized as good transparency practices, focusing firstly on the insights that such practices provide and facilitate and then, secondly, on what is hidden as a consequence of the practices. A similar technique could be used – in fact, *ought* to be used – in journalism and political and public debates whenever new transparency measures and metrics are being considered.

The goal in each case is not to undermine the foundational ideal of insight, but to foster a sharpened understanding of the antagonistic complementarity between secrecy and transparency and see any knowledge pursuit as a source of both “clarity *and* opacity, light *and* darkness” (Christensen & Cheney, 2015, p.76). Such reinvesting in the transparency ideal has implications also for NGOs and social critics explicitly devoted to the fight for more transparency in social and organizational life. The noblest effort of such groups and critics, we believe, is to show in each case how secrecy might creep in as transparency is increased. Rather than regarding such efforts as threatening to the overall transparency pursuit, the notion and practice of *applying transparency to itself* should be seen as transparency’s *sine qua non*, necessary to revive our democratic obligation and endeavour.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our anonymous reviewers and our acting editor Jean-Pascal Gond for their continually constructive and supportive comments in developing this paper.

Funding

There are no funders to report for this submission

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency**References**

- Achrol, R. S. (1991). Evolution of the marketing organization: New forms for turbulent environments. *Journal of Marketing*, 55(4), 77-93.
- Albu, O. B. & Flyverbom, M. (2019). Organizational transparency: Conceptualizations, conditions, and consequences. *Business & Society*, 58(2), 268-297.
- Albu, O. B. & Ringel, L. (2018). The perils of organizational transparency: Consistency, surveillance, and authority negotiations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 57, 227-256.
- Ashcraft, K. L., Kuhn, T. R., & Cooren, F. (2009). Constitutional amendments: "Materializing" organizational communication. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 1-64.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1979). *Philosophical papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *In the shadow of the silent majorities*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Baudrillard, J. (1988). *The ecstasy of communication*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Baudrillard, J. (1990). *Seduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Bellman, B. L. (1981). The paradox of secrecy. *Human Studies*, 4(1), 1-24.
- Birchall, C. (2011a). Introduction to 'secrecy and transparency': The politics of opacity and openness. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(7-8), 7-25.
- Birchall, C. (2011b). "There's been too much secrecy in this city": The False Choice between Secrecy and Transparency in US Politics. *Cultural Politics*, 7(1), 133-156.
- Birchall, C. (2021). *Radical secrecy: The ends of transparency in datafield America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 Bok, S. (1982). *Secrets: On the ethics of concealment and revelation*. New York: Pantheon
4
5 Books.
6
7
8 Brown, S. (2001). Torment your customers (they'll love it). *Harvard Business Review*, 79(9),
9
10 82-88.
11
12 Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of performativity*. London: Routledge.
13
14 Butler, J. (1999). Performativity's social magic. In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu: A critical*
15
16 *reader* (pp. 113-128). Blackwell.
17
18 Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
19
20 Butler, J. (2010). Performative agency. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 3(2), 147-161.
21
22 Cabantous, L., & Gond, J. P. (2011). Rational decision making as performative praxis:
23
24 Explaining rationality's Éternel Retour. *Organization science*, 22(3), 573-586.
25
26 Cabantous, L., Gond, J. P., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2016). Critical essay:
27
28 Reconsidering critical performativity. *Human Relations*, 69(2), 197-213.
29
30
31 Christensen, L. T. & Cornelissen, J. P. (2015). Organizational transparency as myth and
32
33 metaphor. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 18(2), 132-149.
34
35 Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2021). Talk-action dynamics: Modalities of
36
37 aspirational talk. *Organization Studies*, 42(3), 407-427.
38
39 Christensen, L.T. & G. Cheney (2015). Peering into transparency: Challenging ideals, proxies
40
41 and organizational practices. *Communication Theory*, 25(1), 70-90.
42
43
44 Costas, J. & Grey, C. (2014). Bringing secrecy into the open: Towards a theorization of the
45
46 social processes of organizational secrecy. *Organization Studies*, 35, 1423-1447.
47
48
49 Costas, J. & Grey, C. (2016). *Secrecy at work: The hidden architecture of organizational life*.
50
51
52 Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 Courpasson, D., & Younes, D. (2018). Double or quits: Understanding the links between
4
5 secrecy and creativity in a project development process. *Organization Studies*, 39(2-3),
6
7 271-295.
8
9
- 10 Cronin, A. M. (2020). The secrecy–transparency dynamic: A sociological reframing of secrecy
11
12 and transparency for public relations research. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 9(3), 219-
13
14 236.
15
16
- 17 Crowder, P. A. (2006). Ain't no sunshine: Examining informality and state open meetings acts
18
19 as the anti-public norm in inner-city redevelopment deal making. *Tenn. L. Rev.*, 74,
20
21 623-640.
22
23
- 24 Derrida, J. & Ferraris, M. (2001). *A taste for the secret*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers
25
26 Inc.
27
28
- 29 Dufresne, R. L. & Offstein, E. H. (2008). On the virtues of secrecy in organizations. *Journal*
30
31 *of Management Inquiry*, 17(2), 102-106.
32
33
- 34 Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication.
35
36 *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 227-242.
37
38
- 39 Etzioni, A. (2010). Is transparency the best disinfectant? *The Journal of Political Philosophy*,
40
41 18(4), 389–404.
42
43
- 44 Fan, Z., & Dawson, P. (2022). Gossip as evaluative sensemaking and the concealment of
45
46 confidential gossip in the everyday life of organizations. *Management*
47
48 *Learning*, 53(2), 146-166.
49
50
- 51 Fan, Z., & Grey, C. (2021). Everyday secrecy: Boundaries of confidential gossip. *Culture and*
52
53 *Organization*, 27(3), 209-225.
54
55
- 56 Fan, Z., & Liu, Y. (2022). Decoding secrecy as multiple temporal processes: Co-constitution
57
58 of concealment and revelation in archival stories. *Human Relations*, 75(6), 1028-1052.
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 Fan, Z., Costas, J., & Grey, C. (2017). Secrecy and communication: towards a research agenda.

4
5 *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 22(4), 562-566.

6
7 Fenster, M. (2006). The opacity of transparency. *Iowa Law Review*, 91, 885-949.

8
9 Fenster, M. (2017). *The transparency fix: Secrets, leaks and uncontrollable information*.

10
11
12 Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

13
14 Florini, A. (2007) (Ed.). *The right to know: Transparency for an open world*. New

15
16
17 York: Columbia University Press.

18
19 Fung, A., Graham, M., & Weil, D. (2007). *Full disclosure: The perils and promise of trans-*

20
21
22 *parency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

23
24 Garsten, C., & de Montoya, M.L. (2008). Introduction: examining the politics of transparency.

25
26
27 In C. Garsten & M.L. de Montoya (Eds.), *Transparency in a new global order* (pp. 1-

28
29
30 21). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

31
32 Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.

33
34 Gond, J-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2016). What do we mean by

35
36
37 performativity in organizational and management theory? The uses and abuses of

38
39
40 performativity. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 440-463.

41
42 Gusterson, H. (1998). *Nuclear rites: A weapons laboratory at the end of the Cold War*.

43
44
45 Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

46
47 Han, B-C. (2015). *The transparency society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

48
49 Heald, D. (2006a). Varieties of transparency. In Hood, C., & Heald, D., (Eds.), *Transparency*.

50
51
52 *The key to better governance?* (pp. 25-43). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

53
54 Heald, D. (2006b). Transparency as an instrumental value. In C. Hood & D. Heald (Eds.),

55
56
57 *Transparency. The key to better governance?* (pp. 59-73). Oxford: Oxford University

58
59
60 Press.

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 Heil, O., & Robertson, T.S. (1991). Toward a theory of competitive marketing signaling: A
4
5 research agenda. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(6), 403-418.
6
7
8 Henriques, A. (2007). *Corporate truth. The limits to transparency*. London: Earthscan.
9
10 Herzfeld, M. (2009). The performance of secrecy: Domesticity and privacy in public
11
12 spaces. *Semiotica*, 175(1/4), 135-162.
13
14
15 Holquist, M. (2002). *Dialogism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
16
17 Hood, C. (2006). Transparency in historical perspective. In Hood, C., & Heald, D. (Eds.),
18
19 *Transparency: The key to better governance?* (pp. 3-23). Oxford: Oxford University
20
21 Press.
22
23
24 Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (1987/2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Edited by Noerr,
25
26 G. S, translated by Jephcott, E. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
27
28
29 Jarosinski, E. (2009). Of stones and glass houses: Minima Moralia as critique of transparency.
30
31 In Richter G. (Ed.), *Language without soil: Adorno and Late Philosophical Modernity*
32
33 (pp.157–71). New York: Fordham University Press.
34
35
36 Kofman, M. (1996). *Edgar Morin. From Big Brother to fraternity*. London: Pluto Press.
37
38 Lawrence, P. R. & Lorsch, J. W. (1967), Differentiation and integration in complex
39
40 organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(1), 1-47.
41
42
43 Lessig, L. (2009). Against transparency. The perils of openness in government. *The New*
44
45 *Republic*, 9. Available at: <https://newrepublic.com/article/70097/against-transparency>
46
47 [Date accessed: 8 October 2021].
48
49
50 Liu, Y., & Fan, Z. (2022). Spatializing gossip as chaotic and multiple liminal space. *Human*
51
52 *Relations*, Epub ahead of print, DOI: 00187267221112230.
53
54
55 Lodge, M. (2004). Accountability and transparency in regulation: Critiques, doctrines and
56
57 instruments. In: Jordana, J. & Levi-Faur, D. (Eds), *The politics of regulation:*
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 *Institutions and regulatory reforms for the age of governance* (pp.124-144).
4
5 Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
6
7
8 Lord, K. M. (2006). *The perils and promise of global transparency*. Albany: State University
9
10 of New York Press.
11
12 MacKenzie, D. (2004). The big, bad wolf and the rational market: Portfolio insurance, the 1987
13
14 crash and the performativity of economics. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 303-334.
15
16 Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's 'Panopticon'
17
18 revisited. *Theoretical Criminology*, 1(2), 215-234.
19
20 McKinlay, A. (2011). Performativity: From J. L. Austin to Judith Butler. In: Armstrong, P, &
21
22 Lightfoot, G. (Eds.), *'The leading journal in the field': Destabilizing authority in the*
23
24 *social sciences of management* (pp. 119-142). London: Mayfly.
25
26
27
28 Meyrowitz, J. (1985). *No sense of place. The impact of electronic media on social behavior*.
29
30 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31
32
33 Morin, E. (1984). *Sociologie*. Paris: Fayard.
34
35 Morin, E. (1986). *La Méthode 3. La connaissance de la connaissance. Livre premier: Antropo-*
36
37 *logie de la connaissance*. Paris: Seuil.
38
39
40 Morin, E. (1987). *Penser l'Europe*. Paris : Gallimard.
41
42 Morin, E. (1992), *Method: Towards a study of humankind: The nature of nature, vol. 1*, New
43
44 York: Peter Lang.
45
46
47 Morin, E. (2008). *On complexity*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
48
49 Nisbet, R. A. (1966). *The sociological tradition*. London: Heinemann.
50
51 O'Neill, O. (2006). Transparency and the ethics of communication. In Hood, C., & Heald, D.,
52
53 (Eds.), *Transparency. The key to better governance?* (pp. 75-90). Oxford: Oxford
54
55 University Press
56
57
58
59
60

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 Oliver, C. (1992). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management*
4
5 *Review*, 16(1), 145-179.
6
7
8 Oliver, R. W. (2004). *What is transparency?* New York: McGraw-Hill.
9
10 Owetschkin, D. & Berger, S. (2019). Contested transparencies: An introduction. In Berger, S.
11
12 & Owetschkin, D. (Eds.), *Contested transparencies, social movements and the public*
13
14 *sphere: Multi-disciplinary perspectives* (p.1-32). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave-
15
16 Macmillan.
17
18
19 Palais des beaux-arts de Bruxelles. (2020, September 2). Repairing the future with Edgar Morin.
20
21 Interview BOZAR at home, available online:
22
23 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3iw4NwdIa4>
24
25
26 Phillips, J. W. (2011). Secrecy and transparency: An interview with Samuel Weber. *Theory,*
27
28 *Culture & Society*, 28(7-8), 158-172.
29
30
31 Piotrowski, S. J. (2010). (Ed.) *Transparency and secrecy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield
32
33 Publishers.
34
35
36 Piotrowski, S. J., & Borry, E. (2010). An analytic framework for open meetings and
37
38 transparency. *Public Administration and Management*, 15(1), 138-176.
39
40
41 Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
42
43
44 Rawlins, B. (2009). Give the emperor a mirror: Toward developing a stakeholder measurement
45
46 of organizational transparency. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 21(1), 71-99.
47
48
49 Ringel, L. (2019). Unpacking the transparency-secrecy nexus: Frontstage and backstage
50
51 behaviour in a political party. *Organization Studies*, 40, 705-723.
52
53
54 Roth, D. (2009). Road Map for Financial Recovery: Radical Transparency Now!. *Wired*
55
56 *Magazine* 17, February 23.
57
58
59
60 Schmitt, C. (1996). *Roman Catholicism and political form*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

- 1
2
3 Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational transparency: A new
4
5 perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships. *Journal of*
6
7 *Management*, 42(7), 1784-1810.
- 8
9
10 Scott, C. R. (2013). *Anonymous agencies, backstreet businesses, and covert collectives:*
11
12 *Rethinking organizations in the 21st century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- 13
14 Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge:
15
16 Cambridge University Press.
- 17
18
19 Simmel, G. (1906). The sociology of secrecy and of secret societies. *American Journal of*
20
21 *Sociology*, 11(4), 441-498.
- 22
23
24 Simmel, G. (1906/1950). *The sociology of Georg Simmel*, translated and edited by Wolff, K.
25
26 H. New York, NY: Free Press.
- 27
28
29 Stohl, C., Stohl, M., & Leonardi, P. M. (2016). Managing opacity: Information visibility and
30
31 the paradox of transparency in the digital age. *International Journal of*
32
33 *Communication*, 10, 123-137.
- 34
35
36 Strathern, M. (2000). The tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal*,
37
38 26(3), 309-321.
- 39
40 Tapscott, D., & Ticoll, D. (2003). *The naked corporation: How the age of transparency will*
41
42 *revolutionize business*. New York: The Free Press.
- 43
44
45 Taylor, J. R., & van Every, E. J. (2000). *The emergent organization. Communication as its site*
46
47 *and surface*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 48
49
50 Tsoukas, H. (1997). The tyranny of light: The temptations and the paradoxes of the information
51
52 society. *Futures*, 29(9), 827-843.
- 53
54 Vattimo, G. (1992). *The transparent society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60 Vogelmann, F. (2019). Transparency's trap: Problems of an unquestioned norm. In Berger, S.
& Owetschkin, D. (Eds.), *Contested transparencies, social movements and the public*

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

sphere. Multi-disciplinary perspectives (pp. 35-54). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Vujnovic, M., & Kruckeberg, D. (2016). Pitfalls and promises of transparency in the digital age. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 5(2), 121-143

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.

Weick, K.E. (1987). Organizational culture as a source of high reliability. *California Management Review*, 29(2), 112-127.

Wilensky, H. L. (2015). *Organizational intelligence: Knowledge and policy in government and industry*. Quid Pro Books.

Biographies

Ziyun Fan is Associate Professor in Organization Studies at the School for Business and Society, University of York, UK. She is fascinated by the ‘irregularities’ and ‘peculiarities’ in our everyday organizational life and has explored topics such as organizational secrecy, organizational communication, (confidential) gossip, silence, temporality, and space. She has published in *Human Relations*, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *Management Learning*, *Organization Studies*, and elsewhere. [Email: ziyun.fan@york.ac.uk]

Lars Thøger Christensen (Ph.D.) is Professor of Communication and Organization at the Copenhagen Business School (Denmark). His research interests include issues of identity, autocommunication, CSR, ventriloquism, transparency, hypocrisy, talk-action dynamics, and voicing. He approaches these issues through a communication lens focused on how organizations talk themselves into new realities. In addition to six books and contributions to several edited volumes, his research appears in *Organization*

The Dialogic Performativity of Secrecy and Transparency

1
2
3 *Studies, Human Relations, Journal of Business Research, Organization Theory,*
4
5 *Organization, Communication Theory, Management Communication Quarterly, and*
6
7 elsewhere. [Email: lrc.msc@cbs.dk]
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Peer Review Version