The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies

SAGE was founded in 1965 by Sara Miller McCune to support the dissemination of usable knowledge by publishing innovative and high-quality research and teaching content. Today, we publish over 900 journals, including those of more than 400 learned societies, more than 800 new books per year, and a growing range of library products including archives, data, case studies, reports, and video. SAGE remains majority-owned by our founder, and after Sara's lifetime will become owned by a charitable trust that secures our continued independence.

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi | Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies

Edited by
Ann Langley and
Haridimos Tsoukas

SAGE

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Delia Martinez Alfonso
Editorial Assistant: Matthew Oldfield
Production editor: Sushant Nailwal
Copyeditor:
Proofreader:
Indexer:
Marketing manager: Catherine Slinn
Cover design: Wendy Scott
Typeset by:
Printed by:

At SAGE we take sustainability seriously. Most of our products are printed in the UK using FSC papers and boards. When we print overseas we ensure sustainable papers are used as measured by the PREPS grading system. We undertake an annual audit to monitor our sustainability.

Library of Congress Control Number:

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4462-9701-8

32

Organizational Communication as Process

François Cooren, Gerald Bartels, and Thomas Martine

ABSTRACT

Communication as a field of study, and organizational communication as one of its subfields seems, at first sight, naturally predisposed for understanding and analyzing processually the organizational world. In comparison to their sister disciplines – sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, management, etc. – communication studies are, indeed, supposed to focus on specific activities – communicating, interacting, connecting, cooperating, diffusing, transmitting, etc. – that require approaches that do justice to their ongoing nature. Despite this obvious predisposition, most current research devoted to communication in general, and organizational communication in particular, tends to prioritize product over activity; the outcome of these activities rather than what is taking place or happening to produce such results (Taylor, 2009).

For more than 25 years, however, a growing body of research has begun to emerge in organizational communication, positioning communication as what allows organizational forms to emerge and be reproduced (Taylor, 1988). This movement, associated with what is today called the Communication as Constitutive of Organization approach – hereafter, the CCO approach – proposes to start from the in-depth study of communicational episodes to identify their organizing properties (Cooren, 2000). The idea thus consists of questioning the way we traditionally conceive of the link between communication and organization: Instead of just envisaging communication as something that happens in organization, the CCO movement paradoxically proposes to study how organization happens in communication (Smith, 1993).

This reversal of perspective echoes John Dewey (1916/1944), who already wrote, some 100 years ago:

> Society not only continues to exist by transmission, by communication, but it may fairly be said to exist in transmission, in communication. There is

> more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication. Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common. (p. 4, emphasis in the original, quoted in Taylor, 1988, p. 201, as well as in Taylor & Van Every, 2000, p. 69)

If the proximity of pragmatism and process studies no longer has to be demonstrated (Rescher, 2000), John Dewey's pragmatist stance can be understood as an invitation to analyze the communicative processes by which relatively stable societies get reproduced, evolve, and change. This is precisely what the CCO movement proposes to do in order to study organizations.

As Langley and Tsoukas (2010) point out, this process orientation "does not deny the existence of events, states, or entities, but insists on unpacking them to reveal the complex activities and transactions that take place and contribute to their constitution" (pp. 2–3). The idea thus consists of studying organization in action, which is another way to speak about organization in process. Implicit in this formulation is a certain form of stability, constancy, or even identity – to the extent that we can still identify something (an organization, a society, a group) that is deemed as being in process – but the focus is now on what produces this relative stability, constancy, or identity for another next first time, to use the felicitous expression coined by Harold Garfinkel (2002).

In what follows, we thus propose to first present a brief history of the CCO movement, followed by an exposition of the main assumptions, ideas, and concepts that define it. Although this approach is far from being homogeneous (as we will see, at least three schools of thought can be identified), we will give particular prominence to principles and notions that highlight the process-oriented character of this body of research. Subsequently, we will introduce a series of exemplary works that characterize the advances of this approach.

THE CCO APPROACH: A BRIEF HISTORY

Although the expression "communicative constitution of organization" was first coined by Robert D. McPhee and Pamela Zaug in an article published in 2000 in the *Electronic Journal of Communication*, the idea that organizations could be studied in communication can arguably be attributed to James R. Taylor who, in the late 1980s, published a book in French titled *Une organisation n'est qu'un tissu de communication: Essais théoriques* (An organization is but a web of communication: Theoretical essays). The publication of this book, which proposed to respond to John Dewey's plea for the study of communication, can indeed be considered the first step that led him and Elizabeth Van Every to explore this idea, an exploration that continues today (Taylor, 1993; Taylor & Van Every, 1993, 2000, 2011, 2014).

Before Taylor and Van Every, other scholars had already proposed to set a new research agenda focused on the organizing properties of communication – we are thinking of Karl E. Weick (1979), of course, but also of researchers associated with the interpretive paradigm in organizational communication (Putnam & Pacanowsky, 1983). Because of their interpretive bias, however, these scholars tended to almost exclusively focus on members' sensemaking activities, which means that their interest in actual conversations and communication processes was relatively marginal. Most interpretive research was indeed interview based (for interesting exceptions, see Fairhurst & Chandler [1989], as well as Trujillo, 1983).

Although Taylor (1993) was certainly influenced by the interpretive movement, his own research agenda consisted of going beyond member's interpretive activities by focusing on the logic of their interactions. This logic, which, as we will see, he associated with a text/conversation dialectic, was introduced through an article co-authored by Taylor, Cooren, Giroux, and Robichaud, published in 1996 in *Communication Theory*.

It is this article, which is usually considered to have initiated this research movement, that played a major role in the emergence of a first school of thought associated with the CCO approach, namely, the Montreal School of Organizational Communication (Ashcraft, Kuhn, & Cooren, 2009; Brummans, 2006; Cooren, Taylor, & Van Every, 2006; Mumby, 2007).

While the Montreal School is strongly influenced by pragmatism, the two other schools of thought associated with the CCO movement – McPhee and Zaug's (2000) Four Flows Model and Niklas Luhmann's (1995) Theory of Social System – are respectively rooted in Giddens's (1984) structuration theory and Maturana and Varela's (1987) idea of autopoiesis. Beyond their diversity, however, these three pillars of CCO (Schoeneborn et al., 2014) share a deep interest in the study of ongoing processes of communication, which means that they are, as we will show, interested in "time, movement, sequence, and flux" (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010, p. 2).

We will now present some of the ontological, theoretical, and conceptual aspects that define this movement by focusing especially on two of its main representatives: the Montreal School and the Four-Flow Model. Although some connections will be made with Luhmann's (1995) Theory of Social System, we encourage readers to refer to Schoeneborn et al.'s (2014) article to have a better understanding of what separates and unifies these three schools of thought.

MAIN ASSUMPTIONS, IDEAS, AND CONCEPTS

In what follows, we will present key assumptions, ideas, and concepts that characterize the CCO movement. Although this research agenda is, as we saw, far from being homogeneous, we will highlight what unifies it, especially regarding its process-oriented character.

COMMUNICATION FLOW

As mentioned previously, the acronym CCO was first coined in an article co-authored by McPhee and Zaug in 2000; an article in which these two authors introduced what they call the Four Flows Model. By communication flow, an idea which they claim to have borrowed from Weick (1979), they refer to "four types of constituting communication processes" (p. 2); they identify these as (1) membership negotiation, (2) organizational self-structuring, (3) activity coordination, and (4) institutional positioning. According to the authors, each of these four flows, which are characterized by "interactive communication episodes" (p. 7), generates a specific social structure, constituting the organization per se.

As they point out:

> The four flows link the organization to its members (membership negotiation), to itself reflexively (self-structuring), to the environment (institutional positioning); the fourth is used to adapt interdependent activity to specific work situations and problems (activity coordination). (McPhee & Zaug, 2000, p. 7)

In other words, for an organization to exist and function, these four types of communication episode need to take place.

By membership negotiation, McPhee and Zaug (2000) refer to the communication episodes by which people are constituted as members of the organization. These episodes participate in the constitution of the organization itself, given, as they point out, that "one must be a member of something" (p. 8). Although McPhee and Zaug are thinking of episodes such as processes of recruitment and socialization, they also include activities involving questions of reputation, courtship, identification, and positioning. All these processes thus participate in the constitution of organization to the extent that they allow people to negotiate, reproduce, and alter what it means to be the member of this collective.

These processes do not, of course, exhaust what constitutes organizations, which leads

McPhee and Zaug (2000) to identify a second flow: organizational self-structuring. This flow refers to the communication episodes by which some individuals "bring the organization into being" (p. 9) by designing and controlling what gets done in its name. As implied in the idea of process, flux, or flow, this type of activity implies active work by which the organization appears to structure itself. As any reflexive activity, however, this type of process involves people acting in the name of the organization; an organization that their activities contribute to structure and define.

McPhee and Zaug (2000) especially highlight the role that texts and documents play in this flow – they mention "charters, organization charts, policy and procedures manuals" (p. 9) – in that they contribute to the establishment of what is called a formal structure. However, they also identify activities such as accounting, budgeting, as well as issuing directives and orders, which contributes to the division of labor and "the pre-fixing of work arrangements and norms" (p. 10). Although this type of flow creates the conditions of a system, the bottom-up approach advocated by these two authors allows them to avoid the illusion that there would be somewhere and somehow a harmonizing force that would make this whole coherent and unidirectional (Tarde, 2012 [1895]). Because it involves communication episodes, it is subjected to mishaps, gaffes, or mistakes. Systemization is therefore something that has to be worked out in interaction (Cooren, 2010; Luhmann, 1995).

The third flow, activity coordination, corresponds to communication episodes by which adjustments are made to solve practical problems members face when collectively getting things done. Although the self-structuring flows allow organizations to standardize and anticipate what will be done in their name, activity coordination consists of managing or dealing with the unexpected (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001) or any type of system breakdown or incidents. Beyond procedures, protocols, orders, and programs, which, as we saw, structure the organization (second flow), this third flow thus amounts to correcting, adjusting, or altering what was planned in order to complete specific goals and objectives.

Finally, the fourth flow, institutional positioning, allows the organization to communicate with its environment (suppliers, clients, competitors, collaborators, governmental agencies, etc.). We are thus dealing with any communication episode that involves the production of a text in the name of the organization, whether this text will be ultimately voiced by a spokesperson (a CEO, for instance) or presented by what Vásquez and Cooren (2011) call a spokesobject (a website, a press release, etc.). Institutional positioning thus consists of making the organization position itself vis-à-vis its environment; knowing that this can only be done on the terra firma of interaction (Cooren, 2006) through human and nonhuman actors speaking on its behalf (Latour, 2013).

TEXTS AND CONVERSATIONS

Although McPhee and Zaug's (2000) model shows to what extent processes of communication can contribute to the constitution of complex organizations, it does not really go into the detail of the communication episodes they typify. At no point do we see these authors, nor other scholars who mobilized the Four Flows Model, studying the detail of actual interactions, which does not seem to do justice to the processual dimension of the flow they identified (e.g., Browning, Greene, Sitkin, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2009; McPhee & Iverson, 2009). Instead of starting from the type of communication it theoretically takes to constitute an organization, Taylor and his colleagues of the Montreal School (Cooren, 2000; Taylor, Cooren, Giroux & Robichaud, 1996; Taylor & Van Every, 2000) proposed to study "the properties of communication that would explain *how* organization is generated

in interaction" (Taylor, 2009, p. 154, italics in the original).

What is at stake for the Montreal School representatives is a theory of communication that explains why and how organization can be found in communication. This is what Taylor et al. (1996) initially proposed through the identification of what they presented as two essential modalities of human communication: texts and conversations. While conversations correspond to what people actually do in communicating with each other (this is where processes, fluxes, or flows take place), texts can be identified as the content of the conversations themselves, whether these conversations occur orally or in writing.

On the conversational side, the organization thus emerges as a realized object, "in its continued enactment in the interaction patterns of its members' exchanges" (Taylor and Van Every, 2000, p. 4). This modality of communication, which can be relatively chaotic and unpredictable, corresponds to what Taylor and Van Every called the site of the organization. It is a world of events, transactions, turn-takings, uptakes, repairs, alignment, and co-orientation, which means that people always communicate about something, which is the object of their mutual orientation. In order to do that, people are speaking or writing to each other, and it is these acts of communication that constitute an organization-in-the-making.

On the textual side, the organization emerges as a described object; that is "an object about which people talk and have attitudes" (Taylor and Van Every, 2000, p. 4). While the conversational modality tends to mark the eventful character of communication, the textual modality thus expresses its iterable dimension; the fact that people talk about something that is identifiable beyond the localness and eventfulness of their interactions. Because of their iterable character, texts therefore have the capacity to travel from one conversation to another, allowing a form of relative continuity to take place. This is what Taylor and Van Every call the surface of the organization; what identifies its values, norms, procedures, routines, etc. In other words, the textual aspect of communication is what allows us to identify the organization itself, in its continuity, but also its variations.

In speaking about these two modalities of communication, Taylor and Van Every (2000) insisted that they constitute two ways of conceiving of communication – two worldviews, as they sometimes called them – which means that one cannot exist without the other. An organization can therefore be analytically conceived according to two worlds:

> (a) a lived world of practically focused collective attention to a universe of objects, presenting problems and necessitating responses to them [this is the conversational world]; and (b) an interpreted world of collectively held and negotiated understandings that link the community to its past and future and to other conversational universes of action by its shared inheritance of a common language [this is the textual world]. (p. 34)

Organizations as forms of life thus emerge between what Henri Atlan (1979) called the crystal (a perfectly ordered and stable structure) and the smoke (random and chaotic interactions); two extremes between which life can navigate, but that do not constitute life themselves.

Text, the modality of communication that, according to Taylor and Van Every (2000), embodies the source of order, thus functions like, what according to chaos theory, would be called a strange attractor (Gleick, 1987; Kriz, 1997, 1999, 2001). Because texts correspond to what people are talking about, it is indeed around these that the relatively chaotic world of conversation will organize itself, generating a form of structuration. This structuration is always at the mercy of alterations, adjustments, or even transformations, which redefine the texts, creating new attractors. Through their text-conversation model, Taylor and Van Every thus highlight the self-organizing property of communication (see also Taylor, 1995; Taylor & Giroux, 2005), which, as we will see later, establishes

a strong parallel with another CCO school of thought, the one represented by Luhmann's (1992, 1995) and Maturana and Varela's (1987) theories of autopoiesis.

TEXTUAL AGENCY

Given that texts tend to embody a source of order, it becomes progressively obvious that their agency has to be acknowledged, that is, their capacity to do things or make a difference in organizational processes. Cooren (2004) theoretically developed this idea further and illustrated that texts are regularly invoked in conversations to attempt to alter specific courses of action. For instance, something like a contract, an agreement, or a form can be mobilized to enjoin another party to proceed according to its terms (Brummans, 2007). Similarly, we are all familiar with situations where an administrator invokes the policy of her organization in order to reject a request that was made (Cooren, 2010).

Speech acts, which we tend to attribute only to human beings (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969, 1979), can thus be attributed to the texts that humans constantly produce. For instance, we have no problem saying (1) that a memo informs us that someone resigned, (2) that a contract commits the organization to provide specific services, (3) that a policy enjoins employees to work from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, (4) that a document confirms someone's appointment, or even (5) that a newsletter compliments one of the employees. Each of these speech acts respectively correspond to five categories identified by Searle (1979), namely, (1) assertives, (2) commissives, (3) directives, (4) declarations, and (5) expressives (Cooren, 2004, 2008, 2009), which demonstrates the mundane character of this phenomenon.

In keeping with the bottom-up perspective advocated by proponents of the CCO perspective, and paralleling the notion of strange attractors, this reflection on textual agency therefore shows that a source of order, information, or systemization can come from the texts people mobilize in their interactions. As Cooren (2004) noticed, some texts also have the particularity of being relatively established or instituted, which illustrates why they can represent a source of stability or even identity for the organization. For instance, we can think of a mission statement that is regularly invoked by a CEO or a procedure that defines how things get done in a specific organization (Wright, 2016).

Because of what Derrida (1988) calls their restance, i.e., their staying capacity (*rester* means to stay or remain in French), texts can thus be considered fully-fledged contributors to what gets accomplished in the organization's name. People are supposed to know what these documents say and if they do not, they can be told or reminded of what these writings stipulate. This means that texts such as mission statements, policies, procedures, protocols, programs, contracts, etc., make a difference in the way an organization functions (or malfunctions, for that matter). It is, in many respects, because of their existence and agency that a source of stability and iterability, which is typical of organizations and institutions, can be identified.

Studying organizational processes can thus consist of analyzing what people, but also texts, literally do in organizational settings. There is not, as we see, an abstract structure that would govern from the top down what takes place in these processes. On the contrary, we see that in this source of governance, systemization or order comes from other actors: human beings, of course, but also the texts that they produced and are producing (Latour, 2005, 2013). This is what McPhee and Zaug (2000) identified as the organizational self-structuring flow; a process of self-structuring that needs to be constantly reenacted, for another next first time (Garfinkel, 2002). What we call the formal structure of an organization, therefore, is concretely made of documents, organizational charts, statuses, permits, IDs, procedures that actively, literally, and endogenously define

not only the organization itself but also how things get done in its name.

AUTHORITY

This reflection on textual agency allows us to tackle a related CCO notion, which is the one of authority. As Taylor and Van Every (2000) remind us, "without texts, no authority: After all, the words authority and author have the same root!" (p. 242, see also Taylor & Van Every, 2014). This Latin root – *auctor* – also means the creator, father, genitor, the one who initiates, protects, and sanctions (Cooren, 2015a). Authority, according to the CCO perspective, must thus be understood dynamically: It has to be implicitly or explicitly enacted in a given interaction in order to be recognized and acknowledged. As Taylor and Cooren (1997) point out, "In a communicational interpretation of organization […], there is no constant point of stability; the authority to speak for the collectivity must be endlessly renewed, in the performance of the acts of speech" (p. 435).

What does this mean concretely? Simply that people's authority depends on their capacity to author texts that themselves give a voice to other authors (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009). To understand how this works, we can take the typical example we already used about an administrator invoking the organization's policy to reject a request from a client. At first sight, we could think that it is just this person who is talking. However, if we start analyzing the situation carefully, we realize that many other authors can be identified as the sources/genitors/fathers/creators of what is communicated to us, namely, (1) an administrator, embodied by this person at this point; (2) the organization itself, which she is supposed to represent; and even (3) the policy that she is invoking to reject the request.

When this person is telling us, "I'm sorry, but our policy prevents me from disclosing this information," it is therefore not only she who is talking to us, but also the administrator she embodies, a person who is herself authorized to act in the name of the organization she speaks for. This part of her authority manifests itself through the presence of the pronoun "our," which signifies that she is acting as a spokesperson for the organization. It is therefore also the organization that is supposed to speak when she speaks. Furthermore, by invoking the policy, she is staging what authorizes her to reject the request. It is therefore also this policy that tells her and us that we cannot have access to this piece of information.

As we see through this mundane example, analyzing the detail of interaction allows us to unfold or reveal all the authors that/who are participating in a given situation. It is not by chance that the Latin word *auctor* stems from the word *augere*, which means "to augment" (Cooren, 2010). Being in or expressing an authority – a claim that can, of course, be always called into question – thus consists of augmenting the authors of what is put forward, which is a way to justify, legitimize, or account for what we say.

Studying organizational processes, according to the CCO perspective, can thus consist of analyzing the multiple authors that/who invite themselves in activities and conversations. According to this bottom-up approach, there is not, on one side, human beings and their interactions and, on the other side, the organization and its official texts (procedures, programs, policies, statuses, ranks, charts, etc.). As we see, the organizations themselves, but also their procedures, programs, policies, documents, etc., can express themselves, implicitly or explicitly, in what human beings say and do, which is what McPhee and Zaug (2000) allude to when they speak about their fourth flow, institutional positioning.

VENTRILOQUISM AND POLYPHONY

It is therefore a form of polyphony, already noticed by Mikhail Bakhtin (1984), that the

CCO perspective aims to acknowledge in discourse and interaction in general. This polyphony, which we can identify in what people say and write, can indeed demonstrate why communication is constitutive of the mode of being and functioning of organizations: Organizations are able to literally and figuratively express themselves through what their members say in their name or for them, a phenomenon that Cooren (2010, 2012; Cooren & Sandler, 2014) identifies as a form of ventriloquism. Speaking in the name of an organization consists of ventriloquizing it; that is, making it say something.

From a processual viewpoint, the figure of the ventriloquist is extremely interesting, since it shows that there is no absolute separation between the context of an interaction and the interaction itself. In other words, this figure rests on a relational ontology, implicit in any process perspective; an ontology that consists of "the recognition that everything that is has no existence apart from its relation to other things" (Langley & Tsoukas, 2010, p. 3).

This is essential to understand the difference between the conversation/text model and the ventriloquist approach. For the former, the organization is constituted mainly through human interactions (notably through meta-conversations). For the latter, it is constituted through relations that involve – but can never be reduced to – human interactions. In other words, for the former, linguistic phenomena are always central, while for the latter, their weight or significance is (one of the many things that are) determined in interactions. Ventriloquizing indeed amounts to making someone or something say something, which means that aspects of the so-called "context" of a discussion can, in fact, be envisaged as constantly and made to say things in what people say and do.

For instance, the person who is invoking a policy is ventriloquizing it to the extent that she makes it say something at a specific point of an interaction. What is this policy made to say? For instance, that we are not authorized to get the information we were expecting from the organization. From a relational viewpoint, we see that the policy, as an official document of the organization, exists not only under the form of a text consultable online or in a written record available to all the employees, but also through its invocation/evocation/convocation by this administrator at this moment of her conversation with us.

A policy exists relationally to the extent that its mode of existence and action depends on its multiple forms of embodiment/incarnation/materialization in oral and written texts. These texts can exist in people's minds (because the latter know them and can recall what they say), documents (a policy brochure, for instance), or in how they are ventriloquized in an interaction. The phenomenon of ventriloquism thus tends to call into question the bifurcation of nature[1] that Alfred North Whitehead (1920) already denounced almost 100 years ago (Cooren, 2010; Latour, 2008). Nature does not bifurcate to the extent that the world that surrounds us is not mute (Latour, 2013; Stengers, 2011). It literally and figuratively speaks to us, which is what Charles Sanders Peirce (1991), the inventor of pragmatism and modern semiotics, showed us more than one hundred years ago (Lorino, 2014).

Invoking a fact, a situation, a context, a policy, a principle, a procedure, a value thus consists of offering a way to exist and express themselves relationally through a discussion. Ventriloquism as a metaphor of (organizational) communication thus offers a way to resolve the unending debate between objectivism/realism and subjectivism/constructivism (Cooren & Sandler, 2014; Hacking, 2000). Following Étienne Souriau (2009), a French philosopher who was recently brought out of obscurity by Bruno Latour (2011) and Isabelle Stengers (Stengers & Latour, 2009), the ventriloqual thesis makes us realize that things as diverse as organizations, groups, procedures, policies, contracts, facts, situations, etc., come to exist and act more or less (in time and space) through the

way we ventriloquize them in our discussions; a position that is perfectly compatible with a processual view.

There is therefore no opposition, no clash, no rupture between the world that surrounds us and our own discussions. This world, through all its incarnations, materializations, and embodiments expresses itself more or less through what people say to each other, their alignment and disagreement. Going back to the four flows identified by McPhee and Zaug, we therefore have a way to operationalize the flows these two authors identified: (1) Membership negotiation, the first flow, is supposed to link the organization to its members, but this can only be done through the way membership can express itself – i.e., be ventriloquized – through what people say and do. This expression can certainly take the form of hiring contracts, but also other forms such as the cultivation of values, norms, and habits that are supposed to define what the organization is about.

If we turn to (2) self-structuring, the flow that allows the organization to structure itself, we see that this is possible only through the way people design and produce texts in its name (budgets, organizational charts, statuses, charters, procedures, protocols); texts that can later be invoked and ventriloquized to define formal and established courses of action. Note that this self-structuring process is not limited to texts, as architectural elements (buildings, rooms, spaces, hallways, etc.). Technologies also constitute devices by which people will be led to follow specific courses of action and not others.

Regarding (3) institutional positioning, the flow supposed to link the organization to its environment, we now understand that such a positioning can be done through all the spokespersons and spokesobjects that will be deemed as representing the organization, that is, literally making it present (again) to representatives of its environment. A press release will, for instance, ventriloquize the organization to the extent that it will tell the journalists and, through them, the general public, what the organization wants to promote (an event, a position, etc.). There is no need, therefore, to leave the terra firma of interaction (Cooren, 2006) as institutional positioning always, as any other flow, has to be enacted in communication.

Finally, the fourth flow, (4) activity coordination, corresponds with what members constantly do to adapt to specific situations and problems in order to meet their objectives. According to the ventriloqual thesis, this consists of saying that it is not only procedures, programs, rules, and protocols that indicate what members should do (flow 2), but also the situations, circumstances, and problems they face on a daily basis. People are therefore not only ventriloquized by the rules and procedures they invoke, but also by the situations they encounter. These situations and problems also dictate what has to be done, even if people can, of course, disagree about what is dictated.

As we see through this presentation of its key notions (flows, texts/conversations, textual agency, authority, and ventriloquism), the CCO approach defends a strong processual view to the extent that organizations and organizing are always studied in action. But what is noteworthy is that the CCO view also allows us to identify what literally passes through these actions. A process, in order to be identifiable, has to be the process of something (working, making a collective decision, strategizing, collaborating, solving a conflict, preparing a press release, etc.), which means, by definition, that certain things need to remain minimally stable and constant, be it only what people are up to in this process.

Organizational processes will therefore be marked, identified, and defined by what is characteristically invoked or ventriloquized by the people who are involved in these activities. For instance, responding to clients' requests for information might typically imply the mobilization of a policy in order to tell them what they can and cannot have access to (Cooren, 2010). Similarly, strategizing might predictably imply the ventriloquizing

of objectives, graphs, facts, experiences, analyses, tools, techniques, PowerPoint presentations, and numbers (Denis, Langley, & Rouleau, 2006; Whittington, 2003) that will be explicitly or implicitly presented as dictating specific courses of action.

With its polyphonic perspective, the CCO approach thus leads us to identify the numerous voices that can populate a given process, especially when these voices are typically given to facts, situations, documents, procedures, values, experiences, collectives, etc., that literally pass through what people say and characterize the organizational world. We therefore have a way to account for both stability/order and eventfulness/action without resorting to the existence of beings that would not be ventriloquized implicitly or explicitly in interaction. This is precisely what a constitutive approach to communication advocates.

EXEMPLARY WORKS

Another strength of the CCO approach is that its advances are, for the most part, empirically grounded. Given its focus on acting and organizing, representatives of this movement have always been interested in illustrating their theses through case studies taken from the organizational world. Furthermore, because of their process-oriented approach, CCO scholars (especially representatives of the Montreal School) have been mobilizing recording methods that allow them to do justice to the complexity of the courses of action they are trying to analyze and understand. In most cases, and when possible, this has implied the usage of video recording (Cooren, 2006; Cooren, Fairhurst, & Huët, 2012; Cooren, Fox, Robichaud, & Talih, 2005; Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barné, & Brummans, 2014; Robichaud, Giroux, & Taylor, 2004), and more precisely, the technique of video shadowing (Meunier & Vásquez, 2008; Vásquez, Brummans, & Groleau, 2012).

In what follows, we will present some studies that we think are exemplary in terms of their insights and findings.

METACONVERSATION

Daniel Robichaud and James R. Taylor (Robichaud, Giroux, & Taylor, 2004; Taylor & Robichaud, 2007) developed the notion of metaconversation to illustrate the interactional process by which the constitution of organization occurs in interaction. Metaconversation refers to

> a conversation (that of management) that generates accounts about other conversations (those of the multiple communities of practice that make up the organization), all now being given a voice (however authentic the translation is) by their representatives in the managerial metaconversation. (Taylor & Robichaud, 2007)

A metaconversation, as they explain, deals with questions of authority, since it involves different spokespersons claiming to speak on behalf of the organization as well as its interests and preoccupations.

As they display through their analyses, metaconversations lead these spokespersons to talk implicitly or explicitly about what constitutes the organization, that is, assumptions defining the rights and obligations that are typically distributed in any collective endeavor. As they also show, it involves a narrative mode of argument to the extent that managers will put forward various ways of making sense of situations, which lead them to tell different stories regarding what they are co-orienting to. These stories typically involve heroes responding to breaches (of rights and obligations) by trying to overcome obstacles in order to reach specific objectives (Greimas, 1987). They each constitute competing claims about what a situation looks like and what should be done about it.

As Robichaud, Giroux, and Taylor (2004) also demonstrate, metaconversations are characterized by what they call a search for

closure, that is, an attempt to collectively reestablish a tentative state of order so that the organization can move forward with a sense of unity. What needs to be done at some point by these managers is to collectively author what the organization wants and has to do, which is, of course, a question of authority. If an organization should be seen as "a diversity of communities or practice engaged (or failing to be engaged) in the metaconversation, through their representatives" (p. 631), it has, in order to exist, to find and have one voice so that its existence and identity can be acknowledged. As they point out, "organization is thus simultaneously singular and plural – a universe and pluriverse" (p. 631).

SPACING AND TIMING

Consuelo Vásquez's (2009, 2010, 2013; Vásquez & Cooren, 2013) studies on spacing and timing constitute another key CCO work illustrating the processual nature of organizing and organization. By video-shadowing various representatives of Explora, a Chilean governmental organization of science and technology diffusion, she shows how these spokespersons allow their collective to be "here and there at the same time, now and then at the same place" (Vásquez, 2013, p. 127), making it present to various interlocutors that they are trying to enroll for an upcoming event.

While space has traditionally been defined in contrast with time, Vásquez (2013) echoes Massey's (2004) work by conceptualizing space as space-time, which allows her to reintroduce dynamism, movement, and temporality into this notion. The different trajectories she video-shadows are thus conceived as "stories-so-far" (Massey, 2005), that is, stories that are always unfinished and that meet each other through the various encounters she observes and video records. For instance, by video-shadowing Explora representatives trying to enroll scientists by knocking at their office door, she showed how each of these encounters could be analyzed as one of the multiple ways by which this organization spread out in the Chilean University, one interaction at a time.

Explora thus becomes an "organization-in-the-making" (Vásquez, 2013, p. 130) where each representative she follows spaces his, her, or even its organization. These spacing practices allow the organization that is represented (made present again in space and time) to expand and displace itself throughout Chile. Organizational boundaries thus become as dynamic and mobile as the spokespersons and spokesobjects that represent them. They become, as Vásquez (2013) points out, "shifting and fluctuating events. Boundary setting is carried through interaction as it responds to specific criteria of inclusion and exclusion" (p. 130). Setting boundaries can then be seen as a strategic activity as these boundaries are "produced by certain agents, in certain moments, with certain goals" (p. 131). Furthermore, she illustrates how each trajectory can be envisaged as a mode of ordering (Law, 1994), which implies that a lot of work always needs to be done to align these stories-so-far and maintain a coherence between the various trajectories.

APPROPRIATION AND ATTRIBUTION

Nicolas Bencherki's (2011, 2013; Bencherki & Cooren, 2011) studies on activities of appropriation and attribution constitute another exemplary work illustrating the processual view of the CCO movement. In fieldwork where he video-shadowed various organizational activities (meetings, especially), he showed how organizations are able to act (make statements, position themselves, etc.) by being attributed actions through conversations. Through the detailed study of interaction, Bencherki put forward a "genuinely communicative explanation of the way action passes from humans (and possibly other entities) to an organization" (Bencherki & Cooren, 2011, p. 1580).

In keeping with Bruno Latour (1996) and process philosophers such as Henri Bergson (2003 [1907]), Gilbert Simondon (2005 [1958]), Alfred North Whitehead (1967 [1933], 1979 [1929]), or even the sociologist Gabriel Tarde (1893, 1898), action is thus conceived as something that is shared between various beings that are staged implicitly or explicitly in people's conversations. As shown in Bencherki's analyses, the source of a given action is thus something that has to be defined in the becoming of interactions. Being someone or something is therefore not what only defines the static origin of action; i.e., roles, identities, positions are not the only things defining what can be done. Instead, being is also a matter of having someone or something else with whom to share action, to the extent that existing and acting consist of prehending (a Whiteheadian term) other entities' action in a process of concrescence (another Whiteheadian notion), i.e., of gaining concrete existence.

An organization can indeed prehend the actions of its constituents through the way participants conversationally recognize actions, including speech, as being not only that of its human author, but also that of the organization. For instance, focusing on attributive/appropriative practices means that a representative's ability to act and speak in the name of her organization rests in the collective recognition that the deed or the utterance of the representative is also that of the organization, whether through talk, applause, ulterior accounts of the event, etc. Those practices are so many ways for this organization to appropriate or be attributed what its representatives are doing or saying, with all the questions of responsibility that this kind of situation implies.

These activities of attribution/prehension thus allow the organization to reproduce itself and evolve through the interactions that are observed. As pointed out by Bencherki and Cooren (2011):

> Rather than trying to draw a clear line between individual and organizational action, or rather than awkwardly stumbling on the divide between both, we [show] that action is always hybrid, and that it is exactly this oscillation or vacillation that also makes organizations act. It is action's ability to go to and fro, to be attributed and to 'belong' to several authors at once that allows a passing from individual to organizational action. (p. 1599, italics in the original)

CONCLUSION

As we hope we were able to demonstrate, the CCO movement allows us to focus on processes of becoming, while identifying what allows the latter to remain identifiable and recognizable. In other words, it allows us to account for the stability and evolution of organizational forms while showing how they have to be enacted on the terra firma of interaction (Cooren, 2006). As implied in the acronym itself, the CCO approach invites us to take communication in all its forms seriously, since these forms constitute the very site and surface where organizations reproduce themselves and change (Taylor & Van Every, 2000).

While the CCO movement could at first sight be dismissed as a form of "ontological conflationism" (Archer, 1995, 2000) "in which individual agency determine social/organizational structure" (Reed, 2010, p. 153), we saw that, on the contrary, this movement tends to question the very notion of individual agency, even if questions of responsibility remain, of course, addressable (Cooren, 2010). People should never be considered the absolute point of origin in any process precisely because they act as much as they are acted upon. Echoing Reed's terminology, we could say that what determines social/organizational structure (we would prefer to speak in terms of structuration) is actually a configuration of agencies whose articulations and interactions are precisely what the CCO approach proposes to study.

In his critique, Michael Reed (2010) sarcastically writes, "If organization is constituted by communication, then why bother with materiality, spatiality, temporality, and sociality?" (p. 155). Well, as shown in our

panorama of the CCO process literature, studying materiality, spatiality, temporality, and sociality is precisely what CCO is doing. What needs to be understood, however, is that communication should not be reduced to human communication only. We need to acknowledge how the world (in all its incarnations and manifestations) also communicates through what people say, write and, more generally, do. This is what the process philosophers helped us understand, and this is what the CCO movement will hopefully continue to show.

NOTE

1 By bifurcation of nature, Whitehead meant what he denounced as the artificial division, proposed for instance by John Locke (1959 [1690]), between primary qualities (the physical part of the world) and secondary qualities (the experiences and comprehensions human beings have of this world).

REFERENCES

Archer, M. (1995) Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2000) Being Human: The Problem of Agency. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Atlan, H. (1979). *Entre le cristal et la fumée: Essai sur l'organisation du vivant*. Paris: Seuil.

Ashcraft, K. L., Kuhn, T., & 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. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bencherki, N. (2011). Mediators and the material stabilization of society. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *9*(1), 1–6.

Bencherki, N. (2013). The hybrid performance of a district, the limits of speech acts and the possibility of a material ethics. *Collegium,* 13, 28–44.

Bencherki, N. and Cooren, F. (2011). Having to be: The possessive constitution of organization. *Human Relations*, *64*(12), 1579–1607.

Benoit-Barné, C. and 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.

Bergson, H. (2003 [1907]) L'évolution créatrice. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Browning, L. D., Greene, R. W., Sitkin, S. B., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfled, D. (2009). Constitutive complexity: Military entrepreneurs and the synthetic character of communication flows. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 89–116). Oxford: Routledge.

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

Cooren, F. (2000). *The organizing property of communication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cooren, F. (2004). Textual agency: How texts do things in organizational settings. *Organization*, *11*(3), 373–393.

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: Empirical and theoretical explorations in the dynamic of text and conversation* (pp. 81–100). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Cooren, F. (2012). Communication theory at the center: Ventriloquism and the communicative constitution of reality. *Journal of Communication*, *62*, 1–20.

Cooren, F. (2015). *Organizational discourse: Communication and constitution*. London: Polity.

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: Oxford University Press.

Cooren, F., Fox, S., Robichaud, D., & Talih, N. (2005). Arguments for a plurified view of the social world: Spacing and timing as hybrid achievements. *Time & Society*, *14*(2/3), 263–280.

Cooren, F. (2008). Linguistic pragmatics. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of communication (Vol. VI, pp. 2706–2710). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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.

Cooren, F., Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Communication as organizing: Empirical and theoretical explorations in the dynamic of text and conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cooren, F., & Sandler, S. (2015a). Polyphony, ventriloquism, and constitution: In dialogue with Bakhtin. *Communication Theory*, *24*, 225–244.

Cooren, F. (2015b). Speech act theory. In K. Tracy, C. Eli, and T. Sandel (Eds). International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction. Oxford, UK : John Wiley & Sons

Derrida, J. (1988). Limited Inc. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Denis, J.-L., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2006). The power of numbers in strategizing. Strategic Organization, *4*(*4*), 349–377

Dewey, J. (1916/1944). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.

Fairhurst, G., & Chandler, T. A. (1989). Social structure in leader-member interaction. *Communication Monographs*, *56*, 215–239.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. New York: Viking Penguin.

Hacking, I. (2000). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kriz, J. (1997). On chaos and order. *Gestalt Theory*, *19*(3), 197–212.

Kriz, J. (1999). On attractors: The teleological principle in systems theory, the arts and therapy. *Poiesis: A Journal of the Arts and Communication*, *1*, 24–29.

Kriz, J. (2001). Self-organization of cognitive and interactional processes. In M. Matthies, H. Malchow, & J. Kriz (Eds.), *Integrative systems approaches to natural and social dynamics* (pp. 519–537). Berlin: Springer.

Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (2010). Introducing "Perspectives on process organization studies." In T. Hernes & S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking, & organizing* (pp. 1–26). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (1996). On Interobjectivity. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3(4), 228–245.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. London: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (2008). *What is the style of matters of concern? Two lectures in empirical philosophy*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Latour, B. (2011). Reflections on Étienne Souriau's Les différents modes d'existence. In B. Levi, N. Srnicek, & G. Harman (Eds.), The speculative turn: Continental materialism and realism (pp. 304–333). Melbourne, Australia: Re.press.

Latour, B. (2013). *An inquiry into modes of existence: An anthropology of the moderns*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Locke, J. (1959/1690). An essay concerning human understanding (Vol. 1 and 2). New York: Dover Publications

Lorino, P. (2014). From speech acts to act speeches: Collective activity, a discursive process speaking the language of habits. In F. Cooren, E. Vaara, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *Language and communication at work: Discourse, narrativity, and organizing* (pp. 95–124). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1992). What is communication? *Communication Theory*, *2*(3), 251–259.

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

Massey, D. (2004). Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler*, *86*(1), 5–18.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of understanding*. Boston et Londres: Shambhala Publications.

McPhee, R. D., & Iverson, J. (2009). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 21–47). New York/ London: Routledge.

McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *The Electronic Journal of Communication/La revue électronique de communication*, *10*(1/2), 1–16.

Meunier, D., & Vásquez, C. (2008). On shadowing the hybrid character of actions: A communicational approach. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *2*(3), 167–192.

Mumby, D. K. (2007). Organizational communication. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of sociology*. New York: Blackwell.

Peirce, C. S. (1991). *Peirce on signs: Writings on semiotic*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Putnam, L. L., & Pacanowsky, M. E. (1983). *Communication and organizations. An interpretive approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Reed, M. (2010). Is communication constitutive of organization? *Management Communication Quarterly*, *24*(1), 151–157.

Rescher, N. (2000). *Process philosophy: A survey of basic issues*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Robichaud, D., Giroux, H., & Taylor, J. R. (2004). The meta-conversation: The recursive property of language as the key to organizing. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4), 617–634.

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.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1979). Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Simondon, G. (2005 [1958]). *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*. Grenoble: Jérôme Millon.

Smith, R. C. (1993). *Images of organizational Communication: Root-metaphors of the organization-communication relation*. Purdue University.

Souriau, É. (2009). *Les différents modes d'existence, suivi de du mode d'existence de l'oeuvre à faire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Stengers, I., & Latour, B. (2009). Le sphinx de l'œuvre. In E. Souriau, Les différents modes d'existence (pp. 1–75). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Stengers, I. (2011). *Thinking with whitehead: A free and wild creation of concepts*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tarde, G. (2012/1895). Monadologie and sociology. Melbourne, Australia: Re.Press.

Taylor, J. R. (1988). *Une organisation n'est qu'un tissu de communication*. Montréal: Cahiers de recherches en communication.

Taylor, J. R. (1993). *Rethinking the theory of organizational communication: How to read an organization*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Taylor, J. R. (1995). Shifting from a heteronomous to an autonomous worldview of organizational communication: Communication theory on the cusp. *Communication Theory*, *5*(1), 1–35.

Taylor, J. R. (2009). Organizing from the bottom up? Reflections on the constitution of organization in communication. In L. L. Putnam & A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 153–186). Oxford: Routledge.

Taylor, J. R., & Cooren, F. (1997). What makes communication "organizational"? How the many voices of a collectivity become the one voice of an organization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27*, 409–438.

Taylor, J. R., & Giroux, H. (2005). The role of language in self-organizing. In G. A. Barnett & R. Houston (Eds.), *Advances in self-organizing*

systems (pp. 131–167). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Taylor, J. R., & Robichaud, D. (2007). Management as metaconversation: The search for closure. In F. Cooren (Ed.), *Interacting and organizing: Analyses of a management meeting* (pp. 5–30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (1993). *The vulnerable fortress: Bureaucratic organization and management in the information Age*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

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

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. J. (2011). *The situated organization*. New York: Routledge.

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.

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

Trujillo, N. (1983). "Performing" Mintzberg's roles: The nature of managerial communication. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowski (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 73–97). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Vásquez, C. (2009). *Espacer l'organisation: Trajectoires d'un projet de diffusion de la science et de la technologie au Chili.* (PhD), Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada.

Vasquez. C. (2010). Espacer l'organisation: trajectoires d'un projet de diffusion de la science et de la technologie au Chili. In C. Loneux et B.Parent (Eds), Communication des organisations: recherches récentes (pp.187–196). Paris: L'Harmattan.

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). New York: Routledge.

Vásquez, C., & Cooren, F. (2011). Passion in action: An analysis of translation and treason. In P. Quattrone, C. McLean, F. Puyou, & N. Thrift (Eds.), *Imagining organizations: Performative imagery in business and beyond* (pp. 191–212). London & New York: Routledge.

Vásquez, C., & Cooren, F. (2013). Spacing practices: The communicative configuration of organizing through space-times. *Communication Theory*, *23*(1), 25–47.

Vásquez, C., Brummans, B., & Groleau, C. (2012). Notes from the field: Organizational shadowing as framing. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *7*(2), 144–165.

Weick, K. E. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York: Random House.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2001). *Managing the unexpected: Assuring high performance in an age of complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Whitehead, A. N. (1920). *Concept of nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1967 [1933]). *Adventures of ideas*. New York: Free Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1979 [1929]). *Process and reality*. New York: Free Press.

Whittington, R. (2003). The work of strategizing and organizing: For a practice perspective. *Strategic Organization*, *1*(1), 117–125.

Wright, A. (2016). Organizational routines as embodied performatives: A communication as constitutive of organization perspective. *Organization*, 23(2), 147–163.