Guest editorial: Research Methods for the Performative and Communicative Study of Organizing and Organizations

Nicolas Bencherki (nicolas.bencherki@teluq.ca), Alex Wright (awright@audencia.com) and Sophie Del Fa (sophie.delfa@uclouvain.be)

The study of organizations, along with the social sciences more generally, has taken the "performative turn" that Fabian Muniesa (2014) announced. Searching for the phrase "the performativity of" on Google Scholar witnesses the many ways in which it has been completed: gender and economics (probably the two domains that have contributed the most to popularizing the idea that social reality is performed, with the work of Butler, 1988; and Callon, 1990), but also networks, objects, marketing, and even the future (see Wenzel *et al.*, 2023), all turn out to be performatively accomplished.

It seems that we cannot expect anything to be just there, waiting for us to study it. If things are performed, then they rely on the activities and practices of numerous people, but also on multiple technical and social assemblages, in order to come into existence. As those activities and assemblages continuously shift, the things we're interested in also seem to be in constant flux. It is no surprise, then, that there is such a close proximity between performativity and process-based perspectives: performativity, indeed, cannot be extirpated from process philosophy (Simpson *et al.*, 2021), all the way back to their common heritage in American pragmatism and the work of C. S. Peirce, William James and John Dewey (see e.g., Stengers, 2008).

In organizations studies, interest in performativity has translated into institutionalized forms. These include, among others, a book series with the publisher Routledge on "Communication, Organization, and Organizing," edited by François Cooren, where many important works on the topic have been published, including *The Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization* (Basque, Bencherki, *et al.*, 2022). Another important handbook where a performative approach to communication is given a prominent place is the recent *Sage*

Handbook of Qualitative Research in Organizational Communication (Brummans *et al.*, 2024). The field's institutionalization efforts also include the Communication, Performativity, and Organization (CPO) standing working group of the European Group for Organizational Studies (EGOS), which has been organizing a subtheme at the association's colloquium since 2022. The standing working group catalyzed a desire many expressed: to "build a community" around qualitative research (Cunliffe and Locke, 2015). According to its website, the CPO community aims at understanding how "organizing and organizations are continuously produced and performed through communication and interaction," a question that brings together over thirty contributions each year. This special issue continues the community-building effort, as it results from the standing working group's inaugural first meeting, during which key methodological and conceptual problems in the study of performativity were identified.

A growing number of researchers associated with this community, either closely or more loosely, propose that phenomena such as strategy (Bencherki *et al.*, 2021), authority (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009), rituals (Koschmann and McDonald, 2015), routines (Wright, 2016), organizational space (Beyes and Steyaert, 2012), or leadership (Fairhurst, 2007), are performatively brought into being, especially through talk and discourse. Alternatively, though, authors suggest that some of those same phenomena are themselves performative, meaning that they produce effects, including on the organization itself. That is the case, for example, of strategy (Cabantous *et al.*, 2018; Vásquez *et al.*, 2018) and leadership (Simpson *et al.*, 2017). Performativity research thus questions the non-problematic existence of some phenomena, but also takes those same things as starting points to question yet other phenomena. Even the most unexpected or ordinary practices, including "relationships that 'just happen'", can have performative effects and contribute to organizing, as Gherardi, Jensen and Nerland (2017, p. 8) suggest as they explore the metaphor of "shadow organizing." Ultimately, it may seem that all of reality is connected in a long chain of performativity.

There are, however, many understandings of performativity. Gond and his colleagues (2016) identify five broad conceptualizations that serve as foundations for performative work in organizational studies. The first, and the oldest, is Austin's (1962) notion that people "do things with words," which is the basis for linguistic performativity, and which is itself based on American pragmatism. The second is Lyotard's (1984) view of performativity as the structures

put in place to induce people, including workers, to perform in accordance with their organization's expectations. This tradition has led to what we know today as critical performativity (see Cabantous *et al.*, 2016; Spicer *et al.*, 2009). Third, Gond and colleagues identify a tradition that considers the way people constitute their own identity, especially when it comes to gender, with footing in the work of Butler (1988) and in that of Derrida (1988). The fourth way of understanding performativity attends to the way theories make the reality they purport to describe come true. This approach emerges from the sociology of economics (e.g., Callon, 1990; MacKenzie *et al.*, 2007; Muniesa, 2014) but, in organizational studies, it has also been applied to study the performativity of strategy (Cabantous *et al.*, 2018; Vásquez *et al.*, 2018), among others. Finally, Gond *et al.* (2016) describe the fifth theory of performativity as "socio-materiality mattering," a somewhat unsettling designation that points to the role of objects, technologies and other non-human entities in performing social reality, but also very tangible bodies and technological assemblages. This last perspective borrows from actor-network theory (see Latour, 2005), and from feminism (e.g., Haraway, 1985) and new materialism (see Dolphijn and Tuin, 2013), including the work of Barad (2003). We could add to the list a different understanding of performativity, one that Muniesa (2014) identifies in his own categorization, which consists of the theatrical performance metaphor that undergirds symbolic interactionism, especially the work of Goffman (1959), and that of Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969).

Each time, different assumptions are made as to what is available to accomplish a performance, what that performance is, and what it produces. For example, Austin's (1962) theory assumes that people non-problematically produce and understand language, which is the material that serves to sustain social institutions such as marriage, meetings or court trials, through various kinds of speech acts (e.g., constatives, directives, declaratives, commissives, etc.; see Searle, 1969). For Lyotard (1984), multiple discourses on knowledge and science compete with each other, and have legitimation effects on different institutional and professional arrangements in the university (and, arguably, elsewhere). That is why critical management scholars denounce the growing popularity of discourses that position academic and scientific work in the service of industrial and commercial interests (Spicer *et al.*, 2009).

In the same vein, other ways of understanding performativity correspond to different means of sorting between what can be taken for granted and what needs to be produced into being. Such sorting, however, is often implicit, even though it has important implications, to the extent that it considers some beings—human, technical or social—as fragile and deserving of our solicitude, and others as existing unproblematically and as having a responsibility of caring for the first (Bencherki *et al.*, 2024). The ethics involved in how researchers operate that sorting are among the arguments Butler (1999) mobilizes in criticizing Bourdieu's (1990, p. 57) reduction of performativity to "the body's readiness to take seriously the performative magic of the social," arguing that the supposed "magic" is precisely what needs to be explained.

Yet, despite the importance of avoiding such easy ellipses, scholarship on performativity has mostly remained implicit on how it observes and describes performative effects. Studies have espoused a diversity of methods and analytical standpoints, without taking the time to relate them with their theoretical ambition (Bencherki, 2016; Wilhoit, 2016). Very few have formulated a genuinely performative methodological, affective and analytical agenda (exceptions include Basque, Hirsto, *et al.*, 2022; Nathues *et al.*, 2020; Nathues and van Vuuren, 2022). Without clear methodological guidance, research claiming to adopt a performative stance may at times gather and analyze data in ways that do not allow it to support its claims. That may be why a sizeable proportion of performative work in organizational studies remains conceptual and only occasionally ventures towards empirical considerations.

As a result, performative research is yet to articulate an original approach to speak to issues of impact and relevance for practitioners, partner organizations, and students. Indeed, translating the theoretical insights of performativity research into practical advice, as well as into a tangible curriculum for training, is an ongoing concern for a number of researchers in the field (see Kuhn and Schoeneborn, 2015; van Vuuren and Knoers, 2022). This is particularly important when we recognise research's non-representational quality, where it performatively constructs what it investigates and thus plays a part in changing the status quo. Indeed, performativity implies a commitment to change and emancipation from hegemonic power (Butler, 1988), and it is through such acts that alternatives to the usual forms of organizing can be crafted (Cruz, 2017; Del Fa and Kärreman, 2022; Del Fa and Vásquez, 2019). It is therefore necessary to think about the

critical, engaged performative methods that best allow us, as committed researchers, to study—but also act within—our communities (Madison, 2011).

Putting communicative performativity at the heart of our methods

Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management (QROM) has already published multiple studies taking either a communicative or performative stance. For instance, a special issue guest edited by Davison, McLean and Warren (2012) focused on how the visual—especially images and photographs—not only provides access to everyday life in organizations, but also underlies those quotidian practices. Such calls to pay attention to specific communicative objects are typical of communication research published in QROM. Still in the visual realm, Krohn (2019) invited researchers to study organizations' use of videoblogs. Another example is that of Güney and Taylor (2014), who drew attention to the role of project management tools, such as roadmaps and timelines, in delimiting the boundaries of authority in project teams. Other studies have drawn attention to communicative practices that may materialize in multiple tangible supports, such as narratives (Lambotte and Meunier, 2013; Susanne Johansen, 2014) or sensemaking (Kimura, 2024). In a more critical stance, Cruz (2016, p. 214) has suggested that communication researchers conducting ethnography in non-Western settings should be "following traces," either memorial, interactional, and material ones, to account for "alternative and holistic epistemologies in line with African worldviews."

Communication, however, is not only about accessing reality as it was experienced by our research participants. What we observe people saying and doing also constitutes the phenomena we study (e.g., leadership in the case of Styhre *et al.*, 2022). The communicative practices we collect can also affect how we conduct our research. In that sense, the visual can be performative for the production of knowledge, as writing qualitative research aesthetically means considering the research process holistically and thinking about how the visual produces reflexivity (Steyaert *et al.*, 2012).

QROM also has a strong history of contributing to and extending scholarly debate around performativity through publishing both conceptual and empirical works. On the empirical side, Bramming, Gorm Hansen, Bojesen and Gylling Olesen (2012) employ "snaplogs" (snapshots and logbooks) as an experimental method to explore visual methods from a performativity

perspective. They locate their performative work as a form of non-representational theory and offer snaplogs as a means of activating and cooperating with research phenomena. Gherardi et al. (2017) align their study with Callon's (2007, p. 315) idea of performativity as deploying all the materialities comprising "the socio-technical agencements that constitute the world in which these agents are plunged". They also signal Barad (2003) in reframing organizing as the effect of multiple intra-acting elements. Segercrantz, Tuori and Niemistö (2020) also draw on Barad's theorizing of performativity to examine how health promotion is performed in care work. The authors emphasize practices of balancing, as the limitations of health promotion become evident as care home residents' needs often do not align with the assumptions displayed in promotional material content. Performativity of the self is Haynes's (2011) focus, as she offers an autoethnography of undertaking and presenting her research at academic conferences. The experiences of Haynes (2011) will resonate with many who have experienced the challenges of speaking in front of colleagues. Varkarolis and King (2017) position their work as critical performativity (Spicer *et al.*, 2009), as their participatory and responsive action research project identifies some of the tensions that can arise in the research process and offers advice to minimise them.

Two conceptual pieces contribute to understanding through theorizing performativity from different perspectives. Steyaert et al. (2012) review existing visual research and argue for a performative approach to the visual. They draw on numerous sources, such as Bruno Latour, Emilie Hermant, Susanna Shannon and Patricia Reed, and combine these with the filmic and written work of Trinh T. Minh-ha and her collaborators, to advance a framework that facilitates a performative approach to the doing of visual research that emphasizes an aesthetics of movement, sensuality and reflexivity. McDonald (2017) utilizes two performativity approaches, those of Butler and the group of studies that are considered within the performativity of "management", to explore the methodological implications of queering organizational research. In considering what benefits queering methodologies can offer, McDonald advances their disruptive qualities and the possibilities of critique of conventional research practices resulting in new ways of engaging with the work as foremost.

This special issue extends those ideas and suggests that communication offers an operationalization of performativity. Such a suggestion is warranted by the fact that, as

mentioned above, performativity finds its root in Austin's (1962) speech acts theory and, therefore, in the study of the way people talk and write. Approaches for the study of communication and language use abound (e.g., Bartesaghi and Pantelides, 2017; Chia, 2000; Goodwin and Heritage, 1990), including for the study of language as a performative phenomenon (e.g., Levinson, 1983; Pennycook, 2004; Rowe and Tristano, 2021).

The first two articles in this special issue suggest displacing performativity, from an object of study to the method of study itself. In other words, they suggest that performativity can look at itself. That is what Marie Reumont, Magali Simard and James Lapalme accomplish in the first article of the special issue. They examine how a group of researchers used an observation grid designed as part of an action design research project that followed a facilitation team helping a group of engineers negotiate elements of a large-scale construction project. Reumont, Simard and Lapalme note that the observation grid is performative and influences communicative practices between various human and non-human actors, including theory about facilitation. Using a communicative constitution of organizations (CCO) framework and a process perspective, their article analyzes the grid's trajectory as both a research tool and a knowledge object. While the grid did not perform as initially expected, the process of designing and using it provided valuable insights and demonstrated how researchers, and also inanimate actors, can transform theory into practice. The study reveals how the observation grid, as an other-than-human actor, enabled other non-human actors to have a voice, and contributed to their ability to make a difference in the facilitation process and in the research that was conducted about that process. This research offers a novel perspective by focusing on the grid itself rather than treating it merely as a data collection tool, while also exploring performativity through a CCO framework that incorporates the notion of knowledge objects.

François Lambotte, Christel Christophe and Joanne Jojczyk address the performativity of research in a highly innovative manner. They conceptualize Ricoeur's triple mimesis as a hermeneutic tool that enables them to reflect upon a three-year ethnographic study of a cultural event, "Le Grand Huit," part of the Mons 2015 European Capital of Culture initiative. Their reflexive acts allow them to make sense of the research anew, revisiting the process to consider how communication constitutes both research participants' agency and the acts of inquiry that produce research. Their study calls attention to the affective and affecting quality of fieldwork,

collaboration and writing. Through Ricoeur's hermeneutic Phenomenology, Lambotte, Christophe and Jojczyk highlight the role of textualization in CCO ethnographic work, which includes all forms of inscriptions from field notes and footage to interpretive texts. Citing Clifford (1983, p. 130), textualization is "the process through which unwritten behaviour, speech, beliefs, oral tradition or ritual, come to be marked as a corpus, a potentially meaningful ensemble separated out from an immediate discursive or performative situation." The study shows how incorporating textualization into our understanding of ethnographic research allows researchers to enact a form of distanciation that opens up new possibilities for interpreting familiar data. Joanne experienced this distanciation through a visit to Canada where she was able to walk the streets and while doing so made surprising connections with her data from a Belgian city, over 5,000 kilometres away. This research challenges us to rethink our understanding of ethnography and how interpretive acts are performed. The authors question whether experiential authority is sufficient for research to be viewed as legitimate, seek to demystify the process and invite others to follow suit.

Communication beyond language

Another crucial problem of performative research is that it has often been reduced solely to language, raising the question of how we can observe other forms of performativity, that are less well established. An answer that emerges from our special issue contributors is that researchers can use their own bodies as projection surfaces on which performativity is expressed. This can be done in two ways: through affect, and through reflexivity. The first option is explored in the opening article in this section, written by Monica Nadegger and Monica Porzionato. The two authors introduce the notion of diffractive vignettes, originally introduced in the feminist and material realist literature, as a novel analytical approach in organizational communication research to better understand how it can more fully account for the role of linguistic and extra-linguistic forces in shaping how we collectively deal with major societal challenges like the climate crisis.

Nadegger and Porzionato reflect on their own meeting as researchers and on the intersection of their two fieldworks on tourist destinations, the first in the Tyrolean Alps and the second in Venice. Their diffractive methodology demonstrates how different forces interact and create new patterns of meaning through entangled relations. The researchers developed a non-

representational, post-qualitative analytical method that involves juxtaposing, weaving, dividing, and melting data and theory together. Through diffractive vignettes, the study extends work on materialization within organizational communication by highlighting communication's performativity and its extra-linguistic force. This approach ultimately expands organizational communication scholarship by bringing attention to differences in materialization.

Finally, Mallette, Nathues, Cnossen and Brummans reflect in depth on the notion of the *terra firma* of interaction (coined by Cooren, 2004) that structures much of the CCO perspective. Within the situations and scenes they study, the authors explore instead what they refer to as the *terra fluida* (fluid ground) of interaction, by asking the question: Where are we in the *terra firma* of interaction? In answering this question, they show that CCO researchers are always already part of the "field of relation" they are investigating, but also, as they do so, co-constituting. In this sense, the article proposes understanding the research field as an assemblage that is always already constituted by communication, but which researchers also participate in constituting. The article opens up new paths for CCO research, inviting us to envision it as a relational practice through which researchers are "composing with the terra firma of interaction."

Pushing performativity further

We also wanted, in this special issue, to explore alternative ways of thinking about performativity. That is why the issue also includes a review of Timothy R. Kuhn's latest book *What Do Corporations Want? Communicative Capitalism, Corporate Purpose and a New Theory of the Firm* (published by Bristol University Press in 2024). In addition to an introduction helping the reader appreciate the book's argument, the review consists of an interview that University of Cincinnati's Spencer Hall conducted with Kuhn, where both explore the performative implications of the notion of purpose, especially when it is understood in the plural. In other words, organizations pursue many goals at once, as each communicative episode can engender several effects at once. The interview also explores Kuhn's original theorizing of performativity through the work of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, as opposed to the more conventional reliance on speech acts theory. The interview then turns to the topic of branding as an important manifestation of capitalistic performativity, before concluding with an examination of the relevance of Kuhn's perspective on labour unions, which is Hall's research focus.

When studying performativity, another important book that was published in the last year is Judith Butler's *Who's Afraid of Gender?* (published by Farrar, Straus and Giroux in 2024). The book can be understood as a study of how conservative voices against feminism, abortion rights, and transgender people, have come together to form an anti-gender movement. In her review, Gabrielle Fortier observes that *Who's afraid of gender?* tackles two main tasks: critiquing arguments against "gender ideology" while also proposing ways to resist rising fascism and authoritarianism that threaten our "livable lives." The originality of Butler's latest work is that it focuses on the performativity of affect and fear, examining how political instability leads people to abandon rational debate and rally around phantasmatic threats supposedly posed by gender. The review suggests that, while Butler does not aim to provide a new theory of gender, their book makes an important contribution by showing how affect enables certain phantasms and explores ways to neutralize their power through collective organizing and alternative desires for the future.

The special issue concludes with an interview that Sophie Del Fa conducted with Consuelo Vásquez, a Montréal-based researcher associated with the communicative constitution of organization tradition, but who adopts a decolonial perspective and contributes to "mapping" the field of organizational communication in Latin America. Motivated by the observation that performative research centers on European and North American scholarship, Del Fa sought to diversify the voices included in this special issue. Vásquez, who remarks that her own identity— she is a Chilean living in Canada—places her in a liminal position, made a similar observation regarding the hegemonic epistemologies developed in the Global North to address situations specific to those contexts, but that are then imposed on the South as the only acceptable way of conducting research. Reaching out to peers in Latin American countries, she started a network to investigate the original definitions, methods, and assumptions developed in their part of the world, noting that a performative desire for social change is at the heart of how the researcher's role is conceived. In parallel to decentering knowledge production, Vásquez also encourages us to pay attention to those who are in "in the margins," as decolonial studies are not only concerned with what goes on elsewhere, but also with those pockets of the South that may be found in the North, so to speak. In that sense, power relations that take place in contexts of knowledge production should be at the heart of our reflexive analysis.

Moving performative research forward

At present, the literature on methods for performative and communicative studies of organizing and organizations is scattered (see for instance the works published in QROM). In this special issue, we have summarized the field to date and shown how both the performative and the communicative have had a consistent presence in publications for several years. Yet, few of these studies have really unpicked what the performative and communicative are and how they constitute our research objects and subjects. The articles in this issue take up this challenge and, from different perspectives and fueled by distinct assumptions, explore how the performative and the communicative matter for developing qualitative knowledge and understanding of organizing and organizations. In this summarizing section, we share some speculative thoughts about how we see the field developing, so that research in organizations and management truly takes a performative and communicative turn.

Our first call is simple and straightforward: we encourage more empirical work of the kind contained in this special issue. Phenomenon-led studies of performativity and communication represent a minority of scholarly work published in organization and management. We therefore appeal to colleagues to redouble their efforts to produce research that centers how reality is performatively construed. Performativity and communication are often attached to studies, but are seldom the focus of empirical research. In these instances, they are treated as epiphenomena, meaning they are not seen as the focal points of research but as interesting, peripheral concepts. Such work, while valuable, is restrictive in developing a genuinely performative understanding of organization and management. What is needed, in our view, is empirical work that offers insights into how phenomena are performatively constituted and that also advance our knowledge of performativity and communication as forces of organizing. How are they accomplished? What affects do they have? How are power and authority exercised and how do they constitute what emerges? What conflicts, tensions and challenges unfold, and how do they affect organizing? What practices does performativity help us to describe and explain that would remain hidden from more conventional theoretical framings? Answering such questions would require that we be explicit about what aspects of reality we believe we can observe, what other aspects we feel are yet to be brought into existence, and what precise mechanisms allow the first to produce the second.

We already have a base of studies that have examined how phenomena are performatively formed (e.g., Bencherki *et al.*, 2021; Beyes and Steyaert, 2012; Fairhurst, 2007) and that also acknowledge organizational phenomena are themselves performative (Cabantous *et al.*, 2018; Simpson *et al.*, 2017), meaning that they produce affects that move those affected to act and organize. We call for more research that combines these two aspects of performativity—closing the circle, to some extent—and that more fully account for how organizing and managing are accomplished through performative agency that has both intended and unintended consequences. What existing empirical research reveals is that often seemingly mundane organizing practices can have surprising performative affects. Through a communication and performativity lens, subtle and not-so-subtle acts of power and authority can be uncovered (Hollis *et al.*, 2021). We encourage further explorations of this type.

Studies in this special issue successfully problematize taken-for-granted assumptions about subject/object distinctions in the research process. We call for more scholarship in this area that continues to explore how the research act is a fundamentally performative and communicative undertaking. We must, in that sense, investigate the performativity of research itself. Do we, as researchers, contribute to disseminating specific understandings of management and organization, and therefore steer organizing processes in what we deem to be desirable directions (e.g., Vásquez *et al.*, 2018)? Can it be said that every piece of research we conduct is, above all, about ourselves, for instance in establishing our own legitimacy in an economy of epistemic authority (e.g., Cnossen, 2018)? Do we observe actors, interview them, read their documents, study their spaces, take note of their bodies and movements, interpret their moods, watch their reactions, etc., just so that we can gain a deeper appreciation of what we feel is going on? Or do we, as Del Fa's interview with Vásquez suggest, also aim at improving the lives of those we study—but then, who gets to define what a good life is? Fundamentally, reflecting on the performativity of research demands that we make explicit the relationships between us, as researchers, and those we study (or perhaps use) in our research. In that sense, a performative perspective cannot do without a dose of reflexively, as we assess our constitutive role in qualitative research.

Until this special issue, QROM had published only a single autoethnographic study that explicitly adopts a performativity stance (Haynes, 2011), which is perhaps surprising. If a

performativity perspective teaches us anything, it is that there is no escape from the performative; we are all affected by, and are performatively affecting others, all the time. Turning an analytical lens on ourselves and our own research *becomings* can be revealing and enable us to comprehend how research unfolds in ways that can often surprise us. More autoethnographies of doing qualitative research as a communicative and performative undertaking are called for. Key, though, is that autoethnographers are reflexive about their experiences and that their work is analytically insightful, and not just reflective. Autoethnographic accounts are effective means of bringing the body into our research, highlighting its performativity in our daily organizing. At present, we do not have a strong embodied performativity literature. While studying the bodies of others is one approach to adopt, we too are embodied faculty who perform in front of students, alongside research participants and with colleagues when collaborating on projects; how bodies affect what we do is a potentially revealing topic to pursue.

Conclusion

In concluding this Guest Editorial and reflecting on the Special Issue, it behoves us to turn the performative and communicative lens on to our project. In a traditional framing, we could conclude that the Special Issue comprises a guest editorial, four original pieces of research, a conventional book review, a book review in the form of an interview with the author, and an interview with a senior scholar who has revealing and unsettling things to say about a research move many of us are familiar with. However, the Special Issue topic motivates us to offer a novel conclusion. Special issues, by their nature, act differently to standard journal issues. Their focus on a single topic means that the special issue genre contributes to knowledge and understanding in alternative ways than regular journal issues. They act as markers of current states of the field, advance perspectives and seek to shape how future research will be done. In this sense, we assert that *all* special issues are not just conduits for research on a shared theme, they are, of course and unsurprisingly, performative. They exercise textual agency through showcasing new and thought-provoking research, but they also stand as significant contributions to theorizing in their fields. In this framing, special issues are affective in that as a whole—rather than a single article—they affect subsequent empirical and conceptual work in their areas. In concluding this performative Special Issue then, we should acknowledge that we hope and anticipate the work as a whole represents an engaging consideration of performative and

communicative research methods in a state of constant flux, and that problematizes some of the existing assumptions that have fuelled research for a number of decades. How performatively influential the Special Issue proves to be, as with all performativity, will only be known in the future.

References

Austin, J.L. (1962), *How to Do Things with Words*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Barad, K. (2003), "Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter", *Signs*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 801–831, doi: 10.1086/345321.

Bartesaghi, M. and Pantelides, K. (2017), "Critical Discourse Analysis", *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, American Cancer Society, pp. 1–10, doi: 10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0050.

Basque, J., Bencherki, N. and Kuhn, T.R. (Eds.). (2022), *Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization*, Routledge, London.

Basque, J., Hirsto, H. and Wagnac, R. (2022), "Archives in CCO research: A relational view", in Basque, J., Bencherki, N. and Kuhn, T.R. (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Bencherki, N. (2016), "How things make things do things with words, or how to pay attention to what things have to say", *Communication Research and Practice*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 272–289, doi: 10.1080/22041451.2016.1214888.

Bencherki, N., Brummans, B.H.J.M. and Vézy, C. (2024), "Agency without agents: Affective forces, communicative events, and organizational becomings", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 9, pp. 1349–1372, doi: 10.1177/01708406241266310.

Bencherki, N., Sergi, V., Cooren, F. and Vásquez, C. (2021), "How strategy comes to matter: Strategizing as the communicative materialization of matters of concern", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 608–635, doi: 10.1177/1476127019890380.

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*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 5–31, doi: 10.1177/0893318909335414.

Beyes, T. and Steyaert, C. (2012), "Spacing organization: non-representational theory and performing organizational space", *Organization*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 45–61, doi: 10.1177/1350508411401946.

Blumer, H. (1969), *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Bramming, P., Gorm Hansen, B., Bojesen, A. and Gylling Olesen, K. (2012), "(Im)perfect pictures: snaplogs in performativity research", edited by Davison, J., McLean, C. and Warren, S.*Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 54–71, doi: 10.1108/17465641211223465.

Brummans, B.H.J.M., Taylor, B.C. and Sivunen, A. (Eds.). (2024), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Organizational Communication*, Sage Publications, London Thousand Oaks, CA.

Butler, J. (1988), "Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory", *Theatre Journal*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 519–531, doi: 10.2307/3207893.

Butler, J. (1999), "Performativity's Social Magic", in Shusterman, R. (Ed.), *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 113–128.

Butler, J. (2024), *Who's Afraid of Gender?*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.

Cabantous, L., Gond, J.-P., Harding, N. and Learmonth, M. (2016), "Critical Essay: Reconsidering critical performativity", *Human Relations*, SAGE Publications Ltd, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 197–213, doi: 10.1177/0018726715584690.

Cabantous, L., Gond, J.-P. and Wright, A. (2018), "The performativity of strategy: Taking stock and moving ahead", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 407–416, doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2018.03.002.

Callon, M. (1990), "Techno-economic networks and irreversibility", *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 38 No. S1, pp. 132–161, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.1990.tb03351.x.

Callon, M. (2007), "What does it mean to say that economics is performative?", in MacKenzie, D., Muniesa, F. and Siu, Lucia (Eds.), *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp. 311–357.

Chia, R. (2000), "Discourse analysis as organizational analysis", *Organization*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 513–518, doi: 10.1177/135050840073009.

Clifford, J. (1983), "On Ethnographic Authority", *Representations*, Vol. 1, pp. 118–146, doi: 10.2307/2928386.

Cnossen, B. (2018), "Whose home is it anyway? Performing multiple selves while doing organizational ethnography", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 176–185, doi: 10.1108/JOE-12-2017-0068.

Cooren, F. (2004), "The communicative achievement of collective minding: Analysis of board meeting excerpts", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 517–551, doi: 10.1177/0893318903262242.

Cruz, J. (2016), "Following traces: an organizational ethnography in the midst of trauma", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 214–231, doi: 10.1108/QROM-02-2016-1366.

Cruz, J. (2017), "Invisibility and visibility in alternative organizing: A communicative and cultural model", *Management Communication Quarterly*, SAGE Publications Inc, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 614–639, doi: 10.1177/0893318917725202.

Cunliffe, A.L. and Locke, K. (2015), "Continuing to build community in qualitative research", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 310–313, doi: 10.1108/QROM-07-2015-1300.

Davison, J., McLean, C. and Warren, S. (2012), "Exploring the visual in organizations and management", edited by Davison, J.*Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 5–15, doi: 10.1108/17465641211223528.

Del Fa, S. and Kärreman, D. (2022), "Uncritical constitution: CCO, critique and neoliberal capitalism", in Basque, J., Bencherki, N. and Kuhn, T.R. (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Del Fa, S. and Vásquez, C. (2019), "Existing through differantiation: a Derridean approach to alternative organizations", *M@n@gement*, AIMS, Vol. Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 559–583.

Derrida, J. (1988), *Limited Inc*, Northwestern Univ. Press, Evanston, IL.

Dolphijn, R. and Tuin, I. van der. (2013), *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies*, Open Humanites Press, London, UK.

Fairhurst, G.T. (2007), *Discursive Leadership : In Conversation with Leadership Psychology*, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles.

Gherardi, S., Jensen, K. and Nerland, M. (2017), "Shadow organizing: a metaphor to explore organizing as intra-relating", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 2–17, doi: 10.1108/QROM-06-2016-1385.

Goffman, Erving. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y.

Gond, J.-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N. and Learmonth, M. (2016), "What do we mean by performativity in organizational and management theory? The uses and abuses of performativity", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 440–463, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12074.

Goodwin, C. and Heritage, J. (1990), "Conversation Analysis", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 19, pp. 283–307.

Güney, S. and R. Taylor, J. (2014), "Rethinking the role of roadmaps in strategic planning: A close-up analysis from project development in corporate R&D", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 308–331, doi: 10.1108/QROM-08-2012-1090.

Haraway, D.J. (1985), "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s", *Socialist Review*, No. 80, pp. 65–107.

Haynes, K. (2011), "Tensions in (re)presenting the self in reflexive autoethnographical research", edited by Cunliffe, A.L., Linstead, S. and Locke, K.*Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 134–149, doi: 10.1108/17465641111159125.

Hollis, D., Wright, A., Smolović Jones, O. and Smolović Jones, S. (2021), "From 'Pretty' to 'Pretty Powerful': The communicatively constituted power of facial beauty's performativity", *Organization Studies*, SAGE Publications Ltd, Vol. 42 No. 12, pp. 1885–1907, doi: 10.1177/01708406211030663.

Kimura, T. (2024), "The role of strategic communication and sensemaking in implementing management innovation", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, doi: 10.1108/QROM-04-2024-2721.

Koschmann, M.A. and McDonald, J. (2015), "Organizational Rituals, Communication, and the Question of Agency", *Management Communication Quarterly*, doi: 10.1177/0893318915572386.

Krohn, M. (2019), "Strategizing with organizational videoblogs: sensegiving, self-branding or spectacle?", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 465–480, doi: 10.1108/QROM-01-2018-1603.

Kuhn, T. (2024), *What Do Corporations Want? Communicative Capitalism, Corporate Purpose, and a New Theory of the Firm*, Bristol University Press, Bristol, doi: 10.56687/9781529214307.

Kuhn, T. and Schoeneborn, D. (2015), "The pedagogy of CCO", *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 295–301, doi: 10.1177/0893318915571348.

Lambotte, F. and Meunier, D. (2013), "From bricolage to thickness: making the most of the messiness of research narratives", edited by Donnelly, P.F.*Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 85–100, doi: 10.1108/17465641311327531.

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

Levinson, S.C. (1983), *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

MacKenzie, D., Muniesa, F. and Siu, L. (Eds.). (2007), *Do Economists Make Markets? : On the Performativity of Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Madison, D.S. (2011), *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*, Second edition., SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, Calif.

McDonald, J. (2017), "Queering methodologies and organizational research: disrupting, critiquing, and exploring", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 130–148, doi: 10.1108/QROM-06-2016-1388.

Mead, G.H. (1934), *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Muniesa, F. (2014), *The Provoked Economy: Economic Reality and the Performative Turn*, Routledge, London : New York.

Nathues, E. and van Vuuren, M. (2022), "Acting in the name of others: How to unpack ventriloquations", in Basque, J., Bencherki, N. and Kuhn, T.R. (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organization*, Routledge, London.

Nathues, E., van Vuuren, M. and Cooren, F. (2020), "Speaking about vision, talking in the name of so much more: A methodological framework for ventriloquial analyses in organization studies":, *Organization Studies*, SAGE Publications, Vol. 42 No. 9, pp. 1457–1476, doi: 10.1177/0170840620934063.

Pennycook, A. (2004), "Performativity and Language Studies", *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1–19, doi: 10.1207/s15427595cils0101_1.

Rowe, D.D. and Tristano, M. (2021), "Methods of Performance", in Croucher, S.M. and Cronn-Mills, D. (Eds.), *Understanding Communication Research Methods*, 3rd ed., Routledge.

Searle, J.R. (1969), *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, London.

Segercrantz, B., Tuori, A. and Niemistö, C. (2020), "Health promotion in care organizations as material-discursive practices", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 170–190, doi: 10.1108/QROM-09-2019-1826.

Simpson, B., Buchan, L. and Sillince, J. (2017), "The performativity of leadership talk", *Leadership*, SAGE PublicationsSage UK: London, England, doi: 10.1177/1742715017710591.

Simpson, B., Harding, N., Fleming, P., Sergi, V. and Hussenot, A. (2021), "The Integrative Potential of Process in a Changing World: Introduction to a special issue on power,

performativity and process", *Organization Studies*, SAGE Publications Ltd, Vol. 42 No.

12, pp. 1775–1794, doi: 10.1177/01708406211057224.

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M. and Kärreman, D. (2009), "Critical performativity: The unfinished

business of critical management studies", *Human Relations*, SAGE Publications Ltd, Vol.

62 No. 4, pp. 537–560, doi: 10.1177/0018726708101984.

Stengers, I. (2008), "Experimenting with Refrains: Subjectivity and the Challenge of Escaping

Modern Dualism", *Subjectivity*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 38–59, doi: 10.1057/sub.2008.6.

Steyaert, C., Marti, L. and Michels, C. (2012), "Multiplicity and reflexivity in organizational

research", edited by Davison, J., McLean, C. and Warren, S.*Qualitative Research in

Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Group Publishing

Limited, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 34–53, doi: 10.1108/17465641211223456.

Styhre, A., Fasth, J. and Löwstedt, M. (2022), "Pastoral power in leadership work: the relational

leadership idiom in the construction industry", *Qualitative Research in Organizations

and Management: An International Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 18 No. 1,

pp. 84–101, doi: 10.1108/QROM-10-2021-2224.

Susanne Johansen, T. (2014), "Researching collective identity through stories and antestories",

Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, Vol.

9 No. 4, pp. 332–350, doi: 10.1108/QROM-08-2012-1092.

Varkarolis, O. and King, D. (2017), "Voicing researched activists with responsive action

research", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International

Journal*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 315–334, doi: 10.1108/QROM-

11-2016-1461.

Vásquez, C., Bencherki, N., Cooren, F. and Sergi, V. (2018), "From 'matters of concern' to 'matters of authority': Reflecting on the performativity of strategy in writing a strategic plan", *Long-Range Planning*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 417–435, doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2017.01.001.

van Vuuren, M. and Knoers, P. (2022), "CCO and the academic-professional gap: Combining rigor and relevance in organizational communication", in Basque, J., Bencherki, N. and Kuhn, T.R. (Eds.), *The Handbook of the Communicative Constitution of Organizations*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Wenzel, M., Krämer, H., Koch, J. and Reckwitz, A. (2023), "Future Work: Toward a Practice Perspective", in de Vaujany, F.-X., Holt, R. and Grandazzi, A. (Eds.), *Organization as Time: Technology, Power and Politics*, pp. 136–155, doi: 10.1017/9781009297288.008.

Wilhoit, E.D. (2016), "Ventriloquism's methodological scope", *Language Under Discussion*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 45–49.

Wright, A. (2016), "Organizational routines as embodied performatives: A communication as constitutive of organization perspective", *Organization*, Vol. 23, pp. 147–163, doi: 10.1177/1350508414533165.