

Organization Studies

Call for Papers Special Issue on The hidden life of categories: emergence, maintenance and change in organizations, markets and society

Deadline for Submissions: September 30th 2017

Guest Editors for the Special Issue

Giuseppe Delmestri, WU Vienna

Filippo Carlo Wezel, emlyon

Elizabeth Goodrick, Florida Atlantic University

Marvin Washington, University of Alberta

The study of categories or “conceptual boundaries that cluster easily substitutable models...and distinguish them from less substitutable groupings” (Rosa, et al, 1999: 64) has grown in interest as a concept within the organizations literature. Since the formulations by authors such as Douglas (1987), Zuckerman (1999), Rosa, Porac, Runser-Spanjol, Saxon (1999), Lounsbury and Rao (2004), and Hannan Polos and Carroll (2007), the study of social categories has become a central concern in organization theory. Social categories are the building blocks of societies, fields, markets, professions and organizations. They are part of the taken for granted structures of everyday life. Anchored in language, visual symbols and also artifacts, categories allow society in its different domains to exist. For instance, market categories permit producers and consumers to interact with each other. Professional categories permit the distribution of substantive knowledge and associated practices to different jurisdictions. Organizational categories allow for the legitimate orchestration of resources. Societies themselves are constituted along different categorical dimensions depending on how corporate and statist the polity historically developed (e.g., in statist and corporatist polities ‘hospitals’ tend to be constituted as local strongholds of the professions or the state, and not as firms).

Category studies, while “being around” a long time in various disciplines, from philosophy to linguistics to cognitive science, have burgeoned in organization studies only recently. Organizational ecologists for instance have emphasized the impact of the cognitive structure of a market on the behaviour of incumbents, on the evaluations of consumers, and on the decisions of entrepreneurs (see Hannan et al., 2007). Our understanding of the cognitive structuring of markets and of differences among producers has been radically improved by the development of concepts like category contrast and grade of membership (Hannan, 2010).

However, a dynamic view on how categories emerge, change, dissolve, are combined, or contested has only recently been identified as a necessary step in the development of category studies

both by ecologists and institutionalists. Organizational institutionalists in particular have given primacy to the processes of categorization and studied the emergence and institutionalization of market categories (Navis and Glynn, 2010; Delacour and Leca, 2016), the institutional maintenance work of categories (e.g., Micelotta and Washington, 2013), and connected market categories to broader social and political structures (Jones, Maoret, Massa, and Svejenova, 2012). Both streams have recently converged in the attention devoted to category status as an independent (Sharkey, 2014), moderating (Montauti and Wezel, 2016) and dependent variable (Delmestri and Greenwood, 2016).

In this special issue, we are particularly interested in research that integrates different approaches to categories to understand the opportunities, threats, and processes embodied in category dynamics. In particular we envisage to spur research on the dynamics of categories, particularly on the ensuing conflicts and struggles over their meanings, status and morality and to develop a deeper theoretical understanding of how organizations navigate category change, successfully overcoming its challenges and, sometimes, strategically using it. We expect this special issue to support the still adolescent field of category studies within organization theory, and welcome papers that draw from various academic traditions.

Themes and topics needing to be more fully addressed by category scholars include:

- Long-term longitudinal and historical developments. Tracking the change in meaning and/or labels of categories in time is an understudied phenomenon that needs further investigation (Karthikeyan, Jonsson and Wezel, 2016). Long-term quantitative or historical studies on the changes in the meanings associated with categories would be fruitful to enrich our understanding of category dynamics.
- International translation processes. The study of how category change may be facilitated by labels and practices developed elsewhere, edited and translated to new national contexts has received initial recognition (Cattani and Fliescher, 2013). These processes need, however, much more elaboration, as category labels tend to travel across borders carried by ideologies (Czarniawska and Sévon, 2005).
- Recombination and category change. Categories do not exist in a vacuum but are embedded in relationships of mutuality and competition. Processes of recombination may damage firms but may also lead to the extension of a category's meaning through sustained experimentation (Phillips, 2013; Negro et al., 2011). The study of how the sustained recombination of existing categories may lead to the change in the category schema and even to the development of novel categories remains understudied.
- The symbolic and the material in categorization. While the main attention of category scholars has been on labels and symbols, studies are starting to point to the importance of physical exemplars in sustaining recategorization processes (Jones et al. 2012; Delmestri and Greenwood, 2016). Further work on the role of visuals and material objects in categorization would allow for more generalizability of the theory.
- Category struggles, emotions, and morality. While social movements engage in re-categorization efforts when attempting to change meaning and practices associated with social categories,

these efforts can be thwarted by defensive reactions of incumbent elites, activating emotional reactions and denial (Delmestri and Goodrick, 2016). Such categorization processes have also been understood as moral struggles. Studying the sequences of moves and countermoves of these kinds of struggles, and their outcomes, constitutes an important ground for advancing category studies.

More specifically, we welcome papers that give answers to the following questions:

1. How does the embeddedness of social and market categories within broader society promote or hinder category change?
2. How do new categories emerge and become legitimately established?
3. How does category change unfold? What organizational challenges are linked to category change?
4. How does category change affect the diversity of organizations in fields?
5. What is the role of emotions, their arousal or denial in effecting category change?
6. How are categories affected by technological and social challenges?
7. How do social movement engage in category work which changes the status or meaning of categories?
8. How does work aimed at elevating the status of a category differ from the work aimed at de-stigmatizing a category?
9. What are the dynamics of categorization and counter-categorization?
10. How do category dynamics improve our understanding of markets beyond economics?

While the above list of topics and questions describes areas that could benefit from additional research, our list is not exhaustive. We seek articles that push our understanding of categories and category dynamics more broadly. The aim of this SI is to create a platform to cross-fertilize the various research camps that are involved in the study of categories with a particular focus on category dynamics. We welcome contributions from multiple theoretical perspectives, whether inspired by organization theory, organizational sociology, or economics. Studies that incorporate insights from related disciplines, including sociology, business history, political science, linguistics and semiotics, psychology and philosophy, could also find a home in this special issue.

SUBMISSIONS

Please submit papers through the journal's online submission system, SAGE track at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/orgstudies>, create your user account (if you have not done so already), and for "Manuscript Type" please choose the corresponding Special Issue. All papers that enter the reviewing process will be double-blind reviewed following the journal's normal review process and criteria. You will be able to submit your paper for this Special Issue between the 15th and 30th of September 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND GENERAL QUERIES

Sophia Tzagaraki, Managing Editor, Organization Studies: OSofficer@gmail.com

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT ANY OF THE GUEST EDITORS FOR THIS SPECIAL ISSUE:

Giuseppe Delmestri: giuseppe.delmestri@wu.ac.at

Filippo Carlo Wezel: wezel@em-lyon.com

Elizabeth Goodrick: goodrick@fau.edu

Marvin Washington: washingt@ualberta.ca

REFERENCES

- Cattani G, & Fliescher M. 2013. Product category interactions in cultural industries: Spaghetti Westerns influence on American Western movie genre. In L Lazzeretti (Ed.), *Creative industries and Innovation in Europe*, 212-231. Routledge Regions and Cities book series.
- Czarniawska, B., & Sévon, G. (Eds.) (2005). *Global ideas: How ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*. Copenhagen: Liber and Copenhagen Business School.
- Delacour, L., & Leca, B. (2016). The Paradox of Controversial Innovation: Insights From the Rise of Impressionism. *Organization Studies*, Published online before print September 26, doi: 10.1177/0170840616663237
- Delmestri, G., Goodrick, E. (2016): Looking away: denial and emotions in institutional stability and change. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 48A: 235 - 273.
- Delmestri G., Greenwood, R. (2016) How Cinderella became a queen: Theorizing radical status change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Epub ahead of print 1 April 2016. DOI: 10.1177/0001839216644253.
- Douglas, M. (1987), *How institutions think*. Routledge.
- Hannan, M. T. (2010). Partiality of memberships in categories and audiences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 159-181.
- Hannan, M. T., Pólos, L., & Carroll, G. R. (2007). *Logics of organization theory: Audiences, codes, and ecologies*. Princeton University Press.
- Karthikeyan, S. Jonsson, S., & Wezel, F.C. (2016). The Travails of Identity Change: Competitor Claims and Distinctiveness of British Political Parties, 1970- 1992, *Organization Science*, 27: 106-122.
- Jones, C., M. Maoret, F. G. Massa, & S. Svejenova (2012). Rebels with a cause: The formation, contestation and expansion of the de novo category modern architecture, 1870–1975. *Organization Science*, 23: 1523– 1545.
- Lounsbury, M., & H. Rao (2004). Sources of durability and change in market classifications: A study of the reconstitution of product categories in the American mutual fund industry, 1944–1985. *Social Forces*, 82: 969–999.
- Micelotta, E. R. & Washington, M. (2013). Institutions and maintenance: the repair work of Italian professions. *Organization Studies*, 34, 1137–70.
- Montauti, M., & Wezel, C.F. 2016, Charting the Territory: Recombination as a Source of Uncertainty for Potential Entrants. *Organization Science*, 27/4: 954-971
- Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2010). How New Market Categories Emerge: Temporal Dynamics of Legitimacy, Identity, and Entrepreneurship in Satellite Radio, 1990–2005'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55: 439–71.
- Negro, G., Hannan, M. T., & Rao, H. (2011). Category reinterpretation and defection: Modernism and tradition in Italian winemaking. *Organization Science*, 22: 1449-1463.
- Phillips, D. J. (2013). *Shaping jazz: Cities, labels, and the global emergence of an art form*. Princeton University Press.
- Rosa J.A., Porac, J.F., Runser-Spanjol, J., & Saxon, M.S. (1999). Sociocognitive dynamics in a product market. *Journal of Marketing* 63(4): 64–77. Zuckerman, E. W. (1999) The Categorical Imperative: Securities Analysts and the Legitimacy Discount. *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1398–438.

Organization Studies Call for Papers Special Issue on Food Organizing Matters: Paradoxes, Problems and Potentialities

Deadline for Submissions: October 31st 2017

Guest Editors

Grégoire Croidieu (GEM, France)

Frank den Hond (Hanken, Finland & VU, Netherlands)

Christine Moser (VU, Netherlands)

Juliane Reinecke (WBS, UK)

Silviya Svejnova (CBS, Denmark & BI, Norway)

INTRODUCTION

While food is one of the oldest and most critical human endeavours, the many paradoxes, problems and potentialities associated with the organizing of food deserve much greater scholarly attention.

On the one hand, food security and safety are among the 'grand challenges' that face humanity, alongside issues of environmental sustainability, poverty, health, and exploitation of labour. The expansion of agribusiness has fed the staggering rise in world population over the 20th century. It has allowed an accumulation of wealth unprecedented in the history of humankind. Despite this progress, some 800 million people still suffer from malnutrition or lack daily access to food (<https://www.wfp.org/content/hunger-map-2014>). Simultaneously, a high percentage of food goes to waste and the number of obese people worldwide has now surpassed those underweight (Lancet, 387(10026): 1377-1396). In other words, the potentialities unlocked by the industrialized production of food have also created significant challenges yet to overcome. One may hope that more just, inclusive and sustainable forms of food organizing will help to address them.

On the other hand, food organizing is also a 'grand passion' full of potentialities. The variety of food cultures, culinary movements, and food-related innovations testify of the level of passion and entrepreneurial spirit that inspires food organizing. Food can be an unparalleled source of inspiration and motivation for organizing; it sparks off diversity, excellence, and creativity in material, cultural, political, metaphorical, and other senses. It is the basis of communality and sociality, but also of identity politics and exclusions. Either way, food provides opportunities for the collective renewal of traditions, the celebration of human relationships and the valorisation of local savoir-faire.

Such paradoxes, problems and potentialities remind us that food organizing may remain partial or even accidental, despite the tremendous resources, calculations, energy, creativity and good-

will that are involved in the various processes related to food. Conversely, they also suggest that food raises issues that organizational studies have not yet fully attended to and that beg to be unravelled and explored.

With this special issue, we want to draw attention to food as an important setting for organizing, as well as to the roles, conditions and consequences of food organizing in diverse societies. Zooming in on food and its particularities is a way to access, reveal, and enhance the understanding of issues that usually remain 'hidden' for students of organizations from various intellectual backgrounds. This condition invites a cross-disciplinary conversation to build bridges between students of organizational studies and other disciplines, thus reflecting pleas for deeper engagement across disciplines and perspectives (*Organization Studies* 34(11): 1587-1600). In addition to using food as a context for research, we seek to conceptualize food organizing and organizations as a fruitful object of inquiry in and out of itself, one that has the potential to yield important and relevant insights for both scholarship and societies. In sum, it is time to take seriously the paradoxes, problems and potentialities of food organizing in ways that speak to contemporary contexts.

We invite contributions that delve into organizational aspects relating to food. This introduction points some themes and topics as 'entrees' to a 'menu' that is yet to be created and compiled. The special issue is open to a range of topics and themes, including, but not restricted to, the following:

- Food production: How is the production of food organized and what changes do we see in the way it is organized? How do organized relationships in the land, factories, laboratories or kitchens shape and are shaped by us and the food we eat?
- Food governance & regulation: How are food supply and demand governed? How do standards, certifications, classifications and category systems have an imprint on the organization of food production and consumption?
- Food sustainability: What challenges do current ways of food organizing produce? What opportunities do they open? How can we organize and sustain more inclusive, sustainable and biodiverse food systems? What changes are necessary in the organization of food, such that we can distribute food more equitably and reduce food waste?
- Food innovation: How do organizations, collectives and communities innovate in and around the provision, creation, preparation and consumption of food? How can food organizing bridge sensory and aesthetic tastes? What are possible futures of food?

SUBMISSIONS

Please submit your manuscript through the journal's online submission system (<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/orgstudies>). You will need to create a user account if you do not already have one, and you must select the appropriate Special Issue at the "Manuscript Type" option. The Guest Editors handle all manuscripts in accordance with the journal's policies and procedures; they expect authors to follow the journal's submission guidelines (<http://journals.sagepub.com/home/oss>). You can submit your manuscript for this Special Issue between 15 and 31 October 2017.

For administrative support and general queries, you may contact Sophia Tzagaraki, Managing Editor of *Organization Studies*, at osofficer@gmail.com.

Organization Studies Call for Papers Special Issue on Organizational control and surveillance of new work practices

Deadline for paper submissions: June, 29th 2018

Guest Editors :

François-Xavier de Vaujany (Université Paris-Dauphine, France)

Aurélien Leclercq-Vandelannoite (CNRS, LEM UMR 9221, IESEG School of Management, France)

Iain Munro (Newcastle University Business School, United Kingdom)

Yesh Nama (RMIT University, Australia)

Robin Holt (Copenhagen Business School)

INTRODUCTION

Agnès, a young new startupper at the 'Coworking Space' in Berlin, explains¹:

Convivial, flat, free, fun, effective, adaptable, remarkable, transparent...this is how this coworking space described itself. In reality, I've never had the impression to be in an environment freed of hierarchy. We were all installed in a large, open space, separated from each other of only some meters... .. except our CHO (Chief Happiness Officer), who had his own office, and could suddenly burst in. There was no overtime, only flexible hours. Actually overtime was considered the norm. We were all together in the same space, looking at each other's' comings and goings. When a coworker left at 6 pm, we all ironically (and legitimately) asked him if he was having a break! Fortunately beers and pizzas were distributed after 7 pm to motivate us to stay... we all seemed to enjoy this kind of stomach control. The rule for those who arrived late in the morning - 9 was the norm - was to bring pastries ... However over time, I had the feeling that being late was met with disapproval. After all, maybe it was a sign that people were less motivated by, less confident in, or less passionate about their projects? One day, I felt ill at ease with this climate, it stifled me... I isolated myself in the restrooms, took my smartphone, and called my boyfriend to get some kind of support...

The emergence of new work practices and workplaces, as shown by the joint search for more mobility, openness (e.g. with open innovation), horizontality (e.g. with coworking practices and collaborative entrepreneurship), digital and collaborative practices (including more and more external stakeholders, e.g. customers and citizens, in the co-production of services), has raised new questions of organizational control, and surveillance. In a global context marked by the invi-

¹ Inspired and adapted from the story of Ramadier M. (2017) Bienvenue dans le nouveau monde, comment j'ai survécu à la coolitude des startups, Premier Parallèle.

sible revolution of surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2015) and the resurgence of risk (Beck, 1992), security fears and terror, which have re-legitimized the need for close surveillance and control, new work practices and workplaces have transformed the 'premises of human involvement in organizations' (Kallinikos, 2003, p. 595), as well as the mechanisms and conditions of control and surveillance. In particular, work transformations (project-based work, teleworking, distributed work arrangements, collaborative entrepreneurship and the emergence of third and collaborative practices and spaces, e.g. coworking spaces, maker spaces, innovation labs) are revealing how work increasingly gets performed outside the typical physical, spatial and temporal boundaries of the organization or within the context of third spaces and liminal spaces (Oldenburg, 1989; Garrett et al., 2017; Sewell and Taskin, 2015; Spinuzzi, 2012; Waber et al., 2014; Johns and Gratton, 2013).

These work transformations and new 'sites' (Schatzki, 2005) of work alter the structure of 'presence' and 'visibility' of employees and consequently affect the nature of the control of work practices (from supervision to more reporting, from technocratic to more social, peer- and self- control): both horizontal relationships (with co-workers) and vertical relationships (with supervisors) are transformed. These new work practices imply a 'dispersal' and 'distantiation' (Beyes and Stayaert, 2012; Sewell and Taskin, 2015) in the time and space of control (Bauman and Lyon, 2013; Orlikowski, 1991), and raise singular and often paradoxical challenges. On the one hand it entails collaborative forms of management control that extends beyond direct visual sight (Dambrin, 2004; Halford, 2005; Sewell, 2012), and on the other, forms of self-disciplining and transformation in which autonomy becomes almost a synonym for governance. Under the impress of both trends, surveillance has become increasingly mobile, flexible, pervasive and unbounded (Bauman and Lyon, 2013), and in turn encourages them.

It is important, however, not to limit understanding of control and surveillance to the digital and immaterial. Indeed, it seems they are more than ever constituted by, embedded in and infused in the materiality, corporeity, spatiality and temporality of new work practices and workplaces. Organizational control and surveillance should be conceived of not only as digital, virtual, fluid, flexible and discursive, but also as ever more deeply grounded in the concrete, material, spatial, embodied underpinnings (e.g. work practices, spatial practices, places, bodies, technologies in use, information tactics) of everyday life (Munro and Jordan, 2013; Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011). New work practices and recent work transformations enhance the complexity of situations to control and highlight the ambiguity of spaces, instruments, objects, artefacts, management systems (Miller, 2008, 2009; Dale, 2005; Dale and Burrell, 2008; Lorino, 2013; de Vaujany and Vaast, 2014; Munro, 2016). The evolution of organizational control and surveillance through new work practices also points to the versatility of the uses of technologies in control and surveillance efforts (Orlikowski and Scott, 2008); some research for example emphasize a resurgence of ancient, bureaucratic forms of administration in new work settings, as managers seek to compensate for the distance, absence, and lack of visibility of their subordinates (Sewell and Taskin, 2015; Orlikowski and Scott, 2008; Halford, 2005). These new practices, coupled to evolving IT uses, constitute a new kind of organising of employees, placing them on an almost permanent front stage (Goffman, 1959). Such evolutions thus call for a deeper investigation of the materiality, corporeity, spatiality and temporality of control and surveillance through new work practices and work settings.

Furthermore, the continuous evolution of work practices and emergence of new work practices (e.g. remote work, digital mobility, collaborative entrepreneurship, coworking practices, Do It Yourself, makers, corporate hacking...) characterized by a potential shift—from static, central oversight to untethered, dispersed (auto)organization, embedded in material technologies—raises important tensions in terms of power relations, morality and ethics, with potentially paradoxical consequences.

Novel types of control and surveillance find increasing legitimacy among those being subjugated, who may cooperate willingly, in a relation that raises new tensions between technology and human flourishing (Bauman and Lyon, 2013). Developments of consumer surveillance, biometrics, workplace surveillance, and ubiquitous computing constitute the embodied individual not only as a target of continuous oversight, but also as a subject of (self) exposure, through a process of data representation, interpretation and sharing, so that games of visibility (exhibitionism), observation (voyeurism) and secrecy (hiding one's work) now abound in the workplace (Brivot and Gendron, 2011).

Thus, the tensions between the material, the virtual, the social, the embodied individual, and their implications, have never been so crucial to theories of control and surveillance. Emerging practices and organizational forms fuel tensions between our notions of freedom and security, physical and virtual or digital spatiality, the material with the social, the visible with the invisible, the continuous with the discontinuous, the reified with the virtual, the mind with the body, political (domination and oversight) with cultural or ideological control (persuasion and consent), and manipulation and collaboration.

With this special issue, we seek to rethink control and surveillance by developing a more materialized, spatialized, embodied and temporalized view in relation to new work practices that can supplement and so counterbalance a vision these being purely virtual and digitally enabled. By such we refer to theoretical analyses and contributions that emphasize the entanglement of social and material dimensions of control and work practices and the importance of ontological questions (i.e. what should be the main – 'real'- focus of analysis: objects, activities, processes, perceptions, practices...?); issues of space, time, corporeity, embodiment, visibility and materiality involved in control devices and new work practices (Dale, 2005), as well as their relationships with organizations and organizing (Robichaud and Cooren, 2013); and broader ontological debates (Leonardi et al., 2012; Carlile et al, 2013; Orlikowski, 1991; Orlikowski, 2007; Scott and Orlikowski, 2012), across different 'epistemic communities' (Holt and den Hond, 2013; Boxenbaum et al., 2015; de Vaujany and Mitev, 2015).

POTENTIAL APPROACHES AND QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE SPECIAL ISSUE

To summarize, this special issue seeks to advance the study of organizations and organizing by exploring the materiality, meaning, nature and forms of control and surveillance of and through new work practices in contemporary society. We hope to involve a diverse range of scholars and scholarly traditions in debate. We welcome submissions that address control and surveillance from different ontological vantage points, in different contexts, using different methodologies.

Authors intending to submit papers to this special issue are encouraged to focus on some of the broad issues in the following far from exhaustive list:

Philosophical, historical and sociological roots of societal and organizational control and surveillance of work practices;

The unexpected presence and emergence of control and surveillance in the context of new work practices (e.g. sharing economy, remote work, digital mobility, collaborative entrepreneurship, coworking practices, Do It Yourself, makers, corporate hacking...);

Semiosis and digital infrastructure of control and surveillance processes in organizations and organizing;

The role of corporations and the 'security–industrial complex' in the deployment of new techniques;

Materiality, ontologies, politics of control and surveillance, and new agencies for such;

Concern for materiality, spatiality, liminality and temporality in control, discipline and surveillance;

Critical perspectives on new work practices and the emergence of control;
The rise of terrorism (often in the city) and challenges for control and surveillance in the public and private spaces;
Accomplishments and failures of control and surveillance;
The role of risk-management culture and risk-management tools in the emergence of surveillance capitalism and its material, corporeal, spatial and temporal forms;
Relations between control and surveillance in new work practices and governance;
The disciplinary nature of control and surveillance in new work practices;
New work and collaborative practices (e.g. coworkers, digital nomads, makers, hackers);

Managerial and leadership techniques of control and surveillance.

SUBMISSIONS

Please submit papers through the journal's online submission system, SAGE track, by visiting <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/orgstudies>. Create your user account (if you have not done so already), and for "Manuscript Type," choose the corresponding Special Issue. All papers that enter the review process will be double-blind reviewed, following the journal's normal review process and criteria. You may submit papers for this Special Issue through SAGE Track between June, 15th and 29th 2018.

For further information about this CFP, please contact:

oscontrolwork@gmail.com

For administrative support and general queries, please contact:

Sophia Tzagaraki, Managing Editor, Organization Studies: sofficer@gmail.com.

Indicative references

- Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2013). *Liquid surveillance: a conversation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (Vol. 17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beyes, T., Steyaert, C. (2012). Spacing organization: non-representational theory and performing organizational space. *Organization*, 19(1): 45-61
- Boxenbaum, E., Jones, C., Meyer, R., & Svejenova, S. (2015). The Material and Visual Turn in Organization Theory: Objectifying and (Re)acting to Novel Ideas. Call for Papers, Special Issue of Organization Studies, <http://oss.sagepub.com/content/35/10/1547.extract>.
- Brivot, M. and Gendron, Y. (2011). Beyond panopticism: on the ramifications of surveillance in a contemporary professional setting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 36(3), 135–155.
- Carlile, P. R., Nicolini, D., Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.). (2013). *How matter matters: Objects, artifacts, and materiality in organization studies*. OUP Oxford.
- Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. *Organization*, 12, 649–678.
- Dale, K., & Burrell, G. (2008). *The spaces of organisation and the organisation of space: Power, identity and materiality at work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- de Vaujany, F. X., & Mitev, N. (2015). The post-Macy paradox, information management and organizing: Good intentions and a road to hell? *Culture & Organization*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2015.1103242>.
- de Vaujany, FX. & Vaast, E. (2014). If these walls could talk: The mutual construction of organizational space and legitimacy, *Organization Science*, 25(3),713-731.
- Garrett, L.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Bacevice, P.A., (2017). Co-constructing a Sense of Community at Work: The Emergence of Community in Coworking Spaces. *Organization Studies* 0170840616685354.

doi:10.1177/0170840616685354.

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

Halford, S. (2005). Hybrid workspace: Re-spatialisations of work, organisation and management. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 20, 19–33.

Holt, R. & Den Hond, F. (2013), *Sapere Aude*. *Organization Studies*, 34(11), 1587-1600.

Johns, T. & Gratton L. (2013), *The third wave of virtual work*. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, pp. 66-73.

Kallinikos, J. (2003). Work, human agency and organizational forms: an anatomy of fragmentation. *Organization Studies*, 24 (4), 595-618.

Leclercq-Vandelannoitte A., (2011). Organizations as discursive constructions: A Foucauldian approach, *Organization Studies*, 32 (9), 1247-1271.

Leonardi, P. M., Nardi, B. A., & Kallinikos, J. (Eds) (2012). *Materiality and organizing: Social interaction in a technological world*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Lorino, P. (2013). Management Systems As Organizational 'Architextures'. In: *Materiality and Space. Organization, Artefacts and Practices*. Basingstoke (UK) et New York (Basingstoke (UK) et New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, p. 62-95.

Miller, D. (2008). *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge: Polity.

Miller, D. (2009). *Stuff*. Cambridge: Polity.

Munro, I. (2016) Organizational resistance as a vector of deterritorialization: The case of Wiki-Leaks and secrecy havens. *Organization*, 23(4): 567–587

Munro I, Jordan S. (2013). 'Living Space' at the Edinburgh Festival Fringe: Spatial tactics and the politics of smooth space. *Human Relations*, 66(11), 1497-1525.

Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts, and How They Get You Through the Day*. New York: Paragon House.

Orlikowski, W. (1991). Integrated information environment or matrix of control? The contradictory implication of information technology, *Accounting, Management & Information Technologies*, 1(1): 9:42.

Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435-1448.

Orlikowski, W.J., & Scott, S.V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2 (1), 433–474.

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

Schatzki, T. R. (2005). Peripheral vision: The sites of organizations. *Organization studies*, 26(3), 465-484.

Scott, S.V. & Orlikowski, W.J., 2012. Reconfiguring relations of accountability: Materialization of social media in the travel sector. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 37 (1), 26-40.

Sewell, G. (2012). Employees, organizations and surveillance. In K. Ball, K. D. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *The handbook of surveillance studies* (pp. 303–312). London: Routledge.

Sewell, G. & Taskin, L., (2015). Out of sight, out of mind in a new world of work? Autonomy, control, and spatiotemporal scaling in telework. *Organization Studies*, 36 (11), 1507-1529.

Spinuzzi, C. (2012) 'Working alone together: Coworking as emergent collaborative activity', *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26 (4), 399-441.

Waber B., Magnolfi J. and Lindsay G. (2014). *Workspaces That Move People*, *Harvard Business Review*, pp.69-77.

Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology*, 30, 75–89.