



HAL
open science

From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways of Conceptualizing Organization: A Brief History of Organization Studies

Lise Arena, Anthony Hussenot

► To cite this version:

Lise Arena, Anthony Hussenot. From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways of Conceptualizing Organization: A Brief History of Organization Studies. *New Ways of Working - Organizations and Organizing in the Digital Age*, pp.367 - 399, 2021, 978-3-030-61686-1. 10.1007/978-3-030-61687-8_15 . hal-03290300

HAL Id: hal-03290300

<https://hal.science/hal-03290300v1>

Submitted on 19 Jul 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways of Conceptualizing Organization: A Brief History of Organization Studies

2

3

4

Lise Arena and Anthony Hussenot

5

Introduction

6

While organizational scholars have recently investigated varied organizational phenomena, such as social movements, artistic activities, non-profit organizations or informal collectives of people, mainstream organization research has historically carried out empirical work in companies, factories or networks of firms,¹ mainly because of the dominance

7

8

9

10

11

¹This proximity with business has led to a confusion between organization studies, management research (George 1968; Wren 1972) and the theory of the firm. Management research is interested in improving the economic performance of companies and organizations; the theory of the firm concentrates on the economic dimensions of firms. In this chapter, we suggest to highlight the distinction between organization studies, management research and the theory of the firm.

L. Arena (✉)

Université Côte d'Azur, Nice, France

e-mail: lise.arena@univ-cotedazur.fr

A. Hussenot

Université Côte d'Azur, Antibes, France

e-mail: Anthony.hussenot@univ-cotedazur.fr

12 of the industrial context after the Second World War. As such, organiza-
13 tion studies are rooted in social sciences (such as economics, sociology
14 and philosophy), and focus on the evolution of work and management
15 practices. As most of social sciences, organization studies have evolved in
16 line with society, and more specifically, business, managerial and work
17 innovations. Consequently, the relation between innovations at work and
18 the theoretical developments has led to different understandings of the
19 matter of organization over time. If an organization was initially concep-
20 tualized as a social and/or economic entity evolving into an environment,
21 this view has since been challenged by scholars. Recent organization theo-
22 ries have suggested to understand organization as an open phenomenon,
23 always in a state of becoming. An organization is not conceptualized as
24 an entity but as an elusive movement ongoing re/defined in practices.
25 The initial essentialist view of organization was forged in a context of
26 industrialization and mass production, dominated by Fordist practices,
27 while the current elusive view of organization has emerged in the context
28 of 'liquid modernity' (Bauman 2000) and the 'projectification' of work
29 (Jensen et al. 2016).

30 In this chapter, we suggest studying the relation between work innova-
31 tions and the evolution of organization theories. We emphasize the rela-
32 tion between management and work innovations and new ways of
33 conceptualizing the matter of organization over time. The aim is to show
34 how innovations at work have influenced the way scholars have concep-
35 tualized organizational phenomena over time.

36 We describe and analyze this relation from the 1950s to the 2010s. We
37 study this relation through four periods covering the mass production-
38 based organization of the 1950s to the projectification of work of the
39 2010s. Of course, these periods are used for analytical purposes as each
40 new period partly overlaps with the previous ones.

Period 1: The Development of Industrial Innovations—Theorizing Organization as a Centralized Managerial Hierarchy

The period following the Second World War was marked by an unprecedented economic expansion in Western countries that depended on the significant rise of consumption and national modes of capitalism (Arena 2011). Rising working-class prosperity led to mass consumption and Fordist mass production replaced manual work with machines leading to increased labor division and repetitive tasks. Social and technological changes that shaped the second half of the twentieth century built on the first industrial revolution in the nineteenth century; the second industrial revolution was based on the development of organic chemistry, electricity and nuclear physics in the first half of the twentieth century and molecular biology since the 1950s. Post-Second World War advances in engineering, computer science and electronics also paved the way towards the third ‘electronic’ industrial revolution characterized by a smaller number of firms than the ones that shaped the second industrial revolution. These successive waves of inventions shaped industries all over the world, with Europe catching-up the US. The US developed innovations and gained competitive advantage in the computer (e.g. IBM) and car (e.g. General Motors) industries. In the same period, Europe gradually caught up particularly in the chemical (e.g. Haber-Bosch) and car (e.g. Volkswagen) industries in Germany and the transport industry in France (e.g. SNCF). The UK differed slightly as industrial policy was limited and most innovations appeared in the service industry (e.g. financial sector). Organizational forms shaped by industrial innovations in this period resulted from national characteristics: managerial capitalism in the US, state-led nationalized enterprises in France, cooperative capitalism with cartelization in Germany and proprietary capitalism with family-owned businesses in the UK.

71 **Centralized Managerial Hierarchies and the Rise** 72 **of Professional Management**

73 To a large extent, the main characteristics of organizational forms in the
74 post-Second World War period appeared as a continuity of inter-war
75 managerial innovations. Business historian Alfred Chandler claimed that
76 the structures of companies and the role of management played a signifi-
77 cant part in the evolution of capitalism (Chandler 1990). Hence, US
78 capitalism success could be explained by the ability of American manag-
79 ers to develop multidivisional enterprises, characterized by centralized
80 hierarchies, administrative coordination and the rise of managerial ser-
81 vices. By contrast, British managerial backwardness was due to the pre-
82 dominance of small firms (mostly family-owned businesses) and a small
83 number of ‘white collars’.² Innovations were supported by “the new forms
84 of transportation and communication [which] permitted the rise of mod-
85 ern mass production. [...] Thus, came into being a new economic insti-
86 tution, the managerial business enterprise and a new subspecies of
87 economic man, the salaried manager” (Chandler 1990, 1). These organi-
88 zations appeared as an alternative to decentralized market mechanisms
89 and they routinized transactions among units, lowering their costs.
90 Organizational models were based on administrative coordination and
91 task specialization that allowed product specifications and market ser-
92 vices to be adjusted more rapidly to customer needs. At the management
93 level, salaried middle and top managers supervised and controlled the
94 different units. As a result, management became a profession with a direct
95 interest in organization (and innovation), in contrast to shareholders who
96 were still generally driven by short-term profit interest.

97 Based on this vertical integration model inherited from Frederick
98 Taylor’s “Principles of Scientific Management” (first published in 1911)
99 and labor division popularized by Henri Ford, managers and workers of
100 the 1950s took part in a large transformation of work practices. On the
101 one hand, control was placed at the center of managerial corporations, as

²Based on historical case studies (monographs) of the 200 largest US, UK and German firms, Chandler’s study showed the rise of professional managers and ‘organization men’ as a new category of businessmen (Chandler 1990).

managers of multidivisional units were the guardians of standardized methods. The professionalization of management and the emergence of salaried managers justified the development of management education in the US and in Europe which soon became an urgent need to train this new category of businessmen (Arena 2011). Yet, over the 1960s, the top-down understanding of control gradually faded away to allow more room to a consensual view of the employment contract in which workers could develop further adaptability and gain welfare.

On the other hand, the inheritance of Taylor's methods stimulated labor movements which later encouraged the consideration of employees' working conditions and the creation of research committees in America and in Britain to address the 'labor problem'. During the inter-war period, 'labor problems' were due to high turnover, high absenteeism and low workers' motivation and drove employers in large businesses to think about the relationship between workers' welfare and productivity. It was in this context that a number of American firms—such as Proctor & Gamble, General Electric, Eastman Kodak and U.S. Steel—began to develop a range of new initiatives about work welfare that took the form of financial and non-financial measures.³

Pioneer Organization Theories: The Tavistock Institute, the Aston Group and the Carnegie School

Pre-1945 ideas about management and organization developed by engineers such as Henri Fayol, Henri Ford and Frederick Taylor equipped enterprises with new forms of labor specialization that were disseminated beyond America, as the most efficient mode of organization in industrial factories. Although Europe never witnessed a 'scientific management' movement like its American equivalent, Taylorism and Fordism still received a fair amount of attention, mainly positive, by British, French

³This included measures to improve basic working conditions (e.g. provision of shower rooms, cafeterias and drinking fountains), to enhance workers' sense of being part of a factory team (e.g. publication of company magazines, organization of educational lectures and athletic clubs), to recognize seniority in employment status (e.g. bonuses, pension plans, medical assistance and company housing) and to provide training opportunities (e.g. vocational schools and apprenticeship programs) (Moriguchi 2000, 13–14).

130 and German engineers (Chevalier 1937; Whilston 1997). Moreover, the
131 theoretical analysis of bureaucracy by sociologist Max Weber (1922),
132 translated and expanded upon by Talcott Parsons (1942, 1947) and
133 Robert Merton (1949/1968), played an important role in the develop-
134 ment of early organization theories (Shenhav 2003). This is exemplified
135 by the publication of the first academic articles about organization such
136 as the work of sociologist Philipp Selznick who published *An Approach to*
137 *a Theory of Bureaucracy* in 1943 and *Foundations of the Theory of*
138 *Organization* in 1948. In the same period, Herbert Simon published in
139 1947 *American Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in*
140 *Administrative Organization*. As a result, new modes of organization in
141 industrial factories and pioneer publications in the field led to the emer-
142 gence of three major schools of thought: The Tavistock Institute (London,
143 UK), the Aston Group (Birmingham, UK) and the Carnegie School
144 (Pittsburgh, US).

145 **The Tavistock Institute: The Working Group** 146 **as a Sociotechnical System**

147 The first wave of reactions to the scientific method of organizing enter-
148 prises comes from the ‘human relations’ movement. This movement was
149 exemplified by the Hawthorne studies—some of the best known and
150 most influential investigations in the history of organizational research—
151 that took place at the Western Electric Company (US) between 1927 and
152 1932. In the same period, the French industrial engineer Henri Fayol
153 (1916/1949) put a greater (than Taylor) emphasis on the management
154 level (and less on the workers) and discussed the aim of the managerial
155 function.⁴ Management anticipates actions (planning), aims at structur-
156 ing the organization (organizing), disseminates orders (commanding),
157 guarantees the coherence of actions (coordinating) and checks results
158 (verifying).

⁴ Fayol was the managing director of the French *Commentry-Fourchambault et Decazeville* Company (a large mining and steel firm) for 30 years (1888–1918). Fayol’s initial contribution (*Administration Industrielle et Générale*, published in French in 1916) was translated into English in 1930 by J. A. Coubrough, and then by J. Storrs in 1949 with the title *General and Industrial Management*.

Social psychology of work and early studies on groups as organizations went one step further and significantly rose in the UK in the 1960s. In particular, Eric Trist, with a number of colleagues in the Tavistock Institute (such as Emery, Rice and Miller), conducted a series of investigations into groups and organizational functioning. Their main contribution to the emergence of organization studies led to a ‘system approach’ to organizational behavior. In particular, they showed that working groups were neither a social system nor a technical system but an interdependent sociotechnical system. In their view, the traditional technocratic bureaucracy is limited when organizations have to face turbulent and innovative environments. Control systems could be seen as cumbersome and costly even if, thanks to this control, an unskilled worker in a narrow job is inexpensive to replace and takes little time to train. As early as the 1960s, these authors suggested alternative organizational designs for turbulent environments in which “individuals and units have wide repertoires of activities to cope with change”, and an improved quality of working life “by keeping the technological determinants of worker behavior to a minimum to satisfy social and psychological needs by the involvement of all” (Hickson and Pugh 2007/1964, 153).

AU5

The Aston Group: The Structure of Organizations

The structuralist view was deeply anchored in Max Weber’s contribution to sociology and its translation in English by Talcott Parsons. A small interdisciplinary (social psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science and economics) group of researchers (1961–1970) at the University of Birmingham in the UK echoed this initial trend and sought to understand variables influencing organizational structures (such as technology, size, environment and culture).⁵ Aiming to make a contribution to the interdisciplinary study of management behavior, the Aston group tested the idea that organization structure fits its operational context (Greenwood and Devine 1997, 202). Based on a statistical analysis, the group, whose principal investigators were Derek Pugh and David Hickson, collected

⁵ Further details about the history of organization and management studies at Birmingham can be found in Minkes (2011).

190 firms' data that enabled them to build organizational taxonomies. In this
191 sense, the Aston Group's contribution to organization theory also has to
192 be assessed at a methodological level since it was seen as "somewhere in
193 between the tracing of processes over time in early "one case-studies [...]
194 and the postulating of causal explanations informed by wider sampling"
195 (Pugh and Hickson 1972, 273). Their willingness to develop from a
196 descriptive to an analytical discipline led the Aston research team to initi-
197 ate 'strategic contingencies theories' in a research cooperation with the
198 University of Alberta in Canada.

199 **The Carnegie School: Decision-Making Processes** 200 **in Organizations**

201 In the last chapter of his book *The Functions of the Executive* published in
202 1938, Chester I. Barnard, President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone
203 Company at the time, observed that there was a need for "a science of
204 organization" (Barnard 1968/1938, 290).⁶ The publication of Herbert
205 Simon's *Administrative Behavior* in 1947 explicitly relied on Barnard's
206 effort to develop a science of organization. Simon's initial ambition was
207 to formalize Barnard's contribution from a conceptual perspective. He
208 sought to "describe, in words, exactly how an administrative organization
209 looks and exactly how it works" (Simon 1947). Simon's concept of
210 'bounded rationality' directly contributes to the development of organi-
211 zational theory, as organizations are seen as useful instruments "for the
212 achievement of human purpose".⁷ Organizations are therefore seen as a
213 way to economize on cognitive resources, seen as scarce in a context of
214 bounded rationality. Simon discussed innovation in relation with a

⁶Barnard identified this gap in social sciences: "there is no science of organization or of cooperative systems; and the development of the sciences called social has clearly lagged far behind those called physical and mathematical. One reason for this appears to be a false emphasis upon intellectual and mental processes both as factors in human relations and as matters of study" (Barnard 1968/1938, 290).

⁷Herbert A. Simon challenged the well-established concept of 'perfect rationality' used at the time in economics. For him, human cognitive capabilities are limited in information and knowledge and cannot formulate a 'rational' choice resulting from an optimization process. Humans simplify their choice process and can do so when replacing the goal of 'maximizing' with the goal of 'satisficing'.

problem-solving framework. Innovation (technical or organizational) is seen as a significant process in the expansion of firms. As innovation and creativity are a type of complex problem-solving, he argued that it could be captured in terms of simple heuristics and satisficing criteria (by contrast with optimization which was the predominant paradigm in economics at the time). Simon's contribution to 'design science' paved the way towards new models of innovations mainly based on knowledge transfers and information-based approaches.

To a large extent, the publication of Simon and March's book *Organizations* in 1958, and Cyert and March's book in 1963, imported innovation issues in organization theories. In particular, Cyert and March argued that their general theory was "of considerable relevance to the prediction of innovations" (1963, 278). They focused on the notion of failure and argued that firms innovate both when successful and unsuccessful. In the case of successful firms, the existence of organizational slack allows resources to be channeled towards innovative activities. In the same vein, they showed that, in service organizations, managers "prefer to copy the ideas of others or to search for ready-made solutions instead of seeking innovation" (Nutt 1984, 445). They linked innovations with the concept of 'organizational learning', as firms revise their search procedures on the basis of experience (Cyert and March 1963, 124).

This first period (1950–1980) constituted the rise of management as a profession with "concepts, research methods, and specialized techniques of practice that could be studied, taught, communicated and improved by the acquisition of scientific information" (Scott 1992, 25). Organizations were seen as administrative entities and closed systems in which innovation was attributed to the visionary capacities of top managers. As rightly stated by Slappendel (1996, 110), in this perspective, "the actions of individuals are not seen to be constrained by external factors, instead individuals are perceived to be self-directing agents who are guided by the goals that they set".

246 **Period 2: Immaterial Innovations**
247 **and the Knowledge-Based Economy—**
248 **Theorizing Organization**
249 **as a Learning Institution**

250 The second period of analysis is concerned with the development of the
251 ‘electronic’ century (Cortada 2011), also characterized as the second wave
252 of the Information Technologies (IT) revolution enabled by the advent of
253 the personal computer during the 1980s and the Internet during the
254 1990s (Porter and Heppelman 2014). Innovations are essentially immat-
255 terial and developed within the context of a global knowledge economy,
256 with distributed supply chains easing coordination and integration across
257 activities. From the 1980s onwards, large managerial corporations turned
258 into innovative enterprises characterized by coordinated business organi-
259 zations that adopted technologies and learned to adapt in a context of
260 high uncertainty and turbulence. In the US, the *Management in the 1990s*
261 *Research Program*, a close collaboration between academic researchers at
262 the MIT Sloan School of Management and representatives of major cor-
263 porations, represents the organizational archetype of the 1990s and their
264 organizational, work and technological innovations. The final report of
265 the program strongly emphasized the role of information in the evolution
266 of 1990s firms (Scott Morton 1991). Information was considered, for the
267 first time, as a fourth factor of production: “as an ‘information engine’, it
268 can do for business what the steam engine did in the days of the Industrial
269 Revolution” (Scott Morton 1991, 8). The diffusion of IT implied poten-
270 tial organizational change, as it offered the opportunity for organizations
271 to react constructively to environmental turbulence. In the 1980s, most
272 technological innovations were concerned with hardware, software, net-
273 works, workstations robotics and smart chips. These information-based
274 technological innovations gave firms the opportunity to lower their oper-
275 ating costs while improving their efficiencies (Cortada 2011; Porter and
276 Heppelman 2014). For example, in the 1990s, the emergence of supply-
277 chain enhanced the coordination of work and the management of flows
278 of goods, supplies, processes and expenses within the organization.

The Knowledge-Based Economy and Horizontal Informational Structures of Companies 279 280

While the US economy had a significant competitive advantage with a well-established IT industry composed of large corporations such as IBM and Microsoft, the Japanese computer industry arose in the 1980s, from capabilities developed in long-established firms making electrical and telecommunications equipment, such as Fujitsu Limited or Toshiba Corporation. This has to be understood in relation with the evolution of Japanese capitalism based on financial business and conglomerates. The Japanese industrial success of the 1980s was mainly explained by national specificities such as stable shareholding, permanent employment and main-bank lending (Lazonick 2010). In his comparison of two archetypal firms (the American and the Japanese models), the economist Masahiko Aoki observed the rise of the Japanese economy in the 1980s and explained it through a shift from primary and secondary activities (agriculture and manufacturing) to information-based production (telecommunications and computers⁸). The Japanese organizational model paved the way towards a knowledge-based economy⁹ characterized by flexible specialization, mass customization and lean manufacturing. The shift from a vertically integrated organization to a more flexible way of organization is largely rooted in the archetype of 1980s Japanese firms.

The development of horizontally coordinated organizations led to various changes in the nature of work. This period constituted a breaking point with the Fordist era. “The heightened expectations of people in Western Europe and North America are giving rise to pressures to improve

⁸This phenomenon was also observed in the US to a lesser extent at the time under the term “Post-Fordism”.

⁹While embryonic approaches of information and knowledge-based organizational theories originated in the 1960s, they only became popular 30 years later. One example of this theoretical trend is probably the dissemination of resource-based approaches to the firm as a result of Edith Penrose’s early contribution to organizational theory. In her 1959 book, entitled *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, Penrose views firms not like standard economists of her time as price (and output) takers whose access to extra-profits is limited to situations of high degrees of market power (imperfect competition). Instead, she emphasizes that the firm is a device for innovation, problem-solving and cumulative learning through production. She underlines the idea of an endless knowledge-creating process and argues that “the very processes of operation and of expansion are intimately associated with the process by which knowledge is increased” (Penrose 1959, 125).

304 the quality of working life and the quality of the environment. This is
305 resulting in a changing concept of what constitutes value” (Scott Morton
306 1991, 3). In addition, cooperative work enabled by IT tended to alter
307 most tasks in organizations, as the primary objective of organizations
308 moved to coordinate the delivery of goods and services to customers. As
309 a result, traditional roles of managers changed, as employees had “more
310 access to data, they will take over many of the functions associated with
311 supervisors” (Osterman 1991, 236). Managers had to learn to share their
312 knowledge of the production process and of technologies with less quali-
313 fied workers. As teams became a more common organizational form
314 within firms, workers also had to learn new roles and skills. Jobs were no
315 longer specified in detail and workers had to rotate among various jobs,
316 and the development of skills and tacit knowledge became key to firms’
317 strategies.

318 New challenges faced by organizations involved a need to train high
319 skilled workers and to develop a ‘learning organization’. Therefore,
320 knowledge gradually became one of the most important assets in the
321 development of firms’ competitive advantage. The practice of knowledge
322 management was introduced as “the identification, optimization, and
323 active management of explicit or tangible informational assets (such as
324 data physically stored in a computer or on a piece of paper) and tacit
325 knowledge (information and insights residing largely in people’s heads)”
326 (Cortada 2011, 24). In line with this knowledge-view of the organiza-
327 tion, communities of practice emerged as triggers to collective ‘learning-
328 by-doing’ and started attracting scholars’ attention (Lave and Wenger
329 1991). New forms of learning organizations rely on the growth of com-
330 munities of practice with people who share a concern or a passion for
331 something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.

332 **Reinforcing the Mainstream or Being Against?** 333 **Neo-Institutionalism, Postmodernism and the Critical** 334 **Perspective in Organization Studies**

335 These managerial innovations and generally speaking the social and intel-
336 lectual contexts of the 1960s and 1970s inspired organization scholars

during the 1980s and 1990s to either reinforce the mainstream perspective in organization studies or disrupt it by introducing alternative ways of defining and studying organization. To exemplify this tension in the field, the following section introduces the neo-institutionalism, the post-modernism and the critical management studies.

Neo-institutionalism: Isomorphism and Legitimacy

From the 1950s, the notion of ‘organizational behavior’ has been dominant in organization studies. The premise of organizational behavior studies is that an organization is an entity that can (almost) behave on its own. However, others have argued that society and institutions influence this behavior. During the late 1970s, a new form of institutionalism, called ‘neo-institutionalism’, emerged to understand how organizational behavior is situated and influenced by other organizations and wider social forces (Lounsbury and Zhao 2014). For these scholars, any organization evolves in communities of organizations that interact with each other (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). These interactions create an ‘institutional logic’, that is symbolic and material elements tied together and providing order and meaning (Friedland and Alford 1991). According to the neo-institutionalist view, organizations conform to institutional prescriptions to gain legitimacy with key audiences (Meyer and Rowan 1977). Legitimacy is understood as immaterial capital enhancing status, reputation and survival chances (Rao 1994). Organizations implement innovations as a way to conform with institutional logics, and not necessarily because of requirements of technical, human or financial efficiency. These institutional pressures lead to ‘isomorphism’ among organizations, that is organizations imitate each other by adopting common structures, practices and technologies (Meyer and Rowan 1977). Unlike organization theories developed in the first period, the focus of neo-institutional theory is not the relation between the organization and its environment, but rather networks of organizations, such as innovation systems.

[AU8]

[AU9]

367 **Postmodernism: The Role of Language in the Emergence**
368 **of Organizational Phenomena**

369 As much as neo-institutionalism can be understood as expanding main-
370 stream organization studies, the postmodern perspective was developed
371 by some scholars in organization studies during the 1980s and the 1990s
372 and initiated a radical change in the way organization has been studied
373 since. However, the notion of postmodernism covers at least two differ-
374 ent meanings: postmodernism (without a hyphen) as a way of studying
375 organizational phenomena (Cooper and Burrell 1988; Burrell 1994;
376 Cooper 1989; Chia 1995, 2003; Parker 1992); and the postmodern orga-
377 nization (with a hyphen) as a type of organization emerging during the
378 1980s and the 1990s (Clegg 1990).

379 Postmodernism is rooted in European philosophy of the 1970s and
380 1980s, in particular the French theories of Jacques Derrida, Michel
381 Foucault and Jean-François Lyotard, among others. The postmodern
382 view insists on the role of language in constituting organizational phe-
383 nomena. In such a view, there is no ultimate truth about organization
384 and management but only forms of discourses. Postmodernism is thus
385 based on a critique of positive and normative science seeking laws for
386 good practices, which is the foundation of modernist organization stud-
387 ies and management. Instead, postmodern scholars urge scholars to study
388 the situatedness of organizational phenomena and how they are per-
389 formed through discourses.

390 The postmodern perspective characterizes a new form of organization
391 as flexible and niche-marketed and based on a multi-skilled workforce
392 held together by IT networks and outsourcing (Clegg 1990, 181). These
393 new organizational forms are claimed to be innovation-oriented, organi-
394 zational structures flexible with no clear center of power or spatial loca-
395 tion. Japanese innovative working methods illustrate the postmodern
396 organization. Japanese engineers designing products followed the prod-
397 uct from the lab to the manufacturing facility (Aoki 1990). Workers had
398 to become capable of coping with unexpected emergencies as managers
399 increasingly delegated their decision-making power. Knowledge had to
400 be shared and the new challenge was the codification and transmission of

tacit knowledge from expert to non-expert workers, and the organization had to develop learning and adaptation capabilities, rather than concentrate on minimizing transaction costs. This organizational form follows a just-in-time production process which begins when customers order a product and in which each worker has skills to adapt to this new type of production.

Critical Management Studies: The Deconstruction of Hidden Assumptions in Management

Partly based on the postmodern turn, some scholars have started to question the assumptions of management both as an academic discipline and as a practice. This has led to the emergence of critical management studies (CMS), first initiated by Alvesson and Wilmott (1992). According to critical management thinkers, modern management is mainly instrumental and only serves the profit of companies (Adler et al. 2008). Innovations at work such as improvement of working conditions, self-development and self-determination are only adopted by companies if they help to improve business performance. This raises ethical and political questions regarding the value of such ends, and consequently, the responsibility of scholars reinforcing such practices through normative research and teaching. “CMS aims to show how such beliefs and practices are nurtured by, and serve to sustain, divisive and destructive patterns and structures; and also, how their reproduction is contingent and changeable, neither necessary nor unavoidable” (Adler et al. 2008, 3). CMS aim at denouncing the instrumentalism, patriarchy, racism, imperialism, productivism (etc.) that are inherent in modern management.

Period 3: Liquid Modernity—Theorizing Organization as a Movement

In 2000, sociologist Zygmunt Bauman published a book called *Liquid Modernity*. This book marked a turning point in social sciences as his key idea is that we have been entering a society in which the core institutions

431 are diluting. The expression ‘liquid modernity’ was a way to express one
432 of the main trends of our society: the liquefaction of social institutions.
433 For Bauman (2000), this liquid modernity means that individuals can
434 rely only on themselves as their relations with others are uncertain, evolv-
435 ing and temporary. Jobs, family, friendships are becoming more and more
436 uncertain, often in a state of flux. There are many explanations for this
437 liquefaction of society and some of them can be found in the counter-
438 cultures of the 1960s and 1970s, when people started to free themselves
439 from rigid social orders (religion, patriarchy, patriotism, etc.). However,
440 in the 2000s, the world became more globalized than ever, with large-
441 scale exchanges between people. With the end of the Soviet Union at the
442 beginning of the 1990s and market deregulation all over the world, cul-
443 tures and economies became more globalized and a reality that people
444 could experience in their daily life. This globalization generated a period
445 of economic growth and social development for many countries, but at
446 the same time, an intensification of competition between companies.
447 Outsourcing, offshoring, mergers and acquisitions were the main conse-
448 quences of this fierce global competition.

449 **Innovation as the Main Driver in Management**

450 To face these threats, companies had to innovate constantly, again and
451 again. This has become a motto in many sectors. Of course, innovation
452 had been a key activity for companies for decades, but the novelty became
453 the intensity of innovation. Instead of waiting for the end of their prod-
454 ucts’ life cycle before launching a new one, companies started to con-
455 stantly launch new products on the market as a way to beat competitors.
456 This period of development coincided with the second wave of IT-driven
457 transformation, characterized by the rise of the Internet with its cheap
458 and ubiquitous connectivity (Porter and Heppelman 2014). This led to
459 enhanced coordination between suppliers and customers across space
460 and time.

461 This innovation intensity is not only the result of increased competi-
462 tion, it is also the sociological consequence of the liquefaction of society.
463 As people’s identity was no longer based on belonging to institutions

(company, family, state, etc.), mass consumption became a way to define oneself (Bauman 2000). Consumption is motivated by the desire to become someone and belong to groups sharing the same consumption. As innovation became the only way to make business, management and work practices became more knowledge-oriented in order to generate more ideas. This is referred to as the knowledge-based economy, an economy in which knowledge is considered as the core asset and provides competitive advantage for companies. The 2000s was the age of knowledge management, competencies management, communities of practices, learning organizations. All of these notions and managerial practices have aimed at ensuring constant learning, sharing, storing and creation of knowledge for the sake of innovation. Technologies also played an important role in this evolution, as the fast development of the Internet during the 1990s and 2000s and the constant improvement of computers and infrastructures have enabled people to work together and access large amounts of information. These technological developments also participated in the innovation race. Information systems management became another crucial area for companies, as information systems were considered a key element to compete in this knowledge-based economy.

Towards ‘Organizational Mindsets’: The Process View, Practice-Based View and Sociomateriality

Facing this globalized world in which companies were constantly evolving, merging with each other, diversifying their activities, competing and partnering on a global level, organizational scholars could not rely on the essentialist view of organization any longer—the organization as an economic or social entity. Inspired by postmodernism in organization studies (Parker 1992; Chia 1995, 2003), but also by feminists Judith Butler and Karen Barad and posthumanists Andrew Pickering and Bruno Latour, organizational scholars shifted from a quest to develop ultimate explanations about the organization to developing organizational ‘mindsets’ (Cabantous and Sergi 2018), that is a way to provide plausible accounts about how organizational phenomena are produced and maintained on a daily basis by actors. An organization is no longer a company

497 but a constant process of defining outputs and inputs of activities. Chia
498 (1997, 1999) expanded on this idea arguing that organization is a process
499 of world-making. An organizational phenomenon is an ontological activ-
500 ity that consists in defining the world, a situated definition of the world
501 in order to act. By distinguishing the notions of organization as an onto-
502 logical activity from company as a legal object, the study of organiza-
503 tional phenomena belonging to this globalized world became possible.

504 These mindsets are based on two core premises. The first is the primacy
505 given to action, what people do. Organizational phenomena emerge and
506 are maintained only through action. This moves away from the essential-
507 ist view that gave primacy to the organization. The second premise is
508 based on relational ontology (Slife 2004; Cooper 2005). Relational
509 ontology means that everything exists only in relationship to other things.
510 ‘Things’ have not inherent properties and their singularity emerges from
511 their interrelatedness. Interrelatedness is not passive and imposed on
512 ‘things’. According to the principle of action, it is in action that technolo-
513 gies, rules, roles, statuses and so on are mutually defined. Many ‘mind-
514 sets’ have been developed based on these two premises: performativity
515 (Gond et al. 2016), the narrative approach (Rantakari and Vaara 2017),
516 the communication constitutive organization (Cooren et al. 2011), the
517 process view (Langley and Tsoukas 2010), the practice-based view
518 (Gherardi 2012), sociomateriality (Orlikowski and Scott 2008) and so
519 on. They all put action first, but have suggested different foci, such as
520 language, social practice or technologies. As a way to exemplify this
521 stream of research, we outline below three key ‘organizational mindsets’:
522 the process view, the practice-based view and sociomateriality.

523 **The Process View: Understanding Organization as a Movement**

524 The process view is anchored in postmodernism and process philosophy
525 which draws on various philosophers from the pre-Socratic Greek phi-
526 losophy of Heraclitus to the metaphysics of Alfred North Whitehead, the
527 American pragmatism, German phenomenology, Henri Bergson, Gilles
528 Deleuze and so on (Rescher 1996, 2001; Helin et al. 2014). Their key
529 assumption is that reality is constantly flowing and we cannot really grasp

it, but only create images as a way to make it tangible and actionable 530
 (Bergson 2009/1907). Cooper (1976, 2005, 2007, 2014) and Chia 531
 (1995, 1997, 1999, 2003) defined key principles of the process view. 532
 Action and relational ontology are two of them, but the originality has 533
 been to add the principle of immanence (Chia 1999). Immanence means 534
 that everything exists in the current moment. The past, the present and 535
 the anticipated future are not a series of separate events, but are co-defined 536
 and co-redefined in the current moment. In other words, past events can 537
 always be reinterpreted according to the evolution of action, while antici- 538
 pated events can always be redefined. It means that current action always 539
 brings the past, present and anticipated events. Key challenges of process 540
 organization scholars are to understand constant change (Tsoukas and 541
 Chia 2002) and how ‘things’ occur and are maintained in a constantly 542
 flowing world. 543

The Practice-Based View: Understanding Organization 544 from Practices 545

The practice-based view is the second main mindset that has influenced 546
 organization studies since the 2000s. Practice-based studies are rooted in 547
 the work of various sociologists and philosophers such as Bourdieu (1972, 548
 1980), Lyotard (1979), Foucault (1980), Taylor (1995) and Giddens 549
 (1979, 1984). Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens can be considered 550
 as the key inspirations for organizational scholars. For Bourdieu (Bourdieu 551
 1980), the world is made objective through practices, while Giddens 552
 (1984) insists on the role of social practices in the making of social struc- 553
 tures. The main assumption of the practice-based view is that organiza- 554
 tional phenomena are not given but emerge and are maintained through 555
 practices (Schatzki 1996, 2001; Corradi et al. 2010). For these authors, 556
 the practice-based view is thus a “way of seeing”, with the aim of under- 557
 standing “the situatedness of practical reasoning and the contingent 558
 nature of organizational rationality” (Corradi et al. 2010, 268). However, 559
 the concept of practice is difficult to define as practice can be anything 560
 participating in the shaping of the social world. Generally speaking, prac- 561
 tice is simply what actors do with rules, words or things. The 562

563 practice-based view is about understanding how everyday activities pro-
564 duce, reproduce or transform social structures “that are at the heart of
565 collective action” (De Vaujany et al. 2016a, 25). Consequently, the unit
566 of analysis becomes what actors do, or make visible through their actions.

567 **Sociomateriality: The Relation Between the Social** 568 **and the Material**

569 During the 2000s the matter of materiality regained popularity among
570 organizational scholars, partly due to the ubiquity of technologies at
571 work. A stream of research called sociomateriality (with or without a
572 hyphen) emerged as a way to study the entanglement of the social and the
573 material. Mainly anchored in agential realism (Barad 2003, 2007), post-
574 humanism (Pickering 1995), actor-network theory (Latour 2005) and
575 the practice-based approach in organization studies (Orlikowski 2000),
576 studies focused on how the social and the material gain status and roles
577 through their intertwining in practice (Orlikowski and Scott 2008;
578 Introna 2013; Jones 2013; Shotter 2013). Here again, primacy is given to
579 action and the relational ontology. Entities “have a shared being and a
580 mutual constitution” (Slife 2004, 811). From this entanglement perspec-
581 tive, any separation is merely analytical (Orlikowski and Scott 2008), as
582 what we call the technical, the social and the organizational are mutually
583 constitutive, only existing as doing (Shotter 2013) in their radical other-
584 ness (Introna 2013). The core question of this research stream has been
585 how ‘matter matters’, and more importantly how entities matter in prac-
586 tices, how forms and their relations appear (Jones 2013, 223).

587 These mindsets can be considered as renewing ontological debates
588 about organization. However, they have been confronted to their own
589 contradictions about the ontology of organizational phenomena.
590 Contradictions have come from the way scholars have dealt with rela-
591 tional ontology. In most of these mindsets, scholars’ work can be divided
592 into two groups: advocates of a weak relational ontology versus advocates
593 of a strong relational ontology (Slife 2004). In the weak relational ontol-
594 ogy, ‘things’, such as actors, technologies, roles, statuses, have their own
595 existence. Despite their interaction and imbrication, ‘things’ remain

distinct, interdependent phenomena. Strong relational ontology states that ‘things’ do not exist on their own but are entangled and intertwined; ‘things’ gain status only through their interpenetration and intra-action (Barad 2003). A more managerialist view of these mindsets has also emerged. Anchored into weak relational ontology, it has attempted to provide managerial contributions as a way to help companies face economic challenges. This can be found in various research streams in between management research and organization studies, such as strategy-as-practice, community-of-practice, sociomateriality (with a hyphen) and the weak process view dedicated to the understanding of the innovation process.

Period 4: Working and Collaborating Without a Company—Current Developments in Organization Studies

In 2008, the financial crisis revealed an ugly truth to the world. The banking system had played dangerously with people’s money leading to a dramatic economic crisis, seizure of properties, bankruptcies, unemployment and so on. The consequences were dreadful and governments all over the world tried desperately to contain the crisis. This crisis made more visible social challenges such as wealth inequality and unemployment. This led to an unprecedented crisis of faith that has since nurtured various social movements and political extremism. At the same time, environmental challenges have become more urgent. Climate change, scarcity of resources, pollution, loss of biodiversity, deforestation have started to question the industrial and mass-consumption model. The risk of a global collapse is considered a serious scenario by numerous scientists. In such a context, a rather young, educated, globalized and progressivist elite—often ironically called hipsters—has been experimenting with alternative lifestyles and new ways of working, living and consuming. Living and gentrifying neighborhoods of big cities, such as East London, they have developed a new economy called the ‘flat-white economy’ by McWilliams (2015), based on alternative ways of manufacturing and

628 consuming. Veganism, eco-friendly products, the sharing economy, per-
629 sonal development have become some of the key trends; while the devel-
630 opment of new digital and mobile technologies such as social media,
631 smartphones and high-speed mobile networks enable them to develop
632 their business from anywhere.

633 **Against the 9 to 5 Office Job:** 634 **The Lifestyle Entrepreneurship**

635 These people are the tangible manifestation of many changes in society,
636 especially at work. They tend to reject the traditional employment cul-
637 ture, that is 9 to 5 office hours, the hierarchy, job titles and the perks
638 among others, and embrace ‘lifestyle entrepreneurship, that is a strong
639 belief in self-empowerment through entrepreneurship. Many terms have
640 been proposed to name these new workers: mumpreneurs, makers, digi-
641 tal nomads, creative freelancers, influencers, coworkers, solopreneurs and
642 so on. Most of the time they are independent workers, working collab-
643 oratively with other independent workers or companies. They reinvent
644 ways of collaborating by relying on online platforms or social media or
645 joining a shared working space such as a coworking space or a maker-
646 space. Hypothetically they can work where and when they want, on the
647 projects they want to, with whom they want and with no subordinate
648 relation with anyone (Hussenot and Sergi 2018). This ‘lifestyle entrepre-
649 neurship’ also means that work and life are not separate activities any
650 longer, and the entrepreneurial activity serves a lifestyle. The notion of
651 ‘workation’ is a good example of this renewed relationship between work
652 and life as it expresses the idea that work and vacation could be experi-
653 enced at the same time. However, this idealistic scenario (as it has often
654 been depicted on social media, blogs and press articles) has been tar-
655 nished by the so-called gig economy—short-term tasks-based activity
656 carried out by independent workers—which has brought uncertainty
657 and financial insecurity to many workers (Acquier et al. 2017). Car driv-
658 ers and riders delivering food are two of the most common examples of
659 this gig economy in which workers are paid per task.

Theorizing Organization Without a Company: Towards New Challenges and Frameworks in Organization Studies

In such a fast changing and interrelated world, theories and mindsets developed during the 2000s have served as a core background for organizational scholars. There is still a need for strong philosophical and social theories as foundations to understand current trends. Critical management studies, the process view, practice-based theory and the performative-based view are still playing an important role in the intellectual debate. Awareness of this changing global context has encouraged organizational scholars to research new topics such as social movements (Haug 2013; Yousfi 2013), bikers' collectives (Wilhoit and Kisselburgh 2015) or terrorist networks (Schoeneborn and Scherer 2012; Stohl and Stohl 2011). Traditional topics such as management and work are explored through the lens of these global trends; changing work practices are happening outside of big companies and often deal with social, economic and environmental challenges. For instance, freelancers, makers and coworkers question our assumptions about working space, working time, but also collaboration, leadership, collective identity, power relations and so on and traditional dualisms such as work versus life, social concerns versus economic ones, companies versus their environment and so on. These dualisms seem to disappear in our interrelated world. Social, environmental and economic challenges have been at the heart of debates for the last decade and the study of companies has become less of a priority. This has been called the 'societal turn in organization theories' (De Vaujany et al. 2016b). Recent themes addressed at the European Group for Organization Studies conferences (the main European research association in organization studies) speak for themselves: 'Bridging continents, cultures and worldviews' (2013), 'Reimagining, rethinking, reshaping: Organizational scholarship in unsettled times' (2014), 'Organization and the examined life: Reason, reflexivity and responsibility' (2015), 'The good organization: Aspiration, interventions, struggle' (2017), 'Enlightening the future: Challenge for organization' (2019) and

693 ‘Organizing for a sustainable future: Responsibility, renewal and resis-
694 tance’ (2020).

695 Theoretically speaking, the current challenge is to envisage organiza-
696 tional phenomena not only as open but also fluid (Schreyögg and Sydow
697 2010), where activities and relationships are constantly evolving, mem-
698 bers are not clearly identified and boundaries are open or permeable
699 (Blagoev et al. 2019; Dobusch and Schoeneborn 2015). In such organi-
700 zational phenomena, work can be done not only anywhere and at any
701 time, but in multiple spatialities and temporalities. Another challenge is
702 to conceptualize organizational phenomena with no separation between
703 work and life. This is, for example, the case with influencers who have
704 built their business based on their private life (Duffy 2016), or digital
705 nomads who have decided to travel the world, while their professional
706 activity is carried out exclusively remotely (Nash et al. 2018). As a way to
707 understand these open and fluid organizational phenomena, new theo-
708 retical concepts have been suggested recently. For instance, the concept of
709 ‘organizationality’ (Dobusch and Schoeneborn 2015; Schoeneborn et al.
710 2019; Blagoev et al. 2019) and the events-based approach (Hernes 2014a,
711 b; Hussenot and Missonier 2016; Hussenot 2019; Hussenot et al. 2020).

712 **Organizationality: Understanding Organization as an Adverb**

713 In 2015, Dobusch and Schoeneborn introduced the notion of organiza-
714 tionality to understand how organizational dynamics manifest themselves
715 in fluid organizational phenomena. They suggest to understand organiza-
716 tion as an adverb (Schoeneborn et al. 2019). The organization is what
717 characterizes the organizing process (in the same way that the adverb is
718 what characterizes the verb). The organization is what qualifies the activi-
719 ties. An organization is not an entity but the very definition of the activi-
720 ty (goal, purpose, roles, actors, coordination modes, etc.). The authors
721 invite us to rethink dynamics such as collective identity, actorhood and
722 the interconnected instances of decision-making in fluid organizations
723 (Dobusch and Schoeneborn 2015). This approach recognizes the exist-
724 tence of organizational dynamics in fluid organizational phenomena, but
725 emphasizes their emergent, openness and situated nature. These authors

propose an interesting approach, as understanding organization as an adverb is a stimulating way to study how organizational dynamics are produced and reproduced by actors, whichever their activities and their interrelatedness with all aspects of actors' life. This approach offers an alternative way to analyze organizational identity, actorhood and decision-making without necessarily ascribing mechanisms to actors.

Events-Based Approach: Understanding Organization as a Temporality

As an attempt to offer an alternative way of thinking and studying organization, Hernes (2014a, b) has suggested to focus on events and temporality. Based on this, Hussenot and Missonier (2016), Hussenot (2019), Hussenot et al. (2020) have developed the events-based approach. It suggests that organizational phenomena are temporal, emerge and are maintained through the ongoing configuration and co-definition of past, present and future events that define both the current moment and the continuity of the activity. The events-based approach suggests to shift from an essentialist view of organization—that is a view reducing organization to an entity delimited in space and time—to a view in which the organization is a shared history, past, present and future, that enables actors to act collectively. In such a view, 'things' such as rules, technologies, actors and so on gain a meaning, a role and a status through this enacted temporality. Any 'thing' is understood as a temporal phenomenon. Conversely, these 'things' also participate in the co-definition and configuration of the past, present and future events (Hussenot 2019) and organization is defined as a structure of events (Hernes 2014b). By reframing ontological categories (events and not things) and the ontological dimension (situated temporality and not time and space) of organizational phenomena, the events-based approach offers an alternative to understand phenomena in which there is no given space, boundaries, members and so on; but a continuous movement of defining activities in which various actors, technologies, goals, histories and so on are delineated through a shared temporality. The events-based approach is an attempt to study these liquefied, nomadic and rhizomic contemporary organizational phenomena.

760 **Conclusion**

761 Based on a historical perspective, the aim of this chapter was to enquire
 762 about the way innovations at work have influenced organization theories
 763 over time. By focusing on the interrelations between technological inno-
 764 vations, the evolution of organizational phenomena and evolutions of
 765 ways of working, we have argued that organization theories have evolved
 766 along with innovations at work. This historical attempt opens new ave-
 767 nues of research in both organization studies and organizational history
 768 which could provide a better understanding of current work practices as
 769 being part of a more 'longue durée' phenomenon in line with the evolu-
 770 tion of capitalism. For example, longitudinal studies and monographs on
 771 the evolution of work practices in companies could provide further mate-
 772 rial to think about current and future work practices as evolutions
 773 anchored into past transformations.

774 **References**

- 775 Acquier, A., Daudigeos, T., & Pinkse, J. (2017). Promises and paradoxes of the
 776 sharing economy: An organizing framework. *Technological Forecasting and*
 777 *Social Change*, 125, 1–10.
- 778 Adler, P., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2008). Critical management studies.
 779 *The Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 119–180.
- 780 Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical management studies*. London: Sage.
- 781 Aoki, M. (1990). Toward an economic model of the Japanese firm. *Journal of*
 782 *Economic Literature*, 28(1), 1–27.
- 783 Arena, L. (2011). Les modèles nationaux d'enseignement de la gestion
 784 d'entreprise: Formes de capitalisme et modes d'organisation. *Entreprises et*
 785 *Histoire*, 65(4), 6–10.
- 786 Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of
 787 how matter comes to matter. *Signs—Journal of Women in Culture and Society*,
 788 28(3), 801–831.
- 789 Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entan-*
 790 *glement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- 791 Barnard, C. I. (1968/1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA:
 792 Harvard University Press.

15 From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways...

- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. 793
- Bergson, H. (2009/1907). *L'évolution créative*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 794
795
- Blagoev, B., Costas, J., & Kärreman, D. (2019). We are all 'herd animals': Community and organizationality in coworking spaces. *Organization*, 26(6), 894–916. 796
797
798
- Bourdieu, P. (1972). *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. Paris: Le point. 799
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 800
- Burrell, G. (1994). Modernism, post modernism, and organizational analysis: The contribution of Jürgen Habermas. *Organization Studies*, 15(1), 1–19. 801
802
- Cabantous, L., & Sergi, V. (2018). Seeing the potentialities at the intersection: A reflection on performativity and processuality mindsets. *M@n@gement*, 21(4), 1229–1243. 803
804
805
- Chandler, A. D. (1990). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the industrial enterprise*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 806
807
- Chevalier, J. (1937). *La technique de l'organisation des entreprises—Livre 1: Le gouvernement de l'entreprise*. Paris: Dunod. 808
809
- Chia, R. (1995). From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 16(4), 579–604. 810
811
- Chia, R. (1997). Essai—Thirty years on: From organizational structures to the organization of thought. *Organization Studies*, 18(4), 684–707. 812
813
- Chia, R. (1999). A 'rhizomic' model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change. *British Journal of Management*, 10(3), 209–227. 814
815
816
- Chia, R. (2003). Organization theory as postmodern science. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory* (pp. 113–142). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 817
819
- Clegg, S. R. (1990). *Modern organizations: Organization studies in the postmodern world*. London: Sage. 820
821
- Cooper, R. (1976). The open field. *Human Relations*, 29(11), 999–1017. 822
- Cooper, R. (1989). Modernism, post modernism and organizational analysis: The contribution of Jacques Derrida. *Organization Studies*, 10(4), 479–502. 823
824
- Cooper, R. (2005). Relationality. *Organization Studies*, 26(11), 1689–1710. 825
- Cooper, R. (2007). Organs of process: Rethinking human organization. *Organization Studies*, 28(10), 1547–1573. 826
827
- Cooper, R. (2014). Process and reality. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjort, & R. Holt (Eds.), *Process philosophy and organization studies* (pp. 585–604). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 828
829
830

- 831 Cooper, R., & Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, postmodernism and organiza-
832 tional analysis: An introduction. *Organization Studies*, 9(1), 91–112.
- 833 Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication,
834 organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the Special
835 Issue. *Organization Studies*, 32(9), 1149–1117.
- 836 Corradi, G., Gherardi, S., & Verzelloni, L. (2010). Through the practice-lens:
837 Where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading? *Management*
838 *Learning*, 41(3), 265–283.
- 839 Cortada, J. (2011). *Information and the modern corporation*. Cambridge, MA:
840 MIT Press.
- 841 Cyert, R., & March, J. (1963). *A behavioral theory of the firm*. Englewood Cliffs,
842 NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 843 De Vaujany, F. X., Dameron, S., & Rouleau, L. (2016a). Introduction au tour-
844 nant pratique. In F. X. De Vaujany, A. Hussenot, & J.-F. Chanlat (Eds.),
845 *Théories des organisations: nouveaux tournants* (pp. 25–42). Paris: Economica.
- 846 De Vaujany, F. X., Hussenot, A., & Chanlat, J. F. (Eds.). (2016b). *Théories des*
847 *organisations: nouveaux tournants*. Paris: Economica.
- 848 DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional
849 isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American*
850 *Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- 851 Dobusch, L., & Schoeneborn, D. (2015). Fluidity, identity, and organizational-
852 ity: The communicative constitution of anonymous. *Journal of Management*
853 *Studies*, 52(8), 1005–1035.
- 854 Duffy, B. E. (2016). The romance of work: Gender and aspirational labour in
855 the digital culture industries. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*,
856 19(4), 441–457.
- 857 Fayol, H. (1916/1949). *General and industrial management* (translated from
858 *Administration industrielle et générale*). London: Pitman & Sons.
- 859 Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*
860 *1972–1977*. London: Harvester.
- 861 Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, prac-
862 tices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio
863 (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–263).
864 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 865 Gherardi, S. (2012). *How to conduct a practice-based study: Problems and methods*.
866 Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- 867 Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley, CA: University
868 of California Press.

15 From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways...

- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 869
870
- Gond, J.-P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N., & 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*, 18(4), 440–463. 871
872
873
874
- Greenwood, R., & Devine, K. (1997). Inside Aston: A conversation with Derek Pugh. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 6(3), 200–208. 875
876
- Haug, C. (2013). Organizing spaces: Meeting arenas as a social movement infrastructure between organization, network, and institution. *Organization Studies*, 34(5–6), 705–732. 877
878
879
- Helin, J., Hernes, T., Hjorth, D., & Holt, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Oxford handbook of process philosophy and organization studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 880
881
- Hernes, T. (2014a). *A process theory of organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 882
883
- Hernes, T. (2014b). Alfred North Whitehead. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjorth, & R. Holt (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of process philosophy and organization studies* (pp. 255–271). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 884
885
886
- Hickson, D. J., & Pugh, D. S. (2007/1964). *Writers on organizations* (6th ed.). London: Penguin Business. 887
888
- Hussenot, A. (2019). *L'organisation à l'épreuve des makers. Propositions pour une approche par les événements*. Laval, Québec: Presses Universitaires de Laval. 889
890
- Hussenot, A., & Missonier, S. (2016). Encompassing stability and novelty in organization studies: An events-based approach. *Organization Studies*, 37(4), 523–546. 891
892
893
- Hussenot, A., & Sergi, V. (2018). Collaborating without formal organization. In C. Cézanne & L. Saglietto (Eds.), *Human capital-intensive firms* (pp. 53–72). Hershey, PA: IGI Global Publications. 894
895
896
- Hussenot, A., de Vaujany, F. X., & Chanlat, J.-F. (2016). Changements socio-économiques et théories des organisations. In F. X. De Vaujany, A. Hussenot, & J.-F. Chanlat (Eds.), *Théories des organisations: nouveaux tournants* (pp. 11–21). Paris: Economica. 897
898
899
900
- Hussenot, A., Hernes, T., & Bouty, I. (2020). Studying organization from the perspective of the ontology of temporality: Introducing the events-based approach. In J. Reinecke, R. Suddaby, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *About time: Temporality and history in organization studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (forthcoming). 901
902
903
904
905

- 906 Introna, L. D. (2013). Otherness and the letting-be of becoming: Or, ethics
907 beyond bifurcation. In P. R. Carlile, D. Nicolini, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas
908 (Eds.), *How matter matters: Objects, artifacts, and materiality in organization*
909 *studies* (pp. 260–288). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 910 Jensen, A., Thuesen, C., & Gerald, J. (2016). The projectification of every-
911 thing: Projects as a human condition. *Project Management Journal*,
912 47(3), 21–34.
- 913 Jones, M. (2013). Untangling materiality. In P. R. Carlile, D. Nicolini,
914 A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *How matter matters: Objects, artifacts, and*
915 *materiality in organization studies* (pp. 197–226). Oxford: Oxford
916 University Press.
- 917 Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (2010). Introducing perspectives on process organi-
918 zation studies. In T. Hernes & S. Maitlis (Eds.), *Process, sensemaking and*
919 *organizing* (pp. 1–26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 920 Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social. In *An introduction to actor-network-*
921 *theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 922 Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participa-*
923 *tion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 924 Lazonick, W. (2010). Innovative business models and varieties of capitalism:
925 Financialization of the U.S. Corporation. *Business History Review*,
926 84(4), 675–702.
- 927 Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: An institu-
928 tional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies*, 28(7), 993–1012.
- 929 Lounsbury, M., & Zhao, Y. E. (2014). *Neo-institutional theory (Management*
930 *Oxford bibliographies)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 931 Lyotard, J. F. (1979). *La Condition postmoderne*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- 932 March, J. & Simon H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. Wiley: Blackwell Business.
- 933 McWilliams, D. (2015). *Flat white economy: How the digital economy is trans-*
934 *forming London & other cities of the future*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- 935 Merton, R. (1949/1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- 936 Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal
937 structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
- 938 Minkes, L. (2011). Early years in University development in management edu-
939 cation: Reflections and reminiscences on the University of Birmingham
940 (1950s–1970s). *Entreprises et Histoire*, 65(4), 83–95.
- 941 Moriguchi, C. (2000). *The evolution of employment relations in U.S. and Japanese*
942 *manufacturing firms, 1900–1960: A comparative historical and institutional*
943 *analysis*, Working Paper Series, WP 7939. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau
944 of Economic Research.

15 From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways...

- Nash, C., Jarrahi, M. H., Sutherland, W., & Phillips, G. (2018). Digital nomads beyond the buzzword: Defining digital nomadic work and use of digital technologies. In G. Chowdhury, J. McLeod, V. Gillet, & P. Willett (Eds.), *Transforming digital worlds. iConference 2018* (Lecture notes in computer science, vol. 10766). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Nutt, P. C. (1984). Types of organizational decision processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(3), 414–450.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, 11(4), 404–428.
- 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.
- Osterman, P. (1991). Impact of IT on jobs and skills. In M. S. Scott Morton (Ed.), *The Corporation of the 1990s—Information technology and organizational transformation* (pp. 220–243). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, M. (1992). Post-modern organizations or postmodern organization theory. *Organization Studies*, 13(1), 1–17.
- Parsons, T. (1942). Max Weber and the contemporary political crisis. *The Review of Politics*, 4(2), 155–172.
- Parsons, T. (1947). Introduction. In A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons (Eds.), *Max Weber: The theory of social and economic organization* (pp. 1–11). New York: Free Press.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pickering, A. (1995). *The mangle of practice: Time, agency, and science*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Porter, M. E., & Heppelman, J. E. (2014). How smart and connected objects are transforming competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(11), 64–88.
- Pugh, D. S., & Hickson, D. J. (1972). Causal inference and the Aston studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), 273–276.
- Rantakari, A., & Vaara, E. (2017). Narratives and processuality. In A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of process organization studies* (pp. 271–285). London: Sage.
- Rao, H. (1994). The social construction of reputation: Certification contests, legitimation, and the survival of organizations in the American automobile industry; 1895–1912. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(1), 29–44.

- 982 Rescher, N. (1996). *Process metaphysics: An introduction to process philosophy*.
983 Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- 984 Rescher, N. (2001). *Process philosophy: A survey of basic issues*. Pittsburgh, CA:
985 University of Pittsburgh Press.
- 986 Schatzki, T. R. (1996). *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human*
987 *activity and the social*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 988 Schatzki, T. R. (2001). Introduction. Practice theory. In T. R. Schatzki,
989 K. Knorr-Cetina, & E. von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary*
990 *theory* (pp. 1–14). London: Routledge.
- 991 Schoeneborn, D., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Clandestine organizations, al Qaeda,
992 and the paradox of (in)visibility: A response to Stohl and Stohl. *Organization*
993 *Studies*, 33(7), 963–971.
- 994 Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T. R., & Kärreman, D. (2019). The communicative
995 constitution of organization, organizing, and organizationality. *Organization*
996 *Studies*, 40(4), 475–496.
- 997 Schreyögg, G., & Sydow, J. (2010). Organizing for fluidity? Dilemmas of new
998 organizational forms. *Organization Science*, 21(10), 1251–1262.
- 999 Scott, W. G. (1992). *Chester I. Barnard and the guardians of the managerial state*.
1000 Lawrence, KS: Kansas University Press.
- 1001 Scott Morton, M. S. (Ed.). (1991). *The corporation of the 1990s: Information*
1002 *technology and organizational transformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1003 Selznick, P. (1943). An approach to a theory of bureaucracy. *American Sociological*
1004 *Review*, 8(1), 47–54.
- 1005 Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organization. *American*
1006 *Sociological Review*, 13(1), 25–35.
- 1007 Shenhav, Y. (2003). The historical and epistemological foundations of organiza-
1008 tion theory: Fusing sociological theory with engineering discourse. In
1009 H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory*
1010 (pp. 183–209). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1011 Shotter, J. (2013). Reflections on sociomateriality and dialogicality in organiza-
1012 tion studies: From ‘inter-’ to ‘intra-thinking’... in performing practices. In
1013 P. R. Carlile, D. Nicolini, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *How matter*
1014 *matters: Objects, artifacts, and materiality in organization studies* (pp. 32–57).
1015 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 1016 Simon, H. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes*
1017 *in administrative organization*. New York: Macmillan.
- 1018 Slappendel, C. (1996). Perspectives on innovation in organizations. *Organization*
1019 *Studies*, 17(1), 107–129.


15 From Innovations at Work to Innovative Ways...

- Slife, B. D. (2004). Taking practice seriously: Toward a relational ontology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 24(2), 158–178. 1020
1021
- Stohl, C., & Stohl, M. (2011). Secret agencies: The communicative constitution of a clandestine organization. *Organization Studies*, 32(9), 1197–1215. 1022
1023
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York & London: Harper & Brothers Publishers. 1024
1025
- Taylor, C. (1995). *Philosophical arguments*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1026
1027
- Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, 13(5), 567–582. 1028
1029
- Weber, M. (1922 [1978]). *Economy and society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 1030
1031
- Whilston, K. (1997). The reception of scientific management by British engineers: 1890–1914. *Business History Review*, 71(2), 207–229. 1032
1033
- Wilhoit, E. D., & Kisselburgh, L. G. (2015). Collective action without organization: The material constitution of bike commuters as collective. *Organization Studies*, 36(5), 573–592. 1034
1035
1036
- Yousfi, H. (2013). Rethinking hybridity in postcolonial contexts: What changes and what persists? The Tunisian case of Poulina's managers. *Organization Studies*, 35(3), 393–421. 1037
1038
1039

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 15 0005013045

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	Refs. "George 1968; Wren 1972" are cited in text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide details in the list or delete the citation from the text.	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU2	Please note that single quote marks have been made consistent for emphasis and double quotes for cited/quoted text. Please check and confirm if edits are okay	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU3	Please check and confirm if change in quote marks in the sentence "The initial essentialist view of organizationessentialist view of organization..." is okay. Or should double quote marks be retained if the text is cited material?	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU4	Please check we have retained the variant spelling «towards» throughout this chapter.	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU5	Please check and confirm if "repertoires" in the quoted part in the sentence "As early as the 1960s, these authors..." is written as it is in the original text	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU6	Please provide closing double quotes in the sentence "In this sense, the Aston Group's contribution to organization theory also has..."	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU7	The citation "Barnard, 1938" has been changed to "Barnard, 1968/1938" to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU8	The citation "Power & DiMaggio 1983" has been changed to "DiMaggio and Powell, 1983" to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU9	The citation "Meyer & Ronan, 1977" has been changed to "Meyer and Rowan, 1977" to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>
AU10	The citation "Porter & Heppelman, 2015" has been changed to "Porter and Heppelman, 2014" to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>

AU11	The citation “Cabantous & Sergi, 2019” has been changed to “Cabantous and Sergi, 2018” to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	
AU12	The citation “Bergson, 1907” has been changed to “Bergson, 2009/1907” to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	
AU13	The citation “1990” has been changed to “Bourdieu, 1980” to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	
AU14	The citation “1990” has been changed to “Bourdieu, 1980” to match the author name/date in the reference list. Please check if the change is fine in this occurrence and modify the subsequent occurrences, if necessary.	
AU15	Please note that double quotes have been changed to single in the sentence ‘This has been called...’ and its subsequent sentences. Please check if okay. Or should original be retained if phrases are cited material	
AU16	References “Hussenot et al. (2016), Lounsbury & Crumley (2007)” were not cited anywhere in the text. Please provide in text citation or delete the reference from the reference list.	
AU17	Please update “Forthcoming”.	