

Call for Papers

First Colloquium on Philosophy and Organization Studies (PHILOS)

Affiliated with the International Symposium on Process Organization Studies

23-24 June 2020

Conveners:

Jorgen Sandberg, University of Queensland, Australia & University of Warwick, UK

Haridimos Tsoukas, University of Cyprus, Cyprus & University of Warwick, UK

Email: philos.colloquium@gmail.com

Keynote Speakers:

Simon Critchley, Hans Jonas Professor of Philosophy, The New School of Social Research, USA, author of *Tragedy, the Greeks and Us* and *The Problem with Levinas*, moderator of *The Stone*, *New York Times*

Barbara Czarniawska, Senior Professor of Management Studies at Gothenburg Research Institute, School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, author of *Narrating the Organization* and *A Theory of Organizing*.

Rationale

Although not often discussed, generating theories about organizational phenomena inevitably involves philosophical questions. These are *meta*-questions that focus on the frameworks, categories, and concepts, that is, the dominant ways of thinking about, researching, and justifying knowledge claims within organization studies (Mir, Willmott and Greenwood, 2016; Tsoukas and Chia, 2011; Van de Ven, 2007). As such, philosophical questions are generated from *outside* the scholarly practices within which organization scientists ordinarily carry out their research.

Of course, scholars can carry out their research without ever having to bother with philosophical meta-questions. However, when they stumble in their efforts to make sense of the empirical world; their theories are challenged by rival ones; or there are calls for conceptual clarity and integration as perspectives and theories proliferate, hitherto tacitly accepted frameworks and concepts of organizational inquiry come under scrutiny. Philosophical questions enter the scene (Powell, 2001).

Philosophical questions are essentially conceptual in character (Uygor, 1964): they are concerned with the nature (or meaning) of the concepts we use to describe, interpret, understand, and explain organizations (including the concepts ‘describe’, ‘interpret’, ‘understand’, ‘explain’ and ‘organizations’). For example, questions such as how we should

think about organizational change, routines, strategy, learning, decision making, leadership, organizational ethics or aesthetics are not empirical but conceptual. They, therefore, invite us to think more clearly, systematically and/or creatively about the conceptual categories we habitually use to make sense of phenomena of interest. A philosophical approach to organization studies aims to scrutinize, critique, and elucidate key concepts, modes of thinking and researching, as well as ways of justifying knowledge claims commonly used in the scholarly practice of organization studies.

Similar to other institutionalized practices, organizational research legitimates and takes for granted particular ways of engaging with, observing, and talking about the world. Insofar as this is the case, some closure of meaning is inevitably brought about. Philosophical inquiry helps to counter such closure by questioning commonly accepted meanings underlying research practices, as well as cultivating an inquisitive disposition and openness. As Foucault (1985: 9) so eloquently put it: philosophical inquiry is first and foremost an “endeavour to know how and to what extent it might be possible to think differently, instead of legitimizing what is already known.” Philosophical inquiry does so in three main ways (see Tsoukas, 2019).

Cultivating the attitude of “wonder”. “For it is owing to their wonder that men [sic] both now begin and at first began to philosophize,” notes Aristotle in *Metaphysics*. An attitude of wonder finds the ordinary to be extraordinary, the usual unusual. Once in “wonder”, one must *think* - new concepts need to be invented and fresh distinctions to be made. What is taken for granted needs to be questioned and what has withdrawn from focal attention is brought back to scrutiny (Tsoukas, 2019). Wonder seeks to create a form of inquiry in which the phenomenon of interest may reveal its *be-ing* (Heidegger, 1994). For example, rather than study particular distinguishing features of organizations (centralization, formalization, etc.), such inquiry may show how organizing is accomplished (Weick, 1979). Instead of assuming that routines are stable, it could show how stability is accomplished (Feldman et al., 2016).

Questioning received images of thought. Taken-for-granted frameworks, categories, and concepts constitute “images of thought” (Deleuze, 2004) that guide inquiry. An image of thought, notes Deleuze (2004:167), is a presupposition that takes the form “everybody knows that...”. Images of thought are tacitly accepted and non-reflectively practised in academic research. However, when researchers step back from their research practices to inquire about their theories (e.g. How can we think differently about and study organizational change, strategy or routines?), they enter the realm of meta-theory, where philosophical questions gain currency (Tsoukas and Knudsen, 2003; Tsoukas and Chia, 2011). Through meta-theoretical – philosophical – questioning, received images of thought (and their associated concepts) come to the fore and are open to “problematization” (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011, 2013).

Enabling new images of thought for theory development. New conceptual distinctions enable novel theorizing to emerge. It is here that a philosophical approach to organization studies is most constructive: drawing on particular philosophical resources, more refined theoretical distinctions may be made, new theories suggested, and new ways of conducting research and evaluating knowledge claims advanced. Philosophical inquiry can thereby have a “genuinely originitive and constructive [...] function” (Geuss, 2017: 11).

For example, process philosophy furnishes a new image of thought – change is immanent – that is able to do justice to the experience of ongoing change in organizations and which helps lay the ground for more sophisticated theorizing (Helin et al., 2014; Hernes, 2014; Tsoukas and Chia, 2002; Langley et al., 2013; Langley and Tsoukas, 2017). Phenomenology, seeking to overcome the mind-body and agent-world dualisms, provides another image – entwinement,

absorption – that enables us to better understand skillful action (Sandberg et al., 2017), sensemaking (Sandberg and Tsoukas, in press), competence (Sandberg 2000, Sandberg and Pinnington, 2009); mindfulness (Kudesia, 2019); strategy (Chia and Holt, 2006, 2015; Nayak, Chia and Canales, 2019), reflection-in-action (Yanow and Tsoukas, 2009); organizational knowledge (Hadjimichael and Tsoukas, 2019; Tsoukas, 2009), and so on.

In a similar way, several other philosophies have enabled the development of new theory in the field, including (to name but a few): a Wittgensteinian perspective on strategizing (Mantere, 2015); pragmatist explorations of organizations (Cohen, 2007; Dionysiou and Tsoukas, 2013; Lorino, 2018; Simpson, 2009); hermeneutical, narrative and discursive perspectives on organizational life (Cooren, 2007; Czarniawska, 1997; Grant et al., 2004; Morgan, 1997); a “realist” reconceptualization of entrepreneurial opportunities (Ramoglou and Tsang, 2016); practice-based approaches to organizing, strategy and theorizing (Nicolini, 2013; Gherardi, 2006; Golsorkhi et al, 2015; Vaara and Whittington, 2012; Feldman and Orlikowski, 2011; Sandberg and Tsoukas, 2011); ordinary-language philosophy for understanding organizational mind (Weick and Roberts, 1993); virtue ethics (Akrivou and Sisson, 2016; Moore, 2018; Tsoukas, 2018); discourse ethics (Scherer and Patzer, 2011; Reinecke and Ansari, 2015); aesthetics (Strati, 2019); poststructuralist, postmodern and feminist studies (Linstead, 2004; Fotaki and Harding, 2017); new approaches to theorizing (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011, 2013; Suddaby, Hardy and Huy, 2011; Thompson, 2011; Tsoukas, 2017), and so on.

Studies like these highlight that articulating and problematizing conceptual categories and frameworks through philosophical questioning, enables scholars to generate new modes of theorizing, make fresh distinctions, create new concepts, and open up originative inquiry spaces that lead to the development of novel and impactful theories. A philosophically sensitive practice of organization studies can be immensely creative, which is exactly what PHILOS aims to achieve.

References

- Akrivou, K., & Sison, A.J. (2016). *The Challenges of Capitalism for Virtue Ethics and the Common Good*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematizing, *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 247-271.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2013). *Constructing Research Questions*, London: Sage.
- Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Bks. I – IX, Loeb Classical Library, trans. Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933), 82b11 – 12.
- Chia, R., & Holt, R. (2006). Strategy as practical coping: A Heideggerian perspective, *Organization Studies*, 22: 635-655.
- Chia, R., & Holt, R. (2009). *Strategy without Design: The Silent Efficacy of Indirect Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, M.D. (2007). Reading Dewey: Reflections on the study of routines. *Organization Studies*, 28: 773-786.
- Cooren, F. (2007). *Interacting and Organizing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Narrating the Organization*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Difference and Repetition*, London: Continuum, translated by P. Patton.
- Dionysiou, D., & Tsoukas, H. (2013). Understanding the creation and recreation of routines from within: A symbolic interactionist perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 181-205.
- Feldman, M.S., Pentland, B.T., D’Adderio, L., & Lazaric, N. (2016). Beyond routines as things: Introduction to the Special issue on routines dynamics, *Organization Science*, 27: 505-513.
- Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*, 22: 1240-1253.
- Fotaki, M., & Harding, N. (2017). *Gender and the Organization*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1985) *The use of pleasure: History of sexuality*, vol. 2. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gherardi, S. (2006) *Organizational Knowledge*, Oxford: Blackwell.

- Golsorkhi, D., Rouleau, L., Seidl, D., & Vaara, E. (Eds.) (2010). *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd Edition.
- Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C., & Putnam, L. (Eds.) (2004). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, London: Sage.
- Geuss, R. (2017). *Changing the Subject. Philosophy from Socrates to Adorno*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Hadjimichael, D., & Tsoukas, H. (2019). Toward a better understanding of tacit knowledge in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward, *Academy of Management Annals*, 13: 672-703.
- Heidegger, M. (1994). *Basic Questions in Philosophy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Helin, J., Hernes, T., Hjort, D., & Holt, R. (Eds.) (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Process Philosophy & Organization Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T. (2014). *A Process Theory of Organization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kudesia, R.S. (2019). Mindfulness as metacognitive practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 405-423.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. (2013). Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow, *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1-13.
- Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.) (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies*, London: Sage.
- Linstead, S. (Ed.) (2004). *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought*, London: Sage.
- Mantere, S. (2015). A Wittgensteinian perspective on strategizing. In D. Golsorkhi, L. Rouleau, D. Seidl, and E. Vaara (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.220-233.
- Mir, R., Willmott, J., & Greenwood, M. (Eds.) (2016). *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Moore, G. (2017). *Virtue at Work*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of Organization*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Nayak, A., Chia, R., & Canales, I. (2019). Non-cognitive microfoundations: Understanding dynamic capabilities as idiosyncratically refined sensitivities and predispositions, *Academy of Management Review*. Published online.
- Nicolini, D. (2013). *Practice Theory, Work, & Organization* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Powell TC. (2001). Competitive advantage: logical and philosophical considerations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 875 – 888.
- Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. W.K. (2016). A realist perspective of entrepreneurship: Opportunities as propensities, *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 410-434.
- Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. W.K. (2017). In defense of common sense in entrepreneurship theory: Beyond philosophical extremities and linguistic abuses, *Academy of Management Review*, 42: 736-744.
- Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. (2015). What is a “fair” price? Ethics as sensemaking. *Organization Science* 26: 867-888.
- Sandberg, J. (2000). Understanding human competence at work: An interpretive approach, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 9-25.
- Sandberg, J., & Pinnington, P. (2009). Professional competence as ways of being: An existential ontological perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46: 1138–1170.
- Sandberg, J., Rouleau, L., Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.) (2017). *Skilful Performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sandberg, J. & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality, *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 338-360.
- Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (in press). Sensemaking reconsidered: Towards a broader understanding through phenomenology, *Organization Theory*.
- Scherer, A., & Patzer, M. (2011). Beyond universalism and relativism: Habermas’s contribution to discourse ethics and its implications for intercultural ethics and organization theory. In Tsoukas, H. & Chia, R. (Eds.) (2011). *Philosophy and Organization Theory, Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, vol.32, pp.155-180.
- Strati, A. (2019). *Organizational Theory and Aesthetic Philosophies*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Suddaby, R., Hardy, C., & Huy, Q.N. (2011). Where are the new theories of organization? *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 236-246.
- Thompson, M. (2011). Ontological shift or ontological drift? Reality claims, epistemological frameworks, and theory generation in organization studies, *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 754-773.
- Tsoukas, H. (2019). *Philosophical Organization Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsoukas, H. (2018). Strategy and virtue: Developing strategy-as-practice through virtue ethics, *Strategic Organization*, 16: 323-351.

- Tsoukas, H. (2017). Don't simplify, complexify: From disjunctive to conjunctive theorizing in organization and management studies, *Journal of Management Studies*, 54: 132-153.
- Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change, *Organization Science*, 13: 567-582.
- Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2011). *Philosophy and Organization Theory, Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 32.
- Tsoukas, H., & Knudsen, C. (2003). *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory: Meta-theoretical Perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Uygur, N. (1964). What is a philosophical question? *Mind*, 73: 64-83.
- Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy as practice: Taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6: 285-336.
- Yanow, D., & Tsoukas, H. (2009). What is reflection-in-action? A phenomenological account, *Journal of Management Studies*, 46:1339-1363.
- Van de Ven, A. (2007). *Engaged Scholarship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, (2nd Ed.) Reading, MA: Addison-Westley.
- Weick, K.E., & Roberts, K. (1993). Collective mind in organizations: Heedful interrelating on flight decks, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 357-381.

Purpose, Venue, and Organization

The aim of the PHILOS Colloquium is to consolidate and further develop ongoing efforts to advance a philosophical approach to organization studies. The aim is *not* to contribute to philosophy itself, but to advance *a more philosophically oriented organization studies* that will pursue both critique and new conceptual advancements in the field.

We invite papers from researchers who, drawing from any philosophy, wish to critique and/or further develop current understandings about any organizational topic or type of theorizing in the field. The intention is for the Colloquium to be as broad as possible, not to favour any particular philosophical perspective or theme.

PHILOS is affiliated with the International Symposium on Process Organization Studies (PROS). It aims to be an annual event that will take place in the same week and at the same venue as PROS.

The **First PHILOS Colloquium** will take place on **23-24 June 2020** at the **Sheraton Rhodes Resort**, in the island of Rhodes, Greece (<https://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/rhosi-sheraton-rhodes-resort/?program=spg>). The Colloquium venue, comfortable, relaxing, and situated by the sea in one of the most beautiful Greek islands will provide an ideal setting for participants to relax and engage in creative dialogues.

Submissions

Interested participants must submit an extended abstract of about 1000 words for their proposed contribution by **January 31, 2020** through the following link:

<http://www.process-symposium.com/philos-abstractsubmitform/philos-abstractsubmitform.html>

The submission should contain authors' names, institutional affiliations, email and postal addresses. Authors will be notified of acceptance or otherwise by **March 7, 2020**. Full papers must be submitted by **June 1st, 2020**.