Organization Studies: Moving Entrepreneurially Ahead

By Daniel Hjorth and Trish Reay

We write this editorial at a time of transition for Organization Studies (OS). The journal has now moved to a model of overlapping terms for Editors-in-Chief (EIC). Trish Reay has been serving as EIC (together with Frank den Hond and Robin Holt) for two years, and at this time Daniel Hjorth has begun his term as EIC, coinciding with the conclusion of Robin's and Frank's terms. This innovative structure is now in place for the foreseeable future, setting up OS with a model of leadership that provides both stability and ongoing potential for innovation.

We (Daniel and Trish) see ourselves as both entrepreneurs and stewards of Organization Studies and the relationships to the EGOS community, and begin these two years of working together with both enthusiasm for the future and respect for the past. We know that we stand on 'the shoulders of giants' who have set high standards for stewardship and integrity. We also see that they have set the stage for us to move entrepreneurially ahead. Previous Editors have guided the journal with care, creativity, and enthusiasm – consistently growing the readership, submissions and impact over the years. We see our mandate as continuing to reinforce the strong foundations built by others while also making modifications in novel ways. We will engage in creative developments that we believe will make a difference for Organization Studies by cultivating its entrepreneurial sides while remaining grounded in the long-standing principles of OS to focus scholarly attention to "organizations, organizing and the organized in and between societies". We see that we are engaged in a process of creative becoming that is relationally bound with this belonging (Massumi, 2002) to the long-standing profile and aims of OS (see below). As part of this approach, we stress that an important element of OS' identity is its capacity and tendency to continuously invent new ways of becoming.

1

We thus remain committed to the profile and aims of the journal as stated in similar ways by Editors before us. This means that OS should be seen as the leading journal that publishes papers that help to create engaging, relevant, insightful, bold, and complex knowledge that deepens our understanding of organizations as social, cultural, historical and political phenomena in societies. OS papers are typically engaged in a broader social sciences and humanities agenda and therefore often draw on knowledge from disciplines to enrich a more narrow focus on management. Questions of what organizations are, how they are created, how people organize in and through them, and how they are shaping and shaped by societies are central to studies published in this journal. We believe OS should be early in tackling new questions as well as being a source of renewal in its approach and ways of addressing old (and odd) questions in daring and experiment(ing/al) ways. This is also how the journal keeps renewing its capacity to 'stay curious', to embrace a mode of becoming, to operate in the processual dynamics of learning. The journal's relational capacity vis-à-vis society, readers, debates, problems and challenges that concern us as people with organizational lives is the fuel that keeps it creatively moving on. Drawing on philosophers of affect we stress that OS' capacity to affect its readers, organizations and societies (yes, that is a bold ambition), is related to its capacity to be affected by the same (Deleuze, 1988). The world presently comes to us in the experiences of climate change, migration, stress, equality, and so on. We believe OS stays relevant also by tackling the issues of today. For this reason, OS' relationship to the wider EGOS-community is of utmost importance because it is scholarly arena where the journal's receptivity is put to the test.

We want not only to affirm this understanding of OS as a leading journal of relevant knowledge concerning people in organizations in societies, but also to emphasize that 'leading' necessarily means also being creative, entrepreneurial and innovative (which sometimes means upsetting). The Journal's history is full of innovative entrepreneurial initiatives that have brought us to where we are today. Most recently an emphasis on 'daring to know' (Holt & den Hond, 2013) is a message we see anticipating and directly related to our further cultivation of

OS's entrepreneurial attitude. This cultivation happens not only through what we publish – research articles, "X" and Organization Studies, and Perspectives – but also through the communities that the Journal builds and serves: EGOS, OS Summer Workshops, LAEMOS, Central and Eastern European workshops, and Paper Development Workshops in different academic conference settings. This includes a commitment to developing authors, reviewers and editors, which is how the long-term quality of the journal is secured.

It is absolutely central to OS that the editorial team – Editors-in-Chief, Senior Editors, Book Review Editors, and the Editorial Review Board – is composed in a way that reflects heterogeneity and diversity with respect to gender, geography and bases of knowledge. We firmly believe that such heterogeneity and diversity is intimately related to our capacity to stay creative and entrepreneurial. For it is in and through these in-betweens, these entre-spaces (Chia, 1996; Steyaert, 2005), that we find new ideas and questions and can work with them in innovative ways. We are organized to respect the breadth of the EGOS membership, and the pool of potential authors and readership associated with OS. In 2016, there were active subscriptions to OS in *** countries. We had 900 (**) manuscripts submitted from ** countries – with the largest volume of submissions from ******, in that order. Our editorial team spans xx continents and xx countries, and our (number??) editorial review board members are widely distributed around the world. Since its founding, OS is a truly international journal, and we endeavour to continue extending our reach with ongoing support for developing scholars in locations such as Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe, with plans to expand our scope to other geographic areas. We believe that the content of the journal must reflect these ambitions and be part of the central conversations that OS is building with these communities. Below we therefore turn to more specifically discuss Organization Studies and what it publishes. Before we do so, we briefly elaborate on our view of where OS comes from and where we want to go next.

Building on a tradition of being inventive

Since its inception, OS has consistently brought innovations to the traditional format of the academic paper: vita contemplativa (2003), peripheral vision (2004), perspectives, essays (since 1989, and essai since 1997), X and Organization Studies (2013), and alternative models of book reviews. We have a strong tradition of special issues as a way to institutionalize the generation and incubation of new or unusual approaches to understanding organizational topics. In particular, our annual special issue that is tied in with the OS Summer Workshop is a space where new ideas can be tested, refined and brought to the fore. OS remains entrepreneurial even though it has matured into a more complex organization. We see that it is important to perpetuate our tradition of creative-experimental thinking now and into the future because it is a critical component of creative reflection to continually question 'where we want to go next' and to show 'this is our way.' As part of this strong tradition, we see that OS must continually cultivate an entrepreneurial spirit by drawing on its capacity to stay on the move.

For OS, this ongoing attention to re-invention means that we must build upon the journal's ever strengthening emphasis on complex-multi-disciplinary thinking, societal relevance and social embeddedness. Now more than ever, it is critical to continually remind ourselves and others that OS is a journal that seeks to 'deepen our understanding of the complexity of organizations as social and political objects, through the mobilization of wide social sciences' agendas and knowledge.' (Courpasson, 2008: 1384). Studies published in OS are about organizations *in* society, and OS continues to lead the way by re-investigating the links among organizations, policies and politics. Doing so requires cross- and inter-disciplinary research that moves beyond the instrumental, a-contextual, or disembodied. OS publications typically try to navigate between the Scylla of esoteric-elitist academic thinking and the Charybdis of journalistic search for effect by developing critical-creative knowledge with care and relevance for people in organizations in societies. We believe that OS must continuously re-invent its capacity to become a journal that is at the forefront of such research questions about life and work in organizations, and interrelationships among organizations, about organizing and the organized in and between societies. OS

is an important force and source of nourishment for cultivating a community of scholars that nurtures such ambitious and brings us challenging ideas that can inspire theoretical creativity and imagination, helping organization studies to move on.

The most recent editorial team, Frank den Hond and Robin Holt, together with Trish Reay, has continued to work in this innovative tradition of OS that can be traced all the way back to our first editor, David Hickson (Hickson et al, 1980). Over the years, this creative-critical-imaginative-entrepreneurial spirit has been fortified with increased attention to experimentation and courage (Holt & den Hond, 2013). Studying, writing on and reading about organizations, organizing, and the organized requires a taste for the problems that come with arranging people, resources, and forces in particular ways. We concur that OS must be concerned with "the condition of organization, how and why it occurs and how we might make sense of lives being continually organized." (Holt & den Hond, 2013, p. 1588), as well as with how organizations are created as entrepreneurial initiatives. We add that generosity is as important as curiosity for intellectual progress; the community-dimension of OS as a journal embedded in the greater EGOS family is central. We believe that a strong sense of community has historically characterized scientific progress – somewhat in contrast to a more individualistic set of choices that can be associated with a strong focus on publishing. We see knowledge as a social source of enhanced possibilities that can spring from an open, multidisciplinary conversation among diverse groups of people.

We thus add to what other editors before us have said by emphasizing the point that it is the people organizing and organized by work who are important (Barley & Kunda, 1992). People who engage in entrepreneurial activities and take on managerial or leadership roles, and people who inhabit institutions (Fine & Hallett, 2016; Hallett & Ventresca, 2006) are important; they are critical to the heteroglossia (or multi-voicedness) that is organization studies. We encourage more research that builds on these ideas. We are also intrigued by and welcome research investigating attempts to create organization where it is lacking; such research highlights various forms of entrepreneurship in terms of the nature of a

problem to be solved, or an opportunity to be pursued. A start-up, or the launch of a venture, is an organization-creation process that makes the emergent organization into the existing organization (Katz and Gartner, 1988).

And as a new initiative, we encourage research showing how knowledge concerning organizations, organizing (including organization-creating processes), and the organized can best be developed. We refer to this as falling within the domain of method/ology. Resulting questions and avenues of research relate to finding or making a way (Greek *hodos,* as in *methodos*) that we see as increasingly important in relationship to (social) media events that challenge reflexive reasoning from research-based knowledge and the value of such knowledge for society. We believe that OS has a role to play in defending the strength of the weak, the vulnerability of the open society and its tendency to opt for the long road of knowledge rather than the short route of force or simple rule of thumb (Popper, 2003; Foucault, 2007). Method/ology is indeed sometimes seen as the 'long road' to knowledge, and perhaps increasingly so in a society that praises speed and immediate effect. Also for this reason, we believe our welcoming of method/ology papers is well-timed and adds to our role as provider of research-based knowledge.

Staying true to the roots of OS that are grounded in diversity, we enthusiastically endorse the importance of crossing multiple disciplines. Previous Editors have stressed the role of economics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, history, philosophy, cognitive science and political science in building this inter-disciplinary engagement that places the study of organization today at society's centre stage. Consistent with the mandate of EGOS and the breadth of interests held by EGOSians, we seek to "embrace complexity rather than reduce it" (Tsoukas, 2003: 1007) and our attention to questions of method/ology fits well in this regard.

We feel aligned with those who hold deep suspicion of calls for a unifying paradigm or establishing a 'proper' discipline (of organization studies). We believe that OS must continue to take inspiration from its multi-disciplinary

'foundation' by maintaining a child-like enthusiasm for life, always rejoicing in the interruption of stabilizing efforts, and finding new reasons to move onward (as Kierkegaard would have it; 2006: 31). The clear presence of multiple disciplinary and theoretical perspectives in OS helps to prevent us from inward-looking attempts to form total theories. We suggest that organization studies is a polyphony -- a choir with many, distinct voices (Bakhtin, 1984; Morson and Emerson, 1990) that allows for surprise and change. This polyphony can help to avoid the development of a strong discipline-identity that smothers disagreement and conversation; instead, OS must continue to attract and support scholars with a parrhesiastic tint who encourage the ongoing critical examination of our own ways (Foucault, 1997; Butler, 2001; Butler, 2009).

We find ourselves at home in a world of multi-, inter-, and cross-disciplinarity, and as a result, we stress that new and evolving approaches to the study of organization, organizing, and the organized should spring from such cross-fertilization. We look forward to the papers that are developed in response to this year's theme of "Surprise" at EGOS 2018. This focus matches well with our emphasis on the importance of ongoing organizational creation that is associated with unusual knowledge-creating processes, and with interests in art, aesthetics, philosophy, and even play (see our forthcoming Special Issue on Organizational Creativity, Play and Entrepreneurship). We believe it is the sometimes-unexpected combining of different traditions that sets out a mosaic style of disciplinary 'landscape' in which OS gracefully moves. We are strongly committed to continuing this multi-, inter, and cross-disciplinary approach as OS moves forward with debated issues of method and methodology, arguments for feminism or process studies, examining the importance of time and space, accounts of institutional change or stability, opening up thinking to include practices, bodies, ethics, or affect, and other topics.

 Organization Studies benefits immensely from conversing not only with our intellectual siblings in sociology, physical sciences, political science, history, anthropology, ethnology, economics, human geography, and psychology, but also studies in philosophy, art, and literature, historically more distant and silent voices in organization studies' debates and on-going knowledge-creation

processes. When we describe the colourful paintings that the canvas of OS attracts from its contributors, there is a conscious humanities-tint to our image. The use of metaphorical expressions is also intended. As many have pointed out long ago (Nietzsche, 1873; Wittgenstein, 1953; Lyotard, 1979; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Morgan, 1980; 1983; Rorty, 1980) concepts are metaphors (function metaphorically) in that they (like models) acquire descriptive or explanatory power by presenting one thing in terms of another (Morgan, 1980; Czarniawska, 1998: 29; Eco, 1992: 140; Collins, 1976). If we are "aware of the reality-shaping rather than mere representational function of language…" (Tsoukas, 2003: 1007) we, as scholars, can also seek a more affirmative relationship with our own inventiveness. A 'dare to know' attitude (Holt and den Hond, 2013) resonates with what has characterized OS since its birth. An inventiveness supported by a multidisciplinary conversation is both a product of who we are and an important force in shaping the 'undisciplined' discipline we call organization studies.

We thus want to emphasize that thinking creatively is at the heart of scholarly work. But thought is also 'governed' by forces that direct its movements and impacts upon its connective capacity. Constructing concepts (Suddaby, 2010) is a creative addition to the world (Massumi, 2002), a temporary pushing back against the continuous and chaotic falling apart of the world and the reductive and simplifying use of universal templates for handling/dealing with it. Thinking uses concepts to move and connect and conceptual-development, theory-construction, helps us to expand our thinking. Method/ology is an important element in learning to master these processes, which is another good reason to publish more of such articles in OS, a journal that stresses contribution to theory.

Concepts are in this sense important for theory construction as long as they lead to generating new thinking, or creating openness for thinking to freely move in/to. Relevance is not reducible to usefulness in a specific and often more instrumental problem-solving-horizon; it is always a question of the challenging, provoking, opening-up, connective, and creative capacity of concepts. Relevance also relates to the knowledge made possible in the context of use and the context

in which concepts have emerged. This is where critical knowledge and theory makes a difference. If we understand 'critical' as the thinker's insistence to know her knowledge (Foucault, 1997; Butler, 2002), reflexivity is bound to all knowing, and method/ology as a knowledge of the way to knowledge, is bound to reflexivity. To the extent that organization studies, broadly understood, can be said to form part of social sciences, and social sciences cannot be thought independently of philosophical concepts (Winch, 1958; Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000), philosophy matters. When 'critical' means we claim to know our knowledge and want that knowledge to matter vis-à-vis what we have studied, philosophy becomes a resource for thinking (creative use of concepts) if we understand philosophy as 'the movement of thought to the virtual fringe of things' (Massumi, 2002: 241-242). If we are interested in theory-construction (Weick, 1989; Cornelissen, 2006; Suddaby, 2010), thinking must move us; such movement is the creation of new relationships between concepts that enables new theory to form, allowing us to imagine new practices.

OS holds a strong history of embracing multi-, inter-, and cross-disciplinary studies, locating itself *in* society rather than outside society, and seeing its disciplinary pluralism as a strength. This resulting identity is consistent with ongoing initiatives to urge readers and contributing writers to engage in creative thinking; we join previous voices highlighting the importance of questions concerning how we create knowledge through multiple processes and especially through writing. We believe that OS is an excellent venue for renewing attention to what we understand by method/ology and what we understand by an academic text. We push these ideas forward as part of a broader discussion about knowledge creation and the voice of scholars in society. We can now move on to briefly elaborate on (the future of) publishing in OS.

Publishing in OS now and in the future
First and foremost, we publish empirical articles that push organization theory forward through research studies based on qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods. *Second,* and continuing a strong tradition that dates back to the founding of OS, we also publish conceptual articles that are distinct from

empirical articles by developing theory without reliance on empirical data. *Third*, OS publishes essay-style articles now under the label 'X and Organization Studies' that are meant to be provocative pieces exemplifying a 'daring to know' attitude. *Fourth*, we publish *Perspectives* that are virtual issues giving focused attention to a particular scholarly topic (e.g. Strategy-as-Practice was the topic of our first *Perspectives*) with a descriptive and engaging overview article together with examples of previously published OS articles that have contributed to developing the topic. *Fifth*, and as a new initiative, we will now be inviting methodology articles. We explain in more detail below why we find this important and how we see both methods and methodology as integral to meeting the overall aims of OS as a scholarly journal.

Below we provide information about each type of submission, and encourage authors to visit the OS website for more details. (http://journals.sagepub.com/home/oss)

Empirical research studies: Empirical studies can be based on qualitative, quantitative or mixed research methods. Articles must be grounded in and make a contribution to organizational theory. A Senior Editor is assigned based on both content and methodological expertise.

Conceptual papers: Conceptual (Theory) papers develop (or challenge) theory without the use of empirical data. There is no particular formula, however a clear contribution to theory is required. Conceptual, theory-developing papers are important sources of renewing and challenging how we approach, describe, think, and analyze organizations. As such, they affect what organizations are, how organizations work and how they change; they also impact what society is and how societies work and change. This means that such papers must acknowledge the complex, contextual, relational and often multidisciplinary nature of theory-development.

"X" and Organization Studies: These are essay-type papers that are provocative, concise (max 7.500 words), and to the point. They may deal with more marginal, repressed, or overlooked topics. Alternatively, they may address topics that need attention because of current trends or events. As this section of the journal is

becoming more established, submissions will go through the regular review processes. We encourage authors to briefly discuss potential ideas with one of the EICs to avoid overlap with already published or in-progress articles.

Perspectives: These articles are written to provide a focused overview of a particular topic that helps to acquaint readers with key concepts. Authors draw attention to relevant articles previously published in OS and other outlets and explain how the focal topic has developed over time. In addition, authors should raise concerns or gaps in knowledge, and suggest avenues for future research. Our first Perspectives article was focused on Strategy-as-Practice (Seidl & Whittington, 2***) and serves as a notable exemplar. The Perspectives article is published in a regular OS issue, and also published online together with the previously published OS articles as part of a virtual issue. Interested authors should discuss their ideas with one of the EICs.

Methods and Methodology: We are introducing a new section – Method/ology - to provide space for discussion and development of concepts concerning methodology and methods. We invite such articles (11.000 words maximum) that legitimize their place in the journal by tackling issues concerning the generation of data for analysis in organization studies. Such topics can include study design, analytical strategies, dilemmas of interpretation, how to construct theory, critique of established methods, as well as knowledge-sociological and philosophical questions. Contributions should not deal simply with method/ology problems as such, instead we encourage thoughtful studies that are developed with reference to, and in the context of, organization studies and the related method/ology challenges. To further explain this new section, we now elaborate on the relevance of methods- and methodology articles in OS.

We are opening up space for Methods and Methodology papers as a way to further strengthen the position and voice of OS in the wider scholarly community. Empirical research relies on methods and methodology that is appropriately grounded in clear understandings concerning principles of knowledge-generation, typically including relationships to philosophy, history, cultures, art, and contemporary societal concerns (such as the present debate on facts in

11

media). Quantitative research has a long history that is associated with clear precedents and expectations regarding ontology, epistemology and selection of appropriate methods. Qualitative research is also situated on strong foundations that, for example, in the case of hermeneutics can be traced back to Schleiermacher and Dilthey (Winch, 1958; Tool, 2014) and the distinction between social (or cultural) science and natural science in the 1880s. We are convinced that the emerging and intensifying discussion of rigour and relevance (Vermeulen, 2005; Hodgkinson and Rousseau, 2009; Kieser, 2009) in management research is one to which scholarly journals such as OS should contribute given our strong tradition and experience with qualitative method/ology in particular. We encourage the submission of articles that tackle ongoing methodological concerns, or provide helpful advice about how to engage with newer approaches related to quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods.

As we have tried to stress above, we envision "Methods and Methodology" (thus method/ology) in the broad sense indicated by *hodos* in the Greek *methodos,* meaning a way to organize in this sense the knowledge-creation process. As such, it is subject to questions of style (aesthetics), ideology (world-view), pragmatics (what works in the field), method (how is empirics generated), politics and ethics (who gets to say what, when, and how), and writing (how ideas are communicated). Methods and Methodology is thus also the domain of author subjectification, and can lead to specific ways of becoming an author and a subsequent fixation on templates, off-the-shelf tools and standard operating procedures. In contrast to such tendencies, we see method/ology as integral to questions about how authors craft themselves and take account of the many choices involved (Nietzsche, 1891) in writing.

Method is always about crafting, and as such relies on a continued sensibility towards the material at hand. Scholars develop new knowledge through studying a phenomenon, event, situation, text, archive, story, or lived practices, to name a few possibilities. It is through a process of crafting that they move towards a text that makes the studied understood; scholars must engage with existing concepts and theoretical frames to get beyond or deepen the already known (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Morgan, 1980; Morgan, 1983; Tsoukas, 1989; Denzin and Lincoln,

1994; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000; Law, 2004). This process might also require the creation of new concepts. Knowledge-creation, the generation of meaningful, beautiful, interesting, critical, useful, relevant, practical, provocative, and/or challenging insights is of course an important role for scholars to pursue and take on (Lyotard, 1979; Rorty, 1979). Scholars are written as they write, by the conventions they use, by the styles they further, by the schools of thought that bestow authority on those that align with them. We agree with Rhodes (2009) who stresses that researchers and writers work always *for* knowledge and not only *with* knowledge for society, or with knowledge for organizations. It is our responsibility to learn to know our knowledge (Foucault, 2007), i.e., to learn to critically work for knowledge, for organizations, in societies.

There is a risk that method becomes a question of applying templates or instruments in a standard/conventional manner. Templates for organizing knowledge-creation help, but they can also be deceptive or seductive. The 'way' (hodos) can become a comfortable autobahn-drive where we lose your sensitivity before the material at hand and focus only on the road and speed, not on where to go or what you see. Instrumental, unreflective ways of using methods (like templates in need of no further explanation or legitimation) is sometimes the reason why the pursuit of meaningful new knowledge looks like a mason adding bricks to a great wall. In such cases, no matter what we have studied, it ends up in the shape of a brick due to the tools in use and the pursuit of finding a hole to fill. Bringing the 'missing stone' is deemed as a sign of having done something significant: identified the gap in the existing wall of knowledge and chipped off the odd shapes of your own brick to make it fit nicely into that w/hole as defined by existing work (Sandberg & Alvesson, 2010). In a big boat there is more boat to attend to than sea to worry about (Tolbert & Zucker, 1996), and we are thus easily led to think the brick should match the wall rather than tell us something about the soil of which it was made. Instead, we are calling for critical-creative-reflexive discussions of method/ology that are contextually sensitive and that emerge as a concern due to struggles with finding a way. Making the knowledge-creation process open to the reader and helping us to know our knowledge is precisely what method/ology can do. No matter the

stringency of method, no matter how rigorously it is applied, whether in qualitative, quantitative or mixed method studies, if it is not used reflexively and critically, there is a danger that method does violence to the material studied (Barthes, 1982). Massumi says that the scientific method can be "...the institutionalized maintenance of sang froid in the face of surprise." (Massumi, 2002: 198). This can mean that method holds our hand and helps us maintain objectivity if we think of this in the context of quantitative methods, but it can also mean that method prevents us from seeing what is new and unique if we think of this in the context of qualitative method.

OS is a journal that encourages scholars to be thrilled and paused in wonder by the skilfully crafted text that exemplifies scholarship deeply related to creative writing (Rhodes, 2001; de Cock, 2000; de Cock and Land, 2006). As part of this appreciation of writing as a creative act, and writing as central to the research process, OS also commits to a view of multi-disciplinary conversations as being important sources of such creative writing (Tsoukas, 2003; Butler, 2009). This means that both a broader and more diverse social science conversation than is typically seen in management journals can fruitfully be incorporated into the creation of relevant knowledge in organization studies. Also this is intensified in what we call critique, to the extent that we aspire to practice critique as an ongoing learning to know our knowledge (Foucault, 1997; Butler, 2002). It is important to note, as Butler does (2002) that this desubjugation co-emerges with self-formation "...when a mode of existence is risked which is unsupported by what he [Foucault] calls the regime of truth." (p. 3-4). OS is committed to support versions of such risk-taking in writing. We stress that method/ology papers are particularly well suited to give room to such creative-critical writing (which goes for all papers that OS publishes) that springs from the kind of risk we associate with more experimental and provocative writings.

Method/ology can thus contribute to the 'genres' of papers that are published in OS. We have tried to show above that this is consistent with and affirms what has previously been said on publishing in OS by editors-in-chief before us. We realize that a passionate scholarship (Courpasson, 2013) and a 'daring to know attitude'

(Holt & den Hond, 2013) are important. However, we draw attention to what we see as lying at the heart of excellent work – creative-critical writing that can take risks and entrepreneurially make sensitive use of material in reflexive ways that opens the knowledge-creation process to the reader. Such texts are more 'writerly', Barthes noted (1974), as they enable the reader to go on writing them.

In closing – towards writing

We recognize this critical-creative style is resonant with Geertz's (1973) anthropological work (Greenblatt, 1997) and Barthes' as pointed out above. In contrast to some interpretations of disciplined imagining, we stress 'imagining' as much as 'disciplined.' We suggest that more experimenting and entrepreneurship will help to keep OS beyond a Kantian enlightenment ideal. We encourage articles that are edgy and push the boundaries of current thinking. And with this approach, we also encourage a sense of playfulness. Nietzsche challenges us to avoid becoming so serious that we do not know how to laugh, play, and dance (Deleuze, 2006). We want to take up that challenge as journal editors by publishing articles that are appropriately grounded in theory and contribute to research in critical-creative ways. But in addition, we ask for engaged, beautiful, provocative and playful writing that can move us to new ways of thinking.

Writing, as we have emphasized, is the most central part of how 'what organization studies researchers do' does its work (to paraphrase Foucault). Style, tone, address, choice of words, poetics, and composition are an important part of the writing process. We believe that emphasizing writing, expression and style, opens up important ideas about how success can be achieved in the pursuit of publishing a research paper or essay. Rather than merely representing a studied reality correctly while making language and writing secondary, a more performative understanding stresses that we can add to, and change the world when we write. We write as researchers to communicate and we communicate to persuade the reader. We agree with Van Maanen (1995) who suggests that the persuasive is the successful, and we understand this as a question of having moved the reader from one position to a new one. A critical aspect of such ability

to move is a question of affect – a quality of writing that we aspire to cultivate.

Disciplined imagining (according to Weick, 1989) should result in theoretical work that is plausible, interesting, aesthetically pleasing, high in narrative rationality, and describes relationships in the world that enables us to learn something new. Success is of course also accuracy in explanations and is related to how much constructive work a theory can do for us as scholars trying to understand human behavior. Moving towards greater theoretical accuracy, Weick reminds us (with reference to Thorngate, 1999: 802), is an aim 'directed at the explainer rather than the objects being explained.' This resonates with Geertz's (1974; see also Greenblatt, 1997) concept of thickness in descriptions. However, as Greenblatt points out, a well-chosen object, act, event, or story to describe will be a richer source to the extent we become acquainted 'with the imaginative universe within which their [people in any culture] acts are signs' (Geertz, 1974: 11). Accuracy and precision are questions related to writing that we call imaginative, critical-creative theorizing. Such writing can move us between the local story and the bigger conceptual picture in ways that still resonate with what we have empirically in focus. When we want imagining to be important, it is essential that theorizing goes hand-in-hand with philosophy's joy for reaching the fringe. Perhaps we are brought back to Nietzsche's 'becoming child' (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009): "I name you three metamorphoses of the spirit: how the spirit shall become a camel, and the camel a lion, and the lion at last a child." (Nietzsche, 1969: 54). OS is a journal that acknowledges the importance of the heavily loaded Camel (tradition, the erudite, scholarly), that has often provided fodder for the fire that roars in the Lion's 'no' (critique, resistance), but is also a journal that continues to fuel up its capacity to affirm and wonder before the child's sacred 'yes' (becoming, movement) that allows inventions of new possibilities. Ultimately, the aim is not to merely contribute to theory, but to change the way we see the world. Being a journal that publishes studies of organizations *in* societies, this is important to OS.

We reiterate our commitment to continue the OS traditions of diversity with respect to gender, geography and content. We encourage the continuation of

multi-, inter-, and cross-disciplinarity, and call for a new type of submissions – method/ology to strengthen the natural connection of quality research with attention to methods, methodology and the process of writing. Although we recognize the ongoing entrepreneurial spirit associated with OS, we endeavour to bring this creative-critical-imaginative-entrepreneurial approach to the fore. Within this approach, we continually remind ourselves that people are at the heart of organizations, organizing and the organized within and between societies; they must not be overlooked. We hope to exercise both stewardship and entrepreneurship in bringing OS through an exciting, imaginative and renewing stage of becoming by building on and building up the vitality of relationships and interactions with readers and writers. This is an exceptional responsibility and a fantastic opportunity that we believe can only be enacted through a solid grounding in tradition and community while simultaneously engaging in ongoing entrepreneurship.

List of References

Alvesson, M. and Sköldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology – new vistas for qualitative research,* London: SAGE.

Bakhtin, M. (1984) Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Ed. And transl. by Caryl Emerson, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barley, S. R., and Kunda, G. (1992). Design and Devition: Surges of Rational and Normative Ideologies of Control in Managerial Discourse, *Administrative Sciences Quarterly,* 37: 363-399.

Barthes, R. (1974) S/Z – an essay, Transl. by Richard Miller, New York: Hill and Wang.

Barthes, R. (1982) Camera Lucida – reflections on photography, Transl. by Richard Howard, New York: Hill and Wang.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis,* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Butler, J. (2001). What is Critique? An essay on Foucault's virtue, *Transversal (online),* 05/2001 (European Institute for Progressive Cultural Politics), eipcp.net/transversal/0806/butler/en (accessed Sept. 10, 2017)

Butler, J. (2009). Critique, Dissent, Disciplinarity, *Critical Inquiry,* 35(4): 773-795.

Chia, R. (1996) *Organizational Analysis as Deconstructive Practice.* Berlin/New York: De Gryter.

Courpasson, D. (2013) On the Erosion of 'Passionate Scholarship'. *Organization Studies*, 34(9): 1243-1249.

Courpasson, D., Arellano-Gault, D., Brown, A. & M. Lounsbury (2008). Organization studies on the lookout? Being read, being listened to. *Organization Studies*, 29(11): 1383–1390.

Cornelissen, J. (2006). Making sense of theory construction: metaphor and disciplined imagination, *Organization Studies,* 27(11): 1579-1597.

Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A Narrative Approach in Organization Studies,* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Collins, A. (1976). Processes in acquiring new knowledge. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro and G. Montague (Eds.) *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge,* Hillsdale, NJ.: Erlbaum.

De Cock, C. (2000). Reflections on fiction, representation, and organization studies: An essay with special reference to the work of Jorge Luis Borges', *Organization Studies,* 21(3): 589-609.

De Cock, C. and Land, C. (2006). Organization/Literature: Exploring the Seam, *Organization Studies,* 27(4): 517-535.

Deleuze, G. (1988). Spinoza – practical philosophy. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, G. (2006). *Nietzsche and Philosophy,* New York: Columbia University Press.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research,* London: SAGE.

Eco, U. (1992). *Interpretation and Overinterpretation,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fine, G.A., & Hallett, T. (2016). Inhabited Institutions in New Directions – Local Sense-Making and Institutional Work in Community Response to New Immigration, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 45 (2).

Foucault, M. (1997) What is Critique?, in *The Politics of Truth*, eds. Sylvère Lotringer and Lysa Hochroth, New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (2007), *The Politics of Truth*. Paris: Semiotext(e).

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures,* London: Fontana Press.

Gulati, R. (2007) "Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research," *The Academy of Management Journal* 50(4): 775-782.

Greenblatt, S. (1997) "The touch of the real," *Representations,* 59: 14-29.

Hickson, D. J., Agersnap, F., Ferraresi, F., Hofstede, G., Kieser, A., Lammers, C. J., and Thoenig, J-C. (1980). Editorial, *Organization Studies*, 1:1-2.

Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M.J. (2006): "Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner's 'Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy'." *Theory and Society,* 35 (2), 213–236.

Hodgkinson, G. P. and Rousseau, D. M. (2009). Bridging the Rigour–Relevance Gap in Management Research: It's Already Happening!, *Journal of Management Studies,* 46(3): 534-546.

Holt, R. and den Hond, F. (2013) Sapere Aude. *Organization Studies,* 1587-1600

Katz, J. A. and W. B. Gartner (1988), 'Properties of emerging organizations', *Academy of Management Review*, 13 (3), 429–442.

Kierkegaard, S. (2006) *Fear and Trembling,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kieser, A. and Leiner, L. (2009). Why the Rigour–Relevance Gap in Management Research Is Unbridgeable, *Journal of Management Studies,* 46(3): 516-533.

Law, J. (2004) *After Method – mess in social science research,* London and New York: Routledge.

Lyotard, J-F. (1979/1984). The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 605–622.

Morgan, G. (1983). *Beyond Method – Strategies for Social Research,* London: SAGE.

Nietzsche, F (1873) *On Truth and Lies in a Extra-moral Sense*, written 1873, first published 1896, available via internet sources: www.nietzsche.holtof.com (accessed Nov. 13th, 2017)

Nietzsche, F. (1891/1978). *Thus spoke Zarathustra – A book for none and all*, New York: Penguin.

Massumi, B. (2002). Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Popper, K. (2003) *The Open Society and its Enemies*, vol 1, London: Routledge, 2003.

Rhodes, C. (2001). *Writing Organization: (Re)presentation and Control in Narratives at Work,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rhodes, C. (2009). After reflexivity: Ethics, freedom and the writing of organization studies. Organization Studies, 30, 653–672.

Rorty, R. (1980). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature,* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Sandberg, J. and Alvesson, M. (2010). Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or problematization?, *Organization,* 18(1): 23-44.

Seidl, D. and Whittington, R. (2014). Enlarging the Strategy-as-Practice Research Agenda: Towards Taller and Flatter Ontologies, *Organization Studies,* 35(10): 1407-1421.

Steyaert, C. (2005) Entrepreneurship: In between what?: On the "frontier" as a discourse of entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 2 (1): 2-16.

Suddaby, R. (2010) Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization, *Academy of Management Review,* 35(3): 346-357.

Thorngate, W. 1976. Possible limits on a science of social behavior. In J. H. Strickland, F. E. Aboud, & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Social psychology in transition*, New York: Plenum, pp. 121-139.

Tolbert, P. S. & Zucker, L. G. (1996). The institutionalization of institutional theory, In S. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies,* London: SAGE, (pp. 175-190).

Tool, A. (2014) Wilhelm Dilthey (1833 – 1911), in Helin, J., Hernes, T., Hjorth, D., and Holt, R. (Eds.) *The Oxford University Press Handbook of Process Philosophy and Organization Studies,* Oxford. Oxford University Press, pp. 129-142.

Tsoukas, H. (1989). The validity of idiographic research explanations, *Academy of Management Review,* 14(4): 451-461.

Tsoukas, H. (2003). Editorial: Continuity and Change for Organization Studies, *Organization studies,* 24(7): 1003-1014.

Van Maanen, J. (1995). Style as Theory, *Organization Science,* 6(1): 133-143.

Vermeulen, F. (2005). On Rigor and Relevance: Fostering Dialectic Progress in Management Research, *Academy of Management Journal,* 48(6): 978-982.

Weick, K. E. 1989. Theory construction as disciplined imagination, *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 516–531.

Weick, K. (1999) Conclusion: Theory construction as disciplined reflexivity: tradeoffs in the 90s, *Academy of Management Review,* 24(4): 797-806.
Weiskopf, R. and Steyaert, C. (2009). Metamorphoses in entrepreneurship studies: towards an affirmative politics of entrepreneuring, In Hjorth, D. and Steyaert, C. (Eds.) *The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 183-201.

Winch, P. (1958). The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy. London, UK: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953/2010). *Philosophical Investigations,* New York: Wiley-Blackwell.