

PUTTING CRITICAL PERFORMATIVITY TO WORK

Call for Papers – Special Issue of *M@n@gement*

Special Issue Guest editors

Isabelle Huault (Université Paris-Dauphine PSL)

Dan Kärreman (Copenhagen Business School)

Véronique Perret (Université Paris-Dauphine PSL)

André Spicer (Cass Business School, City University London)

Deadline: 30th September 2015

The notion of “performativity” (and the idea of the “performative”) has recently gained traction in the organizational studies field (Cabantous & Gond, 2011; Callon, 2007; Huault & Rainelli, 2009) to the extent that some authors have even talked about a “performative turn” (Muniesa, 2014). Broadly speaking, the notion of performativity points to the idea that discourses (e.g. speech acts, theories) are not merely describing reality but are contributing to enact the reality they describe. It is indeed used by scholars from different research traditions, ranging from Actor-Network theory (Callon, 2007), critical management studies (Spicer, Alvesson, & Kärreman, 2009), gender studies (Butler, 1997), etc.

This special issue locates within this broad literature on performativity, and encourages organization scholars to “put critical performativity to work” by revisiting this notion, and moving forward.

An emerging strand of organization theory has sought to bring the ideas of “critics” and “performativity” together, around the concept of *critical performativity*. For example, Spicer and colleagues (2009) outlined the possibilities and pitfalls of critical performativity. They suggest critical performativity involves “active and subversive interventions into management discourse and practice” (Spicer, Alvesson & Kärreman, 2009: 538). They propose some tactics through which this might be achieved such as affirmation, care, pragmatism, engagement with potentialities, and a normative orientation. For them, critical performativity offers a way of critically working with discourses of management towards progressive social change. Doing this, they claim, offers a way out of the pervasive cynicism and studied impracticality, which characterises so much of critical thought. It also offers a way of yoking the booming research agenda around performativity to a more critical and political agenda.

The concept of critical performativity has sparked a small, but rapidly growing literature. Dynamics of critical performativity opens numerous avenues of research, which echo a range of issues in critical management studies such as leadership (Crevani *et al.*, 2010; Alvesson & Spicer, 2012), diversity (Zanoni *et al.*, 2010), human resource management (Jannsens & Steyeart, 2009), business ethics (Prasad & Mills, 2010), organizational change (Morgan & Spicer, 2009), projects (Daniel *et al.*, 2013), management education (Huault & Perret, 2011) or academic conferences (Bell & King, 2010).

Despite the growing number of studies which try to put “critical performativity” to work, a number of serious questions and limitations can be raised. Drawing on the rich tradition of thinking about performativity (Austin, 1959; Butler, 1997; MacKenzie, 2006), some studies have shed light on the mechanisms whereby theories and models affect practices through embedding in tools and devices (Cabantous & Gond, 2011; Callon, 2007; Guerard, Langley & Seidl, 2013). However, it is not clear how the “critical performativity approach” interacts with such perspectives, builds on them or can contribute to them (and vice-versa). For example, from a theoretical or epistemological viewpoint, is critical performativity compatible with an approach such as actor-network-theory (Alcadapani & Hassard, 2010)? How critical perspective can enrich Callon’s “performativity thesis” (Roscoe & Chillias, 2013)? Besides, some have pointed out the extreme difficulties involved in attempting to put critical performativity into practice in the day-to-day running of an enterprise (King & Learmonth, 2014). Others have pointed out that traditional cannons of critical thinking will severely impede this enterprise (Hartmann, 2013). From an empirical viewpoint, what are the “engines” required to foster the ideals of critical management studies (Leca, Gond & Barin-Cruz, 2014)?

Given these road-blocks, a recent contribution has suggested that a more realistic approach would be a kind of toned down performativity aimed at progressive rather than radical social change (Wickert & Schaefer, 2014). These questions suggest that critical performativity might be an idea that is still very much in the prototyping stage.

In this special issue, we want to put the idea of critical performativity to work. We invite theoretical and empirical contributions, which develop, apply and critique the concept of critical performativity. We are particularly interested in contributions, which relate these ideas to issues of management and organizations – broadly conceived.

Contributions to this special issue might cover some of the following indicative, but not exhaustive, issues:

- Applying critical performativity. How can the idea of critical performativity be applied to a range of key concepts in the study of organization and management such as identity, institutions, space, strategy, business models, management tools, the study of markets and finance, technology, social movements . . .
- Strategies for critical performativity. What potential strategies, tactics and practices could scholars and practitioners interested pursuing critical performativity adopt? What might we learn from other areas of practices such as the visual and performing arts about how to practice critical performativity? How successful or useful are these strategies?
- Education for critical performativity. Should critical performativity be built into management education? Can critical management education be performative? In what ways is this possible?
- Studying critical performativity. What methodological strategies might be used to actually study instances of critical performativity? What are the potential insights and blind spots of these methodological tactics? In what ways are some methods like critical action-research, performative?
- Questioning critical performativity. What are some of the shortcomings with the concept of critical performativity? To what extent can research on “critical performativity” build on, and contribute to the broader stream of performative studies? What are potential alternatives to the concept of critical performativity, which might overcome these problems and open up a different set of possibilities?

Process and Deadline

Deadline: Papers must be received by **September 30th 2015**

Papers for the special issue should be prepared according to M@n@gement's guidelines for authors (http://www.management-aims.com/submission_en.html) and must be submitted to the online submission system of M@n@gement, **before September 30th, 2015:** http://aims.bepress.com/management_submission/

When submitting your full paper, please include a **cover letter** that explicitly states that you would like your paper to be considered for this special issue.

Biography of the Editors

Isabelle Huault is a Professor of Organization Studies at Université Paris Dauphine-PSL. Her research interests lie in the social studies of finance and critical management studies. She has published her work in *Organization Studies*, *Organization*, *M@n@gement*, *Management Learning*, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. Her most recent book is *Finance: The Discreet Regulator* (Palgrave Mac Millan, 2012, with Chrystelle Richard).

Isabelle.huault@dauphine.fr

Dan Kärreman is Professor in Management and Organization Studies at Copenhagen Business School, and Professor in Management at Royal Holloway, University of London. He is also affiliated to the Lumos group at Lund University. His research interests include CMS, knowledge work, identity in organizations, leadership, organizational control and research methodology. His work has been published in the *Academy of Management Review*, *Human Relations*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Organization*, *Organization Science*, and *Organization Studies*, among others. His most recent book is *Qualitative Methodology and Theory Development: Mystery as Method* (SAGE 2011, with Mats Alvesson).

dk.ikl@cbs.dk

Véronique Perret is Professor in Management at Université Paris-Dauphine PSL. She is a member of the DRM Research Center and Head of DRM-Most, the critical management research team. Her research focuses on critical approaches to management in two main fields: the relation between Art and management and the spatial dimensions of management practices. She has published several articles on these topics in edited books and in refereed academic journals such as *Organization* or *M@n@gement*.

Veronique.perret@dauphine.fr

André Spicer is a Professor of Organizational Behaviour at Cass Business School in London. His most recent book is *'The Wellness Syndrome'* (First Edition, Forthcoming with Carl Cederström). He is currently working on a project investigating stupidity in organisations.

Andre.Spicer.1@city.ac.uk

About M@n@gement

M@n@gement is an open-access (free) academic journal that publishes quality articles derived from rigorous research which can improve our knowledge of organizational phenomena. Authors are encouraged to submit papers that promote innovative topics, approaches and methods in management, organization theory and strategy. Because it is an electronic review, M@n@gement welcomes manuscripts featuring non-traditional features (e.g., video files, audio material, or photos). All papers undergo a double-blind reviewing process.

A Special Issue has been published in 2013 to celebrate M@n@gement's 15th anniversary featuring papers from (among others): S. Clegg, P. Jarzabkowski, T. Pinch, A. Langley, L. Rouleau, A. Spicer, E. Vara, H. Willmott. (cf. vol. 16, n.5: http://www.management-aims.com/vol16_en.html).

Recent Special Issues of M@n@gement have focused on *Institutional Theory* (Guest editors: B. Forgues, R. Greenwood, I. Martí, P. Monin and P. Walgenbach, 2012, vol. 15, n. 5); *Critical Management Studies and Management Education* (Guest editors: S. Clegg, F. Dany and Ch. Grey, 2011, vol. 14, n. 5); and *Business Models* (Guest editors: X. Lecoq, B. Demil, J. Ventura, 2010, vol. 13, n. 4).

For more information: http://www.management-aims.com/about_en.html

References

- Alcadipani, R. & Hassard, J (2010). Actor-Network Theory, organizations and critique: towards a politics of organizing. *Organization*, 17, 4, 419-435.
- Alvesson, M. & Spicer, A. (2012). A stupidity-based theory of organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49,7, 1194-1220.
- Austin J.L (1959). *How to do Things with Words*, Second Edition. Oxford University Press
- Bell, E. & King, D. (2010). The Elephant in the Room: Critical Management Studies Conferences as a Site of Body Pedagogics. *Management Learning*, 41, 4: 429-442.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. Routledge
- Cabantous, L. & Gond, J.-P. (2011). Rational decision-making as a “performative praxis”. Explaining rationality's éternel retour, *Organization Science*, 22, 3, 573-586.
- Callon M. (2007). What does it mean to say that economics is performative ?, in MacKenzie D., Muniesa F., & Siu L. (Eds.), *Do Economists Make Markets?: On the Performativity of Economics*. Princeton University Press, 311-357.
- Crevani, L., Lindgren, M. & Packendorff, J. (2010). Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26, 1, 77-86.
- Daniel, S., Dainty A. & Brookes N. (2013). Thinking the ontological politics of managerial and critical performativities: An examination of project failure. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 29, 3, 282-291.
- Guerard, S. Langley, A. & Seidl, D. (2013). Rethinking the concept of performance in strategy research: Towards a performativity perspective. *M@n@gement*, 16,5, 566-578.

- Hartmann, R. K. (2013). Subversive functionalism: For a less canonical critique in critical management studies. *Human Relations*, OnlineFirst Oct 10, 1-22.
- Huault, I. & Rainelli, H. (2009). Market shaping as an answer to ambiguities: The case of credit derivatives. *Organization Studies*, 30, 5, 549-577.
- Huault, I. & Perret, V (2011). Critical management education as a vehicle for emancipation. *M@n@gement*, 14, 5, 281-309.
- Janssens, M. & Steyaert, C. (2009). HRM and Performance: A Plea for Reflexivity in HRM Studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 1, 143-155.
- King, D. & Learmonth, M. (2014). Can critical management studies ever be 'practical'? A case study in engaged scholarship. *Human Relations*, forthcoming.
- Leca, B, Gond, J.-P. & Barin-Cruz, L. (2014). Building critical performativity engines for deprived communities. The construction of popular cooperative incubators in Brazil. *Organization*, 21, 4, 683-712.
- MacKenzie, D (2006). *An Engine, Not a Camera*. MIT Press.
- Morgan, G. & Spicer, A. (2009). Critical approaches to organizational change, in Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T. & Willmott, H. (eds), *Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Sage.
- Muniesa, F. (2014). *The Provoked Economy. Economic Reality and the Performative Turn*. Routledge.
- Prasad, A & Mills, A (2010). Critical management studies and business ethics: A synthesis and three research trajectories for the coming decade. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 2, 227-237.
- Roscoe, P. & Chillas, S. (2013). The state of affairs: critical performativity and the online dating industry. *Organization*, Online first, 3 May.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M & Kärreman, D. (2009). Critical Performativity: The Unfinished Business of Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 62, 4, 537-560.
- Wickert, C. & Schaefer, S. (2014). Toward a progressive understanding of performativity in critical management studies. *Human Relations*, first published on line, February.
- Zanoni P., Janssens M., Benschop Y. & Nkomo, S. (2010). Unpacking Diversity, Grasping Inequality: Rethinking Difference Through Critical Perspectives. *Organization*, 17, 1, 9-29.