Gail T. Fairhurst
Linda Putnam

Organizations as Discursive Constructions

In this article we examine the relationship between discourse and organization. It is a relationship of growing interest in the communication literature as organizations are increasingly framed as discursive constructions. However, such framing appears subject to at least 3 interpretations. First, an organization may be cast as an already formed object with features and outcomes reflected in discourse. Second, organizations may be seen in a perpetual state of becoming through the ways that the properties of discourse shape organizing. Finally, organizations may be grounded in action, anchored in social practices and discursive forms. Moreover, each of these 3 orientations provides a different cast to the terms discourse *and* Discourses. *We use these interpretations and different notions about discourse to explore the research traditions on organizational language and social interaction. We contend that all 3 orientations are necessary and should operate simultaneously to reveal a complex view of the organization-discourse relationship.*

An increasing number of scholars see discourse analysis as the new frontier for advances in the organizational sciences (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000a, 2000b; Grant, Keenoy, & Oswick, 1998). As Putnam and Fairhurst (2001) illustrated in their recent literature review, organizational discourse analysis crosses sociolinguistics; conversation analysis; cognitive linguistics; pragmatics, including speech acts, ethnography of speaking, and interaction analysis; semiotics; rhetorical and literary studies; critical discourse analysis; and postmodern studies.

In this burgeoning field of work, scholars increasingly assert that organizations are discursive constructions because discourse is the very foundation upon which organizational life is built (e.g., Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000a; Boden, 1994; Deetz, 1992; Taylor & Cooren, 1997). However, such framing appears subject to at least three interpretations that we explore in this article. Some researchers see an organization as an *already formed object* or entity with features and outcomes reflected

in discourse. Other scholars see organizations in a constant *state of becoming* through the ways that the properties of discourse and patterns of interaction shape organizing. Still others see organizations as *grounded in action*, anchored in social practices and discursive forms.

Why should we try to understand these different orientations? We offer three arguments. First, researchers may experience and reference a confounded notion of the discourse-organization relationship, even in the same article or book chapter (Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). Errors occur most often with analysts who are unfamiliar with discourse analysis and who gloss or confuse the key functions of discourse or treat it as simply a methodology (for example, the speech act analysis of Ford & Ford, 1995; the structured observation studies based on Mintzberg (1973; see Gronn, 1982, 2000). However, discourse analysts who lack organizational backgrounds also fail to problematize the larger context and ignore the many ways in which an organization writ large surfaces in the discourse (see Putnam & Fairhurst, 2001). In either case, research that muddles or even hides these assumptions limits what we can learn about organizations or organizational discourse.

Second, the object, becoming, and grounded in action orientations interrelate and presuppose inherent relationships with each other. Because all three possess a certain veridicality, collective inattention to these orientations prevents organizational discourse analysts from addressing questions that could further the field's theoretical development beyond its current status of loosely amalgamated approaches (Oswick, Keenoy, & Grant, 2000). For example, just what is the status of an organization as an entity (for example, features, functions, identities, etc.)? How is the leap made from "organizing" to this status? How does the "entity" get anchored in discursive forms and the continuous flow of conduct? In what ways are organizations not considered discursive constructions?

Third, the presumed links between discourse and organization as object, becoming, or grounded in action are ontological and should be considered independent of the theories that fall in a particular orientation. The challenge in metatheoretical debates about communication, in general, and organizational communication, specifically, is to recognize similarities between two or more theories while also preserving their differences. Thus, our goal is not to simplify or reconcile diverse literatures, but rather to demonstrate how ontological shifts rooted in the discourse-organization relationship recast assumptions and reframe relationships, especially within key debates about micro-macro processes and agency-structure, issues that are central to organizational communication. The outcome we seek is a healthy agonism among orientations.

The other challenge associated with this metatheoretical debate concerns the potential status of organizational discourse as a subdiscipline

of organizational communication. As noted, organizational discourse studies is an area defined by its multidisciplinarity, diversity of perspectives, and attendant problems with scope (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b; Oswick et al., 2000). We see no need to advocate a unified theory. Rather, we strive for what Craig (1999) identified as "a common awareness of certain complementarities and tensions among different types of . . . theory, so it is commonly understood that these different types of theory cannot develop in total isolation from each other *but must engage each other in argument*" (p. 124, emphasis added). Our goal is to demonstrate how the three orientations are engaging each other in argument and thus may contribute to the emerging subdisciplinary status of organizational discourse.

Discourse, Communication, and Organizations

Our discussion of the ontological link between discourse and organization certainly benefits from previous metatheoretical work on the communicative constitution of organizations (McPhee & Zaug, 2000; Smith, 1993), although we contend that "communication" and "discourse" are not synonymous.[1] For many organizational analysts, discourse embodies cultural meanings that enable the social and communicative; discourse is a medium *for* social interaction (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Hence, the study of language in use and interaction process is the focus of discourse analysts. For others, discourse refers to forms of talk and social texts that are loosely coupled from meaning and relatively autonomous from communicative processes (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b). A concern for discursive formations encapsulates but goes beyond the linguistic. Communication, as distinct from discourse, is a related but broader construct that encompasses research residing outside discourse studies, for example, network analysis, information processing, and message flow. Thus, a language emphasis distinguishes the discursive from the more general communicative approach.

We also benefit from metatheoretical discussions of discourse, a term whose meanings are multifarious and in danger of "standing for everything, and thus nothing" (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b, p. 1128). Following Alvesson and Kärreman, we distinguish between *discourse* that refers to the study of talk and text in social practices and *Discourses* as general and enduring systems of thought (see also Gee, 1999). Viewed as a local accomplishment, discourse is a medium for social interaction, in which the details of language in use and interaction process are central concerns of analysts (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Talk-in-interaction encompasses the processes of sending and receiving messages, that is, conversing. It is "the doing" of organizational discourse, whereas text is "the done," or the material representation of discourse in spoken or

recorded forms (Taylor & Van Every, 2000). Even though written documents are the simplest way to conceive of organizational texts (for example, emails, reports), verbal routines inscribed in organizations, like performance appraisals or job interviews, also exist as texts and are reconfigured through continued use (Derrida, 1988).

In contrast, the term Discourses refers to general and enduring systems for the formation and articulation of ideas in a historically situated time (Foucault, 1976, 1980). In this view, power/knowledge relations are established in culturally standardized Discourses, formed by constellations of talk, ideas, logics, and assumptions that constitute objects and subjects. These Discourses order and naturalize the world in particular ways (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b; Foucault, 1976, 1980).

Analysts often falsely assume a consensus instead of a range of positions regarding the meaning of discourse/Discourses. Scholars also continue to struggle with the common problem of how to move beyond the discourse of language in use to address the Discourses that reside as a powerful force beyond the text. However, despite Alvesson and Kärreman's (2000b) focus on the formative powers of discourse/Discourses, the concept of organization in their discussion remains elusive. We are less concerned with their inattention to the nature of organizations than we are with their failure to unpack the discourse-organization relationship and to recognize implicit priorities placed on discourse, Discourses, or organization.

We address this relationship by introducing the object, becoming, and grounded in action orientations. Importantly, because this discussion is an ontological site "under construction," that is, a locale where scholars routinely contest the various meanings for the relationship, our goal is not to develop a reified typology nor to designate the "right" or "best" orientation. The function of theory, as Deetz (1992, p. 74) purported, is conception not definition. In other words, theory should direct attention and focus rather than characterize the intrinsic nature of stable objects or mirror fixed attributes among them. Thus, we seek to unpack these questions: What is highlighted and what is obscured within a particular view of the discourse-organization relationship? How did this orientation come to exist? How do orientations coexist and interrelate in the production and reproduction of organizations? In short, the question is not what is the best way to view the discourse-organization relationship, but what are we able to see, think, and talk about if we conceive of the relationship in terms of one orientation versus another?

After we introduce each orientation, we situate its use in theory and in the rapidly growing organizational discourse literature, and then we examine how each approach informs key debates over macro-micro concerns, agency, action, and structure. In addition, we distinguish among

different definitions of discourse and Discourses in each approach. We feel that these three approaches represent the clearest demarcation among the varieties of the discourse-organization relationship.

However, one caveat is in order. In each of the three orientations, we discuss theories and literatures that are often an umbrella of diverse positions. For example, research by critical scholars fits within all three perspectives (for example, Giddens, 1979, 1984; Hardy, Palmer, & Phillips, 2000; Reed, 2000, 2001). In such instances, we specify our lines of demarcation and the general trends in each area. Finally, after the three orientations are examined, we consider their combined use and advocate how scholars can engage in interplay among the perspectives to reap the contributions of each.

The Object Orientation

The first orientation casts the organization as an already formed object or entity with discursive features and outcomes (see Table 1). The organization exists prior to discourse, remains stable over time, and has specified features or components that shape language use. Historically, the object orientation is fundamental to at least three philosophical traditions. First is the research that treats an organization as a container "with height, depth and breadth, occupying a relatively fixed space and manifesting an interior and exterior" (Smith, 1993, p. 12). Discourse, when considered, is an artifact located inside or outside of the container (Axley, 1984). When researchers pose the question, "What do we know about discourse within organizations?" they adopt a perspective consistent with this heritage and its inattention to the origins of the container.

Researchers who focus on the products of social construction represent a second philosophical tradition that adopts the object orientation to organizations. In this view, the organization is a socially constructed product, but "the product acts back upon the producer" and is experienced as something other than a human creation (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 61). Thus, the socially constructed organization appears objective and independent of its creators. Actors orient to organizations through their language use and treat them as objects with realities of their own. These discourses then reconstitute the object, a theme developed by Foucault (1972).

Finally, critical scholars who emphasize the material aspects of organizations (realism) fit the third group of researchers who employ the object orientation. Often posed as a counterpoint to relativism, realism is the philosophy that espouses a social reality that is causally separate from actors (Hikins, 1990; Parker, 1998; Tsoukas, 2000). Thus, beliefs and ideologies expressed in discourse have material consequences and

Table 1.		Object	Becoming	Grounded in Action
Three Orientations to the Discourse-Organization Relationship	Definition	Already formed object with discursive features or outcomes.	Organization in a state of becoming; discourse is formative.	Organization grounded in action and discursive forms.
	Variations	Discourse as artifact, organization as black box.	Organizing emerges as language in use and interaction process.	Organization emerges in laminated accounting process.
		Linguistic variation marks boundaries of speech communities.	Organizing emerges in power/knowledge systems.	Organizations emerge as continually reproduced social systems.
		Organization reduced to key components that produce discourse.		Organizations emerge in associations between humans and objects.
	Emerging emphasis	Status of organization as an entity.	Emergent, organizing properties of discourse.	The dureé or the continuous flow of conduct; how the global is anchored in the local.
	Individual-organization relationship	Top-down; model of organization distinct from and dominant to model of person.	Bottom-up; model of person generates "organizing."	From within; model of person an active component of model of organization.
	Macro-micro	Separate but interactive.	Separate but interactive.	Indifferent to or rejects.
	Agency-structure	Organization is portrayed as detached from members' actions; agency is untheorized or powerfully constrained.	Favors agency over structure.	Aims for balance; agency is an active component structure.
	Model of actor	Unaware or partially aware.	Focuses on what actors know.	Focuses on what actors know but allows for unintended consequences.
	Critique	Downplays the formative power of discourse.	Moving from "organizing" to "organization."	Bias toward agency that minimizes contextual constraints.
		Reifies the organization.	Relativism.	

real constraints (economic and physical) that justify, obscure, or mystify the workings of power. Critical realism contends that organizations, once constructed, become objects with material constraints around which actors must orient (Reed, 2000, 2001).

The links between discourse research and the above intellectual traditions are sometimes explicit and sometimes implicit, especially when the content under study (for example, leadership) dominates the article. Thus, if the researcher treats the organization as a preformed object, the investigator needs to understand what kind of object it is. For example, dis-

course might emerge as an interesting artifact within a black box in which little is known and said about the organization itself. For others, the organization is one or more speech communities or subcultures where linguistic variation marks the boundaries of these entities. For still others, the organization might recede into the background with one or more of its components actively producing or revealing discourse. Whether the organization is a black box, a speech community, or reduced to a few key components, the object orientation holds. The organization's ontological status is assumed, questions about its origins or maintenance are downplayed, and discourse is separate from the organization and its social context.

To illustrate, studies of discourse as language in use embrace different treatments of the organization as an object. Taylor's (1987) investigation of discourse in a British financial institution and Gordon's (1983) study of hospital language focused on the way slang is used to create group solidarity and rapport within preformed organizations. Organizations function as different contexts or black boxes for examining the intergroup dynamics, a phenomenon that could surface in many other contexts.

Bastien (1992) reported on a corporate merger as the integration of two bounded and distinct organizations with divergent language features. Treating each organization as a reified community, he examined technical terms that reveal code switching or linguistic divergence between the communities. Studies on ethnography of speaking also focus on organizations as speech communities. These studies privilege preexisting groups as producers of discourse, such as contrasting newcomers with veterans (Sigman, 1986; Van Maanen, 1973), identifying occupational communities (Philipsen, 1992), and examining in-groups and out-groups (Fairhurst, 1993; Fortado, 1998).

Several types of critical language analyses also embrace the object orientation by focusing on organizational domination. For example, Prasad (1995) pointed out how a new information system produces talk that personifies the computer. The information system as a pre-existing entity engenders a love–hate relationship in which organizational members blame and simultaneously depend on technology. Although language is the key to understanding this paradox, the researcher treats the information system as an object that produces discursive practices.

Key Debates and the Object Orientation

How does the object orientation influence key debates? Debates over macro-micro and agency-structure are viewed in particular ways in this perspective precisely because actors' discourse and organization are situated at distinct levels of analysis. According to Hosking (1988), "to emphasize the condition of being organized is to treat "the organiza-

tion" as an identifiable entity, or unit of analysis, which exists independently of participants' activities or sentiments" (p. 149). For Hosking, this is a top-down approach in which the model of organization (top) is not only distinct from, but dominant to, the model of person (bottom). As such, neither discourse (the microactivity of actors), nor organization (the macro) are problematized in terms of each other, so researchers have little motivation to see them as anything but separate, yet interactive. The distinction between action and structure also holds because the organization is, in effect, portrayed as detached from the actions of its members. As such, the organizational participant as an agent is often left untheorized (Hosking, 1988), or agency is theorized amid powerful organizational constraints (Reed, 2000, 2001).

An untheorized agent in an already formed organization is a stance that analysts adopt either for pragmatic reasons or because the researcher believes it to be descriptively valid (Hosking, 1988). Pragmatic reasons may underlie studies that follow sociolinguistic and ethnographic speaking traditions and that use the object approach to investigate the organization writ large, linguistic boundaries, or boundary integration of preexistent speech communities. The organization as a complex entity with formal properties is central to the study of speech communities with extant histories and cultures. Discourse, in turn, is reflective, not formative, of the boundaries of these communities. The organization is often writ large as a context while discourse is formative of lower level concepts like group solidarity or rapport. However, these concepts often appear as epiphenomena and not intrinsic to the organization (Hosking, 1988). Although the net effect in both types of studies is to deemphasize agency, we find less to quibble with in research that adopts the object orientation for pragmatic reasons as opposed to container view studies that embrace the object orientation as the only descriptively valid view of the discourse-organization relationship.

Reed (2000, 2001) and other critical scholars have demonstrated that when the agent is theorized but constrained by powerful organizational forces, the locus of observation shifts to social, political, and economic contexts and to the hegemonic and material constraints that often lie beyond an actor's awareness. By casting organizations into the background and placing key components like ideologies and power/authority structures in the foreground, the features that constrain, justify, obscure, or mystify the interests of the powerful come to light (Mumby, 2001).

This approach has introduced considerable variety in the way that theorists define discourse. Some critical scholars have shifted from discourse to Discourses (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) or tried to accommodate both (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b; Fairclough, 1993). These scholars trace linguistic patterns across broad contextual arenas as opposed

to doing detailed microanalyses of discourse. This inability to describe and detail language patterns has led some analysts to claim that critical discourse studies are "discourse-lite." In contrast, the shift to Discourses has filled a gap in traditional language studies that often ignores the powerful cultural and institutional forces that lie beyond language use in any given text (Deetz, 1992; Derrida, 1988; Foucault, 1972). Thus, the move to Discourses aims to address the macroprocesses of discourse that embody microactions. In doing so, the object orientation downplays or ignores the formative powers of discourse in shaping organizations, an issue that is addressed in the next perspective.

The Becoming Orientation

A number of language analysts reject the object orientation and highlight the dynamic processes of discourse in organizing (Table 1). Scholars within this orientation aim to uncover "how organizations organize in the first place, continue to stay organized, and sometimes un-organize" (Hawes, 1974, p. 498). As a reaction against the long history of reifying organizations in functionalist work, these scholars treat organizations as a state of becoming. They privilege the processes of organizing and the way that discourse creates, sustains, and transforms these processes. Hence, they focus on the question, "What is organizing about discourse?" As with the object approach, researchers examine both discourse and Discourses in the becoming orientation.

In this perspective, discourse exists prior to organizations because the properties of language and interaction produce organizing. Specifically, organizing emerges through linguistic forms that signal relational differences (such as, requests versus commands), align group members into categories (high versus low status), legitimate actions (affirm versus reject), enact powerful versus powerless speech forms (for instance, interruptions, hesitations, nonfluencies, forms of address), or signal domination (specifically, monopolizing turn taking and controlling topic shifts). This perspective, then, actively rejects the role of language as an artifact and embraces discourse as constituting the micro- and macroaspects of organizations.

Research on speech acts, storytelling performances, symbolic interaction, rhetorical and literary perspectives, and some Foucauldian discourse analyses illustrate this perspective, particularly in the ways that conversational performances enact organizational events and the ways that members interpret these events. For example, Donnellon, Gray, and Bougon (1986) demonstrated how discourse produces organizing through legitimating a decision to strike. Reliance on linguistic indirection, argumentative appeals, and emotional reactions creates a state of equivocal-

ity that affirms decisions and shapes organizational actions toward a strike outcome. Helmer's (1993) critical ethnography of a race track revealed that storytelling performances create and sustain political stratifications in power, authority, and gender between administration and horsemen, chemists and horsemen, and men and women. Finally, Barrett, Thomas, and Hocevar (1995) demonstrated how discourse in a Total Quality Management program transforms and maintains the way workers relate to one another through forming new meanings in their environment.

The becoming perspective not only treats discourse as language in use but it also focuses on Discourses that reside in power/knowledge systems. From a Foucauldian view, these bodies of knowledge are not reducible to linguistic properties (du Gay, Salaman, & Rees, 1996). Hence, Discourses in the becoming orientation also constitute organizational forms and shape the contexts in which these forms emerge.

When a Foucauldian approach is used, researchers emphasize the constitutive power of Discourses relative to nondiscursive, natural, or material conditions that construct subjects and social relations (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983; Foucault, 1972). Analysts studying Discourses as power/knowledge configurations often focus on the sociohistorical "level" (for example, Knights & Morgan, 1991), although these configurations come to life in particular social contexts and practices. Discussions of power also focus on micropractices that discipline actors even in mundane activities, while revealing the plurality of Discourses from which actors may choose but also resist (Foucault, 1979; Knights & Morgan, 1991). Agency is thus conceived as both passive and active. Finally, Foucauldian discourse analysis typically rejects representational views of language by endorsing the indeterminacy of power/knowledge relationships and meaning formations (Derrida, 1976, 1988; Foucault, 1972).

To illustrate, Holmer-Nadesan (1997) employed Foucault to examine the Discourses of personality testing as they constitute power in the workplace. She observed that the Discourses of psychological testing divide employees into subjectively constructed categories of "healthy" and "normal" under the guise of objective, rational assessment. The Discourses of these exams then function as a powerful self-disciplinary technique for individuals to situate themselves vis-à-vis "normative" behavioral standards for organizational members, ones often rooted in gender and racial biases. Thus, the language of labeling in the becoming perspective shapes organizational identities and normative behaviors.

Key Debates and the Becoming Orientation

How does the becoming orientation influence key debates? Debates over macro-micro and agency-structure evolve in particular ways because the organizing potential of actors' discourse *or* Discourses substitutes for

the organization. In Hosking's (1988) terms, this bottom-up approach directs attention away from the presumed whole toward component parts that, admittedly, can be conceptualized in numerous ways. Thus, research traditions and conceptions of discourse in this perspective are diverse, but united by the belief that discourse exists prior to organizations and organizing occurs through language use, interaction process, or discursive formations, or some combination thereof.

Because attention shifts from viewing the organization as a static condition to viewing it as a dynamic process, analysts within this orientation emphasize agency over structure. However, Hosking (1988) argued that a "sufficient model of person" as the "bottom" unit of analysis is dependent upon how much actors function as agents in the enactment of organizing (p. 150). Usually this means tying actors' sense making to actions and emphasizing that which socially constructing actors know. Thus, whereas critical theory focuses on social, political, and economic concerns often outside an actor's awareness, the becoming orientation incorporates contexts and constraints that actors recognize and use in organizing. The predisposition to favor agency over structure generates criticisms of this perspective. In the case of Foucauldian discourse analysis (and social constructionist orientations that lack a realist bent), critics challenge the relativism of this approach and the subjugation of the material to the discursive world (Reed, 2000, 2001).

Foucault's work and that of others in the postmodern tradition supposedly eradicate key dualisms like agency and structure (Knights, 1997; Townley, 1997), although organizational Foucauldian scholars, such as Knights and Townley, have been criticized on these grounds. Newton (1998) argued that these analysts leave the dualism unresolved because they repress the subject and minimize agency relative to disciplinary power. Newton's view is that until more Foucauldian analyses move beyond the programmatic prescriptions of disciplinary power to focus on how agents wrestle with these prescriptions in specific contexts of marked power imbalances, the dualism persists. Clearly the active and passive nature of agency within Foucaudian analyses generates criticism from all sides.

For the language in use approaches, the macro-micro distinction nearly collapses with the substitution of "organizing" for "organization." However, scholars utilizing this orientation usually presume that over time the aggregation or synthesis of discursive forms in micro-organizing produces the (macro) organization. Unfortunately, researchers have difficulty specifying how to move from "organizing" and the ways that talk creates social structure to the complex social form "organization" (Cooren & Fairhurst, in press; McPhee & Zaug, 2000). Just how do discursive forms aggregate and synthesize, especially when they com-

bine with other interaction patterns over time to shape an organization? The nature of this synthesis remains both a conceptual and an empirical question and the inability to address it in the becoming perspective marginalizes the macroconcept of organization. By contrast, the grounded in action perspective jointly conceives of organizing and organization.

The Grounded in Action Orientation

Scholars who focus on the object orientation ask, "What do we know about discourse within organizations?" and those who focus on the becoming orientation query, "What is organizing about discourse?" Those who emphasize organizations as grounded in action ask, "How is the 'organization' anchored in what Giddens (1979, 1984) refers to as the *dureé* or the continuous flow of discursive conduct?" (Table 1).

Influenced by the work of ethnomethodologists, structurationists, and actor-network theorists, these scholars aim to retain a balance between action and structure. However, these theorists also react against the shortcomings of the becoming orientation, namely inadequate explanations of the constancies of organizational life and an inability to account for the ways that organizations develop identities and act (Cooren & Taylor, 1997; Taylor & Van Every, 2000). Although it is tempting to treat the grounded in action orientation as simply a higher level of analysis that combines the object and becoming perspectives, the grounded approach is really a separate perspective that treats action and structure as mutually constitutive. Thus, the organization never assumes the form of an identifiable entity because it is anchored at the level of social practices and discursive forms. This view of discourse also privileges language in use over the power/knowledge Discourses.

The grounded in action orientation contends that structure is organized from within and endogenous to action (Garfinkel, 1967). This contention does not preclude a larger social order in which local action is a constitutive part. As actors describe and account for their actions, they objectify events and attribute a factual quality to their worlds; however, these created-from-within worlds are reflexively organized through their own particulars (Boden, 1994; Garfinkel, 1967). In other words, the unfolding details of organizing influence and are influenced by a reflexive immersion in the whole setting and ongoing stream of experience at a particular time and place.

Boden (1994) combined both ethnomethodology and conversation analysis with a detailed orientation to interaction's "ongoing stream" (that is, turn taking, adjacency pairs). Hence, she applied the grounded in action perspective to the nature of organizing and the temporal and

sequential details of organization, rather than to organiza*tions* as empirical objects. This view extended the becoming approach by demonstrating how structure is found in action, how the historical is situated in the present, and how the global is firmly anchored in the local.

Consequently, unlike researchers who see organizations as arising from aggregated or synthesized microprocesses, Boden's (1994) conception of an organization emerged in "lamination." In this process, members draw from past circumstances, overarching organizational rationalities, or rules and structural forms, and select those features that are immediate and locally relevant to their behavior. Selections from past practices applied to the here and now laminate or layer one upon the other as conversations unfold. Organizations emerge, in effect, in a laminated accounting process in which the global, enduring, and structural collapse into immediate action in a self-organizing system of relevancies. With this emphasis on social practices, Boden retains ethnomethodology's indifference toward the macro-micro distinction.

Research that employs Giddens's (1979, 1984) structuration theory also illustrates how organizations are grounded in action. Giddens asserted a "duality of structure," whereby structure is both the medium and the outcome of social action. Structure is recast as rules and resources, while social systems are sets of practices patterned in time and space and layered to form institutions. Structure in this theory is both enabling and constraining, as demonstrated both by the way that organizations shape language patterns and by the way that discourse shapes organizational processes.

Two examples illustrate how structuration theory fits the grounded in action orientation. Banks (1994) examined how flight attendants use discourse drawn from rules and resources to reconstitute and resist the airline institutions that shape them. In particular, through crafting and recrafting of the self within discourse, flight attendants shape the very institutions that shape them. Adaptive structuration theory also employs the grounded in action perspective by bringing together the inherent structures of technology, the social processes that mediate them, and the outcomes that shape new forms of social interaction and technology (DeSanctis & Poole, 1994; Poole & DeSanctis, 1992). In this research, the organization is grounded in discourse through the ways that language imports organizational rules and resources and then simultaneously produces organizations by shaping structures and technological forms.

Yet another theoretical perspective that attempts to balance action and structure while rejecting the macro-micro distinction is actor-network theory (Callon & Latour, 1981; Latour, 1994). Similar to Boden (1994) and Giddens (1979, 1984), Latour's "organization" never actually exists as an identifiable entity, but rather is located solely at the level

of social practice. However, Latour's unique contribution is his focus on the role of objects (for example, technologies, tools, documents), all of which have an institutional origin with inscribed qualities that enable and constrain human actors.

Objects embody the constancies of organizational life in that they endure beyond the time and place of a given interaction, yet they are present to mediate future conversations. Objects and their qualities, though, are not merely resources for actors to draw upon, as a structurationist might argue; they transform and are themselves transformed by human actors. Thus, agency lies neither in subject nor object, but in a joint mediation between the built-in properties of objects and the intentions and purposes of human subjects. The actors become strings of associations between humans and objects whose joint capacities exert agency. Unlike earlier approaches, the "organization" emerges from associations among human actors and objects whose institutional origins carry the traces of past organizing (Cooren & Fairhurst, in press).

Drawing inspiration from Latour, Taylor and Van Every (2000) argue that organizations emanate from the intersection of conversation and text.[2] Conversation is the "site" of an emerging organization because individuals adhere to the rules and protocols of social interaction. An organization depends on conversation for its activity and sustainability. If conversation represents the dynamics of organizing, text becomes the built-in structures of language or "surface" from which an organization is read. Fundamental properties such as hierarchy, dependence, exchange, and agency surface in the act of communicating (for instance, turn taking) and in linguistic forms found in sentence grammars and narrative structures that position actors and objects in relation to each other. For example, when a person is promoted to manager, organizational authority becomes a discursive object that one member confers and the other accepts. Through discourse that scripts into larger narratives, individuals draw from this event and continue to produce authority as a text. Discourse and organization then mutually constitute one another in that conversations form texts through linguistic patterns that both develop and draw upon memory traces and discursive objects as organizational forms.

Taylor and Van Every's (2000) approach dissolves the macro-micro dichotomy through its reliance on human-object networks, which also accounts for the emergence of macroactors. In contrast to Giddens (1979, 1984), macroactors speak for their organizations by virtue of their underlying networks of associations between organizational participants and various kinds of objects. The collective nature of the associations authorizes a person to speak in the corporate name.

With a different cast on these elements, Cooren (2001) centered on the inherent organizing properties of speech acts and on texts as discur-

sive objects that function like machines. Speech acts transform reality and individual identities through the meanings aligned with them (for instance, the declarative statement, "I baptize you," symbolically enacts the baptizing). Drawing from Greimas's (1987) narratology, different categories of speech acts link to one another in stages such as the opening of schematic sequences (giving directives and assertives), their enactments (using commissive statements), and their closings (providing expressive phrases). Layers of sub-sequences are typically embedded in larger ones. Thus, the structuring patterns of discourse shape the organizing processes that, in turn, form texts. Texts are machine-like in that they have staying power or the capacity to operate outside the original context in which they were developed. By focusing on organizing as discursive objects (for example, authority) structured through speech acts, and texts that have machine-like staying power, Cooren argued that the organization is grounded in discursive forms.

Key Debates and the Grounded Orientation

How does the grounded in action orientation influence key debates? Because organizations are structured in action and anchored at the level of social practice, the macro-micro and agency-structure debates cast agents differently than do the object and becoming orientations. With a structure in action view, agency is not just subject to top-down organizational forces, or a generator of bottom-up organizing, but conceived of "from within." Agency becomes an active component of structure (Garfinkel, 1967). Ethnomethodologists/conversation analysts, structurationists, and actor-network theorists' share some common influences in this regard. Although these theories differ in a number of ways, each seeks a balance between agency and constraint. Boden's (1994) notion of agency comprises "the actions and inactions of social actors who are, *always* and *at every moment*, confronted with specific conditions and choices" (p. 13, emphasis in the original). Agency in actor-network theory lies in neither the human subject nor the object, but in a hybrid arrived at by a joint mediation between them (Latour, 1994). In Giddens's (1979, 1984) duality of structure, structure is the medium and outcome of human action. Theories like structuration also reflect the multidimensional nature of structure and action; structural conditions include interactional rules, material conditions, and communicative resources, whereas action includes agency, subjectivity/intersubjectivity, and actor knowledgeability (Conrad & Haynes, 2001). Thus, actors are viewed as responsible agents, who may or may not fully comprehend or intend the nature of unfolding events (Giddens, 1984).

After reviewing structuration theory research, Conrad and Haynes (2001), among others, saw a bias toward action over structure in this work. Boden (1994) freely admitted to a bias toward action in her view

of organizations, whereas actor-network theory reconceptualizes structure into a nonhuman form of agency (Latour, 1994). Thus, even though these approaches aim for a balance between action and structure, the former is still favored over the latter in much of the literature.

When the organization is explicitly conceptualized as grounded in social practice, scholars are indifferent to or outwardly reject the macro-micro debate. In Boden's (1994) words, "Society does not happen at different levels, research does," nor does individual action build "toward some larger entity that 'is' organization in some cumulative sense" (p. 201). Her view stands in sharp contrast to critical realists like Reed (2001), who espoused a social ontology separating entities and levels of analysis in the complex interplay between agency and structure and macro-micro. Hence, this ontology depicts the object orientation. Within the grounded in action orientation, no macro- or microdistinction exists, only the continuous flow of conduct.

Anchoring organizations at the level of social practice slants a study in favor of the language in use discourse over the power/knowledge Discourses. Yet, this orientation does not preclude a focus on Discourses, but researchers may have more difficulty discerning those powerful forces that lie beyond the texts than they do in analyzing the snippets of discourse or single episodes (cf. Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b; Wetherell, 1998). Moreover, if social practice is anchored episodically, researchers may overlook other discourse approaches like interaction analyses that focus on sequential patterns and temporal forms across episodes. Finally, the grounded in action orientation questions how all three approaches can coexist within the same research framework—a topic addressed in the next section.

Relationships Among the Orientations

Our position in this article is that all three perspectives are important and provide insights into the complex relationship between discourse and organizations. Moreover, by embracing all three and by playing them off one another, we can enhance our knowledge about discourse and organization. The grounded in action orientation provides an exemplar for discussing how the three perspectives interrelate. Different theories in the grounded in action approach invoke (a) the object orientation by focusing on the ways that actors reify the organization, (b) the becoming orientation by centering on the formative powers of language and interaction, and (c) the grounded in action approach that anchors the organization in social practices. For example, Taylor and Van Every (2000) invoked the object orientation by arguing that organizations, once they are constructed as texts, become objects with real material

constraints around which actors must orient. They invoked the becoming orientation when they examined the formative power of conversational sentence structures and story grammars that grow out of texts. Finally, they invoked the grounded in action approach by arguing that the organization exists at the intersection of the text and conversation.

Yet, the grounded in action perspective incorporates the other orientations on somewhat narrow grounds. For example, research within the object orientation emphasizes not only actor reification processes, but also material constraints on agency, including those influences of which actors are unaware. As noted, a major criticism of structuration theory research is the insufficient attention to the constraints on agency relative to its bias toward action (Conrad & Haynes, 2001). Even actor-network theory (Latour, 1994) underplays wider social, political, and economic influences on behavior by privileging the inscribed objects that form networks of association. Because work that invokes the grounded in action orientation typically draws from ethnomethodological assumptions of the knowledgeable actor, scholars tend to minimize contextual constraints, even when they incorporate the ways that material conditions impinge on discourse (for example, Cooren, 2001; Taylor & Van Every, 2000).

Critical theorists who adopt an object orientation are certainly poised to examine a wide array of contextual influences and constraints on agency. Yet, they downplay the formative power of discourse in lieu of the broad social, political, or economic influences that are more easily captured through Discourses. Alvesson and Kärreman (2000b) noted that "a discursive macro order" reinforced through attention to such concepts as culture or marketization can lead scholars to neglect the details of language in use through making broad statements about the macrolevel (p. 1145).

Likewise, many scholars who embrace the becoming orientation revel in the details of language in use and fall prey to linguistic reductionism or to glossing over the ways in which discourse functions culturally (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000b). In addition, scholars often presume that linguistic forms aggregate over time and across settings, rarely accounting for the ways that "organizing" or the finding of "order" in discourse leads to the complex social form "organization" (McPhee & Zaug, 2000). In effect, each orientation has emerged for good reasons at different points in time in this rapidly evolving research arena. The practice of engaging one orientation in relation to another does not negate the strengths or weaknesses of each, individually or combined. Consequently, we contend that organizational discourse analysts should address the discourse-organization relationship within their own orientations as well as within all three perspectives.

Pushing the boundaries of one's own approach by appropriating concepts and arguments from other perspectives is hardly new. As Deetz (1996) noted, "Most researchers and teachers do not cluster around a prototype of each [paradigm] but gather at the crossroads, mix metaphors, borrow lines from other discourses, and dodge [sic] criticism by co-optation" (p. 199). What may be foreign to some analysts is the recommendation to go outside one's predominant theoretical perspectives to consider the other orientations. However, going outside one's "home" perspective should not lead scholars to abandon their beliefs systems or disregard differences among their approaches (Martin, 2002). It requires temporary suspension of one's commitments to consider the possibility of alternative views.

Research is already surfacing that shifts ontological priorities even within the same study. Martin (2002) reviewed studies that conceive of organizational culture in three radically different ways: an integrated unity, differentiated subcultures, or ambiguous and contradictory relationships among cultural parts. In organizational discourse studies, Fairhurst and Cooren (in press) analyze a police radio transcript using three different perspectives. Each analysis highlights a different view of the discourse-organization relationship and reveals insights into the workings of a high reliability organization that is conducting a rescue. For example, interaction analysis in the becoming orientation asserts that the organization qua system emerges in the patterned regularity of interaction; a pattern of deference to authority enabled quick, coordinated action, while a pattern of submissive symmetry provided much needed redundancy in police radio communication. In the grounded in action orientation, the organization enters the scene through the way it is made relevant in the interaction; such was the case when the wounded police officer switched from hysteria to police jargon and minimized emotion, thus signaling a shift from victim to police officer. Finally, in the object orientation, speech act schematics posit that the organization, once constructed, becomes an object with material constraints around which actors must orient. These constraints became evident in a series of unfolding episodes marked by a nested set of problems and objects like the police radio that transformed the agency status of the officer. All three approaches cast the organization as a discursive construction, but a comparison among them reveals different ways in which the "organization" is discursively achieved. This represents a novel way to present findings for a discursive study or program of research. However, the danger is that researchers will treat the contrasting perspectives as mere methodologies, not theories with competing ontological commitments that require articulation, analysis, and a healthy agonism.

Conclusion

What are the benefits of perspective interplay? Cross-theoretical thinking about the discourse-organization relationship could serve to extend the explanatory power of discourse analysis, inform dichotomous thinking, and develop complex theorizing about organizational concepts. For instance, researchers who emphasize the becoming orientation might consider the concerns of the object approach, such as critical theory's focus on the material constraints on agency, to uncover the explanatory limits of discourse analysis (Reed, 2000, 2001). Such a crossover might inform dichotomous thinking about whether discourse is a material or ideational practice and as to whether organizations are reducible to their linguistic constructions.

Researchers who emphasize the object perspective might find that maintaining a tension between the organization as an entity and a non-entity leads to new ways of capturing what an entity is, as Taylor and Van Every (2000) discovered in their expanded view of text. The lamination, structuration, and association processes within the grounded in action orientation uniquely redefine what an entity means. Crossing different notions of "organizations as entity" by holding them in tension with each other could reveal new insights about organizational constructs and practices. Moreover, critical discourse analysts who embrace the object orientation might focus on language in use to discover more of the explanatory possibilities of power enactment.

If research that invokes the grounded in action perspective maintains a tension between actor (or actor-network) knowledgeability and the lack of same, scholars might engage in more complex theorizing about awareness, the unacknowledged, and unseen constraints on agency. Giddens's (1979, 1984) concepts of the discursive and practical consciousness and Latour's (1994) black boxing provide exemplars of this idea, although this work might benefit from incorporating contextual influences into reframing these constructs.

Finally, the tension between what Alvesson and Kärreman (2000b) term discourse versus Discourses runs through this entire discussion. In other words, emphasis on discourse as a local achievement of language in use versus Discourses as enduring systems situated in historical contexts need to be held in tension with each other. Alvesson and Kärreman recommend that researchers focus on ways to move from discourse to Discourses in analyzing organizational texts because both are essential. Although we concur with this plea, we also endorse theoretical efforts that conceptualize these elements as in tension with each other. Taylor and Van Every's (2000) work is exemplary in this regard as they locate organization in reconfiguring the dynamics between conversation and text, a position with implications for the discourse/Discourses debate.

Our position on these orientations is neither one of incommensurability nor integration, but one that holds them and their elements in tension with one another. This stance aims to address the shortcomings of a discursive view of organizations as well as capture the strengths of discourse analysis and its contributions to developing new theories.

Authors

Gail T. Fairhurst is a professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Cincinnati. Linda L. Putnam is a professor in the Department of Speech Communication at Texas A&M University. The authors would like to thank François Cooren, James Taylor, and Heather Zoller for their comments on earlier drafts. Correspondence concerning this article may be directed to the first author at gfairhurst@cinci.rr.com.

Notes

[1] Our three views of the discourse-organization relationship only roughly parallel Smith's (1993) root metaphors. We disagree with Smith over the number and kinds of distinctions made concerning the organization's relationship to communication as compared to that of discourse. We also prefer to focus on key debates and the need to shift ontological priorities within the same research program to stimulate theory.

[2] This thesis stems from earlier work in which Taylor (1993) described human systems as intrinsically binary, in which either the *activity* of individuals or the system as an *object* is emphasized. Depending on the worldview a theorist adopts, communication is interactive speech mediated by text or communication is an intertext mediated by interactive speech. Measuring communication one way suggests "conversation," whereas another suggests "text."

References

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000a). Taking the linguistic turn in organizational research: Challenges, responses and consequences. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36*, 136–158.

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000b). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations, 53*, 1125–1149.

Axley, S. (1984). Managerial and organizational communication in terms of the conduit metaphor. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 428–437.

Banks, S. P. (1994). Performing public announcements: The case of flight attendants' work discourse. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 14*, 253–267.

Barrett, F. J., Thomas, G. F., & Hocevar, S. P. (1995). The central role of discourse in large-scale change: A social construction perspective. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 31*, 352–372.

Bastien, D. T. (1992). Change in organizational culture: The use of linguistic methods in corporate acquisition. *Management Communication Quarterly, 5,* 403–442.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality.* New York: Doubleday/Anchor.

Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Callon, M., & Latour, B. (1981). Unscrewing the big Leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them do so. In A. V. Cicourel & K. Knorr-Cetina (Eds.), *Advances in social theory and methodology: Towards an integration of micro- and macro-sociologies* (pp. 277–303). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Conrad, C., & Haynes, J. (2001). Development of key constructs. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 47–77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cooren, F. (2001). *The organizing property of communication.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Cooren, F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (in press). Dislocation and stabilization: How organizational members scale up their interactions. In A. Nicotera (Ed.), *The communicative constitution of organization: Centering organizational communication.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cooren, F., & Taylor, J. R. (1997). Organization as an effect of mediation: Redefining the link between organization and communication. *Communication Theory, 7*, 219–260.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9*, 119–161.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Deetz, S. (1996). Crossroads describing differences in approaches to organization science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and their legacy. *Organization Science, 7,* 190–207.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited inc.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994). Capturing the complexity in advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organization Science, 5,* 121–147.

Donnellon, A., Gray, B., & Bougon, M. G. (1986). Communication, meaning, and organized action. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31,* 43–45.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

du Gay, P., Salaman, G., & Rees, B. (1996). The conduct of management and the management of conduct: Contemporary managerial discourse and the constitution of the "competent" manager. *Journal of Management Studies*, *33,* 263–282.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse and Society*, *4,* 133–168.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. T. (1993). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. *Communication Monographs, 60,* 321–351.

Fairhurst, G. T. (in press). Text, context, and agency in interaction analysis. *Organization.*

Fairhurst, G. T., & Cooren, F. (in press). Organizational language-in-use: A comparison of interaction analysis, conversation analysis, and speech act schematics. In D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick, N. Phillips, & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational discourse.* London: Sage.

Ford, J. D., & Ford, L. W. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *20,* 1–57.

Fortado, B. (1998). Interpreting nicknames: A micropolitical portal. *Journal of Management Studies*, *35,* 13–34.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge & the discourse of language.* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon. (Original work published 1969)

Foucault, M. (1976). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison.* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage/Random House. (Original work published 1975)

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977.* New York: Pantheon.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gordon, D. P. (1983). Hospital slang for patients: Crocks, gomers, gorks, and others. *Language in society*, *12,* 173–185.

Grant, D., Keenoy, T., & Oswick, C. (1998). Organizational discourse: Of diversity, dichotomy and multi-disciplinarity. In D. Grant, T. Keenoy, & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Discourse and organization* (pp. 1–13). London: Sage.

Greimas, A. (1987). *On meaning: Selected writings in semiotic theory.* (P. J. Perron & F. J. Collins, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gronn, P. C. (1982). Neo-Taylorism in educational administration? *Education Administration Quarterly, 18*, 17–35.

Gronn, P. C. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration, 28,* 317–338.

Hardy, C., Palmer, I., & Phillips, N. (2000). Discourse as a strategic resource. *Human Relations, 53,* 1227–1248.

Hawes, L. (1974). Social collectivities as communication: Perspective on organizational behavior. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60,* 497–502.

Helmer, J. (1993). Storytelling in the creation and maintenance of organizational tension and stratification. *Southern Communication Journal, 59*, 34–44.

Hikins, J. W. (1990). Realism and its implications for rhetorical theory. In R. Cherwitz (Ed.), *Rhetoric and philosophy* (pp. 21–78). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Holmer-Nadesan, M. (1997). Constructing paper dolls: The discourse of personality testing in organizational practices. *Communication Theory*, 7, 189–218.

Hosking, D. (1988). Organizing, leadership and skillful process. *Journal of Management Studies, 25*, 147–166.

Knights, D. (1997). Organization theory in the age of deconstruction: Dualism, gender and postmodernism revisited. Organizational Studies, *18*, 1–19.

Knights, D., & Morgan, G. (1991). Corporate strategy, organizations, and subjectivity: A critique. *Organisation Studies, 12*, 251–271.

Latour, B. (1994). On technical mediation—philosophy, sociology, and genealogy. *Common Knowledge, 3*, 29–64.

Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McPhee, R. D., & Zaug, P. (2000). The communicative constitution of organizations: A framework for explanation. *Electronic Journal of Communication/La Revue Electronique de Communication*, *10*, 1–2.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mumby, D. K. (2001). Power and politics. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 585–623). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Newton, T. (1998). Theorizing subjectivity in organizations: The failure of Foucauldian studies? *Organization Studies, 19,* 415–447.

Oswick, C., Keenoy, T. W., & Grant, D. (2000). Discourse, organizations, and organizing: Concepts, objects and subjects. *Human Relations, 53,* 1115–1124.

Parker, I. (Ed.). (1998). *Social constructionism, discourse and realism.* London: Sage.

Philipsen, G. (1992). *Speaking culturally: Explorations in social communication.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Poole, M. S., & DeSanctis, G. (1992). Microlevel structuration in computer-supported group decision-making. *Human Communication Research, 91*, 5–49.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behavior.* London: Sage.

Prasad, P. (1995). Working with "smart" machine: Computerization and the discourse of anthropomorphism in organizations. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies, 1,* 253–265.

Putnam, L. L., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2001). Discourse analysis in organizations. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 78–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reed, M. (2000). The limits of discourse analysis in organizational analysis. *Organization, 7*, 524–530.

Reed, M. (2001, August). The explanatory limits of discourse analysis in organization analysis: A review. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington, DC.

Sigman, S. J. (1986). Adjustment to the nursing home as a social interaction accomplishment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *14*, 37–58.

Smith, R. C. (1993, May). *Images of organizational communication: Root metaphors of the organization-communication relation.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Taylor, J. R. (1993). *Rethinking the theory of organizational communication: How to read an organization.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Taylor, J. R., & Cooren, F. (1997). What makes communication "organizational"? How the many voices of a collectivity become the one voice of an organization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27*, 409–438.

Taylor, J. R., & Van Every, E. (2000). *The emergent organization: Communication as its site and surface.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Taylor, M. E. (1987). Functions of in-house language: Observations on data collected from some British financial institutions. *Language in Society*, *16*, 1–7.

Townley, B. (1998). Beyond good and evil: Depth and division in the management of human resources. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.), *Foucault, management and organization theory: From Panopticon to technologies of self* (pp. 191–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tsoukas, H. (2000). False dilemmas in organization theory: Realism or social constructivism? *Organization, 7,* 531–535.

Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization*, *32*, 407–418.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretive repertoires: Conversation analysis and poststructuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society, 9*, 387–412.