On the shoulders of Barbara Czarniawska

TOMMY JENSEN

Stockholm University, SE

tje@sbs.su.se

Abstract

The well-versed Czarniawska reader might complain about the selection of publications made in this short essay. This is only fair under the condition that the purpose was to provide a representative view of Barbara Czarniawska's work. This is not the case. Rather, the essay is a personal statement, dealing with the texts that have touched me the most during my career. The text kick-starts with my observation that she was exactly like the band Motörhead: A moving constant. From this observation, the rest of the text folds out as follows: paralogy, epistemology, performativity and mobility. I end with a short comment about the character of the author Barbara Czarniawska.

1. Exactly like Motörhead

Barbara Czarniawska was my first academic hero, and she came alive to me in the late nineties. Of course, she would resist me singling her out as an academic hero, just as she resisted the title of the edited book On the Shoulders of Giants (which I co-edited with Timothy Wilson, 2011). "Tommy," she wrote, "we rather stand on the shoulders of uncountable midgets." Anyway, Barbara said yes to our invitation to write a chapter (about the psychologist Maria Ossowska, Czarniawska, 2011a), and I am still standing on her shoulders.

Although I met Barbara quite a few times during the years I have been active, and we sporadically exchanged emails, my engagement with and appreciation of her has been primarily text-based. In 2021, in a seminar where we were both present, I attempted to express my appreciation. I used the band Motörhead as the basis. A couple of years earlier, I had attended (yet another) Motörhead concert and read a review of it afterward. The journalist said that the universe changes, but not Motörhead; despite line-up changes, change of record labels, and other circumstances, they remain the same. I said that she is like Motörhead. Unsure of Barbara's reaction, I wrote an email afterward:

> What I was trying to say at the beginning was that you have been a constant core of my thinking while continuing to be fluid in your own thinking (which helps me move forward in mine). The analogy with Motörhead was that the journalist wrote that everything changes, but not Motörhead—they remain the same. And so I think it is with you—you are a moving constant! (My translation)

Barbara's reply was: "Thanks, Tommy! That was hilarious, and I know you meant the comparison as a compliment!" (My translation)

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

For me, Barbara was a moving constant—intellectually always on the move, but unmistakably the same. In this text, I will try to explain why I believe Barbara should continue to have a significant impact on organization studies.

This text covers ontological and epistemological stances, methodological choices, and theoretical and empirical arguments and findings, and is also, as pointed out by one of the reviewers for this text, genre-rich. These two aspects of the text are not planned. I think that is a consequence of trying to take on the intellectual heritage of Barbara Czarniawska.

2. Paralogy

A moving constant? It is a contradiction in terms, something impossible. Yes, of course! But still, it is possible, doable, and useful. There is a useful word for a contradiction in terms (e.g., 'moving constant')—paralogy (Lyotard, 1979/1987). In a study of the public sector (Czarniawska, 1992: 49, my translation), Barbara presents 10 paralogical results. She remarked: "But these are absurdities, or so they will shout. This is not logical! (I can already see the headlines: 'A scholar in business and administration shows that the public sector is irrational,' or 'nonsense from the research frontier.')".

Definitions of paralogy start out from logical reasoning—taken as being the normal and reasonable way of approaching the world—and gravitate towards the opposite: "false or specious reasoning" (Oxford English Dictionary). Closely related are (from Webster's Third New International Dictionary):

- *Paralogos*—unexpected and unreasonable.[1]
- *Pa-ral-o-gism*—a fallacious argument.[2]
- *Pa-ral-o-gize*—to reason falsely; to draw conclusions not warranted by the premises.[3]

This may not seem normal, nor reasonable. Exactly! It is precisely this that makes paralogy useful for Barbara, and thereby she deviates from the lexical treatment of paralogy (as per above). Barbara believes that paralogy "is the most useful of innovations, it is about the possibility of language to change its own rules" (1992: 50), and thereby construct new understandings of the world.

Paralogy is recognizable and understandable despite being paradoxical or absurd (Czarniawska, 2013a), and knowledge and society move forward through constant paralogical conversations. Paralogy is thus crucial to learning. It is here that Barbara the pragmatist starts to emerge (and here we spot the influence from Richard Rorty on her thinking, see e.g., 1979/2009; 1989; 1991).

Throughout her career, Barbara's many different types of reports on and about the fieldwork translate, or operationalize, paralogy. For instance, as engagement in

> a constant conversation between theory and managerial practice, but a conversation that is neither smooth nor conflict-free. Theory's contribution is a re-contextualized picture that

[1] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paralogical
[2] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paralogism
[3] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paralogize

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

> can be presented to practitioners with two questions. Do they recognize the picture? And did they want it to be that way?" (Czarniawska, 2001: 15)

Even though Lyotard tells us that "Consensus is only a particular state of discussion, not its end. Its end, on the contrary, is paralogy" (Lyotard, 1979: 65-66), the rule of the game is that plotting and replotting is a never-ending story (Czarniawska, 2013a). Paralogy is always, in that sense, temporal.

Paralogy is particularly needed and useful since our present time is characterized by complexity and meta-changes that "result from a critical mass of unintended side effects" (Beck, 2003: 2). Expressed differently, modern societies and human relations (including nature) are characterized by non-linearity, randomness, collective dynamics, emergence (just to take a collection of words from Wikipedia regarding the term complexity). Or, more related to Barbara's vocabulary: Organizing attempts between humans and between humans and nonhumans are carried out in multiple ways, with multiple unintended effects; there is overflowing (Michel Callon's, 1998, term in, e.g., Czarniawska and Löfgren, 2012).

During her career, Barbara produced many paralogical results, and she had hope in paralogy. We should also have such hope simply because most people live their everyday lives riddled with contradictions in terms but are still quite happy. Moreover, they know a lot. There is much to learn from paralogical conversations with ordinary people. Highlighting Daniel Miller's study of shoppers ("A Theory of Shopping," 1998) as an example of a well-plotted social science, Barbara writes:

> Miller highlights an important occurrence ignored or obscured by many other researchers: that the people studied by social scientists have theories of their own (called "folk theories" by psychologists) and that these theories are interesting to study. Non-scientists also emplot their narratives, thus making sense of the events. [R]espect for such lay theories does not imply that researchers have to agree with them (as many researchers studying powerful and influential people have a tendency to do). (Czarniawska, 2013a: 115)

To have respect for the research participants is essential—always—but as Barbara informs us, respect does not translate into agreement. I think Barbara has a humble attitude, and for good reasons. As Latour pointed out (1999: 19):

> Actors know what they do and we have to learn from them not only what they do, but how and why they do it. It is us, the social scientists, who lack knowledge of what they do, and not they who are missing the explanation of why they are unwittingly manipulated by forces exterior to themselves and known to the social scientist's powerful gaze and methods.

Having a humble attitude requires guts—the courage to continue the paralogical conversation with folk theorists and, not to forget, conversations with social science, especially regarding its claim on normality, being purely descriptive, and the denial of masculinity bias (Czarniawska, 1998).

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

3. Pragmatically speaking, we must get rid of the single epistemology

Barbara is well-known for her take on theory as plot and emplotment (Czarniawska, 2013a) as well as for her extensive fieldwork, where humans and non-humans were studied through interviews, shadowing, and other techniques (Czarniawska, 2007). It is also well-known that Barbara was a pragmatist, particularly closely knitted to Richard Rorty (Czarniawska, 2022). I have the impression that her favourite book was "Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity" (Rorty, 1989).

I am also closely knitted to Rorty, and one of my main takes from him is that he wanted to get rid of the privileges of epistemology in science. Rorty's anti-essential stance declares that there is no singular essence to be found in the universe, nature, or humans. In fact, nowhere at all. Consequently, the ways in which gaining knowledge (epistemology) is attempted and by whom (Westerners or Easterners, moderns or non-moderns, etc.) need to be evaluated based on how useful knowledge is and, notably, if the ways of gaining knowledge pave the way for increased tolerance among humans and societies (Jensen, 2013a; Jensen and Sandström, 2013b). Ways of knowing are thus not a privilege for science—with a capital S (Rorty, 1979/2009; 1989; see also Denzin, Lincoln and Smith, 2008). For Rorty, usefulness and increased tolerance are tightly knitted together (but without this pair being an exclusive relation; there is room for other forms and combinations of usefulness as well).

My reading of Barbara tells me that she does not clearly target epistemology. When touching on the matter, she becomes rather descriptive about it; descriptive in the sense that Barbara puts herself in the backseat and lets other voices do the job for her (for example, see Czarniawska, 2022). That is, of course, not a bad strategy; assemble the (missing) masses, and your voice will be stronger and might travel far (Latour, 1992). Even though Barbara does not follow Rorty and abandons epistemology, she allows it to multiply.

I remember that we talked quite a bit about epistemology, especially during the time that Barbara and I wrote for Hervé Corvellec and his edited book "What is Theory?" (2013). The book comprises 16 chapters (not counting the introduction and the final summary/synthesis chapter); nine chapters were written by senior researchers and nine by junior researchers. Barbara was (of course) the senior and together we represented the (Swedish) discipline of Business and Administration, and more specifically, pragmatism and organization studies. As senior, Barbara had twice the words at her disposal but had to complete the text first ("What social science theory is and what it is not").

Thus, as the junior, I had the privilege to react to a finalized text, having the last say in the conversation ("Theory as hope"). An anecdote: Almost immediately after Hervé had posted my chapter to everyone involved in the book, Barbara wrote to me that I had misunderstood her text. Well, we talked a bit about it but could not reach an agreement. Of course: Plotting and emplotting is a never-ending exercise, and please remember paralogy as mentioned above. Barbara certainly reacted quickly but did not mind carrying on the conversation.

One example of how Barbara practically, and thus, of course, pragmatically, allows epistemology to multiply is found in "A Four Times Told Tale" (1997). There, she argues that there are different stories present in organization studies. More specifically, and with McCloskey (1986) as a basis, the claim made is that organization studies has different ways of weaving together facts, metaphors, logic, and stories. A literary genre among other literary genres is perhaps Barbara's best-known and most provocative statement about the discipline of organization studies (see also Czarniawska, 1995).

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

In the book chapter "What social science theory is and what it is not," Barbara uses Kenneth Burke (1969/1945) and his advice for constructing drama ("i.e., convincing, gripping, credible, beautiful, or all of these," 2013a: 118). She states that "as a pragmatist," Burke's pentad ("scene, act, agents, agency, and purpose," Czarniawska, 2013a: 118) contains no rules of coherence:

> The actual plot construction consists of reproduction, paraphrase, or rebellion against those five. The inappropriate or deviant plot is still related to the same repertoire and can therefore be recognized and thought erroneous, amusing, outrageous, or innovative—while remaining understandable. (Czarniawska, 2013a: 118)

Barbara here undoes the single, unified epistemology, and she also did so in the starting sentences of the same text: "I wholeheartedly embrace the definition of theory as described in Blumer's (1954) footnote 1: an attempt at a meaningful interpretation of life and the world." (2013a: 106).

I suspect you don't quite get the last quote (Blumer). How is the single epistemology undone? But you see, I probably read this sentence quite differently than you. I said at the start of this text that Barbara is a moving constant, and when moving about, Barbara connects to a wide range of bodies of literature and disciplines. Put differently, Barbara's writings are genre-rich, which shows that she is expanding out from any kind of single epistemological idea, ideal, and doing of organization studies. So, there are many ways to read Barbara, and she forces us to read her in many ways. I read the quotes and her body of text as a pragmatist: Interpretations cannot be meaningful if they are not useful. Useful, usefulness, is the core of the matter.

How I wish that Barbara wrote "remaining useful" instead of "remaining understandable" in the second last quote, and "useful interpretation" instead of "meaningful interpretation" in the last quote. Even better would have been if she had added tolerance also. But of course, an author's intentions are not the reader's intentions. Am I not just picking a couple of sentences to fit my own purposes and attempts to make use of Barbara's thinking and writing? Of course I am! How could it be done otherwise?

Is this reading of mine too simplistic, singular, and disrespectful, and am I acting as the devil's advocate? It is you, dear reader, who must make up your mind about this, but be aware that being too simplistic, singular and disrespectful, or acting as the devil's advocate is not my intention. On the contrary, my intention is to conduct what Rorty calls an "edifying reading" (Czarniawska, 2008: 274) and hope that the constant conversation I have with Barbara's texts translate myself. At least she would agree with such a hope. Starting from Michal Serre, continuing with Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, Barbara believes in acts of translation (that do not only concern linguistics) as acts "which change both the translator and what is translated. There is no question of 'faithfulness': By definition, what has been translated is never the same again." (Czarniawska, 2008: 274). Paralogy is a scandal but hopefully a tolerant one.

For Barbara, the single epistemology found in normal science is not useful and she promotes multiple ways of doing knowledge production (I will return to the word multiple soon). As a case for organization studies, Barbara argues that "it is not that organizations produce organizing, but that organizing produces organizations," and she states that "My remedy was

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

to study the construction, stabilization, maintenance, destruction, and reconstruction of action nets" (2011b: 823). Barbara further argues that

> organization scholars should be studying construction and maintenance of connections among collective actions. These collective actions need not be performed within the bounds of a formal organization; an action net can involve actions performed by several formal organizations or simply by assemblies of human and non-human actants […]. (Czarniawska, 2011b: 823)

If this is not abandoning the single epistemology, I don't know what is.

4. Performativity

In her book chapter on what is theory (Czarniawska, 2013a), Barbara thus singles out Daniel Miller's study on shoppers as a well-plotted study in social science. To understand this praise, we need to revisit her anti-essentialist, pragmatic position: There is no correspondence between language and the world—truth is not obtainable. Nor is correspondence especially necessary either. Miller's engagement with two shoppers is illustrative. Sheila banters with Bob in a comic way (about his lack of shopping skills), and Barbara remarks that "A potential criticism by the traditional empiricists would be that the banter was produced for the benefit of the researcher. But what is wrong with that?" (Czarniawska, 2013a). She continues:

> A performance confirming the importance of the traditional gender division of labor can be seen as a message to the researcher, much stronger and more convincing than any answer to an interview question ever could be. Impression management is a methodological problem only under the assumption that the deeds and utterances of people under study should correspond one-on-one to a reality hidden behind appearances, to be revealed during the course of research. (Czarniawska, 2013a: 116)

Performativity is thus not only about how researchers change the very thing they try to describe (Callon, 1998) but also that interferences (Law, 2002) between researchers and folk theorists are characterized by drama, play, and impression management, etc. To a pragmatist like Barbara, this is very useful; it helps social scientists tell good stories. A good story need not be good in the sense that it is a happy story where problems are overcome. A good story is useful because it can be learned and acted upon, e.g., to increase tolerance. A story can also have any plot. What kind of good stories did Barbara write, then?

Let me first point out what kind of stories and plots Barbara refrained from doing, and then interchangeably add what she did. Barbara was not fond of stories that single out individuals' exclusive roles and functions in action, as in e.g., hero tales or tales of villains. For example, she argued that managers, leaders, and entrepreneurs are symbolically important as "expressions of collective hopes and fears" and played out "by those who create organizations by their daily performance" in the theatre of organizations (Czarniawska and Wolff, 1991: 529). A joint collective effort is required to achieve things in organizations, which can highlight certain positions, even individuals, but can only continually be sustained by the collective. Remember Barbara's complaint about the title "On the Shoulders of Giants": It is the midgets rather than the giants' shoulders that organizations stand on.

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

Barbara also refrained from telling human-centric stories. Instead of actors and networks, however, her translation became action nets (see e.g., Lindberg & Czarniawska, 2006). So, in Czarniawska's world, action is carried out in nets in which the actants—humans and nonhumans—can have agency. Agency between humans and nonhumans is thus (at least potentially) symmetrical (Latour, 1987), and what role and function humans and nonhumans have in action nets is an empirical question.

Barbara (2004: 784) further argues that "[t]raditional approaches to organization studies, intent as they are on capturing 'the essence of an organization'" need to rethink. Traditional studies make the mistakes of turning organizations into nouns, carried out at certain places, relying on conversations instead of following human and nonhuman action and interaction. As we saw earlier, action, organizing attempts, produces organizations and not the other way around. Even if action nets might happen 'inside' organizations, they are never exclusively located there, and attempts at organizing action do not normally follow (some) humans' will and intention. Action implies translations, and translations betray but can still be very useful. Lastly, traditional organization studies rely on issues and events and empirically investigate these on single sites and at singular times. In practice, however, organizational action is multiple; both in terms of space—multisited—and time—chronological and thematic (Czarniawska, 2004).

Another way of expressing symmetry is found in the table below. This time, a symmetrical social science is expressed by Barbara—the performative part in the right column—in terms of its relation to other practices that it seeks to study. The performative view is contrasted with the ostensive view—in the left column (Czarniawska, 2017: 4).

Ostensive	Performative
An organization is a separate entity with object-like properties (large, small, innovative, rigid)	"An organization" is a social representation, which varies among contexts and subjects ("My" department is different from my boss' department)
The actors work in an organization, which exists independent of them	The actors construct an organization by acting and interpreting their actions […]
The researchers can describe organizations better than the actors can	Only the actors can have knowledge of an organization; the researchers can have knowledge about it […]
There can be only one correct description of an organization	There are always multiple descriptions, which can be compared using pragmatic, ethic or aesthetic criteria
The purpose of organization studies is to explain the principles of organizing	The purpose of organization studies is to explore the practice of organizing

To the less familiarized reader, actors in action nets are, as already pointed out, actants—thus both human and nonhuman.

Finally, as an anti-essentialist, Barbara imagines multiple ontological possibilities (e.g., Mol, 2002, or Latour's variable ontologies, Czarniawska, 2017) on how to progress or how to 'move

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

ahead.' In the lack of better words, she embraces performativity as richness, as open-ended, but never does it in a type of sloppy, anything-goes way. Barbara had a sharp intellect, a fluent pen-hand, and curious empirical feet. Although she does not talk much—or ever?—with the help of John Law, I find him quite useful here: Are not social scientists making a mess of a messy world by abiding by too clean and rigid epistemologies and ontologies (Law, 2004)? I think Barbara would agree.

5. Mobility

Open-ended, rich performativity translates to how one navigates in the field. Instead of using the popular term "ethnography," Barbara argues for "ethnology" and translates Bruno Latour to develop symmetrical "precepts" for ethnology in "management and organization studies" (Czarniawska, 2017: 6). In doing this, she reduces Latour's ambitions, noting that "management and organization studies are not about human nature; they are about certain ways of life, and, more specifically, about certain ways of work" (Czarniawska, 2017: 6).

In what follows, there are three precepts that Barbara translates from Latour (1993). The motivational text below is partly my translation of her arguments, found on pages 6-7, and partly a reflection made by me with other works of Barbara in mind. The first precept is:

> Use the same terms to explain truths and lies, failures and successes, trials and errors—in other words, render the method judgment-free. (Czarniawska, 2017: 6)

As I read and understand it, the term judgement-free does not imply objectivity or neutrality. Instead, it highlights the importance of forming independent judgement. Explanations are context- and people-dependent, varying across time and space. Consequently, clear-cut judgments are often impossible to make due to the multitude of voices and actions involved (Barbara would warn: do not easily pass a decisive verdict). Using the same terms to explain different 'things' (despite co-optation attempts) allows for the formation of independent judgement, and some kind of continuity in constructing paralogical stories that are thought of as illogical, absurd, or as nonsense (as per the quotes from Barbara in the section on paralogy). The second precept is:

> Simultaneously study the production of and by humans and non-human actants (this approach requires that greater attention be directed toward things and machines—a perspective on the rise in organization studies; but also toward varying degrees of existence and actorhood). (Czarniawska, 2017: 6)

Organization studies cannot simply assume that it is humans who wield power and are the masters of organizing (and of organizations in our case). Therefore, the quest is to uncover the relationships between humans and non-humans and their joint wielding of power. Even if Barbara observes that symmetry is on the rise in organization studies, I argue that there are too few studies that rely on symmetry between humans and non-humans in their methodological design. Often, symmetry is added after the (normally asymmetrical) study has been conducted. The third precept is:

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

> Avoid any a priori declarations concerning the differences between westerners and non-westerners, primitive and modern societies, rationality and irrationality; identity and alterity. (Czarniawska, 2017: 6)

What is useful—and that which increases tolerance—must be plotted and replotted again and again, allowing for epistemology and ontology to multiply. In the field, symmetry is maintained by applying "the same methods [when] studying different societies, communities, and phenomena" (Czarniawska, 2017: 7).

Modern society is (probably) more mobile and temporary than previous societies (but anthropologists still made the mistake of treating non-moderns as immobile, Czarniawska, 2017) and perhaps mobility and temporality are especially evident in attempts at organizing (where the noun "organizations" often hinders the verbs, that is, acts of organizing, Czarniawska, 2013b). Being in the field, then, trying to understand symmetries and asymmetries, implies for Barbara to be on the move to follow humans but also non-humans. On the move, she is on the lookout for 'action' comprising of the:

- 'what, when, why, for whom, and by whom' of organizing,
- *and* 'the who's and what's' that are drawn into the orbits of organizing attempts.

Barbara often refers to the study "Already Elsewhere" (Strannegård and Friberg, 2001). In studying an IT company, where and when to be was a struggle. While "Strannegård was 'then and there', the people he observed, and especially the managers, were 'already elsewhere': travelling, meeting clients, but also in the future, they were in another company, in another world" (Czarniawska, 2008: 9).

The empirical experience of being misplaced in time and space is widely shared among flat-earthed and mobile researchers; it could be argued that such an experience is unavoidable. Such experiences must also be practically dealt with. A realization that there are no optimal choices: "We must start somewhere to study something" is a phrase that comes to mind (my guess is that it is either Barbara or John Law who writes something like this. I cannot find it). The point is that if empirical studies cannot be designed too much a priori, it follows that curiosity, intuition, and luck also have important roles to play when going into the field. Another shared experience among flat-earthed and mobile researchers is surprise, e.g., when Barbara went out to look for calculation centres and found them in different, and surprising, places (Czarniawska, 2004; which I also experienced, Jensen, 2004). There is no point in going to the field if 'we' think that we already know what is necessary to know about.

The term "shadowing" is strongly associated with Barbara (though it has other roots; see Czarniawska, 2014). About the advantages of shadowing, she writes:

> The main advantage of shadowing over stationary observation is, by definition, its mobility. But, it is not only the pure presence of movement that matters: after all, not even stationary observers remain in the same place, immobile. Shadowing creates a peculiar twosome—the person shadowed and the person doing the shadowing—in which the dynamics of cognition become complex and therefore interesting. There is a mutual observation, an establishing of similarities and differences; then there is a focus created by

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

> the movements of the person shadowed, and the double perception of a kind—the researcher guesses (and asks about) perceptions of the events being perceived as well. (Czarniawska, 2008: 10)

Shadowing as a peculiar twosome, where body and mind interfere while being mobile, has its practical hardships: jotting down field notes while on the move, or having to do so when the researcher is about to—finally—get some rest or an opportunity to eat. There are negotiations and re-negotiations of access, and it can be hard to assess different situations; where to draw the lines for the sake of maintaining integrity—on behalf of the researcher and the shadowed person (see e.g., Czarniawska, 2007; 2008, see also Jensen, 2025). It is, of course, also possible to shadow non-humans (or objects and quasi-objects, which is the term sometimes used by Barbara), which is much simpler. Following nonhumans removes "the only difficulty of shadowing—the necessity to be emotionally attuned to the person one is following" (Czarniawska, 2014: 92).

6. The Character

The well-versed Barbara Czarniawska reader might complain about the selection of publications made in this short essay. This is only fair under the condition that the purpose was to provide a representative view of her work. This is not the case. Rather, the essay is a personal statement, dealing with the texts that have resonated, or interfered, with me the most.

Admittedly, I have at times been frustrated with Barbara's reluctance to take a position; call it an ethical stance. In a nutshell, I found her at times too descriptive (e.g., performativity versus responsibility; see e.g., Czarniawska 2011b; or moral and beauty, see e.g., Czarniawska & Kostera, 2024). Writing this text, I realize that this verdict has been unfair. Barbara's texts are always crafted with the utmost respect for the 'folk theorists' and the firm belief that the task of social scientists should be to reveal what is hidden, and that this always involves other, fellow humans and nonhumans. There are a lot of mysteries out there calling for Sherlock Holmes's abduction (Czarniawska, 1999), or, framed in relation to Barbara's strong connection to ANT: There are a lot of black boxes to be found, opened, and replotted. After all, this is a task that social science should be able to undertake, and I think that it is here where organization studies needs her the most.

Yes, *her*, the whole human being. Barbara Czarniawska's legacy is much more than an enormous, influential output; it is just as much about her character that shines through in her writings: a moving constant with integrity and independent judgment, always on the move but unmistakably the same, straightforward yet tolerant, plenty of guts yet humble, and hopeful and curious. So, I hope that generations to come are as much inspired by the character of Barbara Czarniawska as by her texts.

I started with Motörhead and I like to finish off with the folk theorist James Newell Osterberg, more known as the artist Iggy Pop, who in his own way captures the importance of character (which obviously should be read as ironic in a Rortyan way, Jensen, 2025):

> Well, I'll tell you. One good thing at least about some of these junkies was they had some character. They may have driven me nuts sometimes & screwed up. But at least when they played the damn guitar they'd play it like they meant it. These white bread boys nowadays

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

> knowin' all the score don't even know how to puke. (Character, from the album American Caesar, 1993).

Barbara for sure meant it.

Keywords

paralogy, epistemology, performativity, mobility

Reference list

Beck, U. (2003). The theory of reflexive modernization: Problematic, hypotheses and research programme. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(2), 1–33.

Burke, K. (1969/1945). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Callon, M. (1998). *The Laws of the Markets*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Corvellec, H. (2013). *What is theory?*Malmö/Copenhagen: Liber/CBS press.

Czarniawska, B. (1992). Den offentliga styrningens paradoxer. In *Forskning om den offentliga sektorn: Forskningsantologi utgiven av Arbetsgruppen för forskningsfrågor*. Civildepartementet. Stockholm: Allmänna Förlaget: 39–52.

Czarniawska, B. (1995). Narration or science? Collapsing the division in Organization Studies. *Organization*, 2(1), 11–33.

Czarniawska, B. (1997). A four times told tale: Combining narrative and scientific knowledge in organization studies. *Organization*, 4(1), 7–30.

Czarniawska, B. (1998). Who is afraid of incommensurability? *Organization*, 5(2), 273–275.

Czarniawska, B. (1999). Management she wrote: Organization studies and detective stories. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 5(1), 13–41.

Czarniawska, B. (2001). Having hope in paralogy. *Human Relations*, 54(1), 13–21.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). On time, space and action nets. *Organization*, 11(6), 777–795.

Czarniawska, B. (2007). *Shadowing and other techniques for doing field work in modern societies*. Malmö/Copenhagen: Liber/CBS press.

Czarniawska, B. (2008). Organizing: how to study it and how to write about it. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 3(1), 4–20.

Czarniawska, B. (2011a). Maria Ossowska: Those shoulders so elegant... In T. Jensen & T. L. Wilson (Eds.), *On the shoulders of giants* (pp. 217–233). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Czarniawska, B. (2011b). Performativity in place of responsibility? *Journal of Organizational Change*, 24(6), 823–829.

Czarniawska, B. (2013a). What social science theory is and what it is not. In H. Corvellec (Ed.), *What is theory?* (pp. 99–118). Malmö/Copenhagen: Liber/CBS press.

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

Czarniawska, B. (2013b). Organizations as obstacles to organizing. In D. Robichaud & F. Cooren (Eds.), *Organizations and organizing. Materiality, agency, and discourse* (pp. 3–22). New York: Routledge.

Czarniawska, B. (2014). Why I think shadowing is the best field technique in management and organization studies (invited commentary). *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 9(1), 90–93.

Czarniawska, B. (2017). Organization studies as symmetrical ethnology. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 6(1), 2–10.

Czarniawska, B., & Kostera, M. (2024). Narrative glimpses of organizing. *Culture and Organization*, 30(6), 576-587.

Czarniawska, B., & Löfgren, O. (2012). *Managing overflow in affluent societies*. London: Routledge.

Czarniawska, B., & Wolff, R. (1991). Leaders, Managers, Entrepreneurs on and off the Organizational Stage. *Organization Studies*, 12(4), 529–546.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (2008, Eds.). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. London: Sage.

Jensen, T. (2004). Översättningar av konkurrens i ekonomiska laboratorier: Om ekonomiska teoriers förenkling, komplexitet och fördunkling i hälso- och sjukvården. (Eng. Translations of competition in economic laboratories: The simplification, complexity and blurring of economic theories in health care) Dissertation: Umeå University.

Jensen, T. (2013). Theory as hope. In H. Corvellec (Ed.), *What is theory?* (pp. 119–129). Malmö/Copenhagen: Liber/CBS press.

Jensen, T. (2024). Dystopian imagination, organization theory and Richard Rorty. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, 22(1), 63-74.

Jensen, T. (2025). *Fältarbete (eng. Field work)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Jensen, T., & Sandström, J. (2013). In Defence of Stakeholder Pragmatism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(2), 225-237.

Jensen, T., & Wilson, T. (2011). *On the shoulders of giants*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to follow Scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Latour B. (1992). Where are the missing masses? The sociology of a few mundane artifacts. In WE Bijker & J Law (Eds.), *Shaping Technology/Building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change* (pp. 151–80). Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.

Latour, B. (1999). On recalling ANT. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor Network Theory and after* (pp. 15–25). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Law, J. (2002). Economics as Interference. In P. du Gay & M. Pryke (Eds.), *Cultural Economy: Cultural analysis and commercial life* (pp. 21–38). London: Sage Publications.

Law, J. (2004). *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.

Lindberg, K., & Czarniawska, B. (2006). Knotting the action net, or organizing between organizations. *Scandinavian journal of Management*, 22(4), 292-306.

Lyotard, J. F. (1979/1987). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025

McCloskey, D. N. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Economics*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Miller, D. (1998). *A theory of shopping*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mol, A. (2002). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham (NC): Duke University Press.

Rorty, R. (1979/2009). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature: Thirtieth-anniversary edition*. Princeton University Press: New Jersey.

Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1991). *Objectivity, relativism and truth: Philosophical papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strannegård, L., & Friberg, M. (2001). *Already elsewhere: Play, identity and speed in the business world*. Stockholm: Raster Förlag.

Submitted 7/11/2024 – Accepted 21/10/2025