



Journal of Change Management

Reframing Leadership and Organizational Practice

ISSN: 1469-7017 (Print) 1479-1811 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rjcm20

Organizing for Community in Disruptive Times and Spaces

Anna Uhlin, Lucia Crevani & Perttu Salovaara

To cite this article: Anna Uhlin, Lucia Crevani & Perttu Salovaara (18 May 2026): Organizing for Community in Disruptive Times and Spaces, Journal of Change Management, DOI: [10.1080/14697017.2026.2671075](https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2671075)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2671075>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 18 May 2026.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 78



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Organizing for Community in Disruptive Times and Spaces

Anna Uhlin^a, Lucia Crevani^a and Perttu Salovaara^b

^aDepartment of Business and Mathematics, Mälardalen University, Västerås, Sweden; ^bFaculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

ABSTRACT

This special issue explores the holding together of organizations in times and spaces that, due to concerns related to climate change, technological advancements, and geopolitical developments among others, may be called disruptive. These are times marked by instability, uncertainty, and rapid change. With this special issue, a discussion around the meaning of community in these disruptive times and spaces is facilitated, and the articles together bring forward four themes. First, the articles provide insights into how change processes are possible to plan and facilitate but not to control entirely, and that community, therefore, can be both a process for accomplishing the change and a result of the change. Second, the articles highlight the centrality of affect to how change processes unfold, and how important it is, therefore, to acknowledge affect and learn to work with it during a change process. Third, the articles are a reminder about the ethical issues related to change processes, which is particularly sensitive when aiming at organizing for community. Fourth, the importance of including materiality as a crucial actor in organizing for community is brought forward. Together, the articles expand the exploration of organizing around a common object of concern to non-profit organizing efforts.

MAD statement

This leading article introduces a Special Issue intending to contribute to our understanding of the holding together of organizations in disruptive times and spaces marked by instability, uncertainty, and rapid change. The leading article and the articles in the Special Issue together advance our knowledge of how organizing for community may be achieved and facilitate a discussion around the meaning of community. Furthermore, they expand the exploration of organizing around a common object of concern to non-profit organizing efforts.

Introduction

How are organizations ‘held together’ in a world in which we, for a variety of reasons, often find ourselves in flux? How is work organized and managed when the world is

CONTACT Anna Uhlin  anna.uhlin@mdu.se

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

perceived as continuously changing and as increasingly performed through instability and uncertainty? Although these questions are not new, they are now being asked in reflections on a world that can be argued to be different. It is a world that is continuously shaped by, in modern times, previously unseen climate change, technological developments that fundamentally challenge the relations between humans and technologies, a toxic masculinity movement challenging the progress towards equality accomplished over the last century, and a geopolitical landscape of instability and power games devoid of diplomacy and risk mitigation. These are disruptive times and spaces, and throughout this special issue not only the question of how to organize for community in these times and spaces will be explored, but also to what extent the emergence of community can be controlled, and what role affect and ethics play in enabling community to emerge.

In other words, this special issue explores the holding together of organizations in these disruptive times and spaces. It is thus a special issue aiming to contribute to our understanding of what organizing for community means in contemporary dynamics of organizing, and the consequences thereof for processes of change, the doing of leadership, and the reframing of organizational practices.

We find it timely and urgent to facilitate a discussion around the meaning of community in relation to organizing, and we are not alone. We are noticing an increasing interest in exploring the holding together of organizations (see, for instance, Cunliffe et al., 2024; Geissinger et al., 2025; Kornberger et al., 2025; Porath et al., 2025). These sources signal a need to rethink how to approach and conceptualize 'an organization'. We are in need of new ways of making sense of organizations, and, not least, as humans we are in need of finding new ways of being part of and constituting organizations. The Greek word *organon* means tool or instrument, while community comes from Latin and is a combination of *con*, meaning together, and *munis*, meaning public duties. Organizing for community can therefore be understood as a question of creating and maintaining tools for enabling the performance of (public) duties together. This is not done in isolation, but rather in relation to other organizations, whether businesses, public organizations, civil society organizations, and so on.

One example of disruptions that challenge how we can create and maintain tools for performing duties together is the increased use of digital technologies. For instance, the times we live in are referred to as postdigital (Cramer, 2015), with the argument that there are few activities that are performed that are not, at least in some aspect, digital. The fact that 'everything' we do has elements of digital technologies entangled in it has effects on how work is perceived and consequently on how organizations are maintained. AI further challenges the concept of work. Where first-order technologies, such as a plough or an axe, are entangled in human-technology-nature relations, and where second-order technologies, such as a screwdriver or an engine, are situated in human-technology-technology relations, third-order technologies, such as certain AI technologies, leave the human idle in their technology-technology-technology relations (Floridi, 2013). In addition, technological development is a foundation for the flexibilization (Hallin et al., 2025) of contemporary working life when it comes to how, when, and where we work. This flexibility affects our view of what an organization is as well as how community comes about. Flexibilization changes what is perceived as 'a workplace' and blurs the boundaries between work and non-work spheres (ibid), with consequences for the accomplishment of community. Furthermore, the fragmentation of work that the implementation of technologies

often renders (Andersson, 2023) has an effect on work autonomy (Petraiki & Kornelakis, 2016) as well as on how we work together.

Besides the changes to work brought about by the introduction of AI technologies and by flexible work arrangements and hybrid work made possible by digital technologies, there are additional developments prompting us to further investigate how organizing for community is and can be done in contemporary organizations. As noted above, we see an unfolding of events leading to change on a local as well as a global scale. Change in itself is not the problem here – reality is always about change. What is concerning is the direction of the pendulum and the possible magnitude of the consequences that recent turns in the organizing of our shared life sphere bring with them: climate change, wars, and political instability are, for instance, pressing issues. Conservative, authoritarian forces have been successful in gaining ground over the past decades, with 74% of the world population now living in autocracies.¹ This ground-gaining is often achieved through polemical argumentation followed by division, polarization, and individualism.

In times of instability, growing individualism and polarization, how do we get from ‘I’ to ‘We, as Svensson, Stable, and von Knorring (2026) ask? These are among the issues that indicate that the disruptive times and spaces we are living and organizing in call for expanded knowledge of how coming together is accomplished. They change the how as well as the why of how we relate to each other when working, and we can no longer take for granted that *we have* a shared common ground since many traditional organizational structures and boundaries are dissolving. Instead, we propose to assume that collectives need to *produce* common ground to some extent in other ways and through different means than in the past. The challenges presented above cannot be solved by single actors – they demand that people work together by establishing common ground that serves as a foundation for contributing to the common good. How we organize for coming together—for community—changes while at the same time possibly being more important than ever before. An everyday example is digital and hybrid meetings, which invite us to produce common ground and community in new ways—and introduce new and different kinds of challenges than more traditional on-site meetings. In these meetings we are not in the same physical room, but instead materialize in a fragmented way, each participant in an individual square on a screen. At the same time, in these meetings we are enabled to uphold multiple simultaneous conversations (we can talk and we can write in the chat). These meetings are, therefore, new forms of meetings that enable the accomplishment of common ground in certain ways while disrupting others (Uhlin, 2022; Uhlin & Crevani, 2026).

Adler and Heckscher (2006) are among the scholars who have been interested in understanding the organization of community. They suggest that there is a form of community, which they label collaborative community, that can be mobilized in contemporary organizations. In their view, this is a form of community that goes beyond the two traditional views previously brought to the fore in sociology. The first, which according to the authors traces back to Weber, Tönnies, and Sennett, is a view of the dying community as eroded by capitalistic growth and modernity. The second form, building on Tocqueville and others, calls for a return to pre-modern community through traditional collectives such as family and church groups. The third form, in line with the collaborative community they propose, suggests the possibility of a higher form of community that

offers simultaneously higher degrees of solidarity and autonomy. The authors argue that capitalism has brought with it not only a demolished community but also a need for '*complex, knowledge-based and solutions-oriented production*' (p. 12), and therefore progress in terms of community. Adler and colleagues suggest that, in the organizing of work, community emerges as a principle of organizing in parallel with more hierarchical and market-driven principles (Adler et al., 2008; Adler & Heckscher, 2006). That is, building on earlier sociological work, Adler and Heckscher (2006) discuss community in the form of *Gemeinschaft* (which is based on strong personal bonds and traditional authority) as being in the shadow of hierarchy, while community in the form of *Gesellschaft* (which is based on instrumental rationality and market exchanges) is talked about as community in the shadow of the market. *Collaborative* community, on the other hand, brings out community as the dominant principle. The authors argue that this form of community forms when people come together to produce a shared value of some kind, and that it '*characterizes societies in which the generation of knowledge, often involving many specialists, has become central to economic production*' (p. 20). In this form of community, values must be understood in similar ways by everyone; they are the object of shared activity and not individual beliefs (ibid). With the disruptive changes in the world discussed above in mind, we may ask what collaborative community looks like today – 20 years after Adler and colleagues published their work. How does contemporary collaborative community come about, how does it enable us to perform work, and does it, ultimately, contribute to a greater good?

The Articles in This Special Issue

In this special issue, we have collected five articles that explore the issue of organizing for community in disruptive times and spaces in different contexts, making it possible to develop insight into different aspects of this phenomenon. In the following, we first briefly present the content of each of the articles and then discuss which themes emerge when considering the special issue as a whole.

In the first article, Parolin and Pellegrinelli (2026) bring our attention to affirmative ethics as a way of organizing for community and the common good. Quoting Braidotti (2018), they explain that affirmative ethics '*rests on an enlarged sense of a vital interconnection with a multitude of human and non-human others by removing the obstacle of self-centred individualism and anthropocentrism on the one hand and the barriers of negativity on the other*' (p. 221). This means promoting forms of power that empower, rather than repress, in change processes. At the same time, empowering is not confined only to humans, as in many relational ethical stances, but rather social justice is about sustainable ways of living together, among humans and non-humans. The authors apply this theoretical perspective to unpack a change process that took place when spontaneous mutual aid was organized during Covid-19 in a place particularly affected by the pandemic. Showing how this kind of grassroots organizing can address disruption when public and private organizations are more prone to avoid radically changing their activities, the authors invite us to reflect on the need to adopt new ethical frameworks capable of accounting for the grassroots experiences that can make it possible to manage social crises. The authors show how collective ethical practices emerged and were organized through an affirmative ethics that unfolded in an assemblage of

bodies, affections, and technologies. With this study, the authors advance our understanding of relational ethical stances beyond anthropocentrism and trace the forces of ethical action that guide collective action. In particular, they propose that posthumanist practice theory can be a methodological tool for analysing affirmative ethics in concrete situations, bringing to the fore resistance, creativity, and transformation in organizations.

Affect in the form of a wish to live and survive was central to the process described by Parolin and Pellegrinelli (2026), and the second article, written by Leni Grünbaum (2026), also mobilizes an affective sensibility in her reading of the concept of 'communitas,' which she borrows from the work of Turner (1969) and Turner (2012) to characterize 'powerful spontaneous experiences of existential togetherness' (Grünbaum, 2026). Whereas other scholars have used the concept of *communitas* in relation to the study of organizational change, they have tended to portray *communitas* as an experience that can be planned and orchestrated. Based on her own experience as a practitioner of change facilitation, Grünbaum felt that such an understanding was too limited. By means of an affective auto-ethnography, she brings us into the change process she facilitated in a child psychiatric team at a Nordic university hospital and shows the affective dynamics that led to the emergence of *communitas*. To this end, the author uses poetry as a way of writing differently in research, and as we read the text, we are invited to feel the situation and the changing atmospheres. We then see and feel how *communitas* emerges between human bodies and non-human materialities, amplifying affective resonance and 'negative capability' (Keats & Scudde, 1899), which is defined as the capability of being open to something new and different. The study, therefore, shows that someone – a facilitator or a manager – may plan for the conditions for *communitas* to emerge, but the emergence itself is situated and outside that person's control. As *communitas* emerges, it strengthens connection, making it possible for the collective to overcome hardships and move forward together in a way that is open to improving shared practices through collaboration. The examples of the emergence of *communitas* that the author shows took place in a sort of liminal space, or space in between, in which familiar reality was suspended, and something different could be created. What the paper in particular brings forward is that when working with change in collaborative ways, it is important to understand the creation and use of liminal spaces and how they can enable *communitas*.

Liminality and inclusion are also central themes in the third article in this special issue, in which Thunus et al. (2026) present their research on Places for Connection (PFCs) and explore how organizational practices that support placemaking can lead to more inclusive communities. Whereas Grünbaum's article builds on the original notion of liminality as a space in between, Thunus et al. (2026) lean on another understanding of liminality, as a condition that is permanent for marginalized subjects, which they call enduring liminality. In what the authors call relational, emergent, transformative, change-oriented organizations (RETCOs), it is particularly visible how placemaking may lead to more inclusive communities. More specifically, Thunus et al. (2026) combine the three concepts – RETCOs, borderlands, and black placemaking – to study PFCs supporting people with histories of mental health difficulties and show how active placemaking by PFC members creates places of unconditional acceptance. The implications for organizations are particularly interesting, as they show the value of rethinking normative processes related to participation and success. Expanding collective thinking around such processes invites an extended view of inclusion in organizations. Additionally, this study has implications for

how change in organizations can be supported through a trust-based approach, also for individuals with mental health issues. The paper, in mobilizing the concept of placemaking as a way of teasing out how community formation is related to spaces that can be 'claimed' by marginalized individuals or groups of individuals, contributes to knowledge on community in organizations by highlighting the importance of spaces of acceptance for the emergence of community.

The importance of space and place is also brought to the fore in the fourth paper in this special issue, which explores the issue of community as office spaces are reorganized. Activity-based workspaces are increasingly being implemented, and the purpose is often said to be promoting communication, fostering interaction, enabling collaboration, and consequently supporting the building of a sense of community in organizations (Gerlitz & Hülsbeck, 2024). Halldórsson et al. (2026) examine how workplace design in terms of activity-based workplaces impacts employee perceptions of collaboration and communication effectiveness, how such perceptions evolve over time, and how person-environment fit, interacting with the work environment, relates to perceived improvements in collaboration and communication effectiveness. Person-environment fit is a construct that emphasizes the level of alignment between an individual's preferences and the characteristics of her workspace. The findings from Halldórsson et al. (2026) longitudinal study of organizations re-organizing their physical office spaces into flexible, activity-based spaces show that perceived collaboration and communication effectiveness improves with the transition to activity-based offices, but there are no significant differences over time (the study was conducted at four different measurement points). Halldórsson et al. (2026) in addition show that person-environment fit is significant for the perception of collaboration and communication effectiveness, with individuals with higher person-environment fit rating the two measures higher than individuals with lower person-environment fit. The findings are particularly interesting in how they suggest that the positive impact on collaboration and communication of transitioning to activity-based offices is immediate and persistent over time, and in how they point towards the need for careful consideration of individual needs in relation to workplace design in order for such benefits to be realized.

Halldórsson et al.'s (2026) study thus points to how change affects individuals differently when their workspaces are reorganized because digital technologies make it possible not to depend on a fixed desk in an office. Hallin et al. (2026) expand on this issue in the final article in this special issue, in which they discuss the work of virtual teams, i.e. work groups that collaborate and communicate across the boundaries of space and time through the use of digital technologies. The authors ask how the characteristics of the texture of practices of which workers are a part (Gherardi, 2006, 2012, 2019) affect possibilities for interaction. The concept of texture of practices conveys the idea that specific work practices rest on other work practices (Gherardi, 2019) and enable the teasing out of the multiplicity of entanglements of humans and technologies that make up a virtual team, i.e., the many relations in which participants in a virtual team are intertwined with other people and with the different technologies used for communication and collaboration in their daily work. In addition, by mobilizing the concept of texture of practices, the authors bring out the complexities of entangled work-related and seemingly non-work-related practices, and place focus on the proliferation of humans and technologies that co-produce a particular team's common work practices. Hallin et al. (2026)

bring forward the benefits of such a framework for understanding the dynamics of the work community of virtual teams, not as a result of individuals and technologies, but as a result of the entanglements of individual, situated, and affective practices in the texture of practices. In particular, Hallin et al. (2026) use Strum and Latour's (1987) term 'line-of-sight' to highlight how moving jointly as a community within a team is not only about creating opportunities for visibility, for instance by introducing shared digital communication systems, but rather about navigating the complex 'artefact ecologies' (Korsgaard et al., 2022) that co-produce contemporary workplaces. The authors conclude that the texture of practices of virtual teams both supports team members in staying within line-of-sight and enables (or causes) them to fall out-of sight, which contributes to our understanding of how a work community unfolds in virtual teams. Failing to take into consideration the existing texture of practices when introducing new digital technologies in work teams may limit possibilities for staying within line-of-sight, thereby negatively impacting the work community. Hence, when working with change processes that are meant to support a group by introducing a new technology, it is important to consider the texture of practices in which such a change takes place in order not to compromise the community in the group.

Themes Emerging Across the Articles

The articles collected in this special issue, in other words, focus on different kinds of communities and different kinds of change processes that, however, to some extent overlap. Moreover, the articles jointly bring some important themes to the fore.

First, they all speak to the questions of whether it is possible to organize for community and, if so, for which purpose. In relation to the former question, whereas all the articles provide insight into how to create conditions in which community may emerge, they also caution against believing that the emergence of community cannot be controlled. Hallin et al. (2026), for instance, show that the effects of introducing a new technology are not just about the technology itself but rather depend on the texture of practices in which such an introduction happens – such a texture is beyond any single actor's control. The texture of practices of a work group in which a plethora of work- and non-work-related practices take part cannot be fully controlled given its complexity, and therefore the result of the change cannot be controlled. Interestingly, with regard to the second question above, community can be regarded as the means for change to happen, as well as the result of the change. In particular, in Grünbaum (2026), Parolin and Pellegrinelli (2026), as well as Thunus et al. (2026), the change processes studied are inclusive and empowering. In these processes, community is both a process and a result. Organizing for community does, in other words, take place by actually doing community. Moreover, organizing for community is, in all three articles, done outside traditional hierarchical organizational structures, and the doing of community enables changes in organizational practices to emerge. What the special issue provides insight into is, therefore, change processes that are possible to plan and facilitate – but not to entirely control – in which community can be both a process for accomplishing the change and a result of the change.

Second, several of the articles direct our attention to the affective dimension of change, and more specifically, to organizing for community. As the articles show,

change, and in particular, change that makes community possible, is about desire, about intensities and atmospheres, and about being with one another. Traditionally, the literature on change has relegated affect to the background or has often depicted people's reactions to change initiatives as negative. One of the main themes in the change management literature is, for instance, resistance to change. Although this journal has criticized the way in which resistance is often framed and has provided alternative ways of understanding what happens during a change process, the discourse on resistance is still strong. It is clearly an affective discourse, in which people are portrayed as uncomfortable when thrown into a change situation. However, although affect has been explored in research on change in organizations, little research has explored how it may positively contribute to making change meaningful and inclusive for the participants. The articles in this special issue show the centrality of affect to how change processes unfold, and how important it therefore, to acknowledge affect and learn to work with it during a change process.

Third, and to some extent connected to the affective dimension of change, the articles also remind us of the ethical issues related to change processes, particularly when trying to organize for community. Parolin and Pellegrinelli (2026), as well as Thunus et al. (2026), study initiatives that are driven by an emancipatory interest and an inclusive ambition. Parolin and Pellegrinelli (2026) propose mobilizing an affirmative ethics to make sense of the studied initiative and therefore promote an ethics of empowerment and joy. Thunus et al. (2026) also analyze a case where empowerment is at the core of organizing for community, and where creating spaces that enable acceptance for all, not least marginalized groups, is shown to be central. Grünbaum (2026) also engages in empowerment while facilitating a change process. Interestingly, empowerment and discipline are intertwined rather than distinct opposites. Clearly, Grünbaum (2026) wishes to empower the participants in the workshops she held by enabling them to connect through affect and to become ready to create something new as they enter a liminal space. On the other hand, the emergence of *communitas* that she describes could also be seen as a disciplining process, in which certain ways of acting become legitimate while others do not. This is made particularly strong by the intense affect produced in the interactions.

Finally, the articles also invite us to take materiality into consideration. All the articles bring to the fore materiality as an important aspect or actor in organizing for community. Whereas research on change has acknowledged the importance of materiality, few studies bring technologies, spaces, places, and objects to the fore when trying to understand how change unfolds. In this special issue, materiality ranges from new office layouts to the digital technologies we use to do work nowadays, to birds and carpets, to placemaking, to food to be distributed, as well as to the bodies of all humans included in the processes studied. Materiality is therefore multiple and always part of change processes. Practice theories, placemaking, and sociomateriality are among the theoretical perspectives used by the authors in this special issue to include materiality in analyses of organizing for community. We invite scholars of change to take inspiration from these authors and to engage in further advancing our understanding of materiality and what it does in change processes.

Conclusion

This special issue advances our knowledge of how organizing for community may be achieved. The articles provide insights into how collaborative communities may be supported and which challenges emerge when, for instance, new technologies are introduced in organizations, or when inclusion and diversity are taken seriously. The articles, however, also go beyond the collaborative community proposed by Adler and Heckscher (2006), as they expand the exploration of organizing around a common object of concern to non-profit organizing efforts. The articles show that organizing for community can support change to enable the common good, but also that such a change process is not one that can be controlled in traditional ways. The change process towards community is better thought of as one that can be facilitated rather than controlled, and insights from the articles suggest that there are important ethical and affective dimensions that need to be understood and taken into consideration when working with this, as well as material components that should not be underestimated. Our hope is that the research presented in this special issue will not only increase our understanding of organizing for community but also inspire scholars of change and leadership to engage in further research on this important issue. We have only just begun to scratch the surface, and the issue has become even more relevant and urgent during the time in which the articles in this special issue have been written. Moreover, future research would benefit from perspectives and empirical cases from parts of the world other than the so-called global North, not least given how ideas of communing and community have, in different ways been, and continue to be, central to many cultures. To some extent, the articles in the special issue show how unconventional methodological approaches and contexts enable the development of rich understanding – but there is more to be done.

Note

1. https://v-dem.net/documents/75/V-Dem_Institute_Democracy_Report_2026_lowres.pdf.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond [P21-0235].

Notes on Contributors

Anna Uhlin is an Associate Senior Lecturer in Industrial Economics and Organization at the Department of Business and Mathematics at Mälardalen University.

Lucia Crevani is a Professor in Business Administration at the Department of Business and Mathematics at Mälardalen University.

Perttu Salovaara is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Helsinki.

References

- Adler, P. S., & Heckscher, C. (2006). Towards collaborative community. In C. Heckscher & P. S. Adler (Eds.), *The firm as a collaborative community: Reconstructing trust in the knowledge economy* (pp. 11–105). Oxford University Press.
- Adler, P. S., Kwon, S.-W., & Heckscher, C. (2008). Perspective – professional work: The emergence of collaborative community. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 359–376. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1070.0293>
- Andersson, C. (2023). *Digital automation of administrative work how automating reconfigures administrative work*. Malardalen University.
- Braidotti, R. (2018). Joy, the ethics of. In R. Braidotti & M. Hlavajova (Eds.), *Posthuman glossary* (pp. 221–224). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cramer, F. (2015). What is ‘post-digital’? In D. M. Berry & M. Dieter (Eds.), *Postdigital aesthetics: Art, computation and design* (pp. 12–26). Springer.
- Cunliffe, A. L., de Vaujany, F.-X., Hafermalz, E., Introna, L., Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A., & Willems, T. (2024). Experiencing communality in collective activity: Four ways to generate sameness in differences. *Management Learning*, 55(3), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076241244787>
- Floridi, L. (2013). Technology’s in-betweenness. *Philosophy & Technology*, 26(2), 111–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-013-0106-y>
- Geissinger, A., Bromley, P., & Meyer, J. W. (2025). Hyper-organization and myths of community. *Organization Studies*, 47(4), 613–637.
- Gerlitz, A., & Hülsbeck, M. (2024). The productivity tax of new office concepts: A comparative review of open-plan offices, activity-based working, and single-office concepts. *Management Review Quarterly*, 74(2), 745–775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00316-2>
- Gherardi, S. (2006). *Organizational knowledge: The texture of workplace learning*. Blackwell.
- Gherardi, S. (2012). Why do practices change and why do they persist? Models of explanations. In P. Hager, A. Lee, & A. Reich (Eds.), *Practice, learning and change: Practice-theory perspectives on professional learning* (pp. 217–231). Springer.
- Gherardi, S. (2019). *How to conduct a practice-based study: Problems and methods* (2nd ed.). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788973564>
- Grünbaum, L. (2026). Affective moments of togetherness: Communitas in change processes. *Journal of Change Management*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2665117>
- Halldórsson, F., Valgeirsson, H., & Kristinsson, K. (2026). Do flexible workspaces foster employee interactions? Longitudinal evidence from activity-based work environments. *Journal of Change Management*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2651525>
- Hallin, A., Andersson, C., Crevani, L., Ingvarsson, C., Ivory, C., Lammi, I., Lindell, E., & Uhlin, A. (2025). *Creating the future of work: Imaginaries in an era of digitalization*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Hallin, A., Ivory, C., & Uhlin, A. (2026). Exploring the texture of practices of virtual teamwork: The line-of-sight of work-place communities. *Journal of Change Management*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2631403>
- Keats, J., & Scudde, H. E. (1899). *The complete poetical works and letters of John Keats*. Mifflin and Co.
- Kornberger, M., Meyer, R. E., Martí, I., Frey-Heger, C., Cornelissen, J., & Gatzweiler, M. (2025). Collective action in crisis? Introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 46(7), 919–939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406251336033>
- Korsgaard, H., Lyle, P., Saad-Sulonen, J., Klokose, C. N., Nouwens, M., & Bødker, S. (2022). Collectives and their artifact ecologies. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555533>
- Parolin, L. L., & Pellegrinelli, C. (2026). Affirmative ethics and organising for community from a post-humanist practice theory perspective. *Journal of Change Management*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2655212>
- Petrakaki, D., & Kornelakis, A. (2016). ‘We can only request what’s in our protocol’: Technology and work autonomy in healthcare. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 31(3), 223–237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ntwe.12072>

- Porath, C., Gibson, C., & Spreitzer, G. (2025). Community inside and out: Moving community front and center in management research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 19(2), 800–860. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2023.0200>
- Strum, S., & Latour, B. (1987). The meanings of social: From baboons to humans. *Social Science Information*, 26(4), 783–802. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901887026004004>
- Svensson, I., Stuessen Stabel, L., & von Knorring, M. (2026). From 'I' to 'We'-conceptualising the work and experiences of managers in fostering collective leadership. *Leadership*, 22(1), 40–60.
- Thunus, S., Chen, K. K., & Mandiberg, J. M. (2026). Placemaking borderlands: How organizations can support emancipatory inclusion. *Journal of Change Management*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2026.2651524>
- Turner, E. (2012). *Communitas: The anthropology of collective joy*. Springer.
- Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process. Structure and anti-structure*. Aldine de Gruyter.
- Uhlen, A. (2022). "You are on mute ...": *Enabling coming together in digitally mediated meetings*. Mälardalen University.
- Uhlen, A., & Crevani, L. (2026). Verbal, visual and affective work when chairing digital meetings: A micro-ethnographic study. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOE-06-2025-0079>