

5

New ways of working or not? Transcending the continuity versus change conundrum through boundary events

Anthony Hussenot and Jeremy Aroles

Introduction

While change concerns novelty and difference, continuity is often understood as a form of stability or repetition of the same. Through this dualism between change and continuity, academics (but also journalists, intellectuals and society at large) can either emphasize the novelty of a given organizational phenomenon or highlight its historical inscription in older, existing practices. This ambivalence is particularly noticeable with the debate on new ways of working. The recent surge in teleworking in the context of the (ongoing) Covid-19 crisis is a case in point, with some stating that working from home brings a radical change to how people work, while others have aptly reminded us that telework has existed for a long time in a way or another and, as such, does not constitute a new practice. Mindful of these two opposite and contradictory stances, some others have analysed remote working as a first step towards a radical change in the world of work based on flexible workspace and new managerial methods. Finally, others have seen in the rise of teleworking just another sign of the ineluctable casualization of labour that began a long time ago. As such, a same phenomenon can be perceived as either a change that can lead to even more radical changes in the future or simply as a continuation of what has been occurring for quite some time.

Attempting to overcome this long-standing dualism, scholars have developed different views to integrate both continuity and change into a same framework. Orlikowski (1996) has suggested understanding change as endemic to situated practices. For her, change is continuous as it occurs through improvisation, innovation and adjustment of routines. Following this perspective, Weick and Quinn (1999) have advocated operating a shift from the notion 'change' to that of 'changing' to pay more attention to the ongoing and embedded nature

of change. In the same vein, Chia (1999), Feldman (2000) and then Tsoukas and Chia (2002) have suggested rejecting the idea of episodic change and focusing instead on the continuity of change. From this standpoint, change is understood as an ongoing process. Other scholars have endeavoured to further problematize the intricate relation between continuity and change, stating, for example, that 'stability can be both an outcome and a medium of change' (Farjoun, 2010, p. 202).

Finally, others have sought to build up a new understanding of the continuity and change dualism by relying on process philosophy. In such a view, there is no such thing as stability or change but only a 'becoming of continuity' (Whitehead, 1929/1978). Stability and change can be seen as the materialization of dynamic relations between complex processes of repetition and difference *sensu* Gilles Deleuze (see Aroles & McLean, 2016). This metaphysical view of reality means that stability and novelty are only situated experiences and reifications made of the flow of continuous change(s). Following Henri Bergson's philosophy (1896/2010, 1889/2013, 1907/2009, 1911/2011) and more generally a process philosophy perspective (Rescher, 1996; Langley & Tsoukas, 2010, 2017), we can posit that we live in a flow of continuous change. Yet, to make our reality tangible and practical, we need to create 'things' that essentially cut and divide the flow of continuous change. These 'things' (called images in Henri Bergson's philosophy) enable us to experience the reality as being tangible and intelligible.

However, this tangibility and intelligibility only occur through the enactment of temporalities. Enactment here means that when people act, they produce material, spatial, symbolic and temporal 'elements' (Weick, 1988). Enactment is thus a social process in which the flow of experiences is made more or less tangible by actors to serve their action (as material, temporal, spatial and symbolic structures both constrain and enable actors). A temporality is thus a structure of past, present and future events produced through action; a temporality endows the current moment with its sense of continuity defining both the meaning and 'concreteness' of the lived moment (Hussenot & Missonier, 2016; Hernes, 2020; Hussenot, Hernes, & Bouty, 2020). Following this view, the experience of stability or change is a situated and temporary outcome resulting from the way actors enact past, present and anticipated events in their current moment.

In this chapter, our aim is to show the individuals' assessment of organizational phenomena (such as the development of teleworking) as either a form of continuity/stability or a new practice is essentially contingent on how they mobilize, negotiate and translate past, present and future miscellaneous events, thus

forming and assembling different temporalities. By leveraging a temporal view on the matter of new ways of working, our aim is to delve into how various actors perceive a same phenomenon as a new (or not) work practice. More precisely, we argue that 'new' ways of working are neither never completely new nor a simple repetition of the same, but only part of 'immanent temporal trajectories' mobilizing different interpretations (Hernes, Hussenot, & Pulk, 2021). This has, we contend, important implications for how we understand the future of work; the future of work is never a radical shift, disconnected from the current ways of working but is rather a projection based on the enactment of past, present and future events.

The main contribution of this chapter lies in the articulation of a perspective that both encapsulates a process view that sees reality as a becoming of continuity (in which the stability and change dualism needs to be overcome) and captures the situated experience of actors through which stability and continuity/stability are tangible ways to materialize and qualify lived moments. We argue that scholars often conflate the two views, leading to a confusion between a metaphysical development emphasizing the indivisible flux of continuous change on one hand, and the way actors define their intelligible and tangible reality by materializing this indivisible flux in terms of stability and novelty on the other (Hernes, Feddersen & Schultz, 2021). However, this materialization of reality is not unique; various temporalities are enacted by actors leading to qualify a same phenomenon differently as either a mere continuation or a change.

As such, we propose the concept of *boundary event* to account for how a same event can lead to different temporalities for various people. A boundary event is essentially a common event that is experienced differently. Consequently, these *boundary events* participate in the shaping of various temporalities, leading to different continuities. Ultimately, this partly explains why actors do not always experience the same reality despite enacting the same events.

Transcending the continuity and change conundrum

What we call continuity is the way we make the indivisible movement of life intelligible. Considering Bergson's philosophy, life is an indivisible movement in which there are no predefined 'things' (see Hussenot, 2022). We sometimes experience this indivisible movement of life in some moments of meditations, trances, creations or even reading, as suggested by one of the editors of this book. However, to make the world intelligible and tangible, people have to

experience it as a set of *images*. In Bergson's work (1896/2010, 1889/2013, 1907/2009), images are the only way to create a tangible reality. In other words, life is an indivisible movement, but to make sense and act in the current moment, we create rather stable images, thus defining what we call reality. Images can be anything that makes the world tangible. Words, objects, people, events (etc.) may be seen as images. Importantly, Henri Bergson does not posit that reality does not exist, rather that the very existence of reality lies in images. It does not mean either that reality is merely subjective. Images become endowed with objectivity as we experience them as exterior to us. Moreover, these images are shared among people; when people reach a common view about those images, they participate in the building of a shared reality.

From this perspective, continuity is the ability to relate our current moment with some past, present and/or future events. Continuity is what makes sense about the current moment. The expression 'make sense' is here close to the notion of sensemaking found in organization studies (Weick, 1995 ; Maitlis & Christianson, 2004), that is, 'a process of meaning-making in which people attempt to comprehend ambiguous, unexpected, and/or confusing events' (Rheinhardt & Gioia, 2021, p. 77). In other words, we have a sense of why and how the current moment is happening thanks to our ability to relate this moment to a past, a present and a future. More precisely, continuity emerges from the retention of past events and the protention of possible future events (Husserl, 1927/1964). Let's say you are watching a yacht entering the port. As explained by Blattner (2020), to experience the gliding of a yacht from point A (the entrance of the yacht into the port) to point B (the mooring at the dock), we experience the yacht as moving in motion: 'In other words, when you see the yacht at point B, you see it at point B-as-having-earlier-been-at-point-A' (p. 16). To make sense of this current moment, we have to enact simultaneously some past events (the yacht outside the port), present event (the yacht entering the port) and future event (the yacht being moored at the dock). Retention of past events and protention of future events make the experience of a movement intelligible. This is why we can make sense of what's going on with this yacht gliding into the port. Consequently, a current moment can never be isolated from the past, the present and the future, and is always intricately related to them.

In other words, our reality becomes tangible through the enactment of temporalities that are based on the retention of past events and the protention of expected future events. Retention and protention of events form a plausible and useful account enabling us to answer the 'what', 'why' and 'how' questions of the current moment. As such, temporality enables us to make sense of the current moment (me watching a yacht gliding in a port) because we can relate

this current moment to some past and future events. Importantly, people do not need to live all the past events to enact them (and of course, the same goes for future events). To extend Blattner's (2020) example, one can say that if I'm watching a yacht gliding to the dock, I can easily make sense of this current moment by enacting (among others) the past event about the boat entering into the port even if I was not there when it happened. The same can be said about a future event. Even if I cannot wait till the yacht is moored at the dock, I can easily anticipate this event, and this is why this current moment (a yacht gliding in the port) can make sense to me. Even if past and future events are not directly lived by actors, they are plausible enough to make sense of the current moment.

Conversely, novelties, surprises, astonishments or even shocks happen when past and/or future events do not match the expected temporality from which we are supposed to experience the current moment. Most of the time, it just requires a bit of adjustment in the way we enact our temporality to make sense of the current moment. For instance, one can be very surprised if the yacht we were watching going into the port suddenly turns around and leaves the port, instead of gliding through the port to be moored. Consequently, this current moment would not make any sense. Why does the yacht suddenly turn around? What's wrong? To answer these questions, we would need either to find some explanations or articulate some hypotheses: 'Does it have a technical problem? Is it the wrong port? Etc.'. This unexpected event would change our sense of continuity related to this current moment and we would have to reconsider the events enacted, to define a new temporality, even if it would be partly made of some hypotheses about what happened and what will happen for this yacht.

The current moment can sometimes be such a radical shift that it can take a lot of time and effort to (re)create a sense of continuity, especially when what is happening seems to be impossible, at first glance, to relate to any past and future events. This is essentially what happens when we witness an event that has no precedent in our mind, such as a terrorist attack. We unfortunately lived this moment on 11 September 2001 (called 9/11), when we witnessed commercial airliners crashing into the New York World Trade Center twin towers, the Pentagon, and in a Pennsylvania field. For most of us, while we were horrified, it also took a while to make sense of what was happening (i.e. to relate this current moment to past historical events such as the American tensions with al-Qaida and Taliban in Afghanistan and future ones), as we could guess that the (western) world was entering into a new era, made of wars against terrorism. As such, whatever happens (even the most disruptive and shocking events) in our life, we always seek to establish some form of

continuity. This continuity emerges from the temporality we enact, that is the way we relate the current moment to past, present and future events. Even the most radical change is always temporally positioned in such a way that continuity is re-performed. It is our only way to make sense of the current moment. From this perspective, the past, the present and the future continually change through their constant (re)enactment by people. The past, the present and the future are thus always situated to make sense of the current moment (Hussenot, 2019; Hernes & Schultz, 2020).

For example, a wedding day is an important event that can be often re-enacted to make sense of other moments in our personal life, happy or not (birth, wedding anniversary, divorce, death, etc.). As such, the way we enact this wedding day evolves through time. It is essentially 'adapted' to the current moment. Consequently, the way we depict a wedding day, the meaning we give to this event, the way we interpret people's behaviour and speeches during this day (and so on) are slightly (or more radically) different each time we enact this event. By doing that, we make sense of changes happening in our life. Whatever the reason, the way we enact an event is always situated; it is always enacted in a way that resonates with the current moment, a way that contributes to making the current moment intelligible and tangible. From this perspective, changes – inasmuch as they are enacted events – are always in a state of becoming (i.e. they are never given once and for all but are constantly redefined and revisited). Moreover, past, present and future events enacted by people to make sense about these changes are not defined once and for all either, but are redefined and revisited as well. Those past, present and future events form structures of events that are enacted again and again along the activity, leading to (re)definitions, deletions, or integrations of new events into the global structure of events (Hernes, 2014a, 2014b; Hussenot & Missonier, 2016; Hernes, Hussenot, & Pulk, 2020). However, a shared event (such as a wedding day, for instance) is not always part of the same temporalities (i.e. a shared narrative made of past, present and future events). Individuals can experience a same event very differently and/or re-enact this event very differently over time. A same wedding day can be part of a happy story for some and a sad one for others. Moreover, a wedding day can be interpreted as a happy day at first but be re-interpreted as a sad one later on, as people can re-interpret what happened during this event and/or enact other events altering their interpretation.

Introducing the concept of boundary event

A same shared event can thus be interpreted differently, and consequently, be part of very different narratives. This can explain partly why a same event – such as the quick adoption of teleworking in March 2020 in the context of the Covid-19 – can be experienced as a continuation for some people or a change for others. To understand how a same event can be interpreted very differently by people and be part of very different temporalities, we here propose the concept of boundary event.

The concept of boundary event is partly derived from the concept of boundary object developed by Star and Griesemer (1989) (see Levina & Vaast, 2005 and Spee & Jarzabkowski, 2009 – among others – for some developments in organization studies). A boundary object has a common identity and a shared symbolic structure; it ‘is common enough to more than one world to make them recognizable’ (Star and Griesemer, 1989, p. 393). As such, boundary objects are ‘flexible epistemic artifacts that inhabit several intersecting social worlds and satisfy the information requirements of each of them’ (Star and Griesemer, 1989, p. 393).

Following this definition, boundary events are common enough to be recognizable by different people or social groups but are enacted differently. In other words, it means that a boundary event is partly shared by a large group of people, but, at the same time, is interpreted and related to other past, present and future events differently. Paraphrasing Star and Griesemer (1989), boundary events inhabit several intersecting temporalities of different people and groups of people. Hernes and Schultz (2020, p. 8) have recently suggested the notion of singular event to deal with unique and vivid past or future events: ‘they are easily evoked, communicated and visualized because they have essential features that are readily recognizable’. The concept of boundary event, as developed in this chapter, can be understood as a sort of past, future or even present singular event that has ‘features’ that are shared by most actors, but still does not necessarily build a common understanding about a phenomenon. A boundary event is common enough among people, but still enacted to different structure of events, either complementary or opposite, leading to very different stories about a same phenomenon. As such, the notion of boundary event can help us to understand how some events can create both a shared understanding as well as differences and oppositions.

To understand how a same event can be interpreted as a mere continuation or as a radical shift, we now turn our attention to the development of telework in

France in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020–22. We focus on the quick adoption of teleworking in France in March 2020 (i.e. during the first lockdown) and show that if the adoption of teleworking was largely enacted by people as the start event of a new story (the collective story of the pandemic), it led to very different stories that have been disputed and translated. Consequently, the quick adoption of teleworking in France in March 2020 is here seen as a boundary event enacted at the same time by numerous workers but still participating in the definition of various temporalities leading to different ‘stories’ about the evolution of work.

Empirical illustration: change and continuity in the development of telework in France

On 12 March 2020, the French President announced the first nation-wide lockdown. The spread of the virus COVID-19 and the increasing mortality rate forced the French government (and many others across the globe) to make a radical decision. People were asked to stay at home and only some categories of workers – named ‘essential workers’ – were allowed to go to work. For others, they either had to stop working or were urged to work from home. Consequently, 24 per cent of French workers worked from home during the first lockdown¹ (according to the survey published by Odoxa) while only 3 per cent of workers in France had worked remotely in 2017 (according to INSEE²). For some of these new teleworkers, it was an unexpected and radical change. As they had never experienced telework before, working from home full-time appeared as a novelty. Far from their colleagues and office, ‘forced’ to use collaborative and videoconference software and having to reconfigure their home into an office space (Estagnasié, Bonneau, Vasquez, & Vayre, 2021), telework was lived and experienced, for many, as a radical shift. In a way, experiencing telework as a radical change is easily understandable, as this work practice essentially questioned common principles about the world of work. As a consequence, 25 per cent of managers still considered this way of working as inappropriate in December 2020 (according to the Malakoff Humanis annual teleworking barometer 2021).

Conversely, for a large part of new teleworkers, the same event – the adoption of teleworking in March 2020 – was experienced as an expected evolution. For instance, the average satisfaction score about teleworking was 7.2/10 in December 2020 in France (Malakoff Humanis annual teleworking barometer 2021). In fact, teleworking was not really new for most of those ‘new’ teleworkers. As Estagnasié, Bonneau, Vasquez, and Vayre (2021) remind us,

the notion of ‘telework’ appeared for the first time in 1972 in a *Washington Post* article written by the journalist Jack Schiff. Since the 1970s, numerous ways of working remotely have been developed. Digital nomadism, as a practice emerged in the late 1980s and has been conceptualized in the academic literature since the 1990s, notably by Makimoto and Manners (1997) (see Aroles, Granter, & de Vaujany, 2020). In addition, the idea of running an entire company or administration remotely was imagined in the early 1990s, notably by Mowshowitz (1994) and Handy (1995) with the notion of virtual organization. It means that working remotely – even in its most radical way (i.e. by giving up any physical facility and location) – is not new at all and has been part and parcel of managerial debates for almost 40 years. More recently, numerous companies have been known for adopting such remote ways of working these last two decades (Automattic, Buffer, GitHub, etc.). Adding to this, numerous blogs, accounts on social media, YouTube channels and press articles have been promoting this way of working over the last decade.

In the end, is working-from-home really new for new teleworkers? Is a work practice actually new when we are aware of it? Of course, there is no definite answer to this question but only situated ones. For some people, it will be new, for others, it will only be about adopting an existing practice. So, why don’t practitioners have the same interpretation about what is new and what is not?

This question is probably even more relevant for academics. In the field of management and organization studies, the notion of new ways of working – often labelled ‘NWW’ in the literature – is loosely defined (see Aroles, Mitev, & de Vaujany, 2019), which is particularly visible in discussions on time and place, independent work, self-management, flexible employment relations and new media technologies supporting remote working (see Jemine, 2021 for an extensive critical literature review). In fact, the label NWW seems to refer more to a management ideology than a proper well-defined set of theories and methods. Actually, the notion of new ways of working has been crafted mainly by consultants (Jemine, 2021) such as Veldhoen (2005), Bijl (2011), and Broere (2016) in order to promote their vision about work. This leads to an important limit for scholars as this way of researching new ways of working seems to be more about imposing an ideology and some work practices (such as coworking, nomadism, DIY, etc.) rather than studying evolutions at work as they are experienced by workers.

In other words, are scholars legitimate to qualify a way of working as ‘new’ or ‘old’ (see Liang, Aroles, & Brandl, 2022)? For instance, the uberization of the economy could be seen, according to Acquier (2017), as an updated version of the domestic system which played an important role in the economy

between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. This historical work is helpful as it allows us to monitor the evolution of work and create a sense of continuity. However, it is not always what it is experienced by workers. For instance, workers experiencing teleworking for the first time in 2020 did not necessarily know the history of teleworking and its beginning in the 1970s. Even still, knowing this history does not make this work practice less new for some workers experiencing it for the first time. If you have never swum in your life, you would probably experience your first swimming experience as something radically new, even if you know that it has always been an ability of human beings. At the same time, knowing that a work practice is new for yourself but not in general can help to find meaning in its adoption. Adopting telework could be a radical new experience but at the same time, most of the new adopters knew that it was not an entirely new practice as they could even relate their own experience with a broader trend. As such, comprehending the adoption of teleworking in March 2020 as a boundary event enables us to capture how a same shared event can be experienced as a mere continuation or a radical change and above all, to surpass the continuation and change conundrum and understand them as situated, sometimes coexisting and embedded into various temporalities. We discuss these theoretical contributions of the concept of boundary event in our understanding of continuity and change in the next section.

Theoretical contribution: the role of boundary events in change and continuity

To summarize, the challenge is here to understand why a same work practice – such as teleworking – can be experienced as a change by some actors or as a continuation by others. As was underlined previously, it is very much contingent upon the way past, present and future are enacted by actors. If this way of working has already been experienced in one way or another, it might be experienced as a continuation of what has existed before (as this current moment would be related to some past events without being experienced as a temporal rupture for actors). However, if this way of working has never been experienced before, it might be perceived as a change as actors cannot relate this way of working with past events.

In that sense, change and continuity concern the way people relate this way of working to their past, current and future expected experiences. These temporalities emerging from past, present and future events bring coherence and integrity in human experience. However, temporalities continually evolve to

constantly re-create coherence and integrity along activities (Blattner, 2020). Consequently, the co-definition and the pairing of past, present and future is thus constantly adapted to make sense of what individuals are living. A same event can thus be enacted and interpreted differently by a same person or by different groups of people. We proposed the concept of boundary event to deal with these events shared by enough individuals to form a common event that most people can refer to, but lead to very different temporalities. In that sense, boundary events can be a shared turning point for all, but they do not belong to the same narrative.

From this perspective, continuity and change are about the way one or even several boundary events are integrated in a structure of past, present and future events. A boundary event is experienced as part of a continuity when it is enacted as a smooth evolution of some past events and a gentle transition toward expected future events. Conversely, a boundary event is experienced as part of a change when enacted as a temporal cut, leading to some radical shifts. However, it is not always that simple, as people can experience continuity and change simultaneously. In the context of the evolution at work, this can be observed when a way of working is known as an 'old' one by actors but experienced for the first time. Experiencing teleworking for the first time in March 2020 was probably very new for a lot of workers, but most of them already heard about teleworking before. They probably already read press articles, watched news about teleworking and/or met teleworkers before. This means that to experience change and continuity simultaneously, individuals have to enact at least two different temporalities folded within a same boundary event. It can be a very local(ized) one, such as experimenting telework for the first time and a more global one, such as the general evolution of work practices. These two temporalities are not necessary opposite but can be complementary. This has been observed and conceptualized many times in organization studies, either by early neo-institutionalist scholars (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) or in the theory of diffusion of innovation (Rogers, 1995), both insisting on the role of social pressure in the adoption of work practices and/or technologies. In other words, one can trigger some change so as to join a trend. Change and continuity can thus display complementarity through the enactment of boundary events.

However, saying that change and continuity can be simultaneously triggered by the enactment of boundary events does not mean that a boundary event is necessarily past or present. It can also be future. It is the case when a change is expected to happen, like a future marketing campaign or the anticipated launch of a new product. These can be seen as boundary events too as they are shared by people but also can partly shape different temporalities. More pre-

cisely, these future boundary events can be depicted as either a radical rupture from the present or not. There are numerous anticipated events that are envisioned by some groups of people as radically different from the present. The potential rising level of the sea due to climate change or even a potential third world war due to the war in Ukraine are some of the current future boundary events enacted by most people in the West (at least in May 2022 when we were writing this chapter).

Nevertheless, these future boundary events always rely on some past and current evolutions, such as scientific knowledge, innovations, global stakes and artistic work. As any other event, future boundary events are always co-defined with other past, present and future events. In other words, the future is always a projection made from past and/or current weak signals, that is, emergent issues, technologies, scientific knowledge, social trends (etc.) that could become significant in the future. In such an events-based view, future can sometimes be a form of memory actualized through current moments. Tsoukas and Shepherd (2004) have drawn on the notion of memories future to highlight the importance of the previously imagined future. It means that the future is not defined in the current moment from scratch but rather it is a 'past projection about the future' actualized in time. This has been illustrated notably by Schultz and Hernes (2013) in their study of the Lego company or by Hernes, Feddersen and Schultz (2021) in their study of the Carlsberg and Arla companies. These empirical studies have shown how the future of those companies has been envisaged through a new understanding and redefinition of their past. In these empirical studies, actors rely on their past to define a desirable shared future (boundary future events). By doing this, actors enact different past and future boundary events that can then lead to different temporalities according to their activities. The designer can translate these past and boundary future events into the designing of new products, the marketer into a new logo, slogan, and so on. Each worker can define their own temporalities to act accordingly, while still sharing the same past and future boundary events that make their collective activities possible.

Conclusion

The question of novelty is one that never ceases to generate interest, both in academic spheres and in the general press. This is particularly noticeable in debates pertaining to the presumed transformation of the world of work and the acceleration of those transformations through digital technologies. As shown through our example of telework in the context of the on-going pan-

demic, drawing conclusions as to where novelty lies is a rather difficult endeavour as practices are embedded in long and complex history on one hand and experienced very differently by various actors on the other. Here, we sought to go beyond the individual, subjective understanding of novelty to grasp how, collectively, some phenomena are constructed as new or not and how narratives involving past, present and future events partake in this process. Our argument is that matters of continuity and change can occur simultaneously as a same event can be shared but still enacted very differently, a phenomenon which we refer to as boundary event. Boundary events connect different temporalities that are constantly re-assembled in such a way that what is new is simultaneously an extension and a departure from what happened.

Our focus on temporalities and boundary events might be a way of circumventing the classical continuity/change conundrum that, in our opinion, may take us away from the exploration of work practices and more generally speaking, organizational phenomena. We contend that too much attention might have been given to finding out where novelty exactly lies at the detriment of attempting to understand what those practices might mean to those who experiment with them on a daily basis. Paradoxically then, these discussions might have contributed to obfuscating research on work practices by setting up a 'false' dichotomy between old and new work practices. In addition, if it is true that a certain ideology underlies NWW, then this surely rings true for the portrayal of a given practice as new or not. Finally, there might also be an element of cyclicity that frames the development of work practices. Is novelty that which hasn't been found yet or that which has been forgotten about and is later rediscovered? Would it be too far-fetched to imagine that future generations may at some point rediscover on-site work?

Notes

1. This rate has since remained rather stable. In June 2021, teleworkers represented 26 per cent of the population of workers in France (according to DARES).
2. INSEE, *L'économie et la société à l'ère du numérique*, Édition 2019.

References

- Acquier, A. (2017). Retour vers le futur? Le capitalisme de plate-forme ou le etour du 'domestic system', *Le Libellio*, 13(1), 87–100.
- Aroles, J., Granter, E., & de Vaujany, F.X. (2020). 'Becoming mainstream': the professionalization and corporatization of digital nomadism, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 35(1), 114–29.
- Aroles, J., Mitev, N., & de Vaujany, F. X. (2019). Mapping themes in the study of new work practices, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 34(3), 285–99.
- Aroles, J., & McLean, C. (2016). Rethinking stability and change in the study of organizational routines: difference and repetition in a newspaper-printing factory, *Organization Science*, 27(3), 535–50.
- Bergson, H. (1889 [2013]). *Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bergson, H. (1896 [1939]). *Matière et mémoire*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bergson, H. (1907 [2009]). *L'évolution créative*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bergson, H. (1911 [2011]). *La perception du changement*, Paris: Presses Universitaire de France.
- Bijl, D. W. (2011). Journey towards the New Way of Working: Creating Sustainable Performance and Joy at Work, Zeewolde, NL: Par CC.
- Blattner W. (2020). Temporality, aspect and narrative: a Heideggerian approach, in J. Reinecke, R. Suddaby, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (eds), *Time, Temporality, and History in Process Organization Studies* (pp. 15–28), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Broere, A. (2016). *Het Nieuwe Werken. Hoe Werk je Effectiever en Productiever*, Houten/Antwerp: Spectrum.
- Chia, R. (1999). A "rhizomic" model of organizational change and transformation: perspective from a metaphysics of change, *British Journal of Management*, 10(3), 209–27.
- Estagnasié, C., Bonneau, C., Vasquez, C., & Vayre, E. (2021). Créer l'espace habité de travail: pratiques de rematérialisation du travail à distance, in E. Vayre (ed.), *La digitalisation du travail: nouveaux espaces et nouvelles temporalités de travail*, London: ISTE Groupe.
- Farjoun, M. (2010). Beyond dualism: stability and change as a duality, *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 202–25.
- Feldman, M. (2000). Organizational routines as a source of continuous change, *Organization Science*, 11(6), 611–29.
- Handy, C. (1995). Trust and the virtual organization, *Harvard Business Review*, May–June, <https://hbr.org/1995/05/trust-and-the-virtual-organization>.
- Hernes, T. (2014a). *A Process Theory of Organization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T. (2014b). Alfred North Whitehead, in J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjort & R. Holt (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Process Philosophy and Organization Studies* (pp. 255–71), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T. (2020). Events and the becoming of organizational temporality, in J. Reinecke, R. Suddaby, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (eds), *Time, Temporality, and History in Process Organization Studies* (pp. 29–43), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T., Feddersen, J., & Schulte, M. (2021). Material temporality: how materiality 'does' time in food organizing, *Organization Studies*, 42(2), 351–71.

- Hernes, T., Husenot, A., & Pulk, K. (2021). Time and temporality of change processes: applying an event-based view to integrate episodic and continuous change, in M. S. Poole & A. H. Van de Ven (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Change and Innovation* (pp 731–50), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hernes, T., & Schultz, M. (2020). Translating the distant into the present: how actors address distant past and future events through situated activity, *Organization Theory*, 1(1), 1–20.
- Hussenot, A. (2019). *L'organisation à l'épreuve des makers. Propositions pour une approche par les événements*. Presses Universitaires de Laval.
- Hussenot, A. (2022). A modus vivendi between movement and materiality: Henri Bergson and the matter of organization, *M@n@gement*, 25(1), 79–84.
- Hussenot, A., Hernes, T., & Bouty, I. (2020). Studying organization from the perspective of the ontology of temporality: introducing the event-based approach, in J. Reinecke, R. Suddaby, A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (eds), *About Time: Temporality and History in Organization Studies* (pp. 50–68), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hussenot, A., & Missonier, S. (2016). Encompassing novelty and stability: a process event-based approach, *Organization Studies*, 37(4), 523–46.
- Husserl, E. (1927 [1964]). *Leçons pour une phénoménologie de la conscience intime du temps*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Jemine, G. (2021). Deconstructing new ways of working: a five-dimensional conceptualization proposal, in N. Mitev, J. Aroles, K. A. Stephenson & J. Malaurent (eds), *New Ways of Working, Technology, Work and Globalization* (pp. 453–80), Cham: Springer.
- Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (2017). Introduction: process thinking, process theorizing and process researching, in A. Langley & H. Tsoukas (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Process Organization Studies* (pp. 1–25), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (2010). Introduction: perspectives on process organization studies, in T. Hernes & S. Maitlis (eds), *Process, Sensemaking and Organizing* (pp. 1–26), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levina, N., & Vaast, E. (2005). The emergence of boundary spanning competence in practice: implications for implementation and use of information systems, *MIS Quarterly*, 29(2), 335–63.
- Liang, Y., Aroles, J., & Brandl, B. (2022). Charting platform capitalism: definitions, concepts and ideologies, *New Technology, Work and Employment*, 37(2), 308–27.
- Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: taking stock and moving forward, *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 57–125.
- Makimoto, T., & Manners, D. (1997). *Digital Nomad*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony, *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–63.
- Mowshowitz, A. (1994). Virtual organization: a vision of management in the information age, *The Information Society*, 10(4), 267–88.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (1996). Improvising organizational transformation over time: a situated change perspective, *Information Systems Research*, 7(1), 63–92.
- Rescher, N. (1996). *Process Metaphysics: An Introduction to Process Philosophy*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rheinhardt, A., & Gioia, D. (2021). Upside-down organizational change: sensemaking, sensegiving, and the new generation, in M. S. Poole & A. H. Van de Ven (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Change and Innovation* (pp. 77–105), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, E. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovation*, 4th edition, New York: Free Press.

- Schultz, M., & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity, *Organization Science*, 24(1), 1–21.
- Spee, A. P., & Jarzabkowski, P. (2009). Strategy tools as boundary objects, *Strategic Organization*, 7(2), 223–32.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, “translations” and boundary objects: amateurs and professionals in Berkeley’s Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39, *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420.
- Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: rethinking organizational change, *Organization Science*, 13(5), 567–82.
- Tsoukas, H., & Shepherd, J. (2004). Coping with the future: developing organizational foresightfulness, *Futures*, 36, 137–44.
- Veldhoen, E. (2005). *The Art of Working*, The Hague: Academic Service.
- Weick, K. E. (1988). Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations, *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(4), 305–17.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. (1999). Organizational change and development, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 361–86.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929 [1978]). *Process and Reality*, New York: The Free Press.