



Journal Organizações & Sociedade

2021, 28(97), 343-369

© Authors 2021

DOI 10.1590/1984-92302021v28n9705EN

ISSN 1984-9230

www.revistaoes.ufba.br

NPGA, School of Management

Federal University of Bahia

# The Uncomfortable Lack of Space and Spatiality in Strategy Studies as Social Practice: a Research Agenda

Associate Editor:

Josiane Oliveira

Received: 07/31/2018

Accepted: 06/16/2020

Jacqueline Florindo Borges<sup>a</sup>

Adriana Roseli Wünsch Takahashi<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Federal University of Uberlândia, Uberlândia, Brazil

<sup>b</sup> Federal University of Paraná, Curitiba, Brazil

## Abstract

In this theoretical essay, we analyze how strategy studies, seen as social practice, benefit from a dialogue with studies of Philosophy, Sociology and Geography about space and associated concepts such as spatiality, territory, region and place. These studies compose a diversified epistemic and theoretical framework. Human and Social Sciences have promoted two epistemic changes in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, namely: the return to practice and space. The practical turn in the organizational strategy field was not followed by spatial turn. The aims of the present study are to analyze the spatiality of strategy seen as practice and to suggest a research agenda to connect organizational strategy to topics that go beyond the business world. It has also expanded the frontiers of studies focused on investigating strategy as a complex of socially-situated strategizing practices implemented by a plurality of actors who create and transform space as multiplicity: physical / material, cultural / symbolic, political / economic, represented / narrated.

**Keywords:** space; spatiality; strategy-as-practice; *strategizing*; territory.

## Introduction

*What all of these spatial (I would call them anti-spatial) strategies do is evade that challenge of space as a multiplicity.  
Doreen Massey (2015, pp. 97-98)*

Studies focused on investigating strategy as social practice were encouraged by the turn towards practice observed in Social Sciences. The “practice turn” in the strategy field took place in the late 1990s (Chia, 2004; Gherardi, 2012; Whittington, 2004, 2007), along with the debate on post-procedural (Chia & Mackay, 2007) and post-modernism strategy (Wilson & Jarzabkowski, 2004; Whittington, 2004). Postmodern and post-structuralist skepticism gave rise to another turn in the late 20th century, namely: the return to space (*the spatial turn*) in Social and Human Sciences (Warf & Arias, 2009) and the return to territory, region and regionality (Haesbaert, 2010; Santos, 1996). Space is now seen as social construction connected to stories of human subjects and cultural production since, based on human geography, it is essential understanding where things happen in order to understand how and why they happen (Warf & Arias, 2009).

Both the return to practice and the return to space are based on changes in modern capitalism and on new forms of sociability and regulation of postmodernist human relations (Warf & Arias, 2009). In addition to debates about territory and region, space acquired political, economic and cultural meanings associated with life in cities, globalization, immigration, new technologies, cyberspace, climate change and epidemics, among others.

Space was either ignored or implicitly treated by traditional theories in the management field (Chanlat, 2006). In addition, studies focused on investigating strategy as social and *strategizing* practice have neglected dimensions such as space and time (Hydle, 2015). However, an epistemological concept, according to which, strategy is not something that organizations have (Jarzabkowski, 2005), but that is built by people and by actions it in space and time, cannot shy away from debating the space issue. Strategy seen as lived experience implies the debate about the ways space and time enable and limit *strategizing*, which constitute such an experience (Samra-Fredericks, 2013); yet, it does not presuppose the concept of space as the surface life happens on or as a container where things are kept in (Massey & Keynes, 2004).

In this essay, our objective is to analyze the spatiality of strategy seen as practice and propose a research agenda on the subject. Essays have long tradition in the Philosophy and Literary Criticism fields; they can be used to achieve different goals, such as introducing new frontiers and contextualizing knowledge by questioning the “order of things” (Suddaby, 2019), as well as articulating accumulated knowledge and opening new study perspectives (Bertero, 2011). We articulate a dialogue between studies on strategy seen as social practice and Philosophy, Sociology and Geography studies about space and associated concepts such as spatiality, territory, region and place. These studies compose a diversified epistemic and theoretical framework that takes into consideration implications between space and coexistence with others, the responsibility for the place and the ability to (re)imagine new spatialities.

In addition to the current introduction section, the essay comprises two sections addressing theoretical approaches on space and spatiality, namely: Philosophy and Sociology studies, as well as studies conducted in different Geography fields. In the third section, we present a theoretical-

epistemic framework that associates space, organizations and strategy seen as socially-situated practice. Next, we propose a research agenda on the spatiality of strategy seen as practice. Final considerations close the article.

## The Constituted and Constituent Space of Social Coexistence

The current section covers scholars and concepts belonging to the Philosophy and Sociology fields that deal with space and social coexistence. Despite the number of scholars investigating this subject, we highlight authors who have also contributed to the so-called “practice turn” in these knowledge fields. These authors contribute to an understanding of spatiality as the production, organization and appropriation of spaces.

In the field of Social Theory, Lefebvre (1991) develops a dialectical and three-dimensional conception of space production. According to the Lefebvrian epistemological perspective, space is produced by human beings who interact with each other through their activities and practices, bodies, thoughts, sensitivity, imagination and ideologies; time and space are aspects integrating the social practice, i.e., both are result and precondition for the production of society (Schmid, 2012). The Lefebvrian three-dimensional analysis of space production (Lefebvre, 1991; Schmid, 2012) is based on a triad that deals with the self-production of both the subject and society. This triad implies three processes, namely: (a) **perceived space**: apprehension through senses necessary for social practice and for space materiality perception; (b) **conceived space**: the prior conception or production of knowledge about space; (c) **lived space**: daily experimentation of space by humans during their practices.

Lefebvre’s triadic conception of space production (1991) presupposes that this production process is of historical nature. Every society produces its own space; therefore, it is necessary investigating the foundations these spaces are built on; the circumstances and pressures under which spatial changes take place; the constructive and destructive power of productive forces, scientific capacity and new technologies adopted to transform the natural space; as well as the circumstances under which spaces are disputed through wars and violence and/or are instituted by the State. Therefore, it is necessary overcoming the limits of the instrumental and homogeneous analysis of space, as well as understanding the **politics of space**, in order to critically understand the space we produce and live in.

Certeau (1998) conducted a urban study about inequality in cities, based on his political concept of action and social relations (Dosse, 2013). He analyzed modes of action, practice formalities and operation types or “ways of doing” that cannot be separated from the present time and specific circumstances. The analysis of behaviors, according to their place on the “social board”, has shown deviant tactics, which are not defined by the place and do not follow the law of the place, as well as technocratic strategies, which aim to create, map and impose places. Only strategies create places; tactics do not create places; they use, manipulate and change them. The place is “an instant configuration of positions” with stability implications, whereas “space is the practiced place” (Certeau, 1998, pp. 201-202).

According to Certeau (1998), there is difference between strategy and tactics if one takes into consideration the power relations heading towards consumption. Tactic is the way of acting of

the “weak” before the dominant order, whereas strategy is the action taken by “strong” individuals before that very same order. Strategy is the calculated action or manipulation of a subject's power relations about his/her will and power. It postulates a likely place to be “circumscribed as something of its own” (p. 99) from where one can manage relationships with an exteriority of targets or threats. Strategy makes it possible to distinguish and circumscribe a place proper to the will and power. Tactic is the calculated action “determined by the absence of a proper locus” (p. 100). It is related to autonomy, because it is the action of those who do not have the means to keep themselves at a distance; therefore, it requires movement within other’s field of view (adversary); tactic plays with the ground that is imposed to it by a law strange to it. It operates in a non-place (blow by blow and bid per bid), as it is not able to assign itself a “global project”. Tactic mobility refers to the possibilities of making use of the sense of occasion in order to use failures of particular conjunctures of proprietary power in a tireless, insightful, vigilant, creative and surprising way.

The relationship between strategy and tactics is dialectical, because the tactic is determined by the absence of power, whereas strategy is organized by the postulate of power (Certeau, 1998). Tactic mobilizes itself waiting for the occasion for its action “over the terrain of the dominant order” (p. 102), where rationality rules are imposed by the strategy based on “established rights of a proper place” (p. 102). Therefore, tactic waits for the circumstances for its action and hopes to change space organization through its movements. With respect to the present and future of life in large cities, Certeau (1998) has advocated that transformations taking place in contemporary history affect relations between strategy and tactics: a broader, homogeneous, unstable and continuous space reduces the chances of tactics escaping regulation (migrants). And the strategy anchored in a “definition of a proper place”, different from the others, is lost in random and uncontrollable manipulations, networks of coercions and socioeconomic security.

One of the questions emerging from a material approach to space and from an approach based on theories of action in the Space Sociology field lies on the inquiry about whether space is a condition and product (result) of social processes or only operates in a social-action structuring way (Löw, 2008, 2013). Space is understood as a relational category between objects and people, which not only involves a **symbolic** dimension, but also a **material** dimension: “spaces are experienced”. Space emerges from the (structured) orders of social goods and people in places; new spaces are created by performative actions that synthesize and relate these orders.

In analyzing social practices and space, Bourdieu (2013, 2018) argues that **physical space** is an abstraction of **inhabited space, appropriated space** or “**space of the possible**” (Ribeiro, 2014). Space is socially demarcated and constructed. Social space becomes objectified space and/or physically realized social space – fields – through the distribution of different kinds of goods, services, people and groups, in physical spaces. This distribution in physical space defines “the differential value of the various regions of realized social space” (Bourdieu, 2013, p.136; 2018, p. 109). This distribution generates devoid **spaces** (ghettos) and **spatial profits**: profits of localization and of occupation are related to spaces where there is concentration of rare goods and of their dominant owners, who are distinguished by living in a certain neighborhood, enjoying security and other public services, as well as symbolic profits of distinction and profits of occupation. Social segregation is understood as “cause and effect of the exclusive usage of a space and of the facilities necessary for the practices and reproduction of the group that occupies it” (Bourdieu, 2018, 110,

2013, p. 138). Based on the Bourdieusian analysis, the manipulation of groups' distribution in space is at the service of space domination, which is one of the privileged forms of exercising domination.

In analyzing the constitution of society, Giddens (2013) deals with "locatability", which is understood as action/interaction in time and space. Time and space/geography matter in his structuring theory because they concern the restrictions and practical nature of daily activities. The time-space structuring of the interaction scenarios where ordinary people spend their daily lives in presupposes the concepts of location and accessibility of presence. Location refers to space using modes, provides the scenario for interactions, and allows specifying the contextuality of these interactions. Regionalization is understood as the "time-space zoning" of everyday social practices. According to Giddens (2013), "all social life occurs in – and consists of – intersections of presence and absence in the 'low' of time and in the 'gradual transformation' of space". This statement of the theory of structuring implies other concepts, namely: "daily space-time paths, distribution and meetings, regionalization of places, contextualization of regions, intersection of places" (pp. 155-156).

## Space and Spatiality in Geography

Geography is a field rich in epistemic and theoretical concepts and perspectives with long tradition in research. In this section, we discuss different researchers and their study topics. They contribute to the reflection on spatiality, with emphasis on concepts such as space, territory, region and place. These concepts are polysemic because they are appropriated by geographers, as well as by scientists from other knowledge fields and by experts and technicians who need to apply them in policies, decision-making and practices focused on planning and developing social groups, organizations, cities, states and countries.

The concepts of territory, region and place give rise to a fruitful debate in the Geography field about the sense of "cutting out" space (Haesbaert, 2018). This debate implies addressing "space, territory, region and place" as a notion, category or concept. It got broader and deeper in the 1980s due to globalization and fragmentation, social and environmental, and flow and connectivity movements (satellites, internet, computers) that have made social relations more hybrid and multifaceted. As for the relationship between concepts, Raffestin (1993) advocated that "space comes before territory", because "territory is formed from space" (p. 143); people appropriate (concretely and abstractly) space as the result of their actions, programs and practices; thus, these people "territorialize" space. According to Haesbaert (2018), space predates region. He recalls the "hegemony of the concept of territory" in Latin geographies, mainly due to Latin American researchers, as well as the preference for the concept of place by Anglo-Saxon geographers (p. 42). Identity, intersubjectivity and symbolic exchanges are the most visible dimensions of the concept of place that supports the construction of images and meaning of the place: spatiality lived, perceived and endowed with meaning (Souza, 2015c).

The trajectories of the concepts of space, territory, region and place can be found in studies conducted by Bezzi (2004), Haesbaert (2018), Lencioni (2014) and Massey (2015). However, they are entangled concepts, as reported by Souza (2015c): a region or a neighborhood are spaces! A region or a neighborhood can be "places" (lived and perceived spaces). A region or a neighborhood can be a territory, when a social movement starts to exercise an "insurgent anti-power" in there (p.

57) or even when the State adopts these space units at the service of its administration or planning. Next, we analyze spatiality from the concepts of space, territory, region and place. **Spatiality** seen as simultaneously ideal, material and conceived practical space (Retallié, 2005) is, therefore, a set of spatial practices.

In the 1980s, in a study in the field of critical geography, Santos (1988) proposes that “space is a relational reality: things and relationships together” (p. 10). Space can only be understood in relation to other realities: nature, society, work. Santos (2013) has advocated that the analysis of any spatial fraction reveals a technique or a set of particular techniques. The implication of this argument is that studies about space-technical relationships enable and require immersion in social relations themselves. Santos (1996) has also suggested that the use of territory is what makes it the object of social analysis. The aforementioned author has questioned the concept of territory inherited from modernity (nation-state, legal-political notion) by stating that the territory is our “framework of life”. A postmodern idea of territory must consider that (a) the interdependence of places becomes a new reality of the territory; (b) the value of local natural resources is relative and/or relativized; (c) the territory trans-nationalization / globalization process is underway; (d) territories may play active role in trans-nationalization processes. Hence, the metaphor of the return of the territory takes place.

Based on studies conducted in the Marxist critical geography field from 1975 to 2001, Harvey (2005) has questioned the capitalist production of space and repositioned the space category from “given” to “produced”, with material and ideological implications related to capitalist accumulation, as well as to the creation and destruction of new investment and consumption spaces. He advocated that, in order to escape its own contradiction, capitalism simultaneously intensifies social desires and needs, as well as enable geographical expansion to existing spaces or even to new spaces created for capitalist accumulation. By trying to escape its own contradiction, capitalism promotes (and requires) certain space organization forms. However, the search for new spaces can lead to reflections and to progressive political actions. These new spaces are seen by the aforementioned author as “**spaces of hope**”, which must be investigated and cultivated by opposition movements and progressive cultural forces.

In the field of postmodern studies on space, in geography, Gibson and Watson (1995) propose the concept of postmodern spaces. According to them, the concept of postmodern refers to a socioeconomic period and to a scientific thought and knowledge field. With respect to the concept of postmodern, it is necessary understanding urban space in capitalism: cities and politics. This process implies investigating space by taking into consideration events, stories and places as “empirical pieces”. By proposing the study of postmodern **spatiality**, they encourage the reflection on how “we think, represent, live in, and create space” (Gibson & Watson, 1995, p. 2).

Still, in the field of postmodern studies on space and critical geography, Soja (1993) states that space is socially produced and that space organization is a social product, since it “emerges from deliberate social practice” (p. 102). **Spatiality** is the center of a Marxist critical theory of space (Soja, 1993) and it has an “essentially dialectical” nature of opposition, unity and contradiction of social and spatial relations at the production and consumption spheres (p. 98). In his proposal of a spatialized ontology, he concluded that (a) **spatiality** is a social product that incorporates **physical** and **psychological spaces** by socializing and transforming them; (b) **spatiality** “is simultaneously the means of and result from action and social relations”; (c) the “space-time structuring of social life

defines how action and social relations are materially constituted and realized”; (d) the “space-time constitution/embodiment process is problematic, as well as full of contradictions and struggles”; (e) the “contradictions primarily emerge from the duality of the produced space, as the result/incarnation/product and medium/assumption/producer of social activity”; (f) concrete **spatiality** (effective human geography) implies competition and struggles for social practices aimed at “maintaining and strengthening the existing **spatiality**” or at seeking “significant restructuring and/or radical transformation”; (g) “the **spatiality** of social life is rooted in temporal/historical contingency”; and (h) the materialistic interpretation of history and geography “are inseparably interspersed and theoretically concomitant” (pp. 158-159).

In the field of cultural geography and Marxist geography, Massey (2015) proposes a new **spatiality** policy and the spatialization of social theory and political thought. The author offers three propositions: acknowledging “space as a product of interrelationships” “constituted through interactions”; understanding “space as a sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity” and “contemporary plurality”, and as a sphere of coexistence of different trajectories, i.e., “multiplicity and space are co-constitutive”. Finally, the third proposition implies acknowledging space as “a product of relationships-between”, i.e., these relationships are embedded in material practices that must be effected; therefore, space “is always in the process of making itself”, it is never finished or closed, and it implies thinking about “space as the concurrency of **stories-so-far**” (p. 29).

These assumptions can guide progressive policies, rather than an individualistic liberalism, based on the argument that “**space is political**”. Identity and relationships are constructed as part of the political game, and relationships are understood as “embedded practices” in a “relational understanding of the world” (Massey, 2015, p. 30). Space does not precede identities; it is, from the beginning, integral part of the constitution of identity and relationships. In epistemological term, understanding space as a process rather than as a closed system suggests “openness to the future”, as well as enables and encourages political engagement to policies that can “make a difference” (p. 32). Such a political engagement is relevant if one takes into consideration that “place as an ever-shifting constellation of trajectories poses the question of our togetherness” (p. 215).

In the field of critical geography, Carlos (2016) analyzes “the movements of space production as necessary moment of reproduction of the human (and his world)” (p. 17). According to him, space is not the background of human practices or a “stage” of phenomena. Space is a condition: “the act of producing is the act of producing space”; “the production of space is part of the production of objective material conditions for the production of human history”; “there is no a-spatial society” (p. 18). Life and the conditions of life reveal a space-time of action and unveil its use as a form of appropriation. Space appropriation is understood as a space production and continuous reproduction movement. In the socio-spatial practice of everyday life, “the particular story of each individual takes place in the collective story it is inserted in, and in relation to which it gains meaning” (p. 55).

Also, in the 1970s, in addition to return to space, there were discussions about the return to territory, whenever a positivist view of territory was not enough to account for the transformations and demands of geopolitics, for the territorial organization of capitalism, for social domination, as well as for unequal development and forms of control in everyday social life (Saquet, 2015). Studies conducted in the political geography, and territorial and urban development fields in the 1990s

focused on investigating “new territorialities” and postmodern territorial regulation forms. Globalization, the emergence of new territorial actors and migratory processes were analyzed by Antheaume and Giraut (2005), who edited a collection of articles that problematized territoriality, namely: territories with fixed or flexible borders (Piermay, 2005); moving territories (Fremónt, 2005); fluid territoriality (itinerant); and multiple, plural and unstable territories (wars) (Mbembé, 2005).

But, after all, what is territory? According to Sack (2013), “territories require constant efforts to be established and maintained”, and it implies using “strategies to affect, influence and control people, phenomena and relationships” (p. 77). According to Saquet (2015), the concept of territory implies movement (it is related to space production and reproduction), procedures (space production-exchange-consumption involves social contradictions and technification) and multi-scales (flows, networks, hierarchies, centers and peripheries). Territory can be understood as geographical space, “as area controlled and delimited by some authority, as the result from influence strategies that take place individually or through social groups” (p. 84).

Territory and territorialization processes involve material-functional and symbolic-identity issues. If the territory refers to an “appropriate and used extension”, territoriality “can be defined as the sense of belonging to what belongs to us”, i.e., “it is a feeling of exclusivity and limit” in the experience and reproduction field; for both humans and animals (Silveira, 2013, p. 39). Individuals and companies use territories in different ways and this behavior depends on their strength or position in the global capitalist logic (Corrêa, 1998, Silveira, 2013). According to Raffestin (1993), human territoriality involves the construction of the future; therefore, it has political, power and control dimensions, which comprise birth and mortality, mobility (migration flows), resources (language and religion) and differences (races, ethnicities, discrimination).

The concept of territoriality concerns a wide variety of activities and practices: the relationship among state and social groups, home, and workplaces. According to Sack (2013), territories require “constant strategies to be established and maintained”, i.e., “their limits are used to affect behaviors when access is controlled”; thus, a place or a region becomes a territory if its boundaries are “used by some authority to shape, influence, or control activities” (p. 77). According to Corrêa (1998), territory “is the space covered by the political or the affective dimension, or by both of them” (pp. 251-252); territoriality “refers to the set of practices and their material, as well as to symbolic expressions capable of guaranteeing the appropriation and permanence of a given territory by a particular social agent, the State, as well as by different social groups and companies”; deterritorialization refers to the “loss of the appropriated and lived territory due to different processes deriving from contradictions capable of undoing the territory” (p. 252).

According to Souza (2015c), politics are the central dimension to the definition of territory, since they refer to the exercise of power: sovereignty, emancipatory movements, insurgence and spatial practices of resistance, and ideological discourses. In addition to the political dimension, there are also the cultural (symbolism, meaning, identity) and economic (goods’ production, exchange and consumption processes, and labor) dimensions. Therefore, territory is one of the “manifestations of social space and spatiality” (p. 61). According to Medeiros (2015), territory “is a space of identities” and “an identification space” (p. 215). There is also the understanding of territory as a place of mediation between people and culture: the feeling and the imaginary. Again, space and territory are intertwined: the existence of the territory requires space. In addition to this



cultural dimension (of identification and belonging), it is possible thinking about the appropriation of territory, which is seen as a political space: a place of power, which defines limits, cuts it, and is synonymous with domination and control. After all, the "dominance between people and nations goes through the exercise of land control" (p. 216).

In studies in the field of human geography and cultural geography, Haesbaert (2016) argues that postmodern perspectives, at the end of the 20th century, rediscovered space only to declare the end of the territory: deterritorialization. He has analyzed the destruction and creation of new territories as part of the social change process and of new territorialization forms; the study about these movements has evidenced the intensity of changes, as well as enabled new space readings and new territorial articulation forms. Based on the **economic conception**, deterritorialization is interested in topics such as economic globalization and the world market; trade flows; the relationship between territory and different times in capitalism (Fordism/industrial capitalism, financial capitalism, flexible accumulation); the strengthening or loss of economic power in different territories; logic of business location, labor relations and precariousness; the immateriality featuring the financial sector and globalized economy. Based on the **political conception**, deterritorialization is interested in issues such as loss of power of state territories; security issues; territories shared by different ethnic and social groups; borders created by cyberspace; flow of migrants; and changes in the role played by the State. Based on the **cultural conception**, deterritorialization is interested in topics associated with the sense of collectivity; territorial identities; sectarian movements; coexistence in large urban centers; multiple modern tribes; ethnicization of life and territory; cultural identities and fractures.

Studies about region have also contributed to the reflection on spatiality. Region has had its "death" declared through several theoretical/epistemic perspectives, but several movements have also "resurrected" it as geographical category. The emergence of regional mesoscales (Haesbaert, 2018) in the late 20th century has placed region and regionalization in the political and theoretical agenda. Based on a historical and epistemic viewpoint, the concept of region was analyzed by Bezzi (2004) and Lencioni (2014), who showed the influence of positivism (experimentalism, with emphasis on the natural region and concrete existence of the region) and determinism (the rise of science, causal relationship, region seen as objective entity) on the trajectory of this concept. Based on a theoretical-conceptual viewpoint, region is of interest to geographers, scientists from other knowledge fields, as well as to technicians in the public policies and regional planning fields.

Regional restructuring and the concept of region were analyzed by Soja (1993) based on a critical social theory and on the perspective of the construction of postmodern geography. It was necessary enabling another ontology of human society, space and region in the late 20th century, a concretizing ontology historically situated and politically engaged, which comprised the spatial structure of society and the interpretive specificities of different regions as part of a **spatiality** (properties of the social production of space) that extends "from everyday life, to networks, flows and transnational connections that join the global economy of space" (p. 198).

Region/place in the Human Geography field is understood as constituted and constitutive of social life, relationships and identity. **Spatialities** are "part of a wider network of cultural, political and economic processes and of labor division" (Paasi, 2002, p. 804). Regions are currently investigated as historical and identity processes, as part of broader scales of human history itself, rather than being "taken for granted". Region is no longer seen as something given, uniquely

natural; it is now seen as socially and historically constructed in practices, discourses, narratives and meanings produced by actors: symbolic and the material dimensions of region-building process. Thinking about spatiality based on the concept of region also requires reflecting about the concept of regional identity. This concept has emerged in the late 20th century, it was rose by democratic movements that brought new topics to the social, political and economic scenarios. However, regional identity narratives rely on a variety of elements, namely: “ideas on nature, landscape, built environment, culture/ethnicity, dialects, economic success/recession, periphery/central relations, marginalization, stereotyped images of people/communities, both ‘us’ and ‘them’, actual/invented histories, utopias and diverging arguments on the identification of people” (Paasi, 2003, p. 477).

The study conducted by Tomaney (2017) has questioned traditional measurements of local and regional development and their contribution to human well-being. The aforementioned author highlighted the limits of traditional approaches (Gross Domestic Product - GDP) and suggested policy evaluation alternatives for human development purposes. However, it does not imply that the relational approach to the study about region and place is consensual. According to Jonas (2012), the relational approach neglects territorial issues and New Regionalism policies available in the literature. Based on the aforementioned study, an ontology of region cannot consider that it is exclusively built outside, or by, a non-territorial process; therefore, it questions the approach of cities-regions centered on capital, which are seen as constructs of external competing forces separated from territory policies.

Alternatively, regionalisms can be thought of as “territorial expression of relational practices of alterity” or territorialization alternatives (Jonas, 2013, p. 822): counter-hegemonic regionalisms; regionalism based on new urban environmental policies; regionalism based on progressive urban policies, changes in class relations, new coalition forms; and alternative economic practices that challenge market hegemony; art/craft-based regionalism that counters traditional work organization and innovation systems; community-based regionalism that counters the neoliberal agenda and the idea of regional market integration.

Table 1

### A conceptual framework to think about spatiality in the Geography field.

---

#### 1 – Space, Spatiality

---

- “Space results from men's actions in their own space, which is intermediated by objects, both natural and artificial” (Santos, 1988, p. 25).
  - Space is “produced” with material and ideological implications related to capitalist accumulation, as well as to the creation and destruction of new investment and to consumption spaces (Harvey, 2005).
  - Space: condition, medium and product; and **spatiality** is a socially produced space (Soja, 1993).
  - “1. Space is the product of interrelations. It is constituted by interactions, from the immensity of the global to the intimately tiny . . . 2. Space is the sphere of possibility of existence of multiplicity; it is the sphere where different trajectories coexist; it is the sphere of the likely existence of more than one voice. Without space, there is no multiplicity; without multiplicity, there is no space . . . 3. Finally, and precisely *because* space is the product of relationships-between, relationships that are necessarily embedded material practices *that need to be made effective*, it is always in a process of becoming, it is always being done” (Massey & Keynes, 2004, p. 8).
-

- 
- Space, “as category of thought and practical reality, brings within itself the idea of reference for human beings, since it is its condition of existence, just as transformations in society bring, as consequence, spatial changes” (Carlos, 2016, p. 17).
- 

## **2 – Territory, Territoriality, Deterritorialization**

---

- “Territory means a portion of geographical space under the jurisdiction of certain peoples, i.e., it means distinction, separation and partition based on geopolitical and psychological behaviors” (Saquet, 2015, p. 68).
  - “Territoriality . . . reflects the multidimensionality of the ‘lived’ territory” (Rafestin, 1993, p. 158).
  - “Territoriality for humans is a powerful geographic strategy to control people and things through [geographic] area control. . . . Territoriality is a primary geographical expression of social power. It is the means by which space and society are interrelated” (Sack, 2013, 63).
  - Territoriality “refers to the set of practices and their material and symbolic expressions capable of guaranteeing the appropriation and permanence of a given territory by a given social agent, the State, as well as different social groups and companies” (Corrêa, 1998, pp. 251-252).
  - Deterritorialization: the destruction and creation of new territories as part of the social process of change and of new territorialization forms; these movements show the intensity of changes, allow new space readings and new territorial articulation forms (Haesbaert, 2016).
- 

## **3 –Region, Regionalization, Regionalism, Regionality**

---

- “In a regional study, one should try to detail its composition as social, political, economic and cultural organization by addressing concrete facts in order to understand how the area is inserted in the international economic order. It should be done by taking into account the preexisting and the new in order to capture the list of causes and consequences of the investigated phenomenon” (Santos, 1988, p. 17).
  - Region is a “concrete geographical entity”; regionalization concerns the process of differentiating space into articulated and relatively cohesive plots; regionality is a symbolic and lived/identity dimension, the property of being regional (Haesbaert, 2010).
  - “. . . all regionalization must always be considered an act of power – the power to cut, to classify and, often, to name” (Haesbaert, 2018, p. 23).
  - “. . . movements, identities, representations and the so-called regional policies are still alive in a more integrated and lived vision, rather than just in a simply functional and classificatory vision of region” (Haesbaert, 2018, p. 181).
- 

## **4 – Place**

---

- “Elements grouped for enabling the spatial configuration of a place should undergo an in-depth study, from man to the institutions that will direct, together with firms, society materialization forms” (Santos, 1988, p. 17).
  - An object in which one can inhabit and develop feelings and emotions (Oliveira, 2014).
  - Relations between socio-spatial practices and the place, “as a place where the bond to the other is established” (Carlos, 2016, p. 38).
  - “What gives a place its specificity is not a long and internalized history, but the fact that it is constructed from a particular constellation of social relations” (Massey, 2000, p. 184).
- 

Sources: elaborated by the authors.

Table 1 presents concepts associated with the discussion about spatiality in the Geography field, which were addressed in the current section. We close this section by addressing the concept of place and its role in improving the understanding about spatiality. In a study on the meaning (identity) of the place, from a critical perspective and from human geography, Massey (2000) analyzes whether the search for the meaning of place is necessarily reactionary (based on traditionalism, nationalism, antagonisms) or progressive (not closed and defensive, open to the other and facing outwards). According to him, places do not have “singular and essential identities” (p. 182). In addition, it is not enough to think about our experience with a place as exclusively related

to economics, capitalism, or space-time compression; after all, the mobility of capital and labor/workers are different concepts. The contingency of the place requires humans to develop a negotiation policy due to the global connectivity between humans and non-humans. These negotiations “will always be inventions, there will be the need for judgment, learning, improvisation, and there will be no merely portable rules” (Massey, 2015, p. 230).

Therefore, thinking about the concept of place implies reflecting about our experience: mobility levels; communication through space; geographical dimension of social relations; (in)security and feeling of vulnerability; and race and gender issues (Massey, 2000). The search for a global sense of place implies thinking about social differentiation as spatial, moral and political issue. He provides different images of place: people who, even contributing to space-time compression, are prisoners of the place; people who move freely and quickly from place to place; people who seek a place as refuge; people who acknowledge the multiple identities of a place, or for whom the identity of the place is the complex mixture of multiple identities.

A study conducted by Relph (2014) in the Human Geography field has analyzed place as follows: (a) grouping of place’s qualities, experiences and meanings; (b) location: changes the experience of place (does not imply a fixed location, websites); (c) place escape: shape of the place (people, streets, buildings, hills); (d) “*genius loci*”: places that have very strong identity (churches, temples); (e) sense of place: experimentation and apprehension of qualities of place; (f) roots and rooting: deep association and feeling of belonging; (g) interiority: familiarity with and knowledge about place; (h) home: place “where one knows and is known to others”, (i) *placelessness* and non-place: everywhere is a place or settings of things, activities and meanings; non-places are places built in a standardized way (supermarkets, airports, *fast food* restaurants); (j) we: “places are the nodes of national and international networks”; (l) exclusion/inclusion: strong attachment to the place or feeling out of place; (m) contaminated sense of place: prejudiced view heading towards those who are seen as strangers to the place (ethnic cleansing, compulsory displacements); (n) place construction: by those who live in the place and architects and engineers; (o) place fabrication: practices adopted to build the identity of a place, among them, manipulative practices of invented identities, practices based on vague historical or fictitious connection, borrowed identity practices (imitation of monuments), fun-identity construction practices (pp. 22-27).

## Space, organizations and strategy seen as social practice

The interest in space, territory, region and place goes beyond the Geography field. These concepts support research about a whole variety of topics in organizational studies, namely: study about urban dynamics based on power relations among street vendors, government and merchants (Mendes & Cavedon, 2015); research about the relationship between territory and strategies used to add value to products and services (Vieira & Pellin, 2015); critical-reflexive approach to economic, social and symbolic formations in the development of creative territories (Closs & Oliveira, 2017); and essay addressing the understanding about territorialized organizational culture (Mendes & Cavedon, 2013). The study by Mendes & Cavedon (2003) has concluded that the symbolic and political production of organizational culture can be widely understood when it is situated, delimited and allocated. Damásio Filho, Kitazawa, Klichowski, Silva, & Chagas (2017) have presented an overview of organizational studies about space and territory. They have emphasized the existence

of multidisciplinary proposals for research on spatial and social connections, capitalist configuration of urban space, cities seen as spaces to produce and consume goods and services, and the role played by the territory these activities take place in.

This section, we recall Chanlat's (1996) statement about the fact that all human experiences, actions and activities – be them individual and collective, organizational and societal – are rooted in two dimensions, namely: space and time. It reminds us about the need of overcoming the functionalist and quantitative view of time and space in management issues, which are seen, above all (or only), as resource or economic variable of cost and performance. Spatial planning contemplates local, regional, national and international interactions, as well as involves biological survival, psychological existence, power relations, the construction of meaning, and the criticism of spaces. As an explanatory category, the time-space dimension broadens the understanding about organizations and their practices, which are configured in different ways, based on time-space (Vergara & Vieira, 2005).

Based on psychology, Fischer (1994) develops the concept of “workspaces” and defines that individuals organize their activities and regulate their exchanges with others through the domain of spaces and the fixation of people to places. Individuals interact in and with space, and space plays key role in human behavior: occupation and transformation; the **physical, psychological and social dimensions** of space; how spaces are experienced and represented, both symbolically and functionally, i.e., how relationship spaces are imagined, avoided or used to facilitate encounters and displacements. And, above all, workspace is a space of positions, several interventions and practices in a space division/distribution, appropriation and use process. This process is not exclusively based on production relationships, it is also based on values and aesthetics of the human conduct. Human experience with spaces is not passive; since spaces are acting and self-determining, **spaces of physical, symbolic and psychological domain**. Individuals and/or collectivities occupying a space tend to influence the location and adopt control behavior such as border demarcations and territorial domination.

Organizations are not just resource and production spaces; they constitute “the place that each individual explores, adapts and inhabits in order to accomplish his own goals” (Fischer, 1994, p. 89). Instrumental rationality gives the organizational space certain characteristics, namely: divided space; imposed space; controlled space; and emblem space. Logos, gardens, architecture, decoration, perfume and so many other indices evoke sensations, values and images; they are mobilized as a symbol of unwavering power and domination, and they can hide “the ugliness, the old character, and the real pressures of the places they shelter” (p. 99).

Based on the aforementioned study by Fischer (1994) and on a whole variety of other studies, Chanlat (2006) has presented a socio-historical synthesis of space in the main management schools and, based on four more recent perspectives, showed that space has been gaining room in other studies. The **organizational space** investigated in cultural and symbolic studies **has social nature**, since it produces and structures social relations; it is also a **symbolic space**, since it is source of images for internal members and external individuals; it is an **aesthetic space** of members' personal experience with harmony or disharmony, beauty or ugliness, grace or disgrace; space is thought of as a place with emphasis on what is peculiar and meaningful to each organization; **organizational space is spatiality** because it becomes an element of language, symbolic order and meaning system.

In the theory of political organization, the organization is seen as a **social, cultural and political space** regulated by power relations that seek to control materials, resources, people, money and techniques; power is exercised in interpersonal and group relationships, in the use of language and symbols, rules and structure. In order to reduce uncertainties and dependence, and to maintain spatial control, one can use the opposition between internal and external, between those who follow the rules of the game and those who do not follow them.

The Psychosociology perspective emphasizes organizational space as a relevant aspect of individuals' psychic life. Organizational space is both a producer and product of desires, representations and narratives. They present an affective and psychic dynamics that influences the actions of megalomaniac, paranoid or obsessive-compulsive individuals; these actions have implications for organizational structure, culture and strategy. Recent topics address how spaces we live and work in are changing. Among them, one finds globalization, information technology, work fragmentation and flexibilization of the location of organizational activities in different countries, massive use of electronic technologies and new organizational forms in **virtual spaces** (Chanlat, 2006). This factor implies rethinking **organizational spaces as mutant entities**.

In a study that used the triadic conception of space (practiced, planned, lived) of Lefebvre (1991) as starting point, Petani and Mengis (2016) have analyzed the relationship among history, space, time and memory in the process of planning and creating a large cultural center. They have conducted a longitudinal study that adopted a space-time planning perspective involving recurrences, changes, contested narratives about "**lost spaces**", and memories of **happy spaces** that articulate with desires to recover these spaces (of the past). They concluded that the sense of lost spaces leads us to consider that planning is the space-temporal and socio-material work of relating different spaces and times in nonlinear narratives of repetition based on organizational memories. The planning work is immersed in past, present and future possibilities, because, according to them, the memory of a **lost space** and its narratives require a space "that is or was both **materially practiced** and **imaginatively strongly appropriated**" (our emphasis, p. 83). This factor does not imply that such narratives ensure some power in the concept of space.

In a study on the role of spatial scales, Spicer (2006) analyzes globalization as transformations in spatial scales and organizational logics. These transformations also involve changes in accumulation, regulation and discourse patterns. These distinct organizational logics can be observed at external scales (global economy), on new internal scales (the European Union project), on hybrid scales (non-governmental organizations operating locally and globally), or on new shared scales (industrial region). The process of spatial (re)scaling and transformation of organizational logic does not only concern dominant groups, but also groups resisting them, since this process is political, economic, geographical and social. This approach understands space based on a transformational approach according to which, space and organizations are seen as dynamic entities. This approach aims at helping better understanding the mechanisms by which **spaces are produced**. It also goes beyond the concept of organizational space for the recognition of *larger-scale spaces*; above all, it emphasizes that organizations exist and act on multiple scales, as well as that actors can manipulate resources and adopt practices and discourses that make the organization reach certain scales.

By moving to the specific field of strategy studies as social practice, Nicolini (2012) advocated that practical turn and practice language are an alternative for those who aim at understanding

social and organizational phenomena. The search for ontological projects, which provide a new vocabulary to describe the world, organization and strategy based on specific 'analysis units' – practices – has generated different approaches that have shown dissimilarities among theories of practice. The existence of different theories of practice and epistemic positions is explained by the fact that practice is “a polysemic concept”. Seen *from the outside*, practices are a “pattern of activities socially acknowledged and normatively sustained” (Gherardi, 2010, p. 507) and “more or less shared” (Gherardi, 2009, p. 116). Seen *from the inside*, practices are “knowledgeable collective actions” (Gherardi, 2010, p. 507), “from the point of view of the practitioners and the activity that is being performed, with its temporality and processuality, as well as the emergent and negotiated order of the action being done” (Gherardi, 2009, p. 117). Authors’ empirical, theoretical and philosophical levels of engagement to the theory of practice may change (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011).

Different research routes (and concepts) focused on investigating strategy as practice were analyzed by Rouleau (2013): (a) practice seen as the action of strategists at managerial level; (b) practice understood as a set of strategy tools; (c) practice understood as knowledge; (d) practice seen as organizational resources; and (e) practice seen as narrative and global discourse. As research agenda, strategy seen as practice has *strategizing* as its object of study (Jarzabkowski, 2005, p. 3): it investigates how strategists think, speak, act, reflect, interact, thrill, aestheticize and politicize; what tools and technologies they use; as well as the implications of different *strategizing* forms for strategy seen as organizational activity.

Table 2

### Theoretical framework of practical turn in strategy

Approaches to strategy seen as social practice
Activity-Based View (ABV)
Strategy-as-Practice (SAP)
Practice-Based Studies (PBS)
Practice-Based View (PBV)

Sources: elaborated by the authors.

Strategy seen as social practice expands the possibilities of applying the concept of strategy itself when it assumes the **plurality** (Denis, Langley, & Rouleau, 2007; Johnson, Langley, Melin, & Whittington, 2007; Vaara & Whittington, 2012): of (a) analysis levels; (b) actors; (c) theories; and (d) contexts. Among the terms that emerged for the study of the strategy as practice (Table 2), we highlight the SAP and PBS approaches, more disseminated in strategy.

Research adopting the SAP approach, i.e., strategy seen as socially engaged/committed activity must face five theoretical and empirical challenges: What is the strategy? Who is the strategist? What do strategists do? What does the analysis conducted by strategists and their practices explain? How do the existing social and organizational theories contribute to the analysis of strategy seen as practice? (Jarzabkowski & Spee, 2009). Based on another SAP research agenda,

Jarzabkowski, Balogun and Seidl (2007) have evidenced gaps concerning what we (do not) know about practitioner types (individual actors in organizations, groups of actors in organizations, and groups of extra organizational actors) and praxis levels (micro, meso and macro). The initial idea of distinguishing and opposing practice and process (Whittington, 2004, 2007) was replaced by conversations about the concept of strategy process and that of strategy practice. Burgelman et al. (2018) have proposed an analytical model capable of combining both concepts (*Strategy as Process and Practice – SAPP*); Mirabeau, Maguire and Hardy (2018) have shown that little attention has been given to transient manifestations of strategy. In addition, they have identified six strategy manifestation forms, namely: intended, realized, deliberate, emergent, unrealized and ephemeral.

SAP faces challenges of ontological, epistemological and theoretical nature (Clegg, Carter, & Kornberger, 2008; Chia & Mackay, 2007; Ezzamel & Willmott, 2010). Among them, one finds (a) the agency-structure issue; (b) the research about individuals and actions seen as “*practice-complexes*”; (c) the development of a post-procedural perspective of strategy, which comprises the internalized predispositions and the *modus operandi* of strategy practitioners, and acknowledges the collective construction of strategy as culturally and historically-situated practices. This ‘post-processual’ perspective of strategy is different from the traditional view of strategy process, which encompasses decision-making steps arranged in a sequential and linear logic, as conscious, intentional and deliberate action taken by a single individual or individuals in specific hierarchical positions.

PBS suggests that practices are situated and socially learned, as well as sustained and refined (Gherardi, 2012). PBS has strong interest in learning, knowledge and technology (Gherardi, 2010; Nicolini, 2012). New practices require “sensible knowledge”, tests and experimentations, continuous negotiation of aesthetic categories, identity construction, performance refinement, as well as ethical and instrumental judgments (Gherardi, 2012). From the epistemological point of view, PBS (Gherardi, 2009) seeks new ways to study organizations and to overcome dualisms such as action/structure and human/non-human. Organization is seen as a texture of practices between humans and non-humans, interrelated in the form of a network of actions sustained by *knowledge-in-action*, language and symbolic meanings, while renewing and transforming itself through practice (Gherardi, 2012).

PBS strand brings along a new impetus to the study of learning; it emphasizes the role played by socio-materiality as a form of shared agency and intimate relationship between humans and non-humans. Social practice is “the effect of interconnected practices and their reproduction circuit” (Gherardi, 2010, p. 507). Different theories of practice addressing the concept of social and human phenomenon have emphasized the production and reproduction of daily life behind the apparent order or social stability; rethinking the role played by agents/individuals; understanding the world in relational terms (social interactions); the role played by knowledge and discourse in practices focused on building meaning, identity and social things; “the centrality of interests and power in everything we do” (Nicolini, 2012, p. 6).

## **Spatiality of Strategy seen as Practice: A Research Agenda**

A research agenda based on the spatiality of strategy seen as practice is presented in Table 3. The dotted lines portray the porosity between the concepts of space and their possibilities of



study, i.e., it is space as multiplicity (Massey, 2015): simultaneity of multiple trajectories constituted in, and by, space. This research agenda considers that different concepts of space guide interventions in different spaces and shape our relationships with others. Based on the ideological, ethical and conceptual point of view, liberal individuals understand space through individualistic senses of justice, **abstract space**; communitarian individuals link space to local loyalties and intersubjective communication, **local space**; and postmodern individuals understand space in their corporeity and intimacy, **intimate/corporealized space** (Bridge, 2000).

**Practiced place and lived space** (Massey, 2015) and **spaces of the possible (inhabited space or appropriated space)** (Bourdieu, 2013) refer to a relational construction based on material, social, political and meaningful/representation practices. A plurality of actors perform these practices, which constitute the essence of space production, appropriation and reproduction processes, according to revisited studies conducted in the social theory and critical, human and cultural geography fields. Territory, region and place are practiced and lived spaces, although hegemonic discourses or anti-space strategies (Massey, 2015, p. 263) insist in opposing the “place-as-real” to the “space-as-abstract”. This opposition makes it easier to locate the ethical commitment of practices *vis-à-vis* the dispersion of global responsibilities, which is ironic and problematic, since global issues and global interconnectivity are so pressing in place.

Table 3

### Spatiality of strategy seen as practice: a research agenda

Physical/material space	Cultural/symbolic space	Political/economic space	Represented/narrated space
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locus of biological survival practices: humans, other animals and landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locus of language interactions and practices and cultural and aesthetic expressions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locus of power relations: space production, distribution and appropriation practices.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locus of meaning, narrative, emotional and moral repertoires and criticality of practices.</li> </ul>
<b>Implications for studies about strategy seen as practice</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship between human and non-human, material and immaterial in strategy seen as practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency and structure in deterritorialization processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spaces and the conflicting nature of strategy: resistance and domination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Polysemic nature of strategy: multiple voices, interpretations, lived experiences, representations, imaginations, deliberations, responsibilities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies and practices in space deterioration, preservation and restoration processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural multidimensionality of spaces in strategy seen as practice: public/private; individual/collective; deliberate/emergent (chance), contingent/accidental; local/global.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideological nature of strategy appropriation, space demarcation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affective and psychic dynamics of strategy seen as practice and of spaces.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical space historically modified by practices and strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The symbolic factor and strategy seen as practice in perceived, conceived and lived spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies in space production and reproduction processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy seen as practice, learning and memory: learning new practices and forgetting the old ones.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The transformation of spaces by practices and strategies driven by the massive use of new information technologies and others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Space seen as cultural and symbolic capital of strategy seen as practice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established practices in use and new spatial practices in global trade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practices that make the place and the place of what is peculiar and meaningful to each organization.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Virtual spaces and national and global networks ("nodes" are the places)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies focused on the construction and fractures of territorial identities and on place fabrication: construction (invention), cultural and symbolic practices of the territory.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Space appropriation practices: tension, contradiction, negotiation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies seen as exclusion/inclusion sources: attachment to the place or feeling out of place</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practices and strategies in non-places (standardized places).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence of cultural and symbolic expressions on strategies of sectarian spatial movements; of coexistence in large urban centers; of multiple modern "tribes" and cultural hybridization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hierarchy/maintenance of space control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Place fabrication strategies: psychosocial and moral expressions of place identity construction (invention) and territory demarcation (manipulative, narcissistic, immoral practices and fun, healthy, ethical practices).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies and practices at borders created by cyberspace.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture and transfer of strategies and practices of places.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial strategies and practices to deal with uncertainty, dependence (cooperation and warmongering).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrative and discursive practices of lived experiences.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulation of people, objects, performances and strategies</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies and practices in the center/periphery relationship, in the acquisition or loss of economic power of territories.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy and affective memory in the construction and change of spaces.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy seen as practice and production of physical territory paths.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies for sharing territories: different ethnic groups and social groups, flows of migrants.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-escalation of spaces: appropriation and physical demarcation of spaces.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wealth and misery: spatialization strategies, positions and properties.</li> </ul>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatialization and territorialization of companies and labor relationships.</li> </ul>	

#### **The role played by strategy seen as practice and spaces. . .**

Promised, imagined, dreamed, left, lived, possible, appropriate, passing by, represented, perceived, demarcated, stolen/disputed, invented, resistance, dissidents, insurgents, forgotten, recovered, transformed, controlled, refuge, recovered, eternalized, hope, non-places.

Sources: elaborated by the authors.

In addition to the analysis of **perceived, conceived** and **lived spaces** (Lefebvre, 1991), we also find other conceptions of space. Regional identity building practices are questioned when they create **stereotype spaces** to weaken the other space and stigmatize collective identities. Said (2007) has analyzed how the West orientalized the East through interpretation, representation and misguided practices; he suggested reflective practices that follow the idea that the East is neither an inert fact, nor just an idea. Albuquerque Júnior (2011) advocated that the Northeastern region, as an imagined landscape of Brazil, has originated at the end of the first decade of the 20th century: a Northeastern region “suitable for the studies of the academia, for the exhibition in museums, for the television shows, to be the subject of novels, paintings, movies, theater plays, political discourses, economic measures” (pp. 78-79). Said (2007) and Albuquerque Júnior (2011) have shown the **narrated space**.

Spaces and spatial identities are subject to manipulation and they can be influenced by individual and group power projects (Souza, 2015b). Based on this argument, it is possible identifying (a) **eternalized, dreamed and desired spaces**: working in a certain company, cities that are tourists’ desires (Venice, Paris, Barcelona, New York) and even neighborhoods (Copacabana and Ipanema in Rio de Janeiro); (b) **areas of decline/reborn or left**: residents or interest groups can affect the image and boundaries of the neighborhood and the city through practices that lead to their decline or reinvigoration (Detroit in the USA in the 1960s and then in the early 20th century); (c) **created/invented spaces** by governmental policies (Dubai in the United Arab Emirates). Based on the perspective of the relationship between body and place, **biospaces** (laboratories, pharmacies, hospitals, transgenic crops, genetic sequencing, prolongation of life), **symbolic spaces** (cathedrals, theaters, cinemas, museums), **blasphemous spaces** (soccer fields, bars), **orgiastic places and silent places** (Chaveiro, 2014).

Sociospatial practices also define **spaces of resistance and the struggle for spaces**, since the hegemony of capitalism affects the quality of social, political and economic relations, by generating spaces marked by expropriation and exploitation, by reducing individuals of a neighborhood (Paraisópolis in São Paulo), city or region, country or territory to mere labor suppliers (Ribeiro, 2018). Political-spatial practices generate **spaces of control/disputes** (Complexo do Alemão in Rio de Janeiro, militarization of spaces) and **dissident/insurgent/resistance spaces** (some universities, depending on the conjuncture, spaces occupied by homeless individuals, environmental activism spaces, refugee camps). **Dissident/insurgent/resistance spaces** present emancipatory and anti-heteronomous practices and play key role in power agendas: the struggle for the right to the city and the planet (Souza, 2015a), practices called “tactics” by Certeau (1998), which aim at the reorganization of space in pursuit of “**spaces of hope**” (Harvey, 2005).

The current research agenda for studies about strategy seen as social practice requires debating beyond the concepts of objective time and space (Hydle, 2015): concepts of practices carried out at some point in time and place. We show that the greater attention given to the temporality and **spatiality** of practices helps explaining how *strategizing* – as a way of being in the world – is enabled and limited, deliberate and non-deliberate, and featured by ephemeral practice forms (Mirabeau, Maguire, & Hardy, 2018). Although it is possible discussing about objective time and space, which exist regardless of human activity, the same does not apply to temporality and **spatiality**, since they are rooted in human activities. If temporality scrambles the past, present and future as action develops, **spatiality** involves the places and trajectories of a plurality of actors, their

identities, relationships and human experiences. After all, *strategizing* is part of these intricate relationships between space (and spatiality) and subjects in action, namely: interactions, identities, history/trajectories. After all, non-identity, non-relational and non-historical spaces are **non-places** (Augé, 2012): spaces that promise “solitary individuality” (trains, subways, airports, ATMs), **temporary and ephemeral passage spaces** (hotels, holiday clubs, refugee camps); although Relph (2014) defines that non-places are standardly constructed places (supermarkets, airports, franchised shops).

## Final considerations

The dialogue between studies about strategy seen as practice and the ones about space in the Social Theory and Human, Cultural and Critical Geography fields reveals strategy-related topics that go beyond the business world, without excluding it, obviously. In this essay, we show space as multiplicity, which implies thinking about space as a plurality of individual and/or collective trajectories through several socio-spatial practices. Spaces concern the doings, choices, actions and interactions, behaviors, feelings, power symbols, cultural expressions, presence or absence of physical elements of well-being, among other aspects of *strategizing* interest. Spaces are not the stage where strategy takes place or is practiced at; spaces are part of strategy's doings, since they facilitate, hinder, prevent and require socio-spatial strategies to interpret, represent, create, transform and reproduce spaces.

Together with the subject of space and spatiality, other concepts – such as territory, region and place – also enable a broader and more realistic study about strategic practice. The multi-scalability of spaces in “*strategizing*” is an aspect to be taken into consideration in studies about strategy seen as social practice (SAP and PBS). It appears to be conceptually richer than the micro-macro issue proposed by SAP or the local-global concepts of anti-spatial strategies. The political analysis of strategy in spaces is also conceptually richer than the sense of relational tension addressed by SAP. The study about the role played by *strategizing* in the construction of the identity of public and private spaces, such as: source of belonging, trust and protection, fear and insecurity, attachment or revulsion to the place, also enables knowledge, learning and the socio-materiality of practices performed by individuals and collectivities/groups of individuals, and it helps deepening research in PBS.

By reflecting about the uncomfortable lack of space in studies about strategy seen as practice, we show that the **spatiality** of strategy seen as social practice opens new windows for investigations about organizational reality. More specifically, it enabled greater density in research conducted in the field of strategy seen as social practice. It also paved the way to help better understanding the question: what does it imply for the study about strategy to be a situated practice?

## References

- Albuquerque Júnior, D. M. (2011). *A invenção do Nordeste e outras artes* (5a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Cortez.
- Antheaume, B., & Giraut, F. (2005). Au nom du développement, une (re)fabrication des territoires. In B. Antheaume, & F. Giraut (Eds.), *Le territoire est mort, vive les territoires!* (pp. 9-38). Paris: IRD Éditions.
- Augé, M. (2012). *Não lugares: introdução a uma antropologia da supermodernidade* (9a ed.). Campinas, SP: Papirus.
- Bertero, C. O. (2011). Réplica 2 – O que é um ensaio teórico? Réplica a Francis Kanashiro Meneghetti. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 15(2), 338-342. doi:10.1590/S1415-65552011000200012
- Bezzi, M. L. (2004). *Região: uma (re)visão historiográfica – da gênese aos novos paradigmas*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da UFSM.
- Bourdieu, P. (2013). Espaço físico, espaço social e espaço físico apropriado. *Estudos Avançados*, 27(79), 133-143. doi:10.1590/S0103-40142013000300010
- Bourdieu, P. (2018). Social space and the genesis of appropriated physical space. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 42(1), 106-114. doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12534
- Bridge, G. (2000) Rationality, ethics, and space: on situated universalism and the self-interested acknowledgement of “difference”. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 18(4), 519-535. doi:10.1068/d204t
- Burgelman, R. A., Floyd, S. W., Laamanen, T., Mantere, S., Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2018). Strategy process and practices: dialogues and intersections. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(3), 531-558. doi:10.1002/smj.2741
- Carlos, A. F. A. (2016). *A condição espacial*. São Paulo, SP: Contexto.
- Certeau, M. (1998). *A invenção do cotidiano* (3a ed.). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Chanlat, J.-F. (1996). O ser humano, um ser espaço-temporal. In J.-F. Chanlat (Org.), *O indivíduo na organização* (vol. 3, pp. 107-110). São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Chanlat, J.-F. (2006). Space, organization and management thinking: a socio-historical perspective. In S. R. Clegg, & M. Kornberger (Eds.), *Space, organization and management theory* (pp. 17-43). Frederiksberg: Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Chaveiro, E. F. (2014). Corporeidade e lugar: elos da produção da existência. In E. Marandola Júnior, W. Holzer, & L. Oliveira (Orgs.), *Qual o espaço do lugar?* (pp. 249-279). São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva.
- Chia, R. (2004). Strategy-as-practice: reflections on the research agenda. *European Management Review*, 1(1), 29-34. doi:10.1057/palgrave.emr.1500012
- Chia, R., & Mackay, B. (2007). Post-processual challenges for the emerging strategy-as-practice perspective: discovering strategy in the logic of practice. *Human Relations*, 60(1), 217-242. doi:10.1177/0018726707075291

- Clegg, S., Carter, C., & Kornberger, M. (2004). A “máquina estratégica”: fundamentos epistemológicos e desenvolvimentos em curso. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 44(4), 21-31. Recuperado de <https://bit.ly/3g9oPIH>
- Closs, L., & Oliveira, S. R. (2017). Economia criativa e território usados: um debate baseado nas contribuições de Milton Santos. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 15(2), 349-363. doi:10.1590/1679-395152437
- Corrêa, I. L. (1998). Territorialidade e corporação: um exemplo. In M. Santos, M. A. A. de Souza, & M. L. Silveira (Orgs.), *Território, globalização e fragmentação* (2a ed., pp. 251-256). São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.
- Damásio Filho, M. A., Kitazawa, H. M., Klichowski, R. C., Silva, F. M., & Chagas, P. B. (2017). Avanços dos estudos de espaço e território nos estudos organizacionais: uma análise no congresso brasileiro de estudos organizacionais (CBEO). *Caderno de Administração*, 25(1), 121-135. doi:10.4025/cadadm.v25i1.36960
- Denis, J. L., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2007). Strategizing in pluralistic contexts: rethinking theoretical frames. *Human Relations*, 60(1), 179-215. doi:10.1177/0018726707075288
- Dosse, F. (2013). O espaço habitado segundo Michel de Certeau. *ArtCultura*, 15(27), 85-96.
- Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2010). Strategy and strategizing: a poststructuralist perspective. In J. A. C. Baum, & J. Lampel (Eds.), *The globalization of strategy research* (vol. 27, pp. 75-109). Bingley: Emerald.
- Feldman, M. S., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1240-1253. doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0612
- Fischer, G. N. (1994). Espaço, identidade e organização. In J.-F. Chanlat (Org.), *O indivíduo na organização* (vol. 2, pp. 81-102). São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
- Fremont, A. (2005). Le système territorial en France, en Afrique du Sud, dans le monde: éléments pour une comparaison. In B. Antheaume, & F. Giraut (Eds.), *Le territoire est mort: vive les territoires!* (pp. 109-132). Paris: IRD Éditions.
- Gherardi, S. (2009). Introduction: The Critical Power of the ‘Practice Lens’. *Management Learning*, 40(2), 115-128. doi:10.1177/1350507608101225
- Gherardi, S. (2010). Telemedicine: a practice-based approach to technology. *Human Relations*, 63(4), 501-524. doi:10.1177/0018726709339096
- Gherardi, S. (2012). *How to conduct a Practice-Based Study*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gibson, K., & Watson, S. (1995). Postmodern spaces, cities and politics: an introduction. In S. Watson, & K. Gibson (Eds.), *Postmodern cities and spaces* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (2013). *A constituição da sociedade* (3a ed.). São Paulo, SP: WMF Martins Fontes.
- Haesbaert, R. (2010). Região, regionalização e regionalidade. *Antares: Letras e Humanidades*, (3), 2-24. Recuperado de <https://bit.ly/39gFC8e>
- Haesbaert, R. (2016). *O mito da desterritorialização: do “fim dos territórios” à multiterritorialidade* (10a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Bertrand Brasil.

- Haesbaert, R. (2018). *Regional-global: dilemas da região e da regionalização na geografia contemporânea* (3a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Bertrand Brasil.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A produção capitalista do espaço*. São Paulo, SP: Annablume.
- Hydle, K. M. (2015). Temporal and spatial dimensions of strategizing. *Organization Studies*, 36(5), 643-663. doi:10.1177/0170840615571957
- Jarzabkowski, P. (2005). *Strategy as practice: an activity-based approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Jarzabkowski, P., & Spee, A. P. (2009). Strategy-as-practice: a review and future directions for the field. *International Journal of Management Review*, 11(1), 69-95. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00250.x
- Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J., & Seidl, D. (2007). Strategizing: the challenges of a practice perspective. *Human Relations*, 60(1), 5-27. doi:10.1177/0018726707075703
- Johnson, G., Langley, A., Melin, L., & Whittington, R. (2007). *Strategy as practice: research directions and resources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jonas, A. E. G. (2012). Region and place: regionalism in question. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(2), 263-272. doi:10.1177/0309132510394118
- Jonas, A. E. G. (2013). Place and region III: alternative regionalisms. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(6), 822-828. doi:10.1177/0309132513479088
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lencioni, S. (2014). *Região e geografia*. São Paulo, SP: Edusp.
- Löw, M. (2008). The constitution of space: the structuration of spaces through the simultaneity of effect and perception. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 11(1), 25-49. doi:10.1177/1368431007085286
- Löw, M. (2013). O spatial turn. *Tempo Social*, 25(2), 17-34. doi:10.1590/S0103-20702013000200002
- Massey, D. (2000). Um sentido global do lugar. In A. A. Arantes (Org.), *O espaço da diferença* (pp. 177-185). Campinas, SP: Papiros.
- Massey, D. (2015). *Pelo espaço: uma nova política da espacialidade* (5a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Bertrand Brasil.
- Massey, D., & Keynes, M. (2004). Filosofia e política da espacialidade: algumas considerações. *GEOgrafia*, 6(14), 7-23. doi:10.22409/GEOgraphia2004.612.a13477
- Mbembé, A. (2005). À la lisière du monde: frontières, territorialité et souveraineté en Afrique. In B. Antheaume, & F. Giraut (Eds.), *Le territoire est mort, vive les territoires!* (pp. 47-78). Paris: IRD Éditions.
- Medeiros, R. M. V. (2015). Território, espaço de identidade. In M. A. Saquet, & E. S. Sposito. (Orgs.), *Territórios e territorialidades: teorias, processos e conflitos* (2a ed., pp. 215-225). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Consequência Editora.

- Mendes, L., & Cavedon, N. R. (2013). As culturas organizacionais territorializadas. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 15(35), 108-123. doi:10.5007/2175-8077.2013v15n35p108
- Mendes, L., & Cavedon, N. R. (2015). "Território como ordem e caos": relações de poder entre camelôs, poder público e comerciantes. *Base – Revista de Administração e Contabilidade da Unisinos*, 12(1), 15-26. doi:10.4013/base.2015.121.02
- Mirabeau, L., Maguire, S., & Hardy, C. (2018). Bridging practice and process research to study transient manifestations of strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(3), 582-605. doi:10.1002/smj.2732
- Nicolini, D. (2012). *Practice theory, work & organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paasi, A. (2002). Place and region: regional worlds and words. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(6), 802-811. doi:10.1191/0309132502ph404pr
- Paasi, A. (2003). Region and place: regional identity in question. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(4), 475-485. doi:10.1191/0309132503ph439pr
- Petani, F. J., & Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: the process of space planning through remembering and history. *Organization*, 23(1), 71-89. doi:10.1177/1350508415605102
- Piermay, J-L. (2005). La frontière et ses ressources: regards croisés. In B. Antheaume, & F. Giraut (Eds.), *Le territoire est mort: vive les territoires!* (pp. 203-222). Paris: IRD Éditions.
- Raffestin, C. (1993). *Por uma geografia do poder*. São Paulo, SP: Ática.
- Relph, E. (2014). Reflexões sobre a emergência, aspectos e essência de lugar. In E. Marandola Júnior, W. Holzer, & L. Oliveira (Orgs.), *Qual o espaço do lugar?* (pp. 17-32). São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva.
- Retaillé, D. L'espace mobile. In B. Antheaume, & F. Giraut (Eds.), *Le territoire est mort: vive les territoires!* (pp. 175-202). Paris: IRD Éditions.
- Ribeiro, F. V. (2018). A prática socioespacial da resistência. In A. F. A. Carlos, C. S. Santos, & I. P. Alvarez (Orgs.), *Geografia urbana crítica: teoria e método* (pp. 53-64). São Paulo, SP: Contexto.
- Ribeiro, M. T. R. (2014). O espaço dos possíveis, de Pierre Bourdieu. *Ciências Sociais Unisinos*, 50(2), 101-107. doi:10.4013/csu.2014.50.2.01
- Rouleau, L. (2013). Strategy-as-practice research at a crossroads. *Management*, 16(5), 547-565. doi:10.3917/mana.165.0574
- Sack, R. D. (2013). O significado de territorialidade. In L. C. Dias, & M. Ferrari (Orgs.), *Territorialidades humanas e redes sociais* (2a ed., pp. 63-89). Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- Said, E. W. (2007). *Orientalismo: o oriente como invenção do ocidente*. São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras.
- Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003). Strategizing as lived experience and strategists' everyday efforts to shape strategic direction. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1), 141-174. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.t01-1-00007
- Santos, M. (1988). *Metamorfoses do espaço habitado*. São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.



- Santos, M. (1996). O retorno ao território. In M. Santos, M. A. A. de Souza, & M. L. Silveira (Orgs.), *Território, globalização e fragmentação* (2a ed., pp. 15-20). São Paulo, SP: Hucitec.
- Santos, M. (2013). *Técnica, espaço, tempo* (5a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Edusp.
- Saquet, M. A. (2015). *Abordagens e concepções de território* (4a ed.). São Paulo, SP: Outras Expressões.
- Schmid, C. (2012). A teoria da produção do espaço de Henri Lefebvre: em direção a uma dialética tridimensional. *GEOUSP – Espaço e Tempo*, 16(3), 89-109. doi:10.11606/issn.2179-0892.geousp.2012.74284
- Silveira, M. L. (2013). Novos acontecimentos, novas territorialidades. In L. C. Dias, & M. Ferrari (Orgs.), *Territorialidades Humanas e Redes Sociais* (2a ed., pp. 39-62). Florianópolis, SC: Insular.
- Soja, E. W. (1993). *Geografias pós-modernas: a reafirmação do espaço na teoria social crítica*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar.
- Souza, M. L. (2015a). *Dos espaços de controle aos territórios dissidentes: escritos de divulgação científica e análise política*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Consequência.
- Souza, M. L. (2015b). *Os conceitos fundamentais da pesquisa sócio-espacial* (2a ed.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Bertrand.
- Souza, M. L. (2015c). “Território” da divergência (e da confusão): em torno das imprecisas fronteiras de um conceito fundamental. In M. A. Saquet, & E. S. Sposito (Orgs.), *Territórios e territorialidades: teorias, processos e conflitos* (2a ed., pp. 53-68). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Consequência Editora.
- Spicer, A. (2006). Beyond the convergence-divergence debate: the role of spatial scales in transforming organizational logic. *Organization Studies*, 27(10), 1467-1483. doi:10.1177/0170840606067515
- Suddaby, R. (2019). Objectivity and truth: the role of the essay in management scholarship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(2), 441-447. doi:10.1111/joms.12340
- Tomaney, J. (2017). Region and place III: well-being. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(1), 99-107. doi:10.1177/0309132515601775
- Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy as practice: taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1), 285-336. doi:10.5465/19416520.2012.672039
- Vergara, S. C., & Vieira, M. M. F. (2005). Sobre a dimensão tempo-espaço na análise organizacional. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 9(2), 103-119. doi:10.1590/S1415-6552005000200006
- Vieira, A. C. P., & Pellin, V. (2015). As indicações geográficas como estratégia para fortalecer o território: o caso da indicação de procedência dos Vales da Uva Goethe. *Desenvolvimento em Questão*, 13(30), 155-174. doi:10.21527/2237-6453.2015.30.155-174
- Warf, B., & Arias, S. (2009). *The spatial turn: interdisciplinary perspectives*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Whittington, R. (2004). Strategy after modernism: recovering practice. *European Management Review*, 1(1), 62-68. doi:10.1057/palgrave.emr.1500006

Whittington, R. (2007). Strategy practice and strategy process: family differences and the sociological eye. *Organization Studies*, 28(10), 1575-1586. doi:10.1177/0170840607081557

Wilson, D. C., & Jarzabkowski, P. (2004). Thinking and acting strategically: new challenges for interrogating strategy. *European Management Review*, 1(1), 14-20. doi:10.1057/palgrave.emr.1500008

## Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Authorship

### Jacqueline Florindo Borges

PhD in Administration at University of São Paulo (USP), Post-doctorate in Administration at Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). Professor of the Post-Graduate Program in Administration at Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU).

E-mail: jacborges@ufu.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8550-8329>

### Adriana Roseli Wünsch Takahashi

PhD in Administration at University of São Paulo (USP), Post-doctorate in Administration at Getúlio Vargas Foundation (FGV). Professor of the Post-Graduate Program in Administration at Federal University of Paraná (UFPR).

E-mail: adrianarwt@ufpr.br

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4738-5273>

## Conflict of interests

The authors have stated that there is no conflict of interest.

## Authors' contributions

**First author:** conceptualization (equal), data curation (lead), formal analysis (equal), investigation (lead), methodology (equal), project administration (lead), resources (lead), supervision (supporting), validation (equal), visualization (equal), writing-original draft (lead), writing-review & editing (equal).

**Second author:** conceptualization (equal), data curation (supporting), formal analysis (equal), investigation (supporting), methodology (equal), project administration (supporting), resources (supporting), supervision (lead), validation (equal), visualization (equal), writing-original draft (supporting), writing-review & editing (equal).

## Plagiarism check

O&S submit all documents approved for publication to the plagiarism check, using specific tools.

## Data availability

O&S encourages data sharing. However, in compliance with ethical principles, it does not demand the disclosure of any means of identifying research participants, preserving fully their privacy. The practice of open data seeks to ensure the transparency of the research results, without requiring the identity of research participants.

*The O&S is signatory to DORA (The Declaration on Research Assessment) and to COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics).*



*Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional*