Contributions of the Collective Subject Discourse Methodology (CSD) for the Strategy Research as Practice

Paulo Frederico Paganini Oliveira Jr[a], Marlene Marchiori [b], Mario Nei Pacagnan[c]

[a] Mestre em Administração pela Universidade Estadual de Londrina (UEL). Aluno de Doutorado em Administração na Fundação Getúlio Vargas (FGV) e Professor na Universidade Cruzeiro do Sul (UNICSUL), São Paulo, SP - Brasil, email: paganini.paulo@gmail.com

[b] Doutora em Comunicação pela Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Professora Senior do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração da Universidade Estadual de Londrina (UEL), Londrina, PR - Brasil email: marlenemarchiori@gmail.com

[c] Doutor em Administração pela Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Professor na Universidade Estadual de Londrina (UEL), Londrina, PR - Brasil, e-mail: marionei@litzestrategia.com.br

Abstract

This essay reflects on the CSD methodology in studies of the strategy as a social practice, considering as one of the main challenges the methodological procedures of this field of study. Firstly, the origin of the strategy is contextualized as a social practice, focusing then the CSD methodology, emphasizing the construction of collective thought and the presence of the subject-that-talk. It is reflected on the CSD as a possible method for strategizing research that reveals the social skills focused on the subject providing an understanding from social representations. From this discussion emerge approaches suggesting this methodology as a candidate for contribution to the research on this phenomenon because of its conceptual juxtapositions.

Keywords: Strategy as Practice, Collective Subject Discourse, Strategizing.

Introduction

Studies in organizational strategy have been considered fundamental in the organizational field when considering a recent historical period, appearing several schools of thought based on theories that differ in ontological and epistemological perspectives. These studies, most of the time, were guided by the hegemony of the functionalist paradigm, with focus on the researching method, the relations of cause and effect and explanation of a given phenomenon. Strategic phenomena were observed under a more deterministic look for the allocation of general laws on strategic behavior, the skills required and the effectiveness of planning. Moreover, it has been sought by prescription and development of optimal management practices, which shows a concern about what 'should be' strategy, not with what 'really is'. This particular thought to address the strategy as 'what should be' is a characteristic of prescriptive schools trying to delineate processes or strategic plans to achieve certain point viewed by the organization. On the other hand, the approach of 'what actually is the strategy' is commonly noted by alternative strands of prescriptive schools, for example, the procedural and systemic approaches (Whittington, 2002).

However, although there are some alternative insights to the mainstream of the strategy after 1950 (Mintzberg, 2000), this hegemonic position of strategic thinking has become more expressively asked from the 1990s, when they emerged critical to the strategy observed by the functionalist paradigm due to gaps that this one had and that made it impossible to understand the recursive process of (re) creation of a strategy as a practical built by people. This question was one of the fronts that led to the Strategy-as-Practice approach (S-as-P).

Similar to the questioning of functionalist hegemony after the 1980s in the field of organizational studies, other areas of thought had a common movement, such as Sociology, leading to alternative methodological considerations that supplied the gaps left by the hegemonic paradigm and reach the condition of scientism of the interpretive paradigm (Burrell, 2012), approaching the field of the methodologies commonly used by Anthropology. This question was called practical turn in social theory (Schatzki; CETINA; SAVIGNY, 2001). It is noteworthy that despite a decline of positivism, this is still predominant in the field of organizational studies and offers contributions to strategic studies, but by another look (Teixeira; BIRTH, 2011).

Seeing this common movement in the Humanities, we wonder which methodological procedures can be used in studies of the Strategy as Practice. This concern came in the theories of discourse, in particular, the proposed methodology of the Collective Subject Discourse - Lefèvre (2003). In this context, emerged the question of the possible links between the methodology (CSD) and studies in the field of Strategy and Practice.

In this article, we present a brief rescue of strategic thinking highlighting approaches that marked the literature in the field of strategy in order to show that the hegemonic studies prize for a functionalist lens research, while the S-as-P with interpretive approach sees the strategy as a process that emerges from the people, which requires studies of the possible methodological procedures for the development of this field of knowledge. From the exploitation of S-as-P concepts emerge researcher's concerns with people who are in construction of processes of ideas, which character-

38

ize the strategizing. At this point it is taken the strict connection with the CSD methodology due to the appreciation of the speech of the subjects and the construction of shared meaning. Then, based on the understanding of Lefèvre (2003) that the CSD methodology also comes from the discursive field of social representations, it is shown briefly what is understood as discourse and its approach to the formulation of this methodology, and presented its composition. Finally, there is the suggestion of a possible methodological procedure to analyze the S-as-P, indicating the CSD methodological ability to supply the methodological deficiency indicated by Whittington (2006) or work as a complement to other methods used in understanding the strategic process.

Brief Evolution of Strategic Thinking

The organizational strategy while globally recognized field of study was predominantly observed by the functionalist lens. These studies with functionalist basis, emerged four basic insights on strategy, worked by Whittington (2002): classical, evolutionary, systemic and procedural approach .

The first approach, the classical one is still the most influential in the environment, with a focus on rational planning and treating the concept of strategy as a rational process, capable of calculating and deliberate analysis as approaches Igor Ansoff and Michael Porter (Whittington, 2002). In this approach, the strategy disregards any possibility of emerging issues and it is strongly rooted in the planning as able to predict and control changes in the internal and external environment.

This hegemony of strategic thinking suffered his first question with Hannan and Freeman (2007) pointed to the ineffectiveness of the expected environmental conditions as to control them. Thus, the evolutionary approach appears, based on the ecology, which emphasizes the survival of only the fittest organizations find its place in the competitive niche. This approach has a strongly deterministic and objectivist character, in that it is for managers only position their organizations in the environment, and never create it or change it as to obtain benefits from a new context (Whittington, 2002).

The third approach, processual, share the view of the evolutionary approach to treat planning as futile and unnecessary, and considers that planning will be forgotten at the same time as the circumstances in which it was drawn up change. This approach places, in short, that the strategy comes with a practical learning process, and therefore an error in the implementation of a strategic plan would not lead to a competitive disadvantage able to debunk the organization (Whittington, 2002; Minztberg, 2008). However, this school is also marked in determinism, considering that the process of learning takes place by the movement of the market, charging the agent only address the acquired knowledge and absorb it (Mintzberg, Ahlstrand & Lampel, 2000). Its insights that led to the first discussions of S-as-P.

Finally, the systemic approach deals with the ends and means of the strategy linked with existing power structures and culture in the local social system. If considered in a continuum of voluntarism / determinism, this approach is less deterministic of the four ones, but it is still presented as dependent on a specific social system where the strategy is developed (Whittington, 2002).

In addition to the approaches of Whittington (2002), the strategy also tariff in ten schools presented by Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (2000), in which most schools is the strategy as a dependent relationship with the environment, according to which no it is in the process build the context in which it operates, adopting only a reactive process. Schools that differ from the others are cognitive and entrepreneurial: the first places that the positioning of the organization as part of a mental conception strategist environment, but still has deterministic character; and the entrepreneurial school is the strategy as dependent as a visionary strategist and opportunistic, able to lead the organization to the various existing niches in the environment.

Thus, we can see that the schools for less deterministic they are, have always been addressed by a functionalist perspective in order to identify environmental regularities in which the organization has to fit to survive, be this adaptation coming from the strategist or given by environmental selection.

However, in 1996, Richard Whittington brings an innovative approach to the strategy through a practical perspective that focuses on the strategist and the strategy development process, putting in the background the organization and the strategy itself. Thus, this new way of studying uses insights of the procedural school, trying to identify how the need for strategic change arises and how the strategic practice is repeated by placing the agent in focus. This new perception is not characterized as a school, but as a new look of the strategy, addressing the adaptation and recursion on the practice field (Jarzabkowski, 2002).

In this context, emerges the S-as-P as an alternative approach that understands the strategy as a social practice, watching like the strategy practitioners act and interact to formulate it (Whittington, 1996). Coming from the school of procedural insights, S-as-P returns to the approach in management level, but more interested in how is the process of strategizing by strategists, speaking from practitioners themselves and their practices (Whittington, 1996). "So the practical perspective is concerned [also] with administrative tasks, such as managers" do. "" Strategy (Whittington, 1996, p. 732, our translation).

To study the S-as-P traditional functionalist methods are not enough , but the capture of ideas and the seizure of everyday situations and observing the routines that involve the emersion process of the strategy. "Here craftsmanship is as important as technical facility, the essential knowledge is both tacit and formal, local and general; and persistence and detail can make more brightness and inspiration. "(Whittington, 1996, p. 732, our translation).

According Pacagnan (2011) and Rhoden (2008), the Strategy as Practice study activities that are generally considered "invisible" in the light of the traditional strategic theories and that when ignored, can cause unmeasurable and inconsiderable impacts. Thus, the positivist assumptions of the strategy and the traditional sciences are thrown into crisis by not considering such social relations and abstract rationality (Alexander, 1988).

Mintzberg, Ahlstrand and Lampel (2000) notes that only the plans and strategic positioning are insufficient to achieve an effective strategy, since the process does not depend simply of the organization, but also of people, which make this process naturally social. Whittington (2004) proposes a change of approach in strategy research in an attempt to understand how the practitioners do the strategy process,

called strategizing, considered the constant process of making the strategy in an organization. "For this, one must descend to the level of practitioners and study them, see how they act and interact in the organization, what their abilities, skills and performance" (Whittington, 1996 as cited in Canhada & Rese, 2009, p. 283). The method of investigation is not locked into existing causal relationships in full anymore, but address to an intermediate size as worked by Giddens (2009) in the theory of structuring.

According Whittington (1996), there is also change in the agenda of the research in strategy and should be considered from the biography of the strategist to his/her daily activities within the organization. However, the interest of the research in strategy goes out of instrumentality, which usually flows into organizational performance, expanding into social relations of the strategist, his/her history, the context in which he/she was and is inserted, social actors that influenced in his/her conceptions of the world, and critical communication interactions strategizing process.

According Bulgacov and Marchiori, (2010, p. 160) "the fundamentals of the strategy are inextricably grounded in social interaction and understanding the strategy as a permanent process of making strategy." This leads us to the understanding that the S-as-P can then be understood by the ideographic approach able to scrutinize the essence of a phenomenon (Burrell & Morgan, 2006)

This brief construction leads us to consider that the phenomenon of S-as-P shall adopt an interpretive bias capable of understanding how this phenomenon happens, which leads to the questioning of Whittington (2006) of the necessary methodological approaches in S-as- P, failing to be understood through the normal functionalist science regarding the causal relationships and other hegemonic features in the organizational scientific field.

Understanding the Collective Subject Discourse Methodology

This topic is first considered the concept of discourse, which provides input to the understanding of the collective subject discourse analysis methodology (CSD) itself.

The discourse is understood into two parts. The discourse as a political statement, aesthetic or will, characterized by its eloquence and formed by convoluted signs; and the discourse as a concrete manifestation of language, endowed with socially constructed meaning and significance (Fernandes, 2007). The second way of understanding the discourse is considered by S-as-P theorists as a component of the strategizing process (Vaara, 2010), and that the subjectivity of human consciousness is exposed through language and communication through the narratives (Bulgacov & Marchiori, 2010). The discourse is assumed as input for training and ideological expression that are steeped in the words, this discourse is loaded of the need for linguistic elements to exist in its material state (Fernandes, 2007) rather than a continuous period of speech and / or writing (Crystal, 1985).

> Thus, we say that speech implies exterior of language, it is encountered in the social nature and involves issues not strictly linguistic. We refer to social and ideological aspects impregnated in the words when they are pronounced. [...] We see, therefore, that the speech is

> not the language itself, but it needs it to have material existence and / or real. "(Fernandes, 2007, p. 18)

The speech comprises a communication process triggered by historical, ideological and social experiences that makes the speech mobile and suitable for further processing and collective construction, being treated like moving words (Cabral, 2005; Orlandi, 2007). Therefore, the discourse is connected with the production of meaning, and this, in turn, produced as the places and situations that the subjects in dialogue occupy (Fernandes, 2007) going to be seen not only as precepts of thought and structured language but as an expression of a collective thought built on social and temporal conditions, lying in the social sphere (Gondim & Fischer, 2009). According to Brandão (. 1993, p 9) "the linguistic material is only part of the statement; there is also another [sic] part, nonverbal, which is the context of enunciation, "which justifies the existence of the social sphere.

Thus, according to Taylor and Robichaud (2004) the discourse is usually higher than the sentence; oriented to engage in time and seek an end; interactive, especially in conversation; contextualized; governed by social norms as all social behavior; assumed in a interdiscourse, acquiring meaning only within a universe of other discourses. The speech is also assumed:

> [...] it is not speech unless it is related to an instance that at the same time sets as a source of personal reference points, temporal, spatial, and indicates which attitude adopts in relation to what he says and to his interlocutor. "(Charaudeau & Maingueneau, 2004, p. 171).

Thus, the organization is seen as a discursive construction (Fairhust and Putnam, 2010) in which communication is pervasive and strategic processes are not expressing more as a unitary and integrated manner, but as "[...] constituents of meaningful production processes performed by (and in) interactions and interpretations of a collective [...] "which has varied positions (Reis, Marchiori & Casali, 2010, p. 171).

The concept of speech is only capable of understanding with the breakdown of traditional studies on language, which have intended to reach the inviolability of languages (Chamarelli, 2003). From this point, first emerges content analysis and then the Discourse Analysis, with this second critical founded on the first (Brandão, 1993). The first has a positivist cut relying on methodological rigor and neutrality of the method, and seeking basically quantitative and objectivist exploitation; while the second embraces an interpretative character supported in the Weberian verstehen (cf. Weber, 1991), identifying with the proactive dimension to confer linguistic and historical materiality to speech (Rock & Deusdará, 2005).

Individual shows not only the speech perception and individual conception of the world, but a common perception that also forms a shared address and group (Gondim & Fischer, 2009), since the macro context is also shared. However, the authors introduce here the perspective of social representation "adopts the premise that there are individual representations that are not shared and therefore are more relating to how each perceives the world around whether or not this is shared "(Gondim & Fischer 2009, p. 14). From this point, insert the contribution of Lefèvre

and Lefèvre (2005) regarding the collective subject discourse analysis methodology (CSD).

Garfinkel (1967 as cited in Heritage, 1996, p. 285) suggests that "a theory of action and social organization would be incomplete without an analysis of how social agents share the knowledge and the reasoning produced by common sense in conducting its common issues."The author points out that it is possible to identify shared meanings and directions between agents in the course of daily social action and may use the collective discourse as input for empirical research.

The CSD methodology is concerned with the creation of a bridge between common sense and scientific knowledge based on the reconstitution of a collective thought, based on the Theory of Social Representations, also mediating the qualitative and quantitative methodological perspectives. This gives you access to the knowledge and the routine knowledge, treating individuals as owners of sharing rational and cognitive characters. This sharing of common situations is what enables the analysis of discourse as a collective representation in which there are differences between subjects, but with a "common thread" that binds them in their practices and discourses (LEFÉVRE; LEFÉVRE, 2005).

> Objectively, the DSC methodology consists of analyzing statements and other verbal materials that constitute its main corpus, extracting each of the central ideas or anchors from key expressions referred. Based on the central / anchors and corresponding key expressions ideas, it consists of one or more synthetic discourses that are the discourse of the collective subject. (Gondim & Fischer, 2009, p. 15)

The DSC methodology allows putting into practice the qualitative and quantitative approach, which maintains the size of the sample with the existing discursive subjectivity. Thus, it becomes possible to develop synthetic discourses from objective variables (LEFÈVRE; LEFÉVRE, 2003) that support the analysis procedure given search through conceptual explanations. The extracted core ideas of the corpus are interpreted according to their senses and meanings, considering the context in which they operate, making sense of similar speeches in a single speech as something said by the collective subject in first person (LEFÈVRE; LEFÉVRE, 2003). In this scope, it is extracted a procedure that allows to reproduce the collective thought, based on the transformation of thought in speech, then organization and systematization of the statements, and, finally, the qualitative and quantitative interpretation of the systematic testimonials.

The proposal of Lefèvre came to help polls in their qualitative work, but Gondim and Fischer (2009) suggest the approach of the CSD methodology with organizational studies where there may be mutual collaboration: CSD methodology as a facilitator for understanding of organizations, and organizations as experimental field of methodology (Gondim & Fischer, 2009), which gives margin to also approach with the studies in strategy.

While dealing with quantity and frequency of senses and meanings, the CSD methodology "needs not to establish as the main criterion the amount, as the individual expression is always shared, to some extent." (Gondim & Fischer, 2009, p. 16) In order to prepare the synthesis-speeches it is necessary to be based on the similarity of meaning, regardless the level of sharing of a particular way. "Indeed, in the re-

searches with the CSD, the thought is collected through individual interviews with open questions, which enables the thought, as a discursive behavior and individually internalized social fact, to express itself." (Lefèvre & Lefèvre, 2005 p. 21)

Lined on the consideration that the individual thought is expressed as an internalization process previously occurred and socially constructed, Lefèvre and Lefèvre (2005) suggest four operations to produce CSDs: (1) Expressions Key (E-Ch), (2) Central Ideas (CI), (3) anchors (AC), and (4) Collective Subject Discourse (CSD) themselves, explained briefly in Figure 1.

Figure 1 - Collective Subject Discourse Operations

E-Ch	Selected excerpts of the verbal material of each statement that best describe its content
IC	Artificial formulas that describe the senses present in the depositions of each response and joint responses of different individuals who have similar or complementary sense
AC	Synthetic formulas that describe the explicit ideologies in the verbal material of individual or pooled responses
DSC	Putting together the E-Ch present in the depositions that have HF and / or AC of similar or complementary sense, written in the first person singular to represent the thought of the community

Source: prepared by the author based on Lefèvre and Lefèvre (2005, p. 22)

The IC and AC have order to identify, name and mark a position or idea of another. Thus, Lefèvre and Lefèvre (2005) suggest working with a process of (a) selection of key expressions present in individual discourses representing central ideas; (B) the issuance of an excerpt that describes the senses present in the depositions; and / or (c) the issuance of an excerpt describing ideologies present in the depositions; and, finally, (d) preparation of a statement that represents the collective say. Through this procedure it is possible, according Gondim and Fischer (2009), learn the language, the subject, the story and the underlying ideology.

To illustrate the application of the CSD methodology for presentation purposes it is good to rescue Goulart's work (2007). His work in the area of Social Sciences, sought to analyze the oral speech of women over sixty years who participated in the social rite of creation of the State Reserve for Sustainable Development of Ponta do Tubarão (RN). In the CSD approach, Goulart first performed in-depth interviews with nine women who represented the population of its subject matter, selected based on criteria listed by Lefevre and Lefevre (2005) as involvement with the subject at hand, closing time / coexistence with the studied community and acting in specific social practices which are consistent with the objective of the study - in this case, performance in social and religious rites.

After this organization and application, Gourlat (2007) organized the collected data using the methodological assumptions of Lefevre and Lefevre (2003). At first, the discourses (E-Ch, Key Expressions) were separated by the issue of researching screenplay on which developed itself and subsequently by respondent. Then the central ideas and the anchors were highlighted in the text and separated into an arti-

ficially produced speech while maintaining the original excerpt from the idea (Figure ABCD).

IAD 1 - EXPRESSIONS - KEY - CENTRAL IDEAS (IC) & ANCHORS (AC) - QUESTION 1

Legend:

VM = Old Woman

IC- Spelled words in **Blue**;

AC - Words with edges marked in color **Grey**

Expressions key (ECH) - VM 6:

Ah, much has changed. [...] The time I got here in Diogo Lopes, things were more difficult [...] The people were innocent by a [...] had nothing of immorality [...] today is all polluted, things so different. [...] The fishing was so brutal [...] the fisherman went to the sea with brown sugar and flour and water. Did not have that right food. They spent four, five, six, days at sea with only that. [...] The thing were more getting better in a form and failing to another [...] the youth took over, here comes this whole madness, oh the poor of old were falling behind [...] were stopping fishing [...] being different, was changing ranch, was changing food, fishery [...] that woman heads stepping salt, had other fish trying [...] It was another extending. It was the woman, the legwork of the woman [...] here was the woman who worked, it was not just men. [...] The men went fishing, but the woman is that led the way. [...] Grinded salt mill that [...] they worked, they treated fish, would put to dry. [...] They returned pro warehouse to grind that salt and catch that fish and life went that same way. [...] The women here went into the woods to get firewood, wood beam in the head [...] It was a warrior, as are still [...] what women Diogo Lopes wants, they will face. Does it is with man, whether it is with women, they will battle, no.

Central Ideas (CI) - VM 6:

1) changed a lot, it was more difficult, somethings was getting better and worse in others, today everything is polluted;
2) The fishery was brutal and the fisherman went to sea with little or no right food;
3) youth, with "this madness", discards the oldest;
4) Change of ways of working and living;
5) The men went fishing and women worked on land, did the legwork;

Anchors (AC) - VM 6:

1) environmental and social pollution;
2) Lack of condition to work;
3) Awareness of struggle and the struggle of women condition;
4) Dispose of the oldest in the production system;

Subsequently, the central ideas and anchors were grouped into predetermined categories, and made a first treatment in which Central Ideas and Anchors were reduced into smaller Anchor-Synthesis, which, in turn, were reduced to a final Anchor-Synthesis. After this reduction, it was beard an excerpt which represents and warrants that category of analysis.

IAD 1		
REVERSE SPLIT - The "WORK"		
Central Ideas and Anchors **(Sampling collected randomly)**	**Anchorage-synthesis** **(Treatment 1)**	**Anchorage-synthesis** **(Final Treatment)**
• Things were difficult, there was suffering and depended a lot of nature; • Work was only fishing and there was no professional instruction; • Work with fishing took decline for lack of fish and lack of management; • Before there was a lot of fish (free), today there is no more; • The overfishing is harmful to nature;	Record of working with the fish was profitable, however brutal and difficult in the past, but that was at risk due to overfishing.	The fisheries work was profitable, brutal and predatory, in the past, today, even with the possibility of working together, there is still inequality and disposal of older the production chain, although these are still of availability for work.
• Changed a lot, it was more difficult somethings was getting better and worse in others, today everything is polluted; • Change of ways of working and living; • Base Working in the preparation of a group consciousness; • Principles of community work;	Registration ways of working. Pollution and scarcity of fish. Aiming community work as a possibility for transformation.	
• The change in the working profile of girls, women and men; • The work continues. And the more developed work, draws more attention, more people like, the more people want. And that is what is important; • The motion work has brought good things for the community;	Record of the work profile change, as the sexual division, reaffirming the continuing struggle for community work, which benefits the place.	

Finally, the Collective Subject Discourses were developed based on these categories through the logical ordering of individual speeches taking the anchors as input.

IAD 2
DSC THE REVERSE SPLIT "A" - WORK

ECH	**DSC**
Moura [...] the other day there were people who already raised to extend [...] break the fish and leave all a little stretched [...] it was al the other day if broke fish all to do place mat [...] to finish drying and buyers take. [...]. • Ah, much has changed. [...] The time I got here in Diogo Lopes, things were more difficult [...] The people were innocent by a [...] had nothing of immorality [...] today is all polluted, things so different. [...] The fishing was so brutal [...] the fisherman went to the sea with brown sugar and flour and water. Did not have that right food. They spent four, five, six, days at sea with only that. [...] The thing were more getting better in a form and failing to another [...] Youth took over, here comes this whole madness, oh the poor of old were falling behind [...] Were stopping fishing [...] being different, was changing ranch, was exchanging food, changing fishing [...] that woman heads stepping salt, had other fish trying [...] It was another extending. It was the woman, the legwork of the woman [...] here was the woman who worked, it was not just men. [...] The men went fishing, but the woman is that led the way. [...] Grinded salt mill that [...] they worked, they treated fish, would put to dry. [...] They returned pro warehouse, to grind that salt and catch that fish and	*Women. Manual labor was women. Here were women who worked, were not only men. The men went fishing, but women is yielding the way. They ground the salt mill that ... They worked, they treated fish, lowland areas to dry. They returned pro warehouse to grind that salt and catch that fish and life went that same way. And the fish gave good profit, thank God.* *But here had no where to sell. The fish was treated there by the family. The poles were filled, around the ranches. Was so. The marlin and the needle,*

With this approach the Collective Subject Discourse methodology depart on to the overlap of the CSD methodology of contributions to the Strategy as Practice studies.

Methodological Procedure

Aiming to work with the overlapping of a methodological perspective with a theoretical approach, we adopt in this paper the following procedure. At first, we draw the epistemological foundations of the approaches, which were identified in the interpretativism field, according to Burrell and Morgan (2006). Still, to rescue the possibility of understanding the organizational strategy as a social construction, we can bring it to a method that organizes field materials by emerging categories from the data. Finally, we raise the existing gaps in the methodological field pointed in the literature S-as-P and seek supply them by inserting the CSD methodology, giving breadth and depth in the study.

Overlapping the CDS method with the S-P-

In studies of S-as-P was possible to see the emergence of a practical approach in the strategy literature, which now focus more on strategists involved in the actual work of making the strategy (Jarzabkowski, 2004). In this new outlook can work with some analytical possibilities, guided by power relations, symbolism, speeches, common resources, among others, with a view to understand the phenomenon. Such points are entered into a collective system where social actors perform their daily actions, forming structures that "restrict and allow human action and are also created and recreated by actors who have the social structure to act" (Jarzabkowski, 2004, p. 4, our translation). Thus agents, being contained in these networks or "structures" of meaning and significance of their actions, share senses and meanings of other individuals also contained in these structures (Gondim & Fischer, 2009), which paves the way for strategic research practice via shared common features emerged speech from a process that produces both conversational resources discourse, as indicated by Hardy, Lawrence and Grant (2005), the formation of the organizational component as addresses and Robichaud Taylor (2004).

The S-as-P is formed by social practices (Jarzabkowski, 2004) that can be reconstructed through discourse analysis based on the meaning of words (Charaudeau; Maingueneau, 2004). However, the meanings are temporally and socially constructed, as suggested by Fernandes (2007), and the meaning attributed in time witnessed by the individual. Willing meanings in social structures are shared in the instance of political institutions, economic, technological and ethnic (macro), and at the national level organizations (micro) by individual-individual interaction, individual and environment, individual-organization (Jarzabkowski, 2004), which justifies the existence of common speeches or anchors, as approach Lefèvre (2003), as strategists actors feed on common sources. This is evidenced in the approach of Cook and Brown (1999) and Lave and Wenger (1991), cited by Jarzabkowski (2004, p 9, our translation.): "In a" community of practice "individual thought is essentially social and it is developed in the interaction with the practical activities of a community, by living and participating in their experiences over the time."

This process of interaction justifies interpretive methods to understand the phenomenon of strategizing and supports the collective subject discourse analysis methodology as a way to find similar points (anchors) in the speeches of strategist agents. This proposed idea is supported by Charaudeau and Maingueneau (2004, p 172.) who assume the existence of a speech at an interdiscourse, forming the structure previously said:

The speech does not make sense except within a universe of other discourses through which it should open a path. To interpret the lowest statement, you need to put it in connection with all kinds of others, which are discussed, parody, quote "

It is through the set of discourses that agents form senses, recasting them, building them and reconstructing them based on previous experiences and producing new meanings, leading to the understanding of the communication process (Marchiori, Ribeiro Soares and Simões, 2010), which in turn makes the shared meanings. This sharing structure and absorption of speeches resembles the practice of integration model, practice and practitioner presented by Whittington (2006) in Figure 1

(see Whittington, 2006. Figure 1: Integrating Praxis, Practices and Practitioners) where influence one over the other primarily by considering that the effect takes place in the "confluence of the three dimensions" (Bulgacov & Marchiori, 2010, p. 156) and especially the interaction of the size "practitioner" in itself, namely Interaction with the subject in which the subject produces new directions and meanings favors the exchange of the already formed.

There are two ways of sharing moments and meanings: internal and external to the organization. Jarzabkowski (2004, p. 11) suggests that communities of practice are exposed to generative practices, where "new participants learn with continuous members how to interpret the social infrastructure of a particular community, and the rehabilitation process, the players continue and reinforce existing practice. "So the meanings and inner senses of the organization are shared constantly among strategists and heads having in common key ideas, justifying the use of CSD methodology to capture these internally shared ideas. In the organization, there are other "broad community networks" of practice in which strategists organizations are inserted (Jarzabokwski, 2004, p. 11). And on a more macro instance, meanings and feelings can be shared through disembedding mechanisms (Giddens, 1991) that enable the "[...] displacement of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of time-space "(Giddens, 1991, p. 29) leading key ideas of a strategist to another irrespective of temporal and spatial correlation.

Companies can thus be conceptualized as a community of strategic practice. However, companies can also be considered a set of several more or less flexible communities, in that not all are essentially strategic (cf. Brown & Duguid, 2001). (Jarzabkowski, 2004, p. 11)

However, when investigating the strategizing process using the CSD methodology it is for the qualitative researcher abandon the assumption that there is an overrun of the qualitative over quantitative, requiring the union of the qualitative to the quantitative and exploring the quality in large quantities (Lefèvre & Lefèvre , 2005), leaving out that this methodology has just focused on the qualitative perspective with the quantitative as support. When working in quality and quantity, the researcher ends up gaining denser grant to develop categories of speeches and frameworks of respondents to understand in a real dimension the Collective Subject Discourse, working with a double representation of the researched field.

> "[...] Representativity is qualitative because in the research with the CSD each distinct collective opinion is presented in the form of a speech, which retrieves the different contents and arguments that make up the given opinion in the social scale; but the representativeness of opinion is also quantitative because such discourse has, in addition, a numeric expression (which indicates how many testimonies of the total were necessary to compose each CSD) and therefore statistical reliability, considering societies as groups of individuals "(Lefèvre & Lefèvre, 2006, p. 522).

This leads researchers to come across the way of thinking of a community, assisting you in understanding the tangent issues of the strategizing process.

Jarzabkowski (2004, p. 10) points out that "while communities may have some general similarities, each community has specific social interactions that constitute an interpretive unique context", and this weakens the design of the CSD methodology as the only way to understand the phenomenon of strategizing, which leads to consider the CSD methodology as a support to understand the existence of collective discourses and points to the need for other complementary forms of this methodology to that arising from the thematic research of S-as-P be more deeply worked.

6 Concluding Remarks

The existence of the speech as a concrete manifestation of language and endowed with socially constructed meaning and significance can be seen also in strategic processes during the interaction between the strategy practitioners. Such interaction can be understood from methodological approaches that exalt the level of subjectivity, the process, the interaction and the existing movement in the social field. Thus, through a brief historical review we noticed that the S-as-P should approach ideographic methods in order to understand the process of strategizing in the level of subjectivity. This perception opens up various methodological studies of fronts in the strategy as practice field, leading, among others, to the possibility of approximation of this approach with the CSD methodology. The perception of the importance that the discourse of the strategist has for the studies of S-as-P led to consider possible contributions that the CSD methodology can offer.

Assuming used by Jarzabkowski (2004), which states that communities of practice enable the interaction of subjects in order to construct and reconstruct meaning and significance of organizational elements, it is suggested the use of CSD methodology as technical apparatus to understand the strategizing process. Such approach turns itself possible by embracing the strategy practitioner's relationship with practice and with other practitioners, this interaction that offers field for the origin of social representations.

Therefore, it was argued that the CSD methodology supports speech studies in the field of S-as-P for their similarities in practice approaches, field, social representations and macro and micro-social structures, which has been shown to approach of the CSD methodology with the S-as-P in the interpretive nature of issues, but with the exception of the CSD methodology limitations to understand the phenomenon as a whole, requiring thus auxiliary methodologies. It was also possible to emphasize the CSD in their investigations of the functioning of experience produced by common sense and practical reasoning in social situations to understand the practice, practitioners and strategic practices.

Thus, this study contributed to the methodological reflection on the CSD, relying on the contributions of Gondim and Fischer (2009) with regards to organizational studies to overlap this methodological approach to the Strategy as Practice.

References

Alexander, J. (1988). El nuevo movimiento teórico. *Estudios Sociológicos*, Cidade do México, *6*(17), 259-307.

Brandão, H. (2004). *Introdução à analise do discurso*. 9. ed. Campinas-SP: Campinas.

Bulgacov, S. & Marchiori, M. (2010). O Ser e a Comunicação dos Saberes. In: Marchiori, Marlene (Org). ***Faces da Cultura e da Comunicação Organizacional.*** São Caetano: Difusora.

Burrell, G. (2012). Ciência normal, paradigmas, metáforas, discursos e genealogia da análise. *In:* Clegg, S., Hardy, C., & NORD, W. (Orgs.) *Handbook de Estudos Organizacionais*. Vol. 1. São Paulo: Atlas.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (2006). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Cabral, A. C. (2005) A análise do discurso como estratégia de pesquisa no campo da Administração: Um olhar inicial. *Contextus: Revista Contemporânea de Economia e Gestão*, Fortaleza, *3*(2), 59-68.

Canhada, D., & Rese, N. (2009) Contribuições da "estratégia como prática" ao pensamento estratégico. *Revista Brasileira de Estratégia*, Curitiba, *2*(3), 273-289.

Chamarelli, M., Jr. (2003) O que é (ou deve ser) discurso na análise do discurso? ***Primeira Versão***, Porto Velho, *125*(30), 1-5.

Charaudeau, P., & Maingueneau, D. (2004). *Dicionário de Análise do Discurso*. São Paulo: Contexto.

Crystal, D. (1985). *Dicionário de lingüística e fonética*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

Fernandes, C. A. (2007). *Análise de discurso:* reflexões introdutórias. São Carlos - SP: Claraluz.

Giddens, A. (2009) *A constituição da sociedade*. 3.ed. São Paulo: WMF.

Giddens, A. (1991). *As conseqüências da modernidade.* São Paulo: Editora UNESP.

Gondim, S., & Fischer, T. (2009). O discurso, a análise do discurso e a metodologia do discurso do sujeito coletivo na gestão intercultural, *Cadernos Gestão Social*, *2*(1), 9-26.

Goulart, L. L. (2007). ***O Canto das Senhoras:*** Análise do Discurso do Sujeito Coletivo (DSC) de Velhas Mulheres da Ponta do Tubarão, no Rio Grande do Norte. 2007. 244 f. Dissertação (Mestrado) - Curso de Ciências Sociais, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. H. (2007). Ecologia de População das Organizações. In: CALDAS, M. P. & BERTERO, C. O. *Teoria das organizações*. São Paulo: Atlas.

Hardy, C., Lawrence, T. & Grant, D. (2005). Discourse and Collaboration: The role of conversations and collective identity. ***Academy Of Management Review***, New York, *30*(1) 58-77.

Heritage, J. (1996).Etnometodologia. In: Outhwaite, W. & Bottomore, T. ***Dicionário do Pensamento Social do Século XX.*** Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar. p. 284-286.

Jarzabkowski, P. & Wilson, D. (2004). Pensando e agindo estrategicamente: novos desafios para a análise estratégica. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, São Paulo, *44*(4), 11-20.

Jarzabkowski, P. (2002). Strategy-as-practice: recursiveness, adaptation and strategic practice-in-use. *SAGE Journals Online*, Birmingham.

Lefèvre, F. & Lefèvre, A. M. (2003). *Discurso do Sujeito Coletivo:* um novo enfoque em pesquisa qualitativa. Caxias do Sul – RS: EDUCS.

Lefèvre, F. & Lefèvre, A. M. (2005). *Depoimentos e discursos:* uma proposta de análise em pesquisa social. Brasília: Liber Livros Editora.

Lefèvre, F. & Lefèvre, A. M. (2006). O sujeito coletivo que fala. *Interface - Comunicação, Saúde, Educação*, *10*(20), 517-524.

Marchiori, M., Ribeiro, R., Soares, R., & Simões, F. (2010). Comunicação e discurso nas organizações: construtos que se relacionam e se distinguem. ***Comunicação & Sociedade***, São Paulo, *54*(32), 211-238.

Mintzberg, H. (2008). *Ascensão e queda do planejamento estratégico.* Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. & Lampel, J. (2000). *Safari de Estratégia:* um roteiro pela selva do planejamento estratégico. 4. ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Orlandi, E. P. (2007). *Análise de Discurso:* princípios e procedimentos. 7. ed. Campinas: Pontes.

Pacagnan, M. N. (2011) Estratégia como Prática: um olhar alternativo a partir da perspectiva pós-moderna. In: *V Encontro de Estudos em Estratégia da ANPAD*, Porto Alegre. *Anais...* Porto Alegre: 3Es, 1-12.

Reis, M. C., Marchiori, M. & Casali, A. M. (2010) A relação comunicação-estratégia no contexto das práticas organizacionais. In: Marchiori, M (Org). *Faces da Cultura e da Comunicação Organizacional.* São Caetano: Difusora.

Rhoden, V. N. (2008). Strategy as Practice e os lapsos conceituais. In: *CONVIBRA*.

Rocha, D. & Deusdará, B. (2005). Análise de Conteúdo e Análise do Discurso: aproximações e afastamentos na (re)construção de uma trajetória. *ALEA*, *7*(2), 305-322.

Schatzki, T, Cetina, K, & Savigny, E. (2001). *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Oxford: Routledge.

Taylor, J. & Robichaud, D. (2004) Finding the Organization in the Communication: discourse as action and sensemakin. *Organization*, *11*(3), 395-413.

Teixeira, J. C. & Nascimento, M. C. R. (2011) Triangulação entre métodos na Administração: gerando conversações paradigmáticas ou meras validações convergentes? In: XXXV EnANPAD, Rio de Janeiro. *Anais...* Rio de Janeiro: EnAnpad, 1-17.

Vaara, E. (2010). Critical discourse analysis as methodology in Strategy as Practice research. In: GOLSORKHI, Damon et al. (Comp.). *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cap. 14, 217-228.

Weber, M. (1991) *Economia e Sociedade*: fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva. Brasília: Ed. UNB.

Whittington, R. (2002). *O que é estratégia*. São Paulo: Pioneira Thomson Learning.

Whittington, R. (1996). Strategy as Practice. *Long Range Planning*, *29*(5), 731-735.

Whittington, R. (2004). Estratégia após o modernismo: recuperando a prática. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, *44*(4), 44-53.

Whittington, R. (2006). Completing the practice turn in strategy research. *Organization Studies*, *27*(5), 613-634.

52