

Finding Form: Looking at the Field of Organizational Aesthetics

Steven S. Taylor and Hans Hansen

Worcester Polytechnic Institute, MA, USA; Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

ABSTRACT Organizational research has long focused on the instrumental sphere with its questions of efficiency and effectiveness and in recent decades there has been interest in the moral sphere with its questions of ethics. Within the last decade there has also emerged a field that draws on the aesthetic sphere of our existence in organizations. In this review we look at the field of organizational aesthetics in terms of content and method, suggesting four broad categories of organizational aesthetics research: intellectual analysis of instrumental issues, artistic form used to look at instrumental issues, intellectual analysis of aesthetic issues, and artistic form used to look at aesthetic issues. We then suggest how organizational scholars might pursue artistic aesthetic organizational research.

INTRODUCTION

The great philosophic development of the enlightenment in the eighteenth century was to analytically divide the world into three separate spheres of existence, instrumental, moral, and aesthetic (Wilber, 1998). This allowed scientists to address questions of how the instrumental, physical world worked separately from associated ethical and spiritual questions. This freedom led to great advances in our ability to understand and control the physical world, which in turn led to great advances in our standards of living.

Thinking about organizations has reflected this division of our reality into three separate spheres. Historically most organizational theorizing concerns itself with the instrumental questions of efficiency and effectiveness. In the last few decades of the twentieth century, the moral sphere started to receive some attention as the study of business ethics made its way into the mainstream. And in the last decade of the twentieth century, organizational theory has started to include the aesthetic

Address for reprints: Steven S. Taylor, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Department of Management, 100 Institute Rd, Worcester, MA 01609, USA (sst@wpi.edu).

sphere. The degree of domination of the instrumental sphere is clear when we start to ask the question, why might we care about aesthetics, why would we care if something is beautiful or ugly (although as we shall see, the questions of the field are not limited to these)? It doesn't occur to ask the same question about the instrumental sphere (why do we care if it is efficient or effective?); the answer is presumptive and self-evident.

This essay is an attempt to review and make sense of the emerging field of organizational aesthetics. We will look to the various ways that aesthetics has been defined and used within the field to suggest an analytic structure for looking at the field. Then we apply the rough analytic dichotomies to critique where the field is and where we think there is the most promise for the future, concluding with an agenda for pursuing the artistic aesthetic.

CONCEPTUALIZING 'AESTHETICS'

Broadly, aesthetics is concerned with knowledge that is created from our sensory experiences. It also includes how our thoughts and feelings and reasoning around them inform our cognitions. The latest surge of aesthetics into organizational studies comes broadly from the search for alternate methods of knowledge building, and perhaps more specifically, the 'crisis of representation' within organizational research. This 'crisis of representation' emerged along with the movement from positivist/functionalist to interpretive/critical perspectives in organizational studies, and along with the knowledge they generated were the associated problems of representation and form. Postmodernism has begun to show concern for conveying knowledge which involves problems of representation and form, or the poetics of knowledge making (Calas and Smircich, 1999).

Various efforts to organize the field of organizational aesthetics have been made. Strati (2000a) breaks the field down into a focus on (a) images relating to organizational identity, (b) physical space of the organization, (c) physical artifacts, (d) ideas such as the manager as artist and the beauty of social organization, and (e) how management can learn from artistic form and content. Linstead and Höpfl (2000) break their book into parts on 'Aesthetic Theory', 'Aesthetic Processes', 'Aesthetics and Modes of Analysis', 'Crafting an Aesthetic', 'Aesthetics, Ethics and Identity', and 'Radical Aesthetics and Change'. Although these categorizations are interesting, they seem to be based in the authors' sorting of the existing literature and offer little analytic insight into the overall form of the field. We instead turn to ways that aesthetics is defined and used within the existing literature to suggest key analytic dimensions that might be useful for looking at the field.

Aesthetics as Epistemology

In response to Descartes' focus on detached intellectual thinking (e.g. *cogito ergo sum*), both Vico (1744, reprinted in 1948) and Baumgarten (1750, reprinted in 1936)

argue against the logico-deductive thinking that results from mind/body separation, claiming knowledge is more about feelings than cognitions. Vico insisted that we were active, sensing participants in creating a non-rational, felt meaning that he called 'poetic wisdom' (cited in Barrett, 2000). Baumgarten suggested that logic was the study of intellectual knowledge, while aesthetics was the study of sensory knowledge. This sensory knowledge is apprehended directly through our five senses, directly through our experience of being in the world. Since the time of Nietzsche (Welsch, 1997), philosophic thinking has agreed that this experiential or aesthetic knowing is not only a separate way of knowing, but that other forms of knowing such as those derived from rational thought depend on, and grow out of aesthetic experiences (Dewey, 1958; Gagliardi, 1996). Aesthetic knowledge offers fresh insight and awareness and while it may not be possible to put into words, it enables us to see in a new way (John, 2001). In the organizational literature this finds its strongest voice in Polanyi's (1958, reprinted in 1978) idea of tacit knowledge. The embodied, tacit knowing corresponds roughly to sensory/aesthetic knowing particularly as it is so often contrasted with intellectual/explicit knowing. Aesthetic knowledge, like tacit knowledge, is routinely in use in organizations but has lacked adequate attention (Strati, 1999, 2000c).

If we look carefully at this distinction of aesthetic/sensory knowing versus intellectual/propositional knowing, we find a distinction that is not just about how we know things, but why we know things. Intellectual knowing is driven by a desire for clarity, objective truth and usually instrumental goals. On the other hand, aesthetic knowing is driven by a desire for subjective, personal truth usually for its own sake. This suggests an analytic dichotomy that we might apply to inquiry in organizational aesthetics. Is the content for instrumental purposes in the dominant traditions of the physical and social sciences which spring from the enlightenment? Or is the content for more aesthetic purposes? We will consider more about what these aesthetic purposes might be later, as we look at other ways in which aesthetics is conceptualized in the literature, but first let us return to the idea of aesthetics as epistemology.

The idea of different ways of knowing is particularly well developed in the work of Heron and Reason (Heron, 1992; Heron and Reason, 2001). They identify four different ways of knowing, experiential, presentational, propositional, and practical.

Experiential knowing is through direct face-to-face encounter with person, place or thing; it is knowing through the immediacy of perceiving, through empathy and resonance. *Presentational knowing* emerges from experiential knowing, and provides the first form of expressing meaning and significance through drawing on expressive forms of imagery through movement, dance, sound, music, drawing, painting, sculpture, poetry, poetry, story, drama, and so on. *Propositional knowing* 'about' something, is knowing through ideas and theories, expressed

in informative statements. *Practical knowing* is knowing 'how to' do something and is expressed in a skill, knack or competence. (Heron and Reason, 2001, p. 183)

This description shows how sensory knowledge can inform our cognitions, but also raises the very practical issue of how these different ways of knowing are expressed.

Heron's extended epistemology follows Langer's (1942) ideas about the role of art. Langer suggested that tacit knowledge can be represented through artistic or presentational forms and explicit knowledge can be represented through discursive forms. Discursive forms are characterized by a one-to-one relationship between a set of signifiers and the signified, while presentational forms are characterized by a whole that is not divisible into its component parts. The idea that different ways of knowing require different forms of representation and in particular aesthetic, embodied, tacit knowledge requires presentational/artistic forms of representation, is a direct challenge to the completeness of the dominant, intellectual forms of academic knowledge (e.g. journal articles like this).

Looking closely at this idea of fundamentally different forms of representation also suggests a deeper analytic dichotomy to us. In inquiry, forms of representation play out most directly in terms of the methods used. Is the method based in intellectual/discursive forms of representation and intellectual ways of knowing that they are based on or is the method based in artistic forms that directly represent embodied, aesthetic knowing. The dichotomies of method and content give us two general dimensions for looking at the field of organizational aesthetics. We will begin by reviewing the aesthetics literature to date. Out of the various conceptualizations of aesthetics we derived a map of the field according to method and content. Our more general categorization of the ways aesthetics has been approached in the literature to date further allows us to discuss the implications of each approach and suggest where the field might direct future efforts.

Aesthetics as Criteria for Judgments

'An aesthetic' usually refers to a set of criteria for judgment such as when we might say, 'he has a completely different aesthetic' to mean that we think someone else's taste is rubbish. We owe the search (that most now regard as fruitless) for some criteria by which to judge aesthetic value to Kant's (1790, reprinted in 1951) treatise on philosophical aesthetics (Crawford, 2001). Within organizations, Guillen (1997) has argued that Taylorization and Scientific Management defined a specific aesthetic which equated beauty with efficiency, which still dominates modern organizations. In that sense, 'it's working beautifully' (White, 1996) means that it is working smoothly, efficiently, exactly as planned – the realization of twentieth century management ideals of planning and control.

This idea of aesthetics as criteria for judgment offers us an example of how the content of a piece of organizational aesthetic research can be fundamentally instrumental and non-aesthetic (in the epistemological sense discussed above). This approach uses aesthetics as a philosophic idea and analytic tool for intellectual and instrumental goals. Indeed, one might question whether this is not a fundamental property of research and thus whether our content dimension really has the second pole of 'aesthetic content'. We raise that question thinking that we have found examples of 'aesthetic content', although they are certainly in a minority.

Aesthetics as Connection

So what is 'aesthetic content'? Are we left with the idea of art for art's sake, so thus inquiry for inquiry's sake with no instrumental goals? Although that would seem to qualify, we think that that is not all that qualifies. To consider this further, let us look at the idea of aesthetics as connection. Bateson (1979) suggested that by aesthetic he meant experience that resonated with the pattern that connects mind and nature. Ramirez (1991) developed this idea in terms of systems and suggested that aesthetics were about the 'belonging to' aspect of a system (as opposed to the 'separate from' aspect of being in a system). Sandelands (1998) argues that humans are fundamentally both part of a group and individuals and that artistic forms are how humans express the feelings of being part of a social group. Although this way of thinking about aesthetics is not common in western thought, it is the core of many other cultures', such as the Cherokee, conception of aesthetics (Clair, 1998).

Placing connection in a central role echoes calls from the literature on relationality (e.g. Bradbury and Lichtenstein, 2000) to focus on the spaces between people rather than within individuals. Within the questions about what we mean by connection we start to hit upon one of the reasons that organizational aesthetics is important. If indeed, our feeling of what it is to be part of a group is expressed through aesthetic forms, then aesthetics must be the foundational form of inquiry into social action (Sandelands, 1998). The question of what is connection is essentially a question of what is it to be part of a social group.

Although there may be instrumental purposes for studying connection, this view of aesthetics makes clear that we are looking at aesthetic experience and aesthetic forms fundamentally because they are about our feelings of what it is to be part of more than ourselves. This idea of aesthetics as central gets elaborated in a different way in the work of evolutionary biologist Ellen Dissanayake (2000). For her, art is rhythmic modal elaboration of co-constructed meaning and plays a central role in human society. She starts from mother-infant mutuality and suggests that in this mutuality are the seeds for four fundamental human drives: (1) belonging to a social group, (2) finding and making meaning, (3) gaining a sense of competence through making, and (4) elaborating meanings as a way of acknowledging their importance. In art, these drives all come together in the form of co-created

rhythmic experiences that express our shared meaning making – which deepens the idea of aesthetics as connection.

The view of human evolution where art plays a key role as a fundamental drive stands in contrast to evolutionary views based on selection through competition. It is not a great leap to suggest that much of mainstream business thinking is also based in ideas of selection through competition with the implicit logic that if that is how nature and evolution work then business should work that way as well. Then Dissanayake's argument that the way in which art has been marginalized is a maladaptive variation that could have disastrous consequences may well also apply to our study of business organizations from a competitive, instrumental viewpoint. Or in other words, aesthetics for the sake of aesthetics (rather than in the service of instrumental goals) may be hugely important in the long run.

Aesthetic Categories

Another way in which aesthetics are conceptualized which leads us to a broader understanding of what aesthetic content might be is in terms of aesthetic categories. So far, we have spoken about aesthetics in a somewhat unitary way. Often this results in aesthetics being confused with beauty. But the beautiful is only one of several aesthetic categories, such as the comic, the sublime, the ugly, and the grotesque (Strati, 1992). These categories are different types of aesthetic experience. The idea of having more beauty in organizations is intuitively appealing, but the aesthetic category of the grotesque may be the key to personal and organizational transformation.

We might also note aesthetics' ability to transform the very categories we use to organize our experiences. Aesthetic forms of expression are like experiments that allow us to reconsider and challenge dominant categories and classifications. Innovative forms resist existing classifications altogether, compelling the creation of new categories, allowing new things to belong in new places (John, 2001) and making possible the juxtaposition of concepts that had been incommensurable. So aesthetic experiences not only transform organizations, but the lenses we use to view them.

Perhaps the clearest implication of aesthetic categories is the way in which they point us to the distinctive questions of inquiry about aesthetic content. Just as instrumental inquiry asks about efficiency and effectiveness and an ethical inquiry asks about right and wrong, an aesthetic inquiry asks about aesthetic categories. Aesthetic inquiry asks, how can we make organizations more beautiful, more sublime, more comic, or more grotesque – not because we think that might lead to greater efficiency or effectiveness, not because that is the right thing to do, but because we desire to live in world that is more beautiful, more sublime, more comic, or more grotesque. That is, aesthetic categories remind us that we care about aesthetics for the sake of aesthetics. But beyond these specific contributions, it is important to draw a picture of the field as a whole for the sake of compari-

Content

		Instrumental	Aesthetic
Method	Intellectual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artistic forms as metaphors for organizations • Lessons for management from the arts • Arguments for the importance of organizational aesthetics • Using aesthetics to deepen our understanding of traditional organizational topics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industries and products that are fundamentally aesthetic in nature • Aesthetic forms within organizations • The direct sensory experience of day-to-day reality in organizations
	Artistic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artistic forms used to work with individual issues • Artistic forms used to work with organizational issues • Aesthetic forms used to illustrate/present intellectual arguments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artistic forms used to present the direct sensory day-to-day experience in organizations

Figure 1. Categories of organizational aesthetics research

son of underlying assumptions and agendas of various approaches to aesthetics. We now turn to our own categorization of the field with hopes of pushing the field towards fertile ground.

REVIEWING THE FIELD

So in order to discuss the field of organizational aesthetics, we offer two continua that we will combine to create that classic of management theorizing, a two by two (see Figure 1). These analytic distinctions emerged as we began to make sense

of aesthetic approaches in organizational studies, and we found them to be useful in mapping and critiquing the field. We labelled the two continua method and content. The methods used in aesthetic research range from intellectual methods that are the classic tools of social science research to artistic methods that draw on the use of art practices. Of course, in many cases, the methods draw on both artistic practices and traditional intellectual approaches, but one method usually predominated. On the content continuum, at one end is instrumental content that considers mainstream organizational research questions of efficiency and effectiveness, impact on the bottom line, and power inequities. Other content involves aesthetic issues that address the day-to-day feel of the organization, questions of beauty and ugliness, or in short aesthetic content that has not been part of much of mainstream organizational research.

Of course, there is a great deal of variation within each of our categorizations, which will be evident as we review the organizational aesthetics literature for each quadrant in our matrix. Our aim is to show the breadth of the field and what has already been accomplished and to point to promising avenues not yet pursued. We have included what we feel is a representative sampling of the work in the field; however, we do recognize that there may be work that we have missed as the field tends to publish in a wide variety of journals and disciplines and we recognize that our own bias as to which authors and works have influenced us is clearly evident.

Intellectual Analysis of Instrumental Issues

If we acknowledge that intellectual methods are the dominant methods for social science research and that instrumental content dominates organizational studies, it then comes as no surprise that intellectual analysis of instrumental issues includes the majority of work done in organizational aesthetics. It is also not surprising that there is a great deal of variety of approaches within this area.

Let us start by looking at the long tradition of using artistic forms as a metaphor for organizations and/or activity within organizations. If indeed management is 'a matter of art rather than science' (Barnard, 1938, p. 325), it is only reasonable to ask, what form of art is it like? Perhaps the most well known work is the idea of organization as theatre, which goes back to Goffman (1959), is taken the farthest by Mangham and Overington (1987) and continues to be referenced in works such as Vaill's (1989) *Managing as a Performing Art* (see also Clark and Mangham, 2004). Another major metaphor for organizations and organizational activity is storytelling, which finds its strongest voice in the works of Boje (1991a, 1991b, 1994, 1995; see also Hopkinson, 2003) and narrative (e.g. Coupland and Brown, 2004; Czarniawska, 1998). Here organizations are conceptualized as a collection of stories and organizational action is understood as enacting or relating stories (Gardner, 1995). There is an extensive literature on storytelling in organizations

that covers all aspects of management (see Taylor et al., 2002 for a fuller review). More recently there has been an interest in the metaphor of jazz and improvisation (e.g. DePree, 1992; Hatch, 1998; Mirvis, 1998; Montuori, 2003; Weick, 1998) as a way of reconceptualizing our thinking about management. Perhaps the purest expression are pieces that take seriously the idea of the manager as an artist such as Goodsell's (1992) consideration of the public administrator as an artist, Richards' (1995) how-to book on being an artist at work, or the extension of Cameron's popular *Artist's Way* book into the work environment (Bryan et al., 1998).

Following the idea that management is an art, a variety of scholars have asked what lessons management might learn from the arts. This has primarily taken the form of lessons from literature, such as Puffer's (1991) text for teaching organizational behavior and Czarniawska-Joerges' (1994) work. More recently there has been a particular focus in the popular management press on lessons from management to be found in the works of Shakespeare (Augustine and Adelman, 1999; Burnham et al., 2001; Corrigan, 1999; Shafritz, 1999; Whitney and Packer, 2000). This is evolving in the direction of taking lessons for businesses and managers from artists and arts organizations (e.g. Darso and Dawids, 2002; Dunham and Freeman, 2000) and using arts based practices in business organizations (e.g. Austin and Devin, 2003; Ferris, 2002) and management education (e.g. Shim, 2003).

Much of the early work in organizational aesthetics primarily draws on the epistemological conceptualization of aesthetics to make an argument for the importance and reasonableness of an aesthetic approach to organizations. We do not claim to have found all such work, but we think we have found most or at least a good sampling. In roughly chronological order we start with Sandelands and Buckner's (1989) call for research into work feelings generated by aesthetic experience. Strati (1992) explicitly made an epistemological argument that aesthetics was the way to get at the feel of an organization. Then in 1996, there was a special issue of *Organization* in which Strati (1996) argued that aesthetics was an important form of organizational knowledge; White (1996) argued that an aesthetic approach to organizations is apposite, and provided insight into beauty which is a constitutive element of organizations; Ramirez (1996) suggested that future research in organizational aesthetics should address the aesthetic experience of everyday organizational life, organizational design and issues of form, and intervention and research strategies; and Ottensmeyer (1996) argued that we already refer to organizations in terms of beauty and art, but we have not approached them that way academically. In the same year Gagliardi (1996) argued in the *Handbook of Organization Studies* that organizations are filled with artifacts which are perceived by the senses and that means organizations are filled with sensory or aesthetic knowledge. The next year Dean et al. (1997) argued that an aesthetic perspective addresses questions and issues that are not fundamentally instrumental or ethical and that people's aesthetic experience of organizations matter

because people are attracted to things they see as beautiful and are repulsed by the ugly. In 1999 two books came out, Strati's (1999) seminal monograph on the field and one in which Dobson (1999) argued that not only were aesthetics important, they were becoming the most important aspect of organizations and were essential for understanding organizations and organizational activity in the 21st century. Although the arguments may not have been won, they had been made and by the turn of the century there was a recognizable (albeit small) field of organizational aesthetics.

There has also been a stream of works that show how an aesthetic perspective can add to and deepen our understanding of various organizational and management topics. Duke (1986) applies an aesthetic perspective to argue that leadership is about bringing meaning to relationships between individuals and organizations/communities/nations. Brady (1986) suggests that an aesthetic perspective extends ethics from 'knowing that' to 'knowing how' and gets past the problems of ethics as rules (also an issue for Dobson, 1999) because of the epistemological stance of aesthetics as being practice based. Chua and Degeling (1993) add aesthetics as another lens for critically assessing managerial actions. Strati (1995) extends organization theory by suggesting an aesthetic approach provides a new way to define what an organization is. Guillet de Monthoux (1996) suggests how art theory can add to our understanding of strategy. Schmitt and Simonson (1997) discuss how to use skills at manipulating aesthetics in marketing. We note that this work stands out in that it uses aesthetics to further the managerialist project, while the politics of the rest of the field (where it is evident) is generally critical and often interested in the emancipatory potential of aesthetics. Feldman (2000) extends organizational politics to include domination through aesthetic forms. Denzin (2000) talks about how the aesthetics of writing articles matters if we want to change the world. Taylor et al. (2002) offer an explanation for how the aesthetic aspects of management storytelling are central to learning, and Witz et al. (2003) expand the concept of emotional labour with a conceptualization of aesthetic labour.

These basic themes continue to occur in recent collections of organizational aesthetics research. Looking at both Linstead and Höpff's (2000) and Carr and Hancock's (2003) (some of which also appeared in a 2002 special issue of *Tamara* on art and aesthetics at work) edited volumes and the July 2002 special issue of *Human Relations* on organizing aesthetics, the work within this quadrant broadens and deepens these directions. There are introductions and some articles (e.g. Strati, 2000a; Taylor, 2002) that reflect on and make arguments for the importance of the field. The metaphor of organizations as jazz improvisation continues (Barrett, 2000), and the lessons from the arts turn to what the field of organizational studies can learn from the arts (Carr, 2003; Watkins and King, 2002). Many contributions draw on aesthetics to continue the critical project in management studies (Cairns, 2002; Dale and Burrell, 2002; Hancock, 2002) and new subjects such as

organizational justice have been enriched by taking an aesthetic perspective (Boyle, 2003).

The work in this quadrant shows us how aesthetics can work within the existing paradigms of organizational research and provide us with new ways to look at old problems. There is clearly real academic value in doing this, and yet by working within the inquiry tradition of intellectual methods applied to instrumental content, there is the possibility that some of the foundational philosophic arguments about the nature of aesthetics may be forgotten. For example, although we know that aesthetic experience is holistic and the sum of the parts does not equal the whole, mainstream methods push us to divide and delve at ever finer levels of analysis. There is the danger in this quadrant that as we advance we will intellectualize and instrumentalize the very aesthetic aspects we originally sought right out of the picture.

There is also the issue of the picture itself. As aesthetics are used to comment on already existing mainstream topics, we must remember that these topics are a result of the instrumental approach. That is to say, our instrumental approaches *made* these the topics we explored because they are the topics instrumentalism could 'see'. When we bring aesthetics to these topics (topics that 'someone else' selected), their contribution is likely to be seen as trite – a neat and interesting 'another way' to look at these instrumental issues. Aesthetics is somewhat welcomed because it can deepen our understandings of these issues and topics, but it is being applied as a band-aid where instrumentalism cannot provide us with satisfying insights to deeper questions.

Artistic Form Used to Look at Instrumental Issues

Although here we start to move away from mainstream organizational studies, there are social science traditions that use aesthetic methods. For example, the use of artistic forms to work with individual behaviour is the basis of the field of art therapy (Rubin, 2001). Art therapy can be roughly divided into two approaches (Malchiodi, 1998). The first focuses on the art-making process as healing and looks at the art product, the presentational form that is produced, as simply a reminder of that process, while in the second approach the primary value is in the art that is produced as a representation of the artist's inner experience. The practice of psychodrama (e.g. Karp et al., 1998; Wilkens, 1999) uses theatre to get at individual and organizational issues. The field of visual anthropology (e.g. Emmison and Smith, 2000; Leeuwen and Jewitt, 2001) provides diverse theory and method for approaching presentational forms and gaining understanding of a variety of instrumental issues.

Although there seems to be quite a bit of practice within organizations there is not much academic work that engages that practice within the field of organizational studies. For example, Nissley et al. (2004) review a range of ways that theatre

is currently used within organizations from full scripted productions to improvisation. Schreyogg (1999) has written on this phenomenon, as have Meisiek (2002) and Ferris (2002). We also note Barry's (1994, 1996, 1997) work on using drawings and other art forms to explore issues within organizations and Winter and colleagues' (1999) work on using fiction writing for first person research. All of these examples use intellectual methods to talk about the aesthetic forms; that is to say they address issues around the use of aesthetic forms in organizational research and practice, but they do not then use aesthetic forms. This may be more of a comment on the practices and norms of academic publishing than it is on the research.

However, there are exceptions in which authors attempt to use aesthetic forms, such as Jermier's (1985) classic use of short stories to illustrate his intellectual argument, Taylor's (2000) inclusion of the complete text of a play (in an appendix that is longer than the primary article), and Steyaert and Hjorth's (2002) performance script. We note, that all of these use an intellectual form of discursive argument to frame the aesthetic form. If the authors did not include an intellectual framing, then they would simply (not to suggest that it is ever simple) be creating art around instrumental issues. We suggest that it is in the combination of the intellectual and the artistic forms that scholarship exists.

This quadrant raises an important fundamental question: how is creating art different from doing research? Bradbury and Reason (2001) suggest that one of the criteria for good quality action research is that it encompasses different ways of knowing, in their terms experiential, presentational, propositional, and pragmatic ways of knowing. In these terms, doing art may be an inquiry process for the artist, but it is limited in that it encompasses only experiential and presentational ways of knowing. As we have pointed out, the work in this section tends to include intellectual framing or propositional knowing as well. Of course, neither satisfies the action research criteria for pragmatic knowing as well, but the point we want to make is that academic research includes propositional knowledge and work in this quadrant includes artistic forms/presentational knowing in addition to the propositional knowing.

Intellectual Analysis of Aesthetic Issues

To review work in this quadrant, we must start by discussing what we mean by aesthetic issues and we must confess that we find no simple definition. In lieu of a definition, we shall describe a variety of articles. There is an area of study that is often referred to as cultural industries (e.g. Fine, 1992), which looks at industries in which the products are primarily defined in terms of their symbolic or aesthetic value rather than their utilitarian use value. For example, the product of a fine restaurant is not food to keep us alive, but a complete dining experience that appeals to our senses and sensibilities. In short, these are industries where aesthetic

experience (in the sense of being sensory knowledge apprehended directly through the senses), is more important than functionality. Strati (2000b) uses an empathetic-aesthetic methodology to show us the importance of time and the social construction of organizational memory in art photography. Guillet de Monthoux (2000) suggests the idea of aesthetic value (which in his example is created by performance art) as being a separate form of value from the traditional ideas of use value and exchange value.

This focus on aspects of organizations that are somehow fundamentally aesthetic in nature is certainly another type of intellectual analysis of aesthetic issues. Boje (1991b) shows us how storytelling goes on constantly within organizations in a micro, moment-to-moment way. Nissley, Taylor and Butler (2002) argue for how these aesthetic forms are fundamentally different than other forms of discourse in their discussion of the songs sung by Maytag salesmen in the 1930s and 1940s.

This area reaches its fullest realization as researchers look at the direct sensory experience of organizations. Ramirez (1996) suggests that organizational form is not simply an intellectual abstraction but offers a direct sensory experience. Martin (2002) examines the sensory experience of old people's homes (the smell, sight, touch, sound) and its role in providing dignity. Harding (2002) considers the bodies of managers, how they embody the desired aesthetic of the organization, and how they produce and are consumed by the organization. Pelzer (2002) looks at the disgust that comes from an organizational change.

This quadrant represents the type of analytic aesthetics that is rooted in the application of science to the social world. From its beginnings, organizational studies took on the scientific model to explain organizational behaviour and even social constructs such as culture. These deeply rooted yet ill-fitted analytics have also been applied to aesthetic features within organizations. In taking this approach, the artistic object must be privileged over the experience of the object, and aesthetic forms are seen as esoteric in nature and non-instrumental in that they are not created in response to a particular problem. It is not surprising then, that the focus in this area is on industries and products that already involve ongoing aesthetics as a fundamental nature of the work. However, while features or the surrounds of aesthetic objects might be analysed in a valuable way, purely analytic approaches may be too thin to describe deep aesthetic experiences (Shusterman, 2001).

Artistic Form Used to Look at Aesthetic Issues

Approaches that use artistic methods to explore sensory experiences is where we find our unrealized hope for what the field of organizational aesthetics can offer the world. In this final quadrant, we have only two examples to discuss. The first example of aesthetic form being used to look at aesthetic issues is Taylor's (2003b) play *Ties That Bind*. The aesthetic form of the play is used to represent the direct

sensory experience of the negative aspects of what it is like to be a young academic. Here again we note the way the artistic form is wrapped in propositional forms – the play script is published as part of a forum on the play, which had been staged as a symposium at the Academy of Management meetings in Denver, and there are three articles (Elmes, 2003; Rosile, 2003; Taylor, 2003a) and the editor's introduction, all of which provide intellectual analysis of aspects of the performance.

The second example is Brearley's (2001a, 2001b, 2002; Brearley et al., 2001) work with the experience of transition in organizational life. She tracked the experiences of managers as they went through a difficult merger. Part of her research process is creating poems, songs, and multi-media tracks from interview data and images that the managers created. These artistic forms capture the feeling of the transition and work with traditional intellectual analysis to give a richer, fuller, more-embodied understanding.

It is in this quadrant that we see the real hope for organizational inquiry that aesthetics offers us. The use of artistic forms to look at aesthetic issues offers a medium that can capture and communicate the felt experience, the affect, and something of the tacit knowledge of the day-to-day, moment-to-moment reality of organizations. Not just the cleaned-up, instrumental concerns of 'the business', but the messy, unordered side as well. In short it provides a holistic way to get at the whole of the experience, something that the intellectualization and abstraction of traditional organizational research often seems to miss.

So how does aesthetic inquiry move more fully into the final quadrant of our two by two? In pursuing this area, we must elaborate our own epistemology and suggest a research agenda and methods from the ongoing practices and conceptualizations that are emerging as researchers are finding their form in aesthetic research. As we have done throughout, we hope to convey the distinct ways that organizations can benefit from aesthetic knowledge.

It is clear that our focus within organizational aesthetics is the creation of sensory-based knowledge through aesthetic experiences. The two enduring components of this approach to aesthetics are (1) engagement of the senses and (2) the focus on the experiences over objects (in and of themselves). Dewey (1958) said art's purpose was to achieve a more satisfying experience, one that invigorates us and aids our achievement in whatever ends we pursue. We suggest a similar agenda for organizational aesthetics. Recall the example of work songs (Nissley et al., 2002), which provide a satisfying experience within and of themselves. However, aesthetic experiences are also constantly spilling over and being integrated into other activities, enhancing and deepening them (Shusterman, 2001). Here, we would suggest a descriptive account of that aesthetic experience and the meaning that experience has for organizational members, as well as insight into how those experiences enhance the work and organizational life. Artistic forms in organizations show us how individuals relate to and create their organizational lives. If we

express what it means to be part of a group aesthetically, researchers need to research meaning with methods that are consistent with this phenomenon by exploring these meanings in the way they are made.

A constructionist view of aesthetics as sensory knowledge rooted in experience has implications for how we go about collecting and describing aesthetic data. An important aspect of this conceptualization is that while insights provided by an aesthetic experience are not easily detached from that experience, those particular insights cannot be reached by any other route. In this pursuit, aesthetic methods share much with ethnographic methods. Research calls for insight into the experience, either through ethnographic interviews regarding those generative experiences, or direct participation in the aesthetic experiences and the emergent sensemaking that flows from them. Indeed, several aesthetic researchers have made the link explicit and applied ethnographic methods to capture aesthetic knowledge (e.g. Letiche, 2000; Linstead, 2000; Rusted, 2000). While aesthetic data might be interpreted using ethnographic methods, the departure is most evident in how that data is produced and represented, and here is where aesthetic inquiry can make a unique contribution.

Related to data production, aesthetic inquiry does not involve naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) into social interaction, rather aesthetic forms in organizations are more deliberately contrived social productions. To describe the data production in aesthetic inquiry, we might suggest terms such as 'participant construction' as opposed to participant observation. As opposed to social interactions, researchers might participate in artistic interactions where members display more artful expressions to make connections or elaborate meaning beyond what is possible discursively. Aesthetic knowledge might not retain its felt meaning in discourse, but may be expressed in its aesthetic form through artful constructions. To observe artful participant constructions using aesthetic knowledge, we might encourage members to make artistic productions and describe meanings 'at play' and those that emerge from that production experience. This method is certainly not naturalistic, but if the members are enthusiastic, it is a good way to tap into the aesthetic sensibilities of an organization.

In making interpretations, as with ethnography we still rely on the researcher as the interpretive device. Though this still results in an 'art-ificial' production rather than an artful production as by organizational members, Strati (1999) suggests a sort of 'turning on the senses' and researcher reflexivity that focuses on aesthetic judgment. To encourage this new stance, we might modify some terminology, such as 'thick *sensory* description' instead of 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) and 'members with their own senses' as opposed to 'members in their own words' as a way of reorienting ourselves in interpreting aesthetic data. Visual methodologies will be helpful as well.

It is in representing aesthetic knowledge through aesthetic inquiry that new forms must emerge if aesthetics is to continue to contribute to understanding orga-

nizational life. John (2001) notes that worthwhile aesthetic knowledge must be able to travel a bit beyond its acquisition site, allowing us to build upon that knowledge in other contexts. In sharing or transferring aesthetic knowledge, we need forms of presentation that keep the aesthetic knowledge 'intact', closer to the forms and objects that were constructed and experienced by organizational members to convey meaning in organizations. This is not a realist concern, but an attempt to retain the ability of those aesthetic forms to communicate in the terms by which they were produced. Take the case of Taylor (2003b). This was a 'researcher-as-participant' aesthetic production representing early academic life. We might move further into participant construction of artifacts, plays, poems, paintings and all manner of artistic work where the organizational members are the creators and artists.

As we mentioned in our discussion of artistic form used to look at instrumental issues, creating art about organizational issues is only part of the research process; there must also be an intellectual analysis of that art. Within organizational research, dramatist such as Goffman (1959), Burke (1945), and Turner (1982, 1986) provide a theoretical basis for analysis of these types of artistic productions, and of course methods of artistic interpretation and criticism from outside of organizational studies could also prove useful. Regardless of the methods used, an attempt should be made to represent rich aesthetic meanings in a way that diminishes (at least some) of the researchers interpretation, letting the reader in to make an interpretation and relying less on the researcher as connoisseur (Rusted, 2000). The challenge is in seeking ways to continue to favour the aesthetic experience, whether it is the experience of the producers or the interpreter/reader.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Aesthetic inquiry is certainly one of the most active movements within the post-positivist paradigm. Its progress is on the back of hard fought arguments and legitimacy won from approaches such as symbolic interactionism (that includes social construction and dramaturgy), postmodernism, and critical theory. Aesthetic inquiry deepens our understanding of organizations by providing a new epistemology, criteria to assess member judgments and decision making, meaning, connection and provides categories for this sensory data. As such, it is attracting more and more researchers and practitioners as it continues to make sense of organizations in a way that resonates – that fills in the less understood spaces in organizations. For practitioners, it provides a means to express that tacit level knowledge that guides much of organizational behaviour. While this type of research is often characterized as a look into what is often called 'the mundane' in everyday organizational life, it is only mundane in the sense that aesthetic understandings are so

profoundly ingrained and unquestioned that their maintenance through the reconstruction of aesthetic forms in organizations seems so routinely ordinary.

Aesthetics offers a new look into organizations, and a look at alternative ways of expressing and making meanings that deeply influence organizational interactions, behaviours, and understandings. Our categorization helps researchers to be more conscious of the ways they approach organizational aesthetics and the implications of differing methods and content. This is important because raising our awareness regarding underlying assumptions will help aesthetic researchers better direct their efforts as the research itself takes on an aesthetic. The categorization also highlights the small amount of work that uses artistic form to look at aesthetic issues and it is this area where we find the most promise for the field of organizational aesthetics. Although there are clearly contributions to be made in the other quadrants, this area makes a unique contribution and opens the door into a vital and new understanding of organizations. There have long been calls to conduct research into the more sensory and less rational sides of organizational reality and a variety of intellectual efforts to do so have been made. We see the use of artistic forms to look at these fundamentally aesthetic issues to have the potential to finally bring these important areas into the mainstream of organizational research and practice.

This research into organizational aesthetics will require something new of researchers. Unlike concepts that researchers call on organizations to implement such as empowerment, ethics, and diversity, organizational aesthetics are alive and well in organizations. They don't need our encouragement, they need our attention. The onus is on researchers to take on a commitment to studying this space in organizations. To do this, researchers will have to be trained academics, and also exploratory artists. Don't drop your tools, but pick up some new ones or old familiar ones you might have ignored. Researchers have to try to delve into unknown territory, to get messy and crawl into the underbelly of organizations and look for the many ways members build and expose their organizational lives. Heed Clegg and Hardy's call to 'resuscitate the subject, breathe life back into those stilled lips, disturb the somnolent and death-like state, shatter metaphorical bottles of analytic formaldehyde' (1996 p. 697).

REFERENCES

- Augustine, N. and Adelman, K. (1999). *Shakespeare in Charge: The Bard's Guide to Leading and Succeeding on the Business Stage*. New York: Hyperion.
- Austin, R. and Devin, L. (2003). *Artful Making: What Managers Need to Know About How Artists Work*. New York: Financial Times, Prentice Hall.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barrett, F. J. (2000). 'Cultivating an aesthetic of unfolding: jazz improvisation as a self-organizing system'. In Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds), *The Aesthetics of Organizations*. London: Sage, 228–45.

- Barry, D. (1994). 'Making the invisible visible: using analogically-based methods to surface the organizational unconscious'. *Organizational Development Journal*, **12**, 4, 37–48.
- Barry, D. (1996). 'Artful inquiry: a symbolic constructivist approach to social science research'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, **2**, 4, 411–38.
- Barry, D. (1997). 'Telling changes: from narrative family therapy to organizational change and development'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **10**, 1, 30–46.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Baumgarten, A. G. (1750, reprinted in 1936). *Aesthetica*. Bari: Laterza.
- Boje, D. M. (1991a). 'Consulting and change in the storytelling organization'. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **4**, 3, 7–17.
- Boje, D. M. (1991b). 'The storytelling organization: a study of story performance in an office-supply firm'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **36**, 1, 106–26.
- Boje, D. M. (1994). 'Organizational storytelling: the struggles of premodern, modern and post-modern organizational learning discourses'. *Management Learning*, **25**, 3, 433–61.
- Boje, D. M. (1995). 'Stories of the storytelling organization: a postmodern analysis of Disney as Tamara-land'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **38**, 4, 997–1035.
- Boyle, M.-E. (2003). 'Reconciling aesthetics and justice in organization studies'. In Carr, A. and Hancock, P. (Eds), *Art and Aesthetics at Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 51–64.
- Bradbury, H. and Lichtenstein, B. M. B. (2000). 'Relationality in organizational research: exploring the space between'. *Organization Science*, **11**, 5, 551–64.
- Bradbury, H. and Reason, P. (2001). 'Broadening the bandwidth of validity: issues and choice-points for improving the quality of action research'. In Reason, P. and Bradbury, H. (Eds), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. London: Sage, 447–55.
- Brady, F. N. (1986). 'Aesthetic components of management ethics'. *Academy of Management Review*, **11**, 2, 337–44.
- Brearley, L. (2001a). 'Exploring creative forms within phenomenological research'. In Barnacle, R. (Ed.), *Phenomenology*. Melbourne: RMIT University Press, 74–87.
- Brearley, L. (2001b). 'Foot in the air: an exploration of the experience of transition in organisational life'. In Boucher, C. and Holian, R. (Eds), *Emerging Forms of Representing Qualitative Data*. Melbourne: RMIT University Press, 151–84.
- Brearley, L. (2002). *Beyond Univocal Authority: An Exploration of Creative Voices in Academic Research*. Melbourne: Common Ground.
- Brearley, L., Boucher, C., Burrows, P., Jones, S. and Holian, R. (2001). 'Advice for researchers using alternative forms of representation'. In Boucher, C. and Holian, R. (Eds), *Emerging Forms of Representing Qualitative Data*. Melbourne: RMIT University Press, 187–93.
- Bryan, M., Cameron, J. and Allen, C. (1998). *The Artist's Way at Work: Riding the Dragon*. New York: Quill.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burnham, J., Augustine, N. and Adelman, K. (2001). *Shakespeare in Charge: The Bard's Guide to Learning and Succeeding on the Business Stage*. New York: Hyperion.
- Cairns, G. (2002). 'Aesthetics, morality and power: design as espoused freedom and implicit control'. *Human Relations*, **55**, 7, 799–820.
- Calas, M. B. and Smircich, L. (1999). 'Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions'. *Academy of Management Review*, **24**, 649–71.
- Carr, A. (2003). 'Art as a form of knowledge'. In Carr, A. and Hancock, P. (Eds), *Art and Aesthetics at Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 7–37.
- Carr, A. and Hancock, P. (Eds) (2003). *Art and Aesthetics at Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chua, W.-F. and Degeling, P. (1993). 'Interrogating an accounting-based intervention on three axes: instrumental, moral and aesthetic'. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, **18**, 4, 291–318.
- Clair, R. P. (1998). *Organizing Silence: A World of Possibilities*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Clark, T. and Mangham, I. (2004). 'From dramaturgy to theatre as technology: the case of corporate theatre'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **41**, 1, 37–59.
- Clegg, S. and Hardy, C. (1996). 'Representations'. In Clegg, S., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage, 676–708.
- Corrigan, P. (1999). *Shakespeare on Management: Leadership Lessons for Today's Managers*. London: Kogan Page.
- Coupland, C. and Brown, A. (2004). 'Constructing organizational identities on the web: a case study of Royal Dutch/Shell'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **41**, 8, 1325–47.

- Crawford, D. W. (2001). 'Kant'. In Gaut, B. and Lopes, D. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. London: Routledge, 51–64.
- Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*, Vol. 43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1994). *Good Novels, Better Management: Reading Organizational Realities in Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2002). 'An-aesthetics and architecture'. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, **2**, 1, 77–90.
- Darso, L. and Dawids, M. (2002). 'It's time for the artists to help the poor business people'. *Learning Lab Denmark Quarterly*, October, 6–7.
- Dean, J. W. Jr, Ottensmeyer, E. and Ramirez, R. (1997). 'An aesthetic perspective on organizations'. In Cooper, G. L. and Jackson, S. E. (Eds), *Creating Tomorrow's Organizations: A Handbook for Future Research in Organizational Behavior*. New York: John Wiley.
- Denzin, N. K. (2000). 'Aesthetics and the practices of qualitative inquiry'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, **6**, 2, 256–65.
- DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership Jazz*. New York: Dell.
- Dewey, J. (1958). *Art as Experience*. New York: Capricorn.
- Dissanayake, E. (2000). *Art and Intimacy: How The Arts Began*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Dobson, J. (1999). *The Art of Management and the Aesthetic Manager: The Coming Way of Business*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Duke, D. L. (1986). 'The aesthetics of leadership'. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, **22**, 1, 7–27.
- Dunham, L. and Freeman, R. (2000). 'There is no business like show business: leadership lessons from the theater'. *Organizational Dynamics*, **29**, 2, 108–22.
- Elmes, M. (2003). 'Every silver cloud has a black lining: actor reflections on "Ties That Bind"'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **17**, 2, 301–7.
- Emmison, M. and Smith, P. (2000). *Researching the Visual: Images, Objects, Contexts, and Interactions in Social and Cultural Inquiry*. London: Sage.
- Feldman, S. P. (2000). 'Micromatters: the aesthetics of power in NASA's flight readiness review'. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, **36**, 4, 474–90.
- Ferris, W. P. (2002). 'Theater tools for team building: how an improvisational play got one software team back on track'. *Harvard Business Review*, **80**, 12, 24–5.
- Fine, G. A. (1992). 'The culture of production: aesthetic choices and constraints in culinary work'. *American Journal of Sociology*, **97**, 5, 1268–94.
- Gagliardi, P. (1996). 'Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life'. In Clegg, S. R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W. R. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage, 565–80.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goodsell, C. T. (1992). 'The public administrator as artisan'. *Public Administration Review*, **52**, 3, 246–53.
- Guillen, M. F. (1997). 'Scientific management's lost aesthetic: architecture, organization, and the Taylorized beauty of the mechanical'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **42**, 4, 682–715.
- Guillet de Monthoux, P. (1996). 'The theatre of war: art, organization and the aesthetics of strategy'. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations, and Societies*, **2**, 147–60.
- Guillet de Monthoux, P. (2000). 'Performing the absolute. Marina Abramovic organizing the unfinished business of Arthur Schopenhauer'. *Organization Studies*, **21**, 0, 29–51.
- Hancock, P. (2002). 'Aestheticizing the world of organizations: creating beautiful untrue things'. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, **2**, 1, 91–105.
- Harding, N. (2002). 'On the manager's body as an aesthetics of control'. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, **2**, 1, 63–76.
- Hatch, M. J. (1998). 'Jazz as a metaphor for organizing in the 21st century'. *Organization Science*, **9**, 5, 556–7.
- Heron, J. (1992). *Feeling and Personhood: Psychology in Another Key*. London: Sage.
- Heron, J. and Reason, P. (2001). 'The practice of co-operative inquiry: Research "with" rather than "on" people'. In Reason, P. and Bradbury, H. (Eds), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. London: Sage, 179–88.
- Hopkinson, G. (2003). 'Stories from the front-line: how they construct the organization'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **40**, 8, 1943–69.

- Jermier, J. M. (1985). 'When the sleeper awakes: a short story extending themes in radical organization theory'. *Journal of Management*, **11**, 67–80.
- John, E. (2001). 'Art and knowledge'. In Gaut, B. and Lopes, D. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. London: Routledge, 329–52.
- Kant, I. (1790, reprinted in 1951). *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. Bernard, J. New York: Haffner.
- Karp, M., Holmes, P. and Tavou, K. B. (Eds) (1998). *The Handbook of Psychodrama*. London: Routledge.
- Langer, S. K. (1942). *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Leeuwen, T. V. and Jewitt, C. (2001). *Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Letiche, H. (2000). 'Observer versus audience'. In Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds), *The Aesthetics of Organization*. London: Sage, 154–79.
- Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Linstead, S. (2000). 'Ashes and madness: the play of negativity and the poetics'. In Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds), *The Aesthetics of Organization*. London: Sage, 61–92.
- Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds) (2000). *The Aesthetics of Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Malchiodi, C. A. (1998). *The Art Therapy Sourcebook: Art Making for Personal Growth, Insight, and Transformation*. Los Angeles, CA: Lowell House.
- Mangham, I. L. and Overington, M. A. (1987). *Organizations as Theatre: A Social Psychology of Dramatic Appearances*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Martin, P. Y. (2002). 'Sensations, bodies, and the "spirit of a place": aesthetics in residential organizations for the elderly'. *Human Relations*, **55**, 7, 861–85.
- Meisiek, S. (2002). 'Situation drama in change management: types and effects of a new managerial tool'. *International Journal of Arts Management*, **4**, 3, 48–55.
- Mirvis, P. H. (1998). 'Practice improvisation'. *Organization Science*, **9**, 5, 586–92.
- Montuori, A. (2003). 'The complexity of improvisation and the improvisation of complexity: social science, art and creativity'. *Human Relations*, **56**, 2, 237–55.
- Nissley, N., Taylor, S. S. and Butler, O. (2002). 'The power of organizational song: an organizational discourse and aesthetic expression for organizational culture'. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Post-modern Organization Science*, **2**, 1, 47–62.
- Nissley, N., Taylor, S. S. and Houden, L. (2004). 'The politics of performance in organizational theatre-based training and interventions'. *Organization Studies*, **25**, 5, 817–40.
- Ottensmeyer, E. J. (1996). 'Too strong to stop, too sweet to lose: aesthetics as a way to know organizations'. *Organization*, **3**, 2, 189–94.
- Pelzer, P. (2002). 'Disgust and organization'. *Human Relations*, **55**, 7, 841–60.
- Polanyi, M. (1958, reprinted in 1978). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Puffer, S. M. (1991). *Managerial Insights from Literature*. Boston, MA: PWS-Kent Publishing Co.
- Ramirez, R. (1991). *The Beauty of Social Organization*. Munich: Accedo.
- Ramirez, R. (1996). 'Wrapping form and organizational beauty'. *Organization*, **3**, 2, 233–42.
- Richards, D. (1995). *Artful Work: Awakening Joy, Meaning, and Commitment in the Workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Rosile, G. A. (2003). 'Critical dramaturgy and artful ambiguity: audience reflections on "Ties That Bind"'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **17**, 4, 308–14.
- Rubin, J. A. (2001). *Approaches to Art Therapy: Theory and Technique*, 2nd edition. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.
- Rusted, B. (2000). '"Cutting a show": grounded aesthetics and entertainment organizations'. In Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds), *The Aesthetics of Organization*. London: Sage, 111–29.
- Sandelands, L. E. (1998). *Feeling and Form in Social Life*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Sandelands, L. E. and Buckner, G. C. (1989). 'Of art and work: aesthetic experience and the psychology of work feelings'. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, **11**, 105–31.
- Schmitt, B. and Simonson, A. (1997). *Marketing Aesthetics: The Strategic Management of Brands, Identity, and Image*. New York: The Free Press.
- Schreyogg, G. (1999). 'Definition und typen des bedarfsorientierten theaterinsatzes in unternehmen'. In Schreyogg, G. and Dabitz, R. (Eds), *Unternehmenstheater: formen – erfahrungen – erfolgreicher einsatz*. Wiesbaden: Gabler.
- Shafritz, J. (1999). *Shakespeare on Management: Wise Business Counsel from the Bard*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Shim, S. (2003). 'The creative curriculum'. *BizEd*, July/August, 33–9.

- Shusterman, R. (2001). 'Pragmatism: Dewey'. In Gaut, B. and Lopes, D. (Eds), *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics*. London: Routledge, 97–106.
- Steyaert, C. and Hjorth, D. (2002). 'Thou are a scholar, speak to it . . . " – on spaces of speech". A script'. *Human Relations*, **55**, 7, 767–97.
- Strati, A. (1992). 'Aesthetic understanding of organizational life'. *Academy of Management Review*, **17**, 3, 568–81.
- Strati, A. (1995). 'Aesthetics and organizations without walls'. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations, and Societies*, **1**, 83–105.
- Strati, A. (1996). 'Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics'. *Organization*, **3**, 2, 209–18.
- Strati, A. (1999). *Organization and Aesthetics*. London: Sage.
- Strati, A. (2000a). 'The aesthetic approach to organization studies'. In Höpfl, H. (Ed.), *The Aesthetics of Organization*. London: Sage, 13–34.
- Strati, A. (2000b). 'Putting people in the picture: art and aesthetics in photography and in understanding organizational life'. *Organization Studies*, **21**, 0, 53–69.
- Strati, A. (2000c). *Theory and Method in Organization Studies*. London: Sage.
- Taylor, S. S. (2000). 'Aesthetic knowledge in academia: capitalist pigs at the academy of management'. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **9**, 3, 304–28.
- Taylor, S. S. (2002). 'Overcoming aesthetic muteness: researching organizational members' aesthetic experience'. *Human Relations*, **55**, 7, 821–40.
- Taylor, S. S. (2003a). 'Knowing in your gut and in your head: doing theater and my underlying epistemology of communication'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **17**, 2, 272–9.
- Taylor, S. S. (2003b). 'Ties that bind'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **17**, 2, 280–300.
- Taylor, S. S., Fisher, D. and Dufresne, R. L. (2002). 'The aesthetics of management storytelling: a key to organizational learning'. *Management Learning*, **33**, 3, 313–30.
- Turner, V. (1982). *From Ritual to Theater: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Turner, V. (1986). *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.
- Vaill, P. B. (1989). *Managing as a Performing Art*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Vico, G. (1744, reprinted in 1948). *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*. Trans. Bergin, T. G. and Fisch, M. H. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Watkins, C. and King, I. W. (2002). 'Organizational performance: a view from the arts'. *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, **2**, 1, 31–46.
- Weick, K. E. (1998). 'Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis'. *Organization Science*, **9**, 5, 543–55.
- Welsch, W. (1997). *Undoing Aesthetics*. Trans. Inkpin, A. London: Sage Publications.
- White, D. A. (1996). "'It's working beautifully!" Philosophical reflections on aesthetics and organization theory'. *Organization*, **3**, 2, 195–208.
- Whitney, J. and Packer, T. (2000). *Power Plays: Shakespeare's Lessons in Leadership and Management*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wilber, K. (1998). *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*. New York: Random House.
- Wilkens, P. (1999). *Psychodrama*. London: Sage.
- Winter, R., Buck, A. and Sobiechowska, P. (1999). *Professional Experience and the Investigative Imagination: The Art of Reflective Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Witz, A., Warhurst, C. and Nickson, D. (2003). 'The labour of aesthetics and the aesthetics of organization'. *Organization*, **10**, 1, 33–54.