Duquesne University
Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Summer 8-11-2018

Paving the Way for Merleau-Ponty's Eye and Mind in Organizational Communication Studies

Johan Bodaski

Follow this and additional works at: https://dsc.duq.edu/etd

Part of the Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons, Continental Philosophy Commons, and the Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons

PAVING THE WAY FOR MERLEAU-PONTY'S *EYE AND MIND* IN

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION STUDIES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Johan Bodaski

August 2018

PAVING THE WAY FOR MERLEAU-PONTY'S EYE AND MIND IN

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION STUDIES

By

Johan Bodaski

Approved June 8, 2018

_____   _____
Dr. Janie Harden Fritz   Dr. Ronald C. Arnett
Professor of Communication & Rhetorical   Professor of Communication & Rhetorical
Studies   Studies
(Committee Chair)   (Committee Member)

_____
Dr. Erik Garrett
Associate Professor of Communication &
Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

_____   _____
Dr. James C. Swindal   Dr. Ronald C. Arnett
Dean, McAnulty College of Liberal Arts   Chair, Department of Communication &
                                      Rhetorical Studies

ABSTRACT

PAVING THE WAY FOR MERLEAU-PONTY'S *EYE AND MIND* IN

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION STUDIES

By

Johan Bodaski

August 2018

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Janie Harden Fritz

The body is a sense-based medium that creates and interprets organization.

Bodies create organizations. An aesthetic theory of organizational communication

reveals the significance of the body to the organization. Maurice Merleau-Ponty's

philosophy of aesthetics offers a theory of aesthetic organizational communication that is

yet to be developed. Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic essay on painting, *Eye and Mind*,

describes the body as the medium through which painters turn the world into painting.

His philosophy of painting builds bridges between aesthetics, the body, and

organizational communication.

In chapter one, four theories of organizational communication are described:

communication constitutes organization (CCO), text/interpreter, ventriloquism, and

sensemaking. The chapter envisions each theory through an embodied understanding of

organizational communication. The lived body experiences organizational communication, texts, human and non-human dynamics, and non-rational ways of knowing through sense. Chapter two discusses, aesthetic organizing, a theory developed in the 1990's as a response to the predominant rational, cognitive, and analytic models used to understand and theorize organizations. Aesthetics engages senses and therefore our body. Aesthetics integrates cognitive and intuitive ways of knowing. Aesthetic organizing is a holistic way to interpret communication in organizations and reflexively with the body as the research instrument for organizational members, managers, leaders, and consultants. Aesthetic is a way of knowing.

Chapter three discusses affective atmospheres. Human and non human affects make an atmospheres. These atmospheres offer a way to interpret texts, objects, languages, and discourses simultaneously intertwined within organizational bodies. Organizations are atmospheres co-created through affective bodies. The invisible structures of atmospheres and affect are made visible by aesthetics. Like architecture, atmospheres and affect are built environments accessible only by sense. Chapter five discusses Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting. According to Merleau-Ponty, the task of a painter is to make visible the invisible. His ontology of painting in *Eye and Mind* describes the painter's method of interrogating the world. It is a method of understanding that does not abstract or manipulate the subjects it wishes to study. Body, world, and sense are all intertwined for the painter.

Chapter six discusses Wendelin Küpers (2015) book, *Phenomenology of the Embodied Organization*, which is the sole monograph that brings Merleau-Ponty into organizational theory and practice. In this monograph, Küpers applies Merleau-Ponty's

phenomenology and ontology by braiding organizations, aesthetics, and bodies. Küpers

claims that intertwinement, reversibility, and chiasm operate in organizations because

bodies co-create organized contexts. The final chapter, discusses organizational

communication as tactile, sense, and tacit embodiment. To teach business

communication courses on organizational theory by corporeal experiences, e.g. pottery or

painting, students develop a tactile understanding of organizational communication and

embodied leadership.

DEDICATION

To my grandmother Mimi. Impossible takes just a little longer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Research

Communication Studies

Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is not often cited in communication scholarship. Most communication scholarship only makes references Merleau-Ponty because their work engages the body, reflexivity, ambiguity, intertwinement, language, intersubjectivity, or world. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting from *Eye and Mind* is not engaged in the work of Lanigan.

The main categories in communication literature that Merleau-Ponty has been engaged are: structuralism (Warnick, 1979), language (Deetz, 1973), discourse (Lanigan, 2015), semiotics (Lanigan, 1982), performance (Becker, 1983), identity (Sekimoto, 2012; Macke, 2015), media (Nelson, 1989, 1987), communicology (Catt 2014; Lanigan, 1978, 1979, 1988), and interpersonal communication (Macke, 2015). Scholarship does not exist on art, aesthetics, and embodied organizational communication through *sense*. To fill the gap this dissertation grounds itself in the study of communication in organization through Merleau-Ponty's essay *Eye and Mind*. This dissertation seeks to uncover the communication between painter and world grounded in the body given through a hermeneutic phenomenological approach as compared to semiotic phenomenology.

Communicology

The majority of Merleau-Pontian scholarship comes from three scholars in the communicology tradition: Issac Catt, Richard. L. Lanigan, and Frank J. Macke. Communicology uses a semiotic phenomenological approach to understand how body and signs interact in lived experience (Catt, 2014). Communicology correlates the study

of human and world through signs (Catt 2014). Sign and human are interconnected and due to this relationship posit a world (Catt, 2014). This would also be considered a praxis approach in the semiotic tradition (Lanigan, 1982). Communicologists try to get to the origin of speech (Lanigan, 1992).

Communicologists are led by the work of Catt, Eicher-Catt, Lanigan, and Macke. Communicology asks the question: What is the experience of communication (Catt, 2014; Macke, 2015)? Communicology is a response to behaviorism and empiricism (Catt, 2014). Communicology is a response to social science communication scholarship (Catt, 2014). Social science is based off Information and data instead of perception and experience (Catt, 2014). A communication science can be posited using lived experience (Catt, 2014). Communicology uses semiotic phenomenology to inquire about the experience of communication (Catt, 2014).

Catt (2014), Lanigan (1988), Macke (2015) trace the origin of commmunicology to American pragmatism, John Dewey, William James, and George Herbert Mead, in addition to Charles Sanders Peirce, Anthony Wilden, and Umberto Eco work on semiotics (Lanigan, 1978). Communicology under the method of semiotic phenomenology allows one to bracket the usual things they see every day and suspend in a constant state of beginning (Catt, 2014). This is an ontological feature that informs the choices we make and the things we see or do not see (Catt, 2014). Catt (2014) seeks to get below the event or discourse. Discourse always emerges so to investigate the consciousness that employs that discourse is the focus of communicology.

Communicology takes a rhetorical approach to semiotic phenomenology because of the emphasis on pedagogy and culture (Catt, 2014). Pedagogy and the way social

codes are taught and cultural theory that theorizes is a result of our theory of culture. Humans learn codes, choose them and enact them. Reflexivity is important for communicology to see the consciousness that employs those learned signs (Catt, 2014).

Eicher-Catt (2005) ask how do new meanings and interpretations occur in the world? Communicology and rhetoric ground this inquiry in the sign and the constant place of beginnings from which we are constantly negotiating (Eicher-Catt, 2005). Communicology, through semiotic phenomenology, seeks to understand the relation between the sign, body, and world. Intersubjectivity is a major theme in communicology literature (Catt, 2014).

Richard Lanigan and Ambiguity

One communication scholar who has grounded their work in Merleau-Ponty is Richard L. Lanigan. Communicology and Richard Lanigan seek a human science built out of the communication and rhetorical disciplines. Lanigan's early work in the field of communication from the 1970's to the 1990's was heavily influenced by Merleau-Ponty. Lanigan has several books with Merleau-Ponty in the title: *The Human Science of Communicology: A phenomenology of Discourse in Foucault and Merleau-Ponty* (1992), and *Phenomenology of Communication: Merleau-Ponty's Thematics in Communicolgy and Semiology* (1988). Lanigan wants to know, what is conscious experience (Lanigan 1979)? What is the conscious relationship between rhetoric and ethics (Lanigan, 1988)? Lanigan (1978) uses Merleau-Ponty's existential phenomenology to find the perception a speaking individual and the connection between consciousness and the expression of experience. Lanigan's existentialism is a way to speak of communication as the foundation of the life world (Macke, 2015). Rhetorical ethics negotiates ambiguity with

a focus on ethics, whereas ethical rhetoric presupposes an ethical argument to get rid of ambiguity (Lanigan 1979). Ambiguity is central to rhetoric, ethics, and Merleau-Ponty.

Frank Macke and the Experience of Communication

Frank Macke too works in the domain of communicology and asks, what is the experience of communication? In his most recent book, *The Experience of Communication: Body, Flesh, and Relationship* (2015, p. 2), Macke suggests an alternative to the Palo Alto group's dictum that "we cannot *not* communicate". Humans do not always communicate (Macke, 2015). Macke (2015) seeks to find how we actually communicate and what are the conditions necessary for communication to occur. Macke (2015) relies on Merleau-Ponty's later work focusing on embedment, flesh, chiasm, and self-reflection.

Macke (2015) references that Merleau-Ponty develops a new ontology in *Eye and Mind*. Merleau-Ponty notes in *Eye and Mind* that the Cartesian cannot see him or herself in the mirror. Since the Cartesian is disembodied there cannot be self-reflection in relationships. Merleau-Ponty recognizes that self emerges through the interconnection of humans and world; and the same can be said of relationships (Macke, 2015). The narrative that we make ourselves with others is woven in flesh (Macke, 2015). Communication ethics is central to daily life because humans are in constant relationship the other is always involved in the formation of self (Macke, 2015).

Humans communicate through signs and form intersubjective relationships (Macke, 2015). Signs are the intersubjective links between body and world in semiotic phenomenology. Humans interact with a sign that is embodied through interactivity with another human. The interconnection among body, world, and sign form embodiment

4

with others (Macke, 2015). The matrices that body, world, sign, and other form can be thought of as flesh. Flesh interconnects humans and relationships. Flesh "holds" being while being itself holds flesh (Macke, 2015, p. 78).

Macke (2015) concludes that communication has become abstracted and lifted from its habitat of everyday lived experience. This leads us to believe that consciousness is only located in the mind. To understand corporeal lived experience communication is the object of focus because "interaction is defined by talk" (Macke, 2015, p. 218). It is in the "embodied event of bonding, coupling, connecting, and holding" that communication is found at the interaction of things (Macke, 2015, p. 218). For Merleau-Ponty, flesh, chiasm, and intertwining are descriptions of the body's communicative experience (Macke, 2015).

Macke (2015) response to the Palo Alto School is that the intertwining of flesh, body, and world constitute the experience of communication. The conditions needed for a philosophy of this to exist is that it meets the lived experience of those whom it theorizes about. When lived experience and cultural theories about that experience match, rhetoric and philosophy work in tandem. Communicology is a movement that realigns lived experience back into theory. Communicology engages praxis where theory about lived experience and the performance of that theory is reciprocating the other. One exists to complement the other. For communicologists, the sign grounds embodied praxis.

Communicology and Lanigan cite Merleau-Ponty most regularly in communication studies. Merleau-Ponty has contributed to a semiotic perspective. The human body, language, perception, phenomenology, and ontology are keywords in the

communication literatures that cite Merleau-Ponty. The text of Merleau-Ponty's that is least represented in communication studies, and organizational communication, is *Eye and Mind.* This dissertation reads Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting through the lens of organizational communication to create an aesthetic theory of organizational communication.

Discussion of the New Contribution: Aesthetic Organizational Communication

There are two aspects addressed in the literature that engages Merleau-Ponty. First, there is the problem of the social sciences vs. the human sciences which deals with the way in which human behavior and phenomenon are interrogated (Catt, 2014). The second is the difficulty to study lived experience since it is difficult to see it. These two questions are addressed followed by the contribution to the literature.

Social and Human Sciences

In communication studies, social scientific research prefers quantitative and qualitative methods to descriptive and hermeneutic approaches to observation and data collection (Catt, 2014). Quantitative and qualitative methods are based off experience and are not objective (Catt, 2014). Next, the experience of communication can only be studied if we agree what constitutes an experience of communication (Catt, 2014; Macke, 2015)? The interpretation of communication experience occurs in the body and with other bodies.

The perspective of science is that the researcher, method, steps, and guidelines do not influence the outcome of an inquiry. The apparatus used to measure only finds what it was designed to find (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Merleau-Ponty (1993a) proposes an ontology as a hermeneutic of the body. One's ontology brings a world into being; just as

a painter's ontology brings paintings into being (Merleau-Ponty's, 1993a). The friction

between the body of a painter the world birth paintings. Organizational members

perform the same task without awareness of doing so.

Organizations are independent bodies that are interdependently organized to form

a corpus. Aesthetic organizational communication is a hermeneutic phenomenological

approach to study simultaneously the lived body and its constitution to the larger corpus

through sense. One's ontology is interwoven into the organizational corpus and can be

interpreted by sense. Hermeneutic phenomenology is a method to interrogate one's lived

body and its daily lifeworld. The bodies of organizational members constitute an

organizations communicative existence. The interweaving of interdependent bodies

creates a textuality to be interpreted by text. The ontology of a painter interprets the

world with "innocence" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 123). Bodies interpret and create

lived experience.

Some philosophers that take us to the ambiguity of lived experience are, Bergson

(time), Heidegger (Being and time), and language and communication for Merleau-

Ponty. Bergson's duration is the longevity of time that transcends the temporal

experience of the everyday. From a phenomenological perspective we are in the

temporal flow of time and also in a horizon of time. Merleau-Ponty's *Eye and Mind*

brings together time, ontology, and language through the body. Merleau-Ponty gestures

towards a human science where the researcher is implicated in their research like a

painter is their paintings. Style is footprint painters leave. Biases and presuppositions

support that interrogation and also have to be accounted for.

Carnality originates in the body and stands us at the door to Being. The ontology of Merleau-Ponty's painter interprets phenomena from their origin. A painter lives in "fascination" and their "vision is an on going birth" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 129). Hermeneutic phenomenology is the approach taken to interpret *Eye and Mind*. Ambiguity is important for human science. Being, body, world, other, and communication are products of ambiguity.

Evidence and ambiguity characterize the philosopher according to Merleau-Ponty (Lanigan, 1988). One must accept ambiguity and equivocate from it. In ambiguity new categories emerge. Rhetoric and communication ethics exist because good and bad ambiguity exists. In the sense of phenomenology "rhetoric is speaking that creates an *object for consciousness* that speaker and listener perceive" (Lanigan, 1988, p. 4). Hermeneutic phenomenology interprets sense-based objects in organizational communication that speakers and listeners perceive.

Merleau-Ponty's theory of painting from *Eye and Mind* shows us how to interpret qualities of human experience. The hidden interactivity between body and world is made visible on canvas. The painter's ontology reveals aesthetic dimensions of organizational communication in concrete lived experience. A painter sees the naissance of things (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

The Problem of Studying Lived Experience

The second question the communicology points to is that communication is a difficult to phenomena to study (Catt, 2014; Macke, 2015). Communicologists research lived experience through the relationship of body, world, and sign (Catt, 2014; Macke, 2015). Communicology research brings grounds the world and sign in the body. In

language we understand the phenomenology of everyday lived experience. Semiotic phenomenology brings together semiotics and phenomenology in the lived body (Catt, 2014; Macke, 2015).

Communicology pushes on central issues of human language, speech, and being; communicology researches the experience of communication (Catt, 2014). Questions of lived experience, communication, body, and sign bring the conversation to Merleau-Ponty. This dissertation acknowledges the scholarship on signs, and suggests another approach to the aforementioned problems. Merleau-Ponty (1993a) explains that being and ontology are the painter's faculties that interpret and act through a body. Painters make visible being to others through a hermeneutic phenomenological approach. Being and ontology, signal body more than does sign. The painter's task is to make visible (Paul Klee as cited in Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). A painter's ontology and action are connected. The body's performance in the world expresses itself through interpretation and action, to paint and to be painted.

The Contribution to the Literature

Lanigan says (1979) that we interrogate conscious experience where lived world meets the human body. Lanigan (1982) refers to this as a praxis approach. Merleau-Ponty's *Eye and Mind* also theorizes a praxis approach to interrogating bodily experience in the world with innocence. Merleau-Ponty returns the sensing body to the world before sense has been given meaning. A painter's ontology naturally performs this in order to paint. The ontology—the way painter's way of being in the world, what they think about, decide, do, etc.—is the inquiry itself. Painting is an action of inquiry. The theory is the

action, and the action is the theory; there is no difference to touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, which occur at the same time (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

Merleau-Ponty, in *Eye and Mind,* focuses on a painter's ontology to explain lived experience. *Eye and Mind* describes the ontology of a painter as a way to explain something of all culture (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Aesthetics and performance help ground an interpretation of lived experience. Hermeneutic phenomenology concerns the body in language (Smith, 2008). Sense, rather than signs, are the ground of interpretation and action. Through sense, the body is the medium of interpretation and action. The drawback to language is that it is linear, and painting takes into consideration many things at once (Klee, 2012).

Question and Chapter Organization

This dissertation proposes to follow Merleau-Ponty's lead to ask a similar question to his in *Eye and Mind*:

What, then, is the secret science which he [the painter] has or which he seeks?

That dimension which lets Van Gogh say he must go "still further"? What is this

fundamental of painting, perhaps of all culture? (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 123)

Art, especially painting, studies the "fabric of brute meaning" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 123) that science ignores due to the way it operationalizes the things it studies. Science categorizes and numerically assigns arbitrary value to data. The question this dissertation asks is: What is the "dimension" Merleau-Ponty refers and in what ways could it inform organizational communication? The rationale for this question is that in the *SAGE Handbook of Organizational Communication* (2014) there is not an approach to

understanding organizational communication through art or aesthetics. This dissertation proposes to fill in that gap.

The first three chapters gain an understanding of communication, organizations, and aesthetics. Chapter two reviews CCO, text/interpreter, ventriloquism, and sensemaking from the organizational communication literature. Aesthetic organizing is the literature reviewed in chapter three. Chapter four reviews the organizational literature on atmospheres and affect. These three chapters are the foundation to understand aesthetic organizational communication through Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting in chapter five. Chapter five is an interpretation of *Eye and Mind*. Chapter six reviews the work on Merleau-Ponty and embodied organizations. Chapter seven returns to the project with implications and directions for future research in pedagogy, leadership, and rhetoric and hermeneutics informed by Merleau-Ponty.

Method

The contribution of *Eye and Mind* makes to organizational communication comes through hermeneutic phenomenology. Hermeneutic phenomenology is the idea that we understand the world and ourselves through our language since speech mediates our experience of the world and the contexts our bodies inhabit (Smith, 2008). Hermeneutic phenomenology comes from Martin Heidegger and then Hans George Gadamer took it up. In the method, part is used to understand whole and the whole is used to understand the part. The problem is that there has to be something from which an interpretation begins. Pre-knowledge comes from our biases and presuppositions that language gives to us (Smith, 2008).

This describes the hermeneutic circle; a constant process of interpretation and action (Smith, 2008). As interpretation continues we uncover more biases that *circulate* an interpretation of experience from which those biases are shaped. Interpretation is always undergoing change in a dialectical movement. To be alive in a body and contemplate existence describes the predicament of the human condition. Descriptions of the everyday are communicable because of phenomenology. To interpret everyday experience is the job of hermeneutics. Communication is the reason for a phenomenology to exist that at the core is hermeneutic. Through dialectical interpretation of self and world, Being can be understood better (Smith, 2008). Hermeneutics, phenomenology, and rhetoric form our ontology. Sense can provide a description of ontology. Our performance in the world is the way being exists in the world.

The emphasis of the body in hermeneutic phenomenology connects well to the painter who changes the world into paintings through their body (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p.123). A painter uses their hands and vision to perform their work (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The body interprets lived experience. Sense can be read from a hermeneutic phenomenology. The lived experience of researchers, consultants, and leaders is a resource to access the organizational corpus by sense, tacit, and intuitive knowledges.

Chapter 2: Organizational Communication Literature Review

Chapter one is an organizational communication literature review with the purpose of finding connections to Merleau-Ponty and painting. Organizational communication started as a field of study in the early 20th century in speech departments

in the United States (Taylor, 2011). Early development of the field was led by W. Charles Redding (Clair, 1999).

Perhaps the most significant development in the field was Ruth Smith's dissertation (Taylor, 2011). Smith's contribution switched the focus of study from communication in organizations to "organization in communication" (Taylor, 2011, p. 1276). Instead of studying certain communications in organizations, communication is said to be the raison d'être of an organization. One theory that relies heavily on this is Communication constitutes organization (CCO).

Communication constitutes organization to the degree that communication itself creates and maintains organizations (Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, & Clark, 2011). Organizations are co-created interactive events. For the Montreal School of CCO, the text and interpreter are important because the text of an organization creates a "self-organizing loop" to be interpreted (Cooren et al., 2011, p. 1155).

Organizational communication is made of humans and non-human things (Wright, 2016). A ventriloqual approach to organizational communication takes both human and non-human phenomena into consideration (Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barné, & Brummans, 2013). The ventriloquist and the puppet animate and express the other (Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barné, & Brummans, 2013). Each maintains agency, and each has a stake in the agency of the other.

Sensemaking is another important theory in organizational communication. Sensemaking focuses on the present moment in organizations (Weick, 2006). An "aesthetics of contingency" characterizes Weick's work (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1693). To research the ambiguity and uncertainty in organizations one must ask, "what's the story?"

(Weick, Sutcliffe, Obstfeld, 2005, p. 410). Disruption namely induces one to ask this question when our lived experience is different from what we expected (Weick, Sutcliffe, Obstfeld, 2005).

What makes an event and what does that event mean are questions sensemaking makes inquiry into (Weick, Sutcliffe, Obstfeld, 2005). The language of sensemaking understands qualitative meanings often missed by quantitative measures (Weick et al, 2005). The "interplay of action and interpretation" are the focus for sensemaking (Weick, Sutcliffe, Obstfeld, 2005, p. 409). Weick's work on sensemaking ushered in the interpretive turn at the 1980's Alta Conference (Eisenberg, 2006). Taken together, CCO, text and interpreter, ventriloquism, and sensemaking help to find points of entry for Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting and organizational communication.

Chapter 3: Organizational Aesthetics Literature Review

Aesthetics is a response to Descartes' split of the mind and the body (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). Aesthetic organizing is an approach to organizational studies that developed in the 1990's as response to the rationalization of organizations (Witz, Warhurst, Nickson, 2003). Aesthetics points towards seeing "ways of organizing" that "a rationalist paradigm obscures" (Witz, Warhurst, Nickson, 2003, p. 44). Aesthetic categories come from "the sensory presence of humans in their environment" (Böhme, 2014, p. 92). Organizational aesthetics "renders visible" an unseen organization that did not exist before (Strati, 1995, p. 101). Organizational research has shifted from a focus on efficiency and effectiveness, to morals and ethics, and to aesthetics now (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). Organizational aesthetics operates outside a profit model to understand organizational actors and actions (Taylor, Bathhurst, Ladkin, Meisiek, & Wood, 2012).

Art reveals the shared meanings that support aesthetics place as a connective theory (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). "In short, aesthetics are a form of organizational knowledge" and not just artifacts (Strati, 1996, p. 215). Organizational aesthetics hermeneutically oscillates around the person who describes an organization and the description of the organization itself, the text (Strati, 1996).

Aesthetic discourse is like a hologram of an organization (Strati, 1992). It takes into account people in organizations who describe aesthetic qualities, the researcher who interprets and takes those descriptions, and the reader who interprets the researchers findings (Strati, 1992). Organizational aesthetics invites inquiry into the way objects of study make us feel (Strati, 2005). The researcher's experience constitutes aesthetic research (Warren, 2008). The researcher is aware of their senses. One individually experiences aesthetics but our interpretation of them is collective (Warren, 2008). Organizations have an "immediate sensory impact on individuals" (Dobson, 2010).

Chapter 4: Atmospheres and Affect Literature Review

In organizations, atmospheres and affect, are immaterial, lack boundaries, and are co-created by bodies (Fotaki, 2017). Atmospheres and affect add texture to organizational aesthetics and its function in organizational communication. Merleau-Ponty's idea of touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, theorizes that bodies co-create organizational contexts.

Bodies generate atmospheres (Anderson, 2009). "Atmospheres do not float free from the bodies that come together and apart to compose situations" (Anderson, 2009, p. 80). Participation is required to make an aesthetic object more complete (Anderson,

2008). Atmospheres act upon the body and are being acted upon by the body (Ott, Bean, & Marin, 2016). Aesthetics act upon the body in atmospheres (Ott et al. 2016).

A situation is composed of aesthetic qualities that make an atmosphere, for example, like dust particles do when sunlight shines on them (Tawa, 2014). An atmosphere can be made visible though its aesthetic qualities. These are the qualities that through sense the body interprets. The atmosphere's affective qualities enable it to create an intensive space-time (Anderson, 2009).

In many contexts atmospheres are designed. Atmospheres are a widely researched topic in architecture and design studies (Jelic, 2015). Built environments shape the body (Jelic, 2015). Architecture creates an atmosphere that generates affect. Atmospheric qualities are resupplied by the design, atmosphere, and affective bodies (Borch, 2009). Atmospheres are experienced in the urban environment through ambiance (Thibaud, 2011). Cities have an atmosphere to them (Griffero, 2013). Museums often create atmospheres (Ott, Bean, & Marin, 2016). Products are marketed and branded by creating an atmosphere that appeals to aesthetic sense (Kotler, 1973).

Atmospheres and affect are ephemeral because they never "achieve the stability of form" (Anderson, 2009, p. 78). A collectivity of affect creates an atmosphere (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres prompt the need to ask, what do I perceive and how do I perceive, where am I, and what do I feel (Rauh, 2017, p. 9). Subjectivity is created from human and non-human things in atmospheres (Anderson, 2009).

Affect is always felt at the level of the body (O'Sullivan, 2001). "From the perspective of organization theory, affect emphasizes the intersubjective transmission of intensity: that which exists between bodies" (Fotaki, Kenny, & Vachhani, 2014, p. 6).

16

Affect occurs when bodies merge (Anderson, 2009). "…affect is taken to be the transpersonal or prepersonal intensities that emerge as bodies affect one another" (Anderson, 2009, p. 78). Affect describes what is produced when a body is in contact with another body (Ott, Bean, & Marin, 2016). Affect consists of bodies and materials (Kidd & Smitheram, 2014). Affect is ambiguous (Anderson, 2009). Affect conditions the "energies, intensities, and sensations" that make an attitude (Ott, 2010, p. 50). Affect is experienced before emotion (Ott et al., 2016). One is aware of emotion whereas affect escapes one's awareness (Malin, 2016).

Chapter 5: Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Painting

This chapter introduces the life, work, and philosophy of Merleau-Ponty. It takes a specific focus on his aesthetic philosophy from his text *Eye and Mind*. The first section describes Merleau-Ponty's life, philosophical training, and contributions. The second section discusses the major ideas from the text. The third section discusses ontology and why being is central to Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics. A painter's ontology accesses the gap—*écart*—where opposites exist in co-mutually in the body and the world. Chapter 5 builds a bridge to Merleau-Ponty and organizational research in chapter six.

Chapter 6: Merleau-Ponty's Relational Ontology and Entering Organizational Bodies

Chapter six reviews the literature on Merleau-Ponty and organizations. Wendelin Küpers has done the most work at this intersection of embodied organization, leadership, and a Merleau-Pontian perspective. This chapter brings the existing literature on Merleau-Ponty and organizations into conversation with painting, aesthetics, and communication.

In, *Phenomenology of the Embodied Organization: The Contribution of Merleau-Ponty for Organizational Studies and Practice*, Küpers (2015) mentions three important aspects that Merleau-Ponty can help us understand: inter-practice, letting-be, and habits. Phenomenology and aesthetics are understudied in organizational studies and their integration can help organizational praxis (Küpers, 2002). Organizations are embodied lifeworlds brought together through bodies as incorporations (Küpers, 2015). Organizations are not independent from the bodies, intensions, and agencies that create them (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's work enables a "multidimensional" and "embodied inter-practice" (Küpers, 2015, p. 6). It is important to learn about our habits of attention in order that we can attend to our attention (Küpers, 2015).

To let-be is to sit with paradoxes and can be described as an "engaged-letting" or an "active non-doing" (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). The performance to let be is not one of comatose but one of "waiting and listening" (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). The performance invites a poetic relation engaging presence and meditation (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). Performance is "bodily and socially co-created through indeterminable, interrelational and emergent processes" (Küpers, 2015, p. 172). Practitioners and their practices are ontological because a practitioner cannot practice outside of their own lived experiences (Küpers, 2015).

The life-world is our everyday lived experience of the world we live in (Küpers, 2015). A life-world is a world that we affect and are affected by. Phenomenology examines the "dynamics of experience" that imprint the life-world (Küpers, 2015, p. 18). How these things present themselves is what Heidegger wondered (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology provides an entrance into experience by

inviting us into the in-between relations among things, humans, and world. Buddhist traditions of Nhat Hanh's "inter-being" (81), Kimura's "in-be-tweenism" (81), and "Qi" (82) are similar to Merleau-Ponty's non-dual and non-rational philosophy (Küpers, 2015). In these traditions there is a "dependent co-arising of phenomena" and spontaneous "self-organizing emergent be(com)ing…dance of co-creation" (Küpers, 2015, p. 81). From "crisscrossing" the world arises out of us and we arise out of it (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). Crisscrossing "is a simultaneous contact and distancing" (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). This "body-scheme" for Merleau-Ponty allows us to inhabit the energy that shapes us as we shape it (Küpers, 2015, p. 82).

We inhabit organizations in the same way that we inhabit the world (Küpers, 2015). Our relationship with the world is a "habit-based 'body-forthing'" (Küpers, 2015, p. 188). Habits reveal our embodiment with the world and allow for new ways of living in the world. Habits are formed through our relationship with the world (Küpers, 2015). An action is "bodying-forth" due to its relationship to other people and things (Küpers, 2015, p. 98). We inhabit the world by the way we live our habits (Küpers, 2015). Habits reveal the pre-reflective because we respond according to them before we reflect. The embodied knowledge situated in the finger to type comes before language.

Creative action is situated in practice. Habits can be shaped around creativity and their forms change in organizations (Küpers, 2015). This kind of praxis takes into account simultaneous and multiple relations (Küpers, 2015). The capacity to wait, attend, and hold is what allows us "to catch the ripe moment of karios" (Küpers, 2015, p. 232). We catch the right performance in time and space by engaging that we are "inter-be(com)ing" (Küpers, 2015, p. 79).

Chapter 7: Implications for Organizational Communication and Future Research

Rhetoric

To make things visible in the performance of painting (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a) is similar to rhetoric's function to "make-known" (Hyde and Smith, 1979, p. 348). The rhetor-leader brings audiences from potential consciousness to actual consciousness. An aesthetic theory of organizational communication informed by Merleau-Ponty will make power, discourse, texts, objects, bodies, biases and presuppositions, problems, and opportunities more visible.

Fritz (2013) echoes this because practices themselves—the doing and performance of something—brings out the good and recognizable value. Practical wisdom (Greek *phronesis*) is an "integral" and "sustainable concept" for leadership and management (Küpers & Statler, 2008, 392). Leadership connects painting to an embodied organizational communication.

Education

If business students are taught art they would act with holistic perspectives in management and leadership contexts (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009). Four things are good for an arts-based approach to business courses. The first is skills transfer; for example, medical students learning theatre to increase empathy. At Yale, medical students saw more detail after taking art history. Second, the medium of art enables somethings to be expressed that could not have been otherwise in language. This "helps the manager to understand and work with the multiplicity of meaning making that surrounds complex organizational issues" (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009, p. 65). Third, art can connect students to

tacit knowledge. Fourth, art can foster a better understanding of self to help through the

difficulties of management (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009).

CHAPTER 2

Introduction to Organizational Communication Literature

The body constitutes organization and aesthetics reveals this to sense communication. Sensation is the reservoir of knowledge in the human body about what is happening in the moment; aesthetic communication describes this. Aesthetics helps make sense of the data found amongst organized bodies. Aesthetic communication exists in both the interior and the exterior of human body. The liminal space in between bodies provides an active and passive understanding of one's body in context to another's body. Aesthetic communication in organizations inquiries into the way which individually contextual bodies form a collective body. Bodies create organizational contexts as in-corpor-ations. Aesthetic communication reveals the lived body in context.

Aesthetic communication reveals to our body through sense how bodies live amongst other bodies. Organizations are interdependently composed of independent bodies and understood holistically through sense. Aesthetics organizational communication is a response to the current description of the historical moment as an aesthetic economy. In the organizational studies literature Taylor (2013) offers one however he does not use Merleau-Ponty. This dissertation takes a new perspective to aesthetic organizational communication through Merleau-Ponty and his philosophy of painting.

Three theories of organizational communication—Communication Constitutes Organization (CCO) (Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009; Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, and Clark, 2011), text/interpreter (Cooren et al. 2011; Wright, 2016), and sensemaking (Weick, 2011; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005)—combine to provide a framework for

aesthetic organizational communication. From CCO the importance of paying attention to our communication is discussed. From text/interpreter a theory of part and whole, hermeneutically functions as a way to interpret how texts and interpreters influence one another.

Sense is involved in the interpretation and creation of organizational bodies and texts to be sensemaking. Aesthetic communication in organization brings theories of communication, sense, body and organization together. Communication comes from the body and sense is generated from the friction between text and interpreter in an organization. Organizational contexts and bodies are intertwined. Sensemaking makes clear that understanding in organizations occurs in the body.

The part missing is how one performatively access the body to make sense of what occurs. To teach how to act and reflect simultaneously is the premise of aesthetic organizational communication. To draw upon theory generated from the experience happening right now, an action occurs in response to that theory. This back and forth of praxis is aesthetic organizational communication. A theory of organizational aesthetic communication answers how organizations occur through the body. Since the body creates organization, accessing the organizational corpus via sensation to gain information about what is going on is a possible feat of the body. Organizational contexts, communication, and ontology comes from somewhere; and aesthetic organizational communication seeks the origin.

Five theories of organizational communication are discussed in this chapter. First, communication constitutes organization (Cooren et al., 2011); second, text and interpreter discussed through the CCO tradition; third, the performance of organization;

fourth, ventriloquism; and fifth, Weick's sensemaking. Each theory points closer towards aesthetic organizational communication. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting unifies these theories of organizational communication.

The need exists for this research because a theory of aesthetic organizational communication does not exist. Second, in the SAGE Handbook (2014) there is not a theory nor mention of aesthetics. Organizations are created by aesthetics. To speak of aesthetics, we speak of the body. The assumption is that aesthetics, sense, and the body exist together in an organization. Organizations are currently situated in a creative economy. Organizations produce an aesthetic grounded in the sensing body.

Envisioning Aesthetic Communication in Organization

The common thread that links CCO, text/interpreter, performance, ventriloquism, and sensemaking Is interpretation. Each theory draws upon a different aspect of the hermeneutic process. For example, CCO views organizations as a multiplicity of communication that can be interpreted. Text/interpreter views organizational communication as a text that can be interpreted in a similar manner to the way a reader and book interact in an interpretive process. Performance interprets organizations through the lens of the actions organizational actors take. Ventriloquism adds non-human agency to the interpretation organizational to a holistic interpretation of organizations. Sensemaking accounts for the tacit knowledge residing in the body that sense not rational cognition interprets.

Aesthetic organizational communication threads body, context, and corpus together in the matrices of flesh. Thyssen (2011) says "…all communication has an aesthetic dimension" (Thyssen, 2011, p. xiii). Aesthetic organizational communication is

a kind of inquiry that interrogates the aesthetic dimension to organizations. Aesthetics does not privilege mind or body. Aesthetics puts human corporality in touch with the object of inquiry through sense. Communication creates organizations yet the patterns and meanings from that communication are sensed (Thyssen, 2011, p. xiii). "Aesthetics is used to programme people, so that, through their own urges, they help promote the life of the organization" (Thyssen, 2011, p. xi). The aesthetics of communication concern what we lose when we try to put into words what only sense can communicate and interpret (Thyssen, 2011).

Communication is a "sense based media" (Thyssen, 2011, p. xiii). Aesthetic communication and observation gets us to use our senses in other ways in addition to the way we usually use them (Thyssen, 2011). For example, we all look at the same thing but see that thing in a different way depending upon our perception, biases, spatial orientation, context, and role. Aesthetic organizational communication can be thought of as the ability to observe observing. Artists are well known for having this trait. The artist's genius is their body; the ability to take a step back from their work and observe what they have done (Thyssen, 2011). "It is a classical insight that feelings move people" (Thyssen, 2011, p. 32). Thyssen (2011) agrees that communication constitutes organization, however Thyssen (2011) adds to this equation that the body is a central component to communication.

Communication Constitutes Organization

According to Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, and Clark (2011, p. 1150) CCO means that communication processes "establish, compose, design, and sustain" what we name in language as "organization". Cooren et al. (2011, p. 1150) have given new ontological

and epistemological ways of "conceptualizing" organizations through CCO. The

evidence of this is that communication is an interactive event (Cooren et al., 2011). For

Cooren et al. (2011)

> A CCO perspective of organizational sensemaking considers organizations not as a given, but as emerging in, and indeed constituted by or incarnated in local episodes of communication. What this means is that organizations are constantly (re)produced, (re)incarnated, and (re)embodied in local interactions, and thus subject to change and renewal. (p. 1158)

Human beings generate organizational communication that makes local communication

contexts (Cooren et al., 2011). Organizational communication is "co-constructed" and

"co-oriented" perspective (Cooren et al., 2011, p. 1152). Human and non-human

agencies compose an organization, for example, architecture creates a certain experience

(Cooren et al., 2011).

An organization's ontology is composed of many human and nonhuman agencies

(Cooren et al., 2011). Organizational communication is not a composition of singular

ontologies but how agencies form an ontology (Cooren et al., 2011). Latour's action-

network theory is one way to understand the role that non-human actors play in

organizations (Cooren and Fairhurst, 2009). The processes of organizing are an event.

Communicative experience is the process of a context taking shapes.

Cooren and Fairhurst (2009) are interested in the way part and whole mesh in

organizational communication. A discussion of text and interpreter lend insight to the

way part and whole mesh. What is the process of going back and forth between part and

whole; in between micro human processes that take place daily in the organization and

macro organizing processes? The micro concerns communication taking place in the

"here and now" and the macro concerns the "there and then" (Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009, p. 121-122).

A theory of organizational communication as text and interpreter must take into account human agency, nonhuman things, and the continual creation of texts to understand the constitution of organizations. Organizational text and organizational members, or interpreters help make visible the meshing of part and whole (Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009). The oscillation of interpreters and text and within micro and macro communication contexts constitutes organization. The process of going back and forth between part and whole are inherent to theories of text and interpreter (Cooren & Fairhurst, 2009). An interpretation—or theory of the organization—is made in the oscillation of part and whole.

A Communicative Ontology of Text and Interpreter

CCO connects communication and text (Cooren et. al., 2011). When we speak with others in an organization we create a text. This co-created text creates conditions for our experience of that text and interpretations and decisions to follow (Cooren et al., 2011). "Text is the product of conversational process, but it is also its raw material and principal preoccupation. Together, then, conversation and text form a self-organizing loop" (Taylor & Van Every, 2000, p. 210–211, as cited by Cooren et al. 2011, p. 1155). The ontology of texts and dialogues create organizations (Wright, 2016).

Non-human objects are involved in the organizing process (Wright, 2016). An example of a non-human object that has agency would be our routines we have in organizations (Wright, 2016). "What Cooren and Fairhurst (2009) point to instead are 'strings of associations' that relationally link actors, both human and nonhuman, in

ongoing co-orientation as routines unfold" (Wright, 2016, p. 155). Wright (2016) explains that human and non-human phenomena are interconnected. Through communication and relationships, routines occur. Organizational routines are a result of communication and we can look to them to get a sense of the organization in communication (Wright, 2016).

Bodies are an important element to communication in organization (Wright, 2016). Human and non-human things are accounted for by the body and the routine (Wright, 2016). The routine is the non-human phenomena performed by a body that creates a conversation and text that move dialectically to an evolving object (Wright, 2016). Bodies compose organizational routines and these routines emerge among the different bodies and non-human agencies which through conversations and dialogue create an ongoing project (Wright, 2016).

Communication constitutes organization is a "strategy-as-practice" method (Cooren et al. 2011, p. 1156). Organizations are composed of a multiplicity of texts that are available for interpretation (Cooren et al., 2011). Communication is the phenomenon that upsets texts and keeps them undergoing constant change (Cooren et al., 2011). Communication is the factor that organizes (Cooren et al., 2011). Human and non-human things are fused into a "narrative infrastructure" from which situations are created (Cooren et al. 2011, p. 1161). A text is the narrative infrastructure from which we interpret situations and from which we act upon them. Organizational communication—from human and non-human agencies—create text(s) through conversation. Actors in this communication network then interpret those conversations (Cooren et al., 2011).

CCO and theories of text and interpreter in the organizational communication exist. We generate and interpret conversation making it the most important raw material. A "self-organizing loop" forms among conversation, text, and interpreter (Cooren et al.2011, p. 1155). Organizations comprise a multiplicity of texts that are available for interpretation (Cooren et al. 2011).

Cheney'(2001) reviews Cooren's (2000) book, *The Organizing Property of Communication*, and cautions readers that Cooren's argument that language is an organizing factor means it emerges out of itself. If language organizes then authorial intent is privileged. If texts are interpreted through authorial bias, there is a loss of the horizon in between text and interpreter. This means that people and objects are "positioned" with discourse through the author's biases (Cheney, 2001, p. 453). If text is privileged the narrator's authorial intent actually does the organizing which clouds accurate interpretation.

For CCO, routines are "citational patterns of embodied conversation and textual dialectics that performatively co-orient toward an object" (Wright, 2016, p. 158). An organization is a performance of human and non human agencies grounded in text (Wright, 2016). Organizations are events and performances.

Performance of Organizational Communication

Performance of Part and Whole

Performance links text and interpreter in organizational communication. Organizations can be thought of as a happening (Schatzki, 2006). Organizational performance considers the duration of time. Organizational performance happens over a duration of time (Schatzki, 2006). Governance, the performance itself, and action are the

materials embedded in duration. Duration, rhythm, pattern, and memory performative aspects of organizations that can be read over the duration of time.

What is an organization as it is happening (Schatzki, 2006)? Organizations are more than real-time events (Schatzki, 2006). Organizations are made of past, present, and future assemblages of "persons, artifacts, organisms, and things" (Schatzki, 2006, p. 1864). The performance of an organization takes into consideration everything *happening* (Schatzki, 2006) is concerned with the entirety of things that create an organization. "The happening of an organization is, above all, the performance of its constituent actions" (Schatzki, 2006, p. 1866). The theory of organizations as performance accounts for a constituency of simultaneous events that are spread out over networks and extensions in organizations. Organizational communication is the organizational performances that include past, present, and future. Organizational performance is embedded with other performance in the duration of time that allows for the interpretation of that performance to represent part and whole (Schatzki, 2006).

Cultural Performance

The performance of organizational communication also creates organizational culture (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Performance studies originated in the work of Erving Goffman and Victor Turner (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Goffman found saw communication as performance through plays and theatre. Turner thought of communication as a process rather than a structural form (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Performance and process are ways to understand culture.

Culture was studied by Von Bertalanffy's systems theory in the 1960s and 1970s (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Cultural attitudes arise within an

organizational system that performance in context has created. Cultural performance adds the depth that systems theory lacks. Performance accounts for historical depth in organizational communication.

Organizational cultural is created by the dialogic performance of many actors (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Organizational communication enculturates (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). It is ritualistic, improvisational, emotional, and political system that creates social norms and ways of acting (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983). Performance accounts for context and history to theorize organizational communication (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1983).

A Critique of Organizational Performance

The interpretation of performance in organizational communication has a critical side (Rogers, 1994). Rhythm is tied to machine labor that Fordism and Taylorism theorized.   Fordism and Taylorism coordinate the body, consciousness, understanding, and organization to a violent rhythm. Rhythm is a kind of knowledge that shapes people in an organization (Rogers, 1994).   Machine and human rhythms are synced to create an organizational rhythm. Identifying the critical side to dominant rhythms is how we change the form of an organization (Rogers, 1994).

Ventriloquism

Human and Non-Human Agency

The account of human and non-human agency in an organization is consistent in the organizational communication literature. Ventriloquism is a theory created to study human and non-human agency in organizational communication (Cooren, Matte, Benoit-Barné, and Brummans, 2013). Ventriloquism provides a "useful analytic concept" to

theorized how human and non human agents co-create in organizations (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 262). Ventriloquism accounts for both human and non human agency because the ventriloquist maintains agency by also giving agency to the puppet (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 262). Ventriloquists maintain agency and also engage in non human agency by making another speak. Ventriloquists show provide agency while also being affected by nonhuman agency at the same time.

Cooren et al. (2013) have an insight that multiple things occur in an organization at once. A "thing" for Cooren et al. (2013) are things that "are continuously inviting and expressing themselves in human interactions" (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 262). From these things we can find the "enactment of situations" (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 262). In terms of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting this is considered origin.

The origin of communication is found in "polyphonic or multivocal" voices. (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 263). Cooren et al. (2013) articulate a theory that seeks to account for human and non human agency in the interpretation of organizational communication. People communication and express themselves through "numerous figures" and opens new dimensions of interpretation (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 274).

Tension and Ventriloquism

Tension in organization is a good example of a ventriloqual approach (Cooren et al., 2013). The two major implications are that tensions are co-created and embodied. Cooren et al. (2013) use an ethnographic approach over time to think through tension, a common approach to organizational communication research. A "ventriloqual approach to communication enables us to combine a formal/abstract and grounded-in-action approach to the study of organizational tensions" (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 272).

Ventriloquism combines theory and action such that tensions can be studied from both sides.

People position themselves and are positioned by others in organizations through a ventriloqual approach (Cooren et al., 2013). Relationships are create tensions that exist internally and externally (Cooren et al., 2013). A tension exists at the aggregate level where non human things, such as mission and ideology, have their own agency. Tension is a co-constituted and embodied phenomenon.

Ventriloquism accounts for human and non human agency that creates organizational communication contexts. Ventriloquism is a metaphor that allows us to study communication through the multiplicity of voices grounded in action. "Communication is about people who interact with each other as well as about aspects of reality that play into our interactions and thereby create the tensions we experience, witness, and mostly take for granted" (Cooren et al., 2013, p. 274). Ventriloquism provide an analytic tool to understand the enactment of situations that human and non human things create.

Sensemaking builds on human and non human things co-creating in the body. Sensemaking invites an understanding of the things we take for granted in our daily life that they body experiences.

Sensemaking

Sensemaking as Language and Tacit Knowledge

Communication is central to sensemaking (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). Sensemaking determines human behavior and emphasizes "the interplay of action and interpretation" in a chaotic environment (Weick et al., 2005, p. 409). Sensemaking

approaches daily organizational life as "an ongoing, unknowable, unpredictable streaming of experience" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 410). To make sense of this experience one must ask "what's the story" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 410). Sensemaking is not a theory of choice-making but how choices are made (Weick, et al., 2005). In the process of sensemaking actors try to figure out what they are feeling (Weick, 2003). Sensemaking is a process of coming to collective understanding with others (Weick, 2003).

Sensemaking privileges language stating that to bring things into language humans see what is going on within an organization as our body is also creating it (Weick, 2005). Sensemaking instigates the body when a break in experience occurs; when the reality of the situation does not match what we expected (Weick et al., 2005). The break in experience is called a disruption (Weick et al., 2005). Sensemaking works on the dyad of "same or difference" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 415). That which is different is a disruption.

Erbert (2016) thinks through disruption as storytelling. Story reconciles and understands something strange that happens outside of a normal organizational context (Erbert, 2016). Sensemaking is a retrospective activity; after a disruption we try to fill in the blanks (Erbert, 2016). Interpreting those gaps is the aesthetic organizational communication.

Sensemaking and language are connected, however, once language articulates experience, sense no longer exists. "The language of sensemaking captures the realities of agency, flow, equivocality, transience, reaccomplishment, unfolding, and emergence, realities that are often obscured by the language of variables, nouns, quantities, and structures" (Weick et al., 2005, 410). Weick et al. (2005) search for a language that takes

account of the continuous flow of sensemaking. In order to bring sensemaking into linguistic terms, one asks, "How does something come to be an event for organizational members? Second, sensemaking is about the question: What does an event mean" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 410)?. Language articulates events. Our sensemaking of an experience constitutes that experience. In language, "…sensemaking and organization constitute one another" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 410). Language describes what began first as sensation.

Sensemaking and organizations structure co-ordinated tacit knowledge (Weick et al. 2005). Sensemaking makes tacit knowledge accessible and usable. Sensemaking lifts concrete meaning out from tacit knowledge. Sensemaking engages a tacit knowledge of both body and mind (Weick et al., 2005). The process to put tacit organizational knowledge into language is organizational co-creation. The interaction between the nurse and the child is how sensemaking occurs (Weick et al., 2005, p. 412). Sensemaking "is as much a matter of thinking that is acted out conversationally in the world as it is a matter of knowledge and technique applied to the world" (Weick et al. 2005, p. 412).

Sensemaking "acts thinkingly" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 413). Sensemaking is a praxis approach that puts theory into action and action into theory. Communication points to the past, present, and future of communication. The way humans find and apply knowledge onto lived experience is the basis of sensemaking. "In the sensemaking recipe "how can I know what I think until I see what I say?" sensegiving corresponds to the saying" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 416). Sensemaking labels things with language and is retrospective.

Sensemaking and Organizational Design

Weick (2003) theorizes sensemaking as organizational design through the architectural work of Frank Gehry. In 1965, the literature viewed organizational design as something static and unchanging. Weick (2003, p. 94) refashioned this through Gehry work's for its "variability". Sensemaking is used in organizations when design is unsure. For example, Gehry and client work is such a way that Gehry does not know what his client wants him to design. The client too does not know what they want to have designed until Gehry gives them some options. Gehry and the client both work with sensemaking to figure out what the other is communicating. Organizational design works in this way (Weick's, 2003). When Gehry and the client meet drafts are initiated, changed, and evolved. Since both parties are unsure, each one holds an available space for the emergence and change of an idea to occur (Weick, 2003).

Design is a moral problem because people in live created space (Weick, 2003). Sensemaking holds to an ethic of openness to the ethic that is negotiated in language amongst participants. For example, Gehry's client does not presume that he the designer (Gehry) knows the best way to design a certain space. Design is a dynamic back and forth between the concrete and dreaming, between the designer and the purchaser. Through materials communication occurs.

Gehry's final architectural sketch emerges from previous drafts. The drafts of Gehry's sketches take shape based upon back and forth communication. These material drafts are allowed to remain open, dreamy, and "malleable" for both parties (Weick, 2003, p. 95). The sketches, and the communication, are fragments that come together as a unity through this back and forth (Weick, 2003, p. 95).

Sensemaking and Aesthetics

Eisenberg (2006, p. 1693) states that Weick introduced language and an "aesthetics of contingency" into organizational communication. Eisenberg (2006) writes that scholars ought to pursue aesthetics in their research instead of the usual topics. The aesthetic features in Weick's work are improvisation and contingency. Weick's work is grounded in the "contingent and multifaceted" worlds of aesthetics communication (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1695). Weick brought improvisation into a field where classical management and Taylorism sought to reduce ambiguity. Organizations showcase the way in which our world is improvisation and the difficulty to find the origins of an action (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1695). Eisenberg (2006) says that sensemaking is difficult to confirm since its object of study is not concrete. Sense, communication, and equivocality do not take on material form.

Weick introduced "a genuine alternative to the transmissional model of human inter-action" to communication practitioners (Putnam, 1983, as cited in Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1696). Weicks' theory of sensemaking is "conceptually appealing" for the interpretation of phenomena that are "shapeless and fleeting" (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1696). Sensemaking sounds like a good theory but to translate it to practical application has been difficult to do. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting fills this gap. Painting can teach a way to apply sensemaking to research, leadership, and consulting.

Weick pointed organizational communication to research communication as the organizing factor ((Eisenberg, 2006). Weick's insight is that ambiguity and uncertainty organize: "equivocality is the engine that motivates people to organize" (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1696). Communication offers the ground from which an approach such as sensemaking could be studied. Communication is the object of study, and Weick

suggests sensemaking as the way to interpret aspects of communication that we cannot see. For example, attention must be "grasped" to apply sensemaking (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1698).

Communication creates social reality (Eisenberg, 2006). Communication "reworks categories" to change social reality (Eisenberg, 2006, p. 1701). The hermeneutical side is that communication categories are also what we use to interpret communication. Biases and presuppositions inform those categories. This is the hermeneutic circle that drives organizational communication and the changes the corpus takes. Ambiguity and uncertainty are central to sensemaking. Merleau-Ponty's nondualist phenomenology and ontology are grounded in the in between, ambiguity, and uncertainty, all of which signal the significance of the body (Küpers, 2015) to organizational communication. Sensemaking, an important milestone in the organizational communication literature, led to the interpretive turn at the 1980s at the Alta Conference in Utah (Eisenberg, 2006).

Strategic ambiguity is a good way to change organizations (Eisenberg ,1984). Clarity is not tied to employee effectiveness. Clarity works on a continuum giving room to work in some ambiguity. A multiplicity of interpretations of an event are allowed to emerge in ambiguity. Strategic ambiguity "promotes unified diversity" (Eisenberg, 1984, p. 236). Goals and organizational metaphors are changed within strategic ambiguity. Different interpretations are encouraged to be made known (Eisenberg, 1984), and within this horizon change is forged.

Aesthetic organizational communication is a sense-based approach to the study what cannot be seen, for example, attention, ambiguity, communication, interpretation,

texts, and bias. The ontology of painting is a method to make visible invisible

phenomena that form organizational corpuses. The method and the phenomena are

grounded in the body.

Sensemaking as Improvisation

Organizing engages unexpected phenomena, and a performance that uses existing

and unknown knowledge (Weick, 1989). Organizing is made of "talk, symbols,

promises, lies, interest, attention, threats, agreements, expectations, memories, rumors,

indicators, supports, detractors, faith, suspicions, trust, appearances, loyalties, and

commitments" (Weick, 1989, p. 244). Commitment, choice, and decisions are the

"content" that effects organizing (Weick (1989; p. 246). Conversation holds this content

together, and when we speak we become aware that organizing is a social construction.

Beliefs, biases, and presuppositions focus what we see and do not see (Weick, 1989).

The obvious is missed, because lived experience is taken for granted, and where this

communication content exists (Weick, 1989). This content is not visible; sensemaking

makes these invisible aspects of communication visibly interpretable through the body.

A metaphor to understand organizing is jazz improvisation (Weick, 1989).

Improvisation is a way to speak about the occurrence of organizing. Weick (1989) tells a

story, where a clear box is set on a stage. The box is filled with water and inside fish

swim around. Painted on the outside of the box is a musical staff. A musician sat on

each side of the box, and as the fish swam around the musicians played the improvised

notes made by the fish. Only a small amount of structure—the box, water, musicians—is

needed to coordinate the action. The action of the fish is the improvised notes that

coordinate the playing of music (Weick, 1989). "Organizing is a continuous flow of

movement that people try to coordinate with a continuous flow of input" (Weick, 1989, p. 243). Strategic planning is a practical example of improvisation. Strategic plans provide some structure and leave variation open.

The rationality of an organization is the justified actions in accord to that rationality. Sensemaking studies the communication that rationality makes. Sensemaking studies the variation and "causal linkages" of an event that creates organization (Weick, 1989, p. 243). Rationality becomes embodied in the process. Sensemaking pays attention to where a rationality comes. "Organization exists because variation in each event is limited by the causal linkages in place" (Weick, 1989, p. 243). Sensemaking interprets those linkages in their variability.

One of the reasons we fail to question our assumptions is because we are "lost in thought" (Weick, 1989, p. 247). Emotion is something that is not considered as a factor in organizing yet we need it to be there. Emotional categories would be stress and interruption for example. Sensemaking search for a starting point to enter into emotion and non-rational dynamics. When we organize an order is imposed (Weick, 1989). Before a choice is made there are "perceptions, hunches, experiences, and reasons" floating around (Weick, 1989, p. 245). We make a choice and that choice becomes the content that organizes, and the process restarts over again and again. The fish in the box represent that a choice has been made to put staffs on a box and have a performance. Decisions have been made to provide a structure that does not overshadow the variability needed for improvisation.

Sensemaking as Organizational Narrative and Rhetoric

Narratives are created by language, and the dominant organizational narrative organizes us (Weick, 2011). Sensemaking can be practiced by "noticing, interpretation, and action" (Weick, 2011, p. 146). Where does our attention go, take us to, and what object(s) is it paying attention to? "Actions, contemporary stories, embodied reactions, imagination, presumptions of logic, faith, and creative assembly of antenarratives into plausible narrative rationality, all can broaden, multiply, and update the number of cues with which we are willing to become acquainted" (Weick, 2011, p. 150). Sense gives us more data, we access more cues to what is happening (Weick, 2011). Narrative holds all these things together such that an interpretation can be informed by all of them at once.

The number of cues are increased because a narrative brings past experience into the present. A narrative holds the origins of its rationality (Weick, 2011). Sensemaking gives a narrativized context to experience. These cues from sensemaking help to understand organizing. Organization and the experience in organization both must be paid attention to be in the continuous flux of sensemaking (Weick, 2011). The body brings identity, narrative, and plot together into coherence (Weick, 2011).

Narrative and argumentation create "different organizational structures" in the way information and meaning making ae made (Weick & Browning, 1986, p. 243). Argumentation reveals different structures than a narrative approach to organizations. Communication theories such as "rhetoric, poetics, narration, interpretation, and values" have not been used enough in organizational studies (Weick & Browning, 1986, p. 244). Narratives create organizations and give them ontologies (Weick & Browning, 1986). "Organizational and communication variables are viewed as mutually relevant" (Weick

& Browning, 1986, p. 243). Communication has been central to organizational research since the Hawthorne studies (Weick and Browning, 1986).

Organizations are metaphorically between smoke and crystal (Weick, 2006). Weick (2006) borrows the metaphors from Taylor and Van Every who describe crystals as having defined boundaries and smoke to have undefined boundaries. Actors and conversations continually adjust these boundaries. Crystals signify structure and smoke signifies ambiguity. Tight and loose structures are necessary (Weick's, 2006)

Weick points out that "[b]elief and faith are prerequisites of organizing and sensemaking" (Weick, 2006, p. 1729). In organizing, to focus on the "vocabularies of the invisible (e.g. faith, belief)" changes the questions we ask (Weick, 2006, p. 1730). Sensemaking pushing us to see our seeing so as to see from origins (Weick, 2006).

> Order, interruption, recovery. That is sensemaking in a nutshell. And organizing is the act of trying to hold things together by such means as text and conversation, justification, faith, mutual effort (heedful interrelating), transactive memory, resilience, vocabulary, and by seeing what we say in order to assign it to familiar categories (Weick, 2006, p. 1731).

Sensemaking explicitly engages the ambiguity that our body feels amongst other bodies. Human communication, memory, faith, bias, and beliefs all hold together an organization. The categories we see an organization through are the familiar categories in language. Sensemaking discovers in ambiguity and uncertainty ways to assign new categories to experiences. Sense helps us to see how conversations, texts, and beliefs create organizations.

A Critique of Sensemaking

Absence, mood, and openness need to be added to the model of sensemaking (Holt & Cornelissen, 2014). Our frames of reference—which are our tools in the

Heideggerian sense—that we use to understand organization cannot be gotten out of (Holt and Cornelissen, 2014). The language of frames, narratives, and categories describe what sensemaking studies. Sensemaking is created by the same things it signifies word, body, language, and action. For sensemaking to work outside its limits it must avoid becoming its own frame of reference. Sensemaking risks becoming a dominant category and become what it distinguishes itself from (Holt & Cornelissen, 2014).

Absence signals that a jolt or disruption has clued that something out of the ordinary has occurred. Mood is an example of the way things work together. Mood takes into consideration the co-creation of experience. The experience in bodies in organizing is something we have not been able to see. Sensemaking makes visible the invisible that disruption brings.

Sensemaking "conflates sense with organization; sense is what governs the condition of Verfallenheit" (Holt and Cornelissen, 2014, p. 537). Verfallenheit means to be fallen. Holt and Cornelissen (2014) are say that sense governs organization and cannot be the thing that organizes, because sense is the condition of an organization.

In summary, sensemaking is a theory of organizational communication that seeks to make visible the ambiguity and uncertainty of organizations and through sense make invisible texts visible. Action, conversation, narrative, text, and belief are the contents sensemaking retrieves its data from. Sensemaking is a kind of tacit knowledge that is embodied. Sensemaking allows us to enter our own embodiment to see that social reality is created out of communication that organizes. Narratives are like a mesh that holds the all the different content together. Conversation creates the communicative contexts that

narrative describes. The body is the tool used to interpret organization through sensemaking.

Conclusion

Although not exhaustive, this chapter has covered five major theories of organizational communication: CCO, text and interpreter, ventriloquism, performance, and sensemaking. These theories have a common theme that communication constitutes organization. Linguistic or bodily communication constitutes an organization. The experience of organization is the text we draw from to base our interpretation and communication of the organization on.

Another common theme is accounting for human and non human things in organizations. Many communicative events contribute to the creation of an organization. the five theories all try to account for things that are difficult to account for. Organizations in communication are complex entities that bodies, aesthetics, and painting can help us to better understand. One has to step back and view communication and interpretation in an organizational context at the same time to see organization. Sensemaking requires the researcher to be aware of their attention and what it is grasping onto; and this is called noticing. The back and forth dynamic that creates organizations is similar to a dance.

Organizations are not limited to the here and now, and have history, ambiguity, and tensions all part of the interpretation and communication. Sensemaking researches the variability, ambiguity, and uncertainty that constitutes organization. Sensemaking is a theory that reflects, attends, and notices the contributions bodies make to a context.

Sensemaking has one step away from the context to think about how we help create that context.

The body creates with other bodies an organizational corpus that has an ontology. One must enter one's own body as a way to enter the organizational corpus. Communication, text, language, emotion, belief, bias, and presuppositions are interpreted by the body. Sense is the access to this dimension of data through. Embodiment, not rationality and cognition, that lead us to invisible data.

Sensemaking makes visible interpretations of things that are invisible. Sensemaking shows how bodies and narratives form together. Sensemaking makes visible the meaning that is formed in between structure and ambiguity. The organizational communication theories that are discussed try to account for invisible things in organizations. Aesthetics is vital to this argument because aesthetics engages sense. Sense is invisible however painting brings to visibility the interpretation given by our senses. According to Merleau-Ponty (1993) who cites Paul Klee painting makes visible. Through the body the painter turns the world into painting (Merleau-Ponty, 1993).

CHAPTER 3

An Introduction to Organizational Aesthetics

This chapter provides a description of organizational aesthetics which emerged in the 1990s in the organizational studies literature. Aesthetics is an important part of organizational life and often overlooked. Organizational aesthetics asks organizational members to examine the things that they do not see. Organizational aesthetics brings the conversation closer to the invisible texts that standard inquiry misses. Aesthetic inquiry is conducted by sense. Organizational aesthetics is important to organizational theory because the current economy is built on aesthetics, creativity, and art (Fletcher, 2008).

The next part of this chapter discusses the connection in the literature between organizational aesthetics and the current aesthetic economy. Section two asks, what is organizational aesthetics for Antonio Strati and Steven Taylor. The former is one of the first scholars to theorize organizational aesthetics and the latter is a contemporary scholar of organizational aesthetics. The third section discusses methods of organizational aesthetics. The fourth section discusses applications of organizational aesthetics. The fifth section offers a conclusion.

Aesthetic organizational communication research returns us to the organizational corpus through bodily sense. All communication has an inherent aesthetic aspect (Thyssen, 2011). Organizational communication has not researched aesthetics in communication. Organizational aesthetics offers a way to add the interpretation and communication that sensation delivers that theories such as CCO, sensemaking, ventriloquism, and text and interpreter have not fully considered. Organizational aesthetics recognizes the body to be central to organization, organizing, and

organizations. The aesthetics of communication supply the data and ques that the sensing body interprets.

Aesthetic Economy

The current historical moment situates organizations in an economy of aesthetics (Chytry, 2008). We spend the majority of our time in organizations, so an aesthetic theory can be helpful to interpret organizational contexts (Taylor, 2013). Aesthetics, art, artist, and firms are connected (Chytry (2008). For example, the advent of the "art-corporation" (Chytry, 2008, p. 63) is a publicly traded organization that works at the edge of gaining surplus value from regular business practices and creating events that artistically inform those business practices. Aesthetic design is a competitive advantage (Chytry, 2008).

Aesthetics is the larger category that art and organizations fall into, however art and aesthetics are different. For example, art is the product and aesthetics are the sense appeals among bodies to that product. The ethos of an artist is a good model for organizations because an artist is not driven by adding value and profit to conduct their work (Chytry, 2008). An art-corporation values craftwork over commodity production (Chytry, 2008).

The work of an artist is motivated by the spontaneity of play (Chytry, 2008). Hans Georg Gadamer's notion of play contains spontaneous and aesthetic qualities (Chytry, 2008). "Human play" emerges in between the back and forth nature of "form and substance" in which an order takes shape (Chytry, 2008, p. 67). Rules of the game emerge within the play, as it shapes the order of further play. Nature is "purposeless, non-intentional, continually self-renewing play" (Chytry, 2008, p. 67). An artist plays

better than the craftsman and entrepreneur. An artist may appear to not be doing anything worthwhile due to the freedom they embody, however, this embodied freedom invites them the craft (Chytry, 2003).

The "artist-entrepreneur" is a new professional identity (Fletcher, 2008, p. 145). Artists and entrepreneur contribute the most to the creative economy (Fletcher, 2008). The post-industrial economy, known as post-Fordism, has turned to creative human labor. "One increasingly important sector of these industries–both economically as well as symbolical–is communication-based, cultural, creative or 'tacit-knowledge' businesses" (Fletcher 2008, p. 145). Communication links creativity and tacit-knowledge and is what businesses in the current historical moment desire (Fletcher, 2008). Ideas and intellectual property rights are at a premium in organizations today. The difficulty to measure today's economy comes from its aesthetic, ephemeral, idea, and creative orientation. Quantitative and qualitative science and the liberal arts are needed to understand today's organizations (Fletcher, 2008).

Organizations are situated in an aesthetic economy. Organizations are turning to tacit knowledge and creativity to create value and profits. An artist provides a model to study the things in organizations that cannot be measured but contribute to its creation. Organizations seek creative and tacit based knowledges to further their mission (Fletcher, 2008; Chytry, 2003).

Critique of the Current Economy

Organizations seek creativity from employees, and in turn people become commodified labor. Aesthetic based work shapes employee personality for the creation of profits (Witz, Warhurst, & Nickson, 2003). Aesthetic labor is "the mobilization,

development and commodification of embodied 'dispositions'" (Bourdieu, 1984, as cited in Witz et al., 2003, p. 37). Service sectors are another example of a kind of work where employees "animate" the organization (Witz et al., 2003, p. 34). In service work employees adopt a personality to communicate the disposition of the organization (Witz et al., 2003).

In an aesthetic economy the body is the commodity for sale (Witz et al., 2003). Sexuality and gender are at the heart of affective performance. Employees are required to become an embodied image of the organizational brand. Embodied labor is aesthetic and is different than emotional labor because of "stylized workplace performances" (Witz et al., 2003, p. 50). A corporate socialization in terms of Erving Goffman's work, where employees must wear a uniform and are told to speak with the customer a certain way and with specific language. The employee's body supplies the raw material to create an artefact of the organization (Witz et al., 2003).

The hardware and software of employees has become conflated in organizational aesthetics (Witz et al., 2003). Hardware describes design and physical things in an organization and software is human flesh. Embodiment is a performance in between world and body. Over the past decade a push away from rationalization of organizations towards an aesthetic approach has developed (Witz et al., 2003). The aesthetics of an organization refer to its ontology. Embodied work is an aesthetic performance in service to the organization (Witz et al., 2003).

What is Organizational Aesthetics?

Organizational Aesthetics for Antonio Strati

Strati (2010) lays out four approaches to organizational aesthetic research: the archeological, empathic-logical, aesthetic, artistic. These approaches work against the logical and rational organizational studies paradigm that neglects emotion and sense. "The aesthetic understanding of work and organizational life studies how individuals and groups act in organizations by heeding their feelings, desires, tastes, talents, and passions" (Strati, 2010, p. 880). A researcher pays attention to their body to gain data about individual and group functioning. The researcher puts themselves into an organization and listens to it with empathy in an aesthetic approach. A researcher looks at metaphor, language, practices, and work descriptions. One way to think of this approach is that of participant observation which involves a bodily presence—at least, in traditional approaches (rather than, say, in cyberspace contexts).

Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Richard Shusterman's soma-aesthetic philosophy treat sense impressions in the tradition of John Dewey's pragmatism where bodily sensations are "due both to the external senses–sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell–and the inner bodily senses whereby one's own corporeality can be perceived in action" (Strati, 2010, p. 883). One listens to "inner voices" within an organizational context and the researcher 's inner voice (Strati, 2010, p. 883). Through our senses, the external environment and our inner body are engaged together. Organizational aesthetics researchers attend to their own body as they engage the organization. The body is perceived in action as it conducts research by paying attention to the perception of perception (Strati, 2010).

To research the aesthetic organizing of a group it is important to see the way our perception influences our perception and interpretation of that group (Strati, 2000). The

researcher needs to be aware of "…what do we look at when doing research, and what do we feel when looking at it? On what does our attention focus, and where does our sensibility finish" (Strati, 2000, p. 55)? Strati (2010) believes that this reflective capacity could be taught to business students by having them attend art classes.

The Object of Study

The identification of the aesthetic object of study is required before organizational aesthetics can be developed into a methodology (Strati, 1992). Baumgarten was the first to think about aesthetics as its own field of theory (Strati, 1996). The elusive aesthetic object in organizations is outside the general aesthetic category of beauty (Strati, 1992). Aesthetics is a form of knowing and also "an organizational dimension, aspect or object" (Strati, 1992, p. 569).

> What does exist is the organizational artifact, which escapes objectifying hypotheses and which remains distinct from the subjects operating within the organization. This artifact is a result of the interpretation of a complex of events that arise in the everyday life of an organization. (Strati, 1992, p. 580)

There is an important bridge between art and organization, but it is important not to conflate the two (Strati, 1992). "Aesthetics is not art; rather, it is concerned with sensory perceptions acquired through vision, hearing, smell, touch, and taste" (Strati, 2000, p. 54). Sensations of beauty, disgust, and sublimity affect aesthetic judgments (Strati, 2000, p. 54).

Organizational aesthetics is an inquiry that searches for a comprehensive and "holistic" approach to understanding organizations (Strati, 1992, p. 568). The researcher pays attention to their own experience of research to interpret aesthetics in organization. For example, Strati (1992) describes an office space focusing on the things within that space to identify an aesthetic object. The job of the researcher is to interpret the meaning

behind these objects within the organization (Strati, 1992). The particular form of an aesthetic object comes from the discourse surrounding it (Strati, 1992). Organizational communication creates the particular form an object takes. "…[T]he aesthetic discourse created resembles more a hologram than a photograph of the organization" (Strati, 1992, p. 575). Organizational communication is the hologram of an organization that can be interpreted.

Three parts coordinate the make-up of the hologram in organizational aesthetics (Strati, 1992). One part are the people that describe aesthetic qualities. The second component is the researcher who writes down and interprets those descriptions. The third part is the reader who interprets the interpretation of the researcher. The method requires the researcher to have a direct experience with aesthetic organizing that is unmediated by others' perceptions. The researcher receives data in real-time (Strati, 1992).

Aesthetic organizing has a similar component to hermeneutics. The researcher gathers direct experience as a reader who is also an active participant. Conversations are vehicle through which the researcher receives stories and information passively (Strati, 1992). Aesthetic discourse concerns "unique, ephemeral, and ambiguous organizational facts which, although not experienced directly by the reader, can be perceived at the level of imaginative experience and fantasy and are thus credible" (Strati, 1992, p. 577). This knowledge is the checked against "personal analogies and metaphorical processes" (Strati, 1992, p. 577). Communication and the researcher interform an interpretation that becomes the organizational text to be read.

Aesthetic Knowledge in Organizations

Three categories dominate the way we know organizations: product characteristics, work environments, and organizational culture; all have aesthetic features that aesthetic awareness can interpret (Strati, 1992). "In organization theory, the rational and structuralist paradigm stresses that aesthetics add value to organizational output" (Strati, 1996, p. 210). Chairs, for example, represent the everyday objects that go unnoticed, but communicate something about organizational aesthetics (Strati, 1996). "Chairs give distinctive connotations to an organization, its organizational levels, the activities that go on within it" (Strati, 1996, p. 212). Focus is given to the chairs epistemology rather than its ontology: what is the meaning of this chair in this space and context (Strati, 1996)?

Aesthetic understanding brings us in between science and analytic findings and intuitive knowledge found by letting things be (Strati, 1996). Organizational aesthetics is not just concerned with artifacts and the whole of an organization, "but the manner in which organizational life is approached, studied, understood" (Strati, 1996, p. 215). "aesthetics are a form of organizational knowledge" (Strati, 1996, p. 215). In most case aesthetics are "fleeting phenomenon" (Strati, 1996, p. 216). Aesthetics are a sense-based form of knowledge. Aesthetic knowledge in between science and intuition. Aesthetics provides a text to be read through sense experience. The text is located in both the body of the researcher and the organizational corpus. Aesthetic knowledge engages both sense and intellect, body and mind (Strati, 1996). Aesthetics is holistic.

Aesthetics as a Text to Read

Text and aesthetics are connected by information and communication technologies (Strati, 2005). "Aesth-hypertext" encourages a nonlinear interpretation of

organizations. "[A]esth-hypertext is constantly in the making; it is fragmentary, incomplete and ephemeral…a multiplicity of organizational languages" (Strati, 2005, p. 921). The hyper-text metaphor encompasses interpretations that slide around different mediums, images, videos, stats, speech, and the Internet. Aesthetics allows knowledge to traverse multiple mediums (Strati, 2005). The body maneuvers us through these linkages. The movement through these linkages gives form to the organization. The way a reader reads the text organizes the form (Strati, 2005). Organization is a continuous back and forth process of writing and reading. "Writing-readers" enter texts and soon begin to write those texts as performance changes from reading (Strati, 2005, p. 921-922).

An organizational aesthetic approach supplies the language to speak about what science cannot. Integrating all forms of knowing within organizational life allows for a holistic interpretation due to the number of things that go on at once. The knowledge of human actors continuously change "social and collective" organizational dimensions (Strati, 2005, p. 920). Management as design is complex, uncertain, and filled with ethical and political questions that holistic knowledge can help interpret (Strati, 2005). Aesthetics "is a form of *knowing by acting*" and incorporates "*personal knowledges*" (Strati, 2005, p. 920). Aesthetic organizing encourages thinking, perceiving, and attending to what is normally overlook. Aesthetic organization is the performance and the body.

Making the Invisible Visible.

Invisible organizational elements can be seen when we are thinking aesthetically (Strati, 1995). Invisible refers to implicit things that we do not usually pay attention to.

Photography allows researcher and participant to exist in the experience of taking a picture. In photography there is always something in between the thing photographed and the person who takes the photograph. The event is reproduced by the photograph and the one who views it (Strati, 1995). "Art photography is an *organization without walls*" (Strati, 1995, p. 83).

Aesthetic dimensions beneath the surface of attention created aesthetic discourse (Strati,1995). This discourse recreates organizing aesthetics (Strati, 1995). The style of an organization is communicated by the discourse of those whose talk about the organization (Strati, 1995). Like art photography organizations do not have walls. An organization comprises internal and external inputs in multiple contexts. In language organization aesthetics are interpreted (Strati, 1995).

Ethnographic interviews are a methodology for organizational aesthetics (Strati, 1995). A researcher collects and interprets data given in the speech and actions of organizational actors (Strati, 1995). People reveal boundary by defining themselves in a community, and the language used to draw these boundaries indicates how they situate themselves within a discourse (Strati, 1995). While language does this boundary work it is evident how malleable the boundaries shift and could be shifted.

Aesthetic organizing studies the invisible often overlooked (Strati, 1995). Organizational aesthetics "renders visible the organization that previously did not exist for the outside observer" (Strati, 1995, p. 101). Analytic approaches are unable to display the richness and fullness of invisible phenomena. Analytic knowledge cannot make visible because once something is named it no longer remains invisible. To name

imposes an organization through language and demarcates boundaries of what is and what is not.

Strati was one of the first to advance the field of organizational aesthetics. Strati's work engages aesthetics as another way of knowing. Organizational aesthetics is a bridge between analytic and sense-based understanding. Strati's approach to organizational aesthetics asks that we pay attention to our attention. The following section reviews a contemporary voice in organizational aesthetics.

Organizations are Creations of Art

Organizational Aesthetics for Steven Taylor

Organizational aesthetics is a method of interrogation whereby the researcher is aware of their awareness in the present moment (Taylor, 2013). A similar awareness happens in yoga, meditation, and the Jesuit tradition (Taylor, 2013). Organizational aesthetics is an approach that views day to day life, i.e. reality, as a canvas. Humans create organizations with others in the way a human being creates a piece of art (Taylor, 2013). For Merleau-Ponty, a painter turns the world into painting through the body. In organizations, bodies turn *this* context into an organization. Organizational aesthetics makes visible by sense the collection of bodies in an organizational corpus.

An aesthetic theory of organizing enables us to simultaneous understand what is happening in the outside world and within ourselves (Taylor, 2013). This co-creative activity takes place amongst internal and external and bodies. Organizational aesthetics theoretically allows emergence to occur. Emergence happens by "letting things be" (Küpers, 2015). We ought to approach the organizational text as an open state (Taylor, 2013). The organizational lifeworld made of actions, communication, bodies, and

languages. The text is the way internally and externally these things impinge upon our senses. Organizations treated in this manner are like a piece of created art (Taylor, 2013).

Organizational aesthetics is "the possibility of living one's life…as a work of art" (Taylor, 2013, p. 30). The life lived in organizations is no different than a work of art (Taylor, 2013). When to be flexible and let things emerge and when to be tight and inflexible is an aesthetic skill. Aesthetic organizing seeks to understand how we make sense of organizational contexts and how it shapes organizational members (Taylor, 2013). Aesthetic theories of organizing discuss "epistemology, art, and the meaning of life" (Taylor, 2013, p. 30).

To have an awareness of our awareness is to attend to the contexts and perceptions, externally and internally, that the body is the site of (Küpers, 2015). Affect and atmospheres get in touch with our bodies (Anderson, 2009) and the body is the mediator in this relationship (Küpers, 2015). Aesthetics is the method that makes us mindful of sense.

Aesthetic organizing sees organizations as flexible, adaptive, spontaneous, and open canvas to the unfolding of lived experience in organizational contexts (Taylor, 2013). Organizing is created like a piece of art which creates new space and ways of being. Organizational aesthetics interprets organizational phenomenon beneath the visible plane. The organizational context is molded by bodies that are in touch with it (Taylor, 2013).

Aesthetics Enters Structures of Language

Taylor and Hansen (2005) are interested in the way aesthetics can be implemented into analytic theories. Taylorization and Scientific Management view beauty as

efficiency (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). Aesthetics was a big movement in post-positivism owing its beginning to "symbolic interactionism (that includes social construction and dramaturgy), postmodernism, and critical theory" (Taylor & Hansen, 2005, p. 1226). An aesthetic approach to organizations, on the other hand, views data production as socially created (Taylor & Hansen, 2005, p. 1225). Organizational research has evolved from efficiency and effectiveness, to morals and ethics, and now to an aesthetic model (Taylor & Hansen, 2005).

Aesthetics has to do with sense and of the senses that have been engaged. Organizational aesthetics is a theory that understands "…organizational members are the creators and artists" (Taylor & Hansen, 2005, p. 1226). Aesthetics as a response to Descartes' separation of mind/body which Vico, Baumgarten, and Kant took up. Polanyi's tacit knowledge is another example of aesthetic knowledge (Taylor and Hansen, 2005). Aesthetics is a different way of knowing. The form of art brings aesthetic elements into "co-created, rhythmic experiences that express our shared meaning making" (Taylor & Hansen, 2005, p. 1215-1216). Aesthetics exist for their own sake and withstands instrumentalization. Aesthetics reorganize the categories we see the world through.

Organizational aesthetics interprets organizations as aesthetic sense interprets art. "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" (Taylor and Hansen, 2005, p. 1224). Aesthetics bring us into social dimensions created by human language and tacit knowledge.

Organizational aesthetics "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" (Taylor and Hansen, 2005, p. 1224). Atmospheres and affect, and non-physical entities that lack structure can be given corporality from sense. Aesthetics gives language to speak about sense. To get an accurate interpretation of the organization the researcher must have reflexivity (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). Inter-corporeal reflexivity is needed to overcome the gap between employee descriptions and the researcher's interpretation of that description (Taylor & Hansen, 2005).

An aesthetic theory understands organizations outside rationality, instrumentalism, and analytic procedures (Taylor, Bathhurst, Ladkin, Meisiek, & Wood, 2012). Aesthetics allows us to preserve a research integrity and richness outside profit and efficiency (Taylor et al., 2012). The information and data gathered by sense can be viewed through an aesthetic frame to give it form (Taylor, 2016). Aesthetics enables reflexivity to see our frames of reference. Artists and organizational theorists need to come together to create methods (Taylor et al., 2012).

Methods of Organizational Aesthetics

Attention to Attention

How is aesthetic research conducted (Warren, 2008)? One part of this research process is to pay attention to one's attention, by paying attention to what our attention becomes fixated upon (Warren, 2008). Strati's aesthetic research method puts the researcher into the organizational text, and from that position become aware of their

experience of the text. Warren (2008) pushes one step further to include the aesthetic experience of the other. This is how the sense of organizational corpus is interpreted.

Warren (2008) researched emotion in organizations using interviews. Participants took photographs of the organization that Warren (2008) used to coordinate an aesthetic entrance into the conversation. To find aesthetic judgments of participants, Warren (2008) used participant narratives to locate judgements from their past and current experience of organizational aesthetics. To working from past to present experience is a way to see the future.

Language, metaphor, and stories allow us to access aesthetic readings of texts. Metaphor is a poetization of aesthetics. Metaphor poeticizes aesthetics. Aesthetic language embodies ideas (Warren 2008). We subjectively feel aesthetic encounters through our individual body, however "the *interpretation* of those encounters is socially shaped" (Warren, 2008, p. 561). Aesthetics reveals the origin of part and whole, the hermeneutic circle, and independent bodies in an interdependent organizational corpus. Aesthetics are interpreted by sensation. The body exclusively experiences sense individually, but our interpretation of that encounter is socially shaped by the corpus.

Critical Approach to Aesthetic Labor

Aesthetics runs through every part of an organization and daily life. Weick's sensemaking informs us that the content given to experience from narrative and discourse informs sense experience (Beyes, 2016a). The ethical challenge of aesthetics is the commodification bodily experience that reenergizes those narratives and discourse. Socially constructed narratives are artistically shaped. The creativity of artists have been

co-opted by capitalism towards the commodification of sense experience through artistic narratives (Beyes, 2016a).

The economy needs to be understood through aesthetics because rational and cognitive approaches are not sufficient (Beyes, 2016a). The new paradigm of capitalism relies on "entrepreneurial self-reliant" ways of thinking (Beyes, 2016a, p. 119). Art can be used as a commodity and also metaphysical substance. Art has not been tied to use value, however, today's economy, organization, and labor are all being driven by aesthetic intelligence (Beyes, 2016a). Aesthetic and artistic treatments stem from the immateriality of labor (Beyes, 2016a). Emotion, affective, and sense-based labor is theoretical, communicative, and social.

The aesthetic labor that an entrepreneurial subjectivity performs is self-work (Beyes, 2016a). Aesthetic labor requires humans change their sense, emotion, feeling, subjectivity, and embodiment to the desires of capital. This "engineers affect" or Sloterdijk's "atmospheric politics" which leads to "biopolitical management" (Beyes, 2016a, p. 121). The aestheticization of everyday life creates a predictable population (Beyes, 2016a). Organizational aesthetics has power to change, shift, and shape the corpus of bodies which signals ethical consideration of the other.

Aesthetic research is a way to see the everyday without decisive boundaries (Beyes, 2016a). Art reflects on itself by showing its production which allows it to have emergent properties. Organizational aesthetics views cognition and sensemaking as intertwined (Beyes, 2016a, p. 118). Organization are atmospheres that "takes shape as a swirl of affect, constructed from constellations of objects, stories, technologies, texts, human bodies and their affective capacities" (Beyes, 2016a, p. 115). Beyes (2016a, p.

61

115) says this is in accord with Rancière's "distribution of the sensible". Aesthetic

organizing within the "sensible fabric of experience" shapes what is seen (Beyes, 2016a,

p. 124).

In capitalism, creative labor relies on aesthetics and artists (Beyes, 2016a). An

"experience economy" (p. 115), "creative industries" (p. 115-116), "aesthetic capitalism"

(p. 116), and "design-economy" (p. 120) require creativity (Beyes, 2016a). Aesthetic

theories of sense and body are needed to meet the current situation of management and

organization (Beyes, 2016a). For example, managing as a curator does a museum

collection (Beyes, 2016a.)

> …the 'aesthetic turn' provokes the organizational scholar to engage with struggles
> over what can be felt, seen and expressed and to locate those moments and
> situations in which the relation between the order of space, affect, speech and
> visibility is suspended and redrawn. (Beyes, 2016a, p. 124).

Other theories that organizational aesthetics complements are affective theory,

speculative realism, "non-representational approaches to spatial analysis", and

performance studies (Beyes, 2016a, p. 118).

The "poetics of organization" refer to the assumption that sense is constantly

changing within organizations (Beyes, 2016a, p. 122). Boundaries of organizations are

not fixed. Organizational aesthetics recognizes the material and nonmaterial things that

intertwine in the body. Sense allows access to see lived experience transcending the

interior and the exterior of the body. Given from narratives and discourse is sense

experience. Creative, aesthetic, and design capitalism demand that bodies aesthetically

attune themselves to the demands of capitalism. Organizational aesthetic theory must

take an ethical and critical approach otherwise it will succumb to the forces of capitalism

and further aestheticize bodies.

Juxtaposition Method

Ethics and politics are embedded into organizational aesthetics. Art can be used as a counter-narrative to dominant ideology. A photograph or work of art shows to us collective memories. Art lifts us out of the status quo we have been taught to accept as brand and image; and creates sense counters the memory of the majority. A work of art "reorganizes memory" because it teaches us new ways to experience ourselves with in the collective (Sørensen, 2014, p. 292). Art reveals collective beliefs that we overlook. Art has the power to reorganize memory and beliefs. Reorganization exposes dominant ideologies (Sørensen, 2014).

An organizational researcher is not an artist. Organizational aesthetic researchers use art to find new ways to say something about an artifact (Sørensen, 2014). Art finds the means to express thing unsaid or invisible by creating "new sensations" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, as cited in Sørensen, 2014, p. 293) that other methods cannot. Art opens new routes to seeing, saying, and knowing the intangible world. The new sensation that surface from art help to articulate the object (Sørensen, 2014).

Juxtaposition is a method that compares art to an organizational object (Sørensen, 2014). King (2003) for example juxtaposes a Mondrain painting to think about organizational charts. Art creates frame interpterion of past subjects, cultures, and people (Sørensen, 2010). For example, a piece of high art stands as a standard description of a person from the past (Sørensen, 2010). Sørensen (2010) takes Caravaggio's painting of St. Paul's Conversion to show how an individual was constructed. In Christianity the individual was in the corpus, the body of Christ, which then switched to labor and work, and today the market has taken over the God term (Sørensen, 2010). Sørensen (2010)

juxtaposes a historical piece with an contemporary piece to see what they say about individualism, for example.

The power and control of the individual comes from knowledge, not force, in aesthetic organization (Sørensen, 2010). "Art is always already organizing our world in an ongoing process of aesthetic landscaping" (Gagliardi, 2006, as cited in Sørensen, 2010, p. 321). Aesthetic landscaping, termed by Gagliardi, is the idea that art creates us can, and can be brought to organizations. There is "*organization in art*" (p. 309) and aesthetic "artefacts are the technologies" used to form the perception of docile subjects (Sørensen, 2010, p. 310).

King (2003) shares a similar sentiment to Sørensen (2010, 2014) that organizational aesthetics uses methods of art to view organizational material and non-material objects. For Cézanne, painting meant a return to "the truth of seeing, that is, the actual form of our knowledge of things" (King, 2003, p. 200). Cézanne wished to show vision before our actual knowledge of the thing changes it as it comes into being. For Cézanne, perspective skewed truth (Kind, 2003).

A Semiotic Method

Sørensen (2010) critiques that Strati's work is too romantic and does not account for power. Sørensen (2010) and Hancock (2005) both suggest the method of semiotics for organizational aesthetics to overcome romanticism. Semiotics is a method to analyze aesthetic artefacts in organization (Hancock, 2005). A semiotic approach to organizational aesthetics

> is made possible by the ways in which its subject matter functions by tapping into a reservoir of shared meanings and culturally located aesthetic categories and experiences, and ordering them into particular, though often temporary,

constellations of aestheticized signs and signifying relations (Hancock, 2005, p. 40).

Rhetoric uncovers more of what organizational objects are and not just what they say there are. Aesthetic knowledge bypasses cognition and creates a "sensual relationship" between employee and organization (Hancock, 2005, p. 30). Organizational artifacts for Gagliardi are

> those products of human action that, by virtue of their very materiality, possess the capacity to be moulded and presented, or, in his terminology, landscaped, in such a way as to generate a specifically aestheticized regime of meaning or pathos. (Hancock, 2005)

For Gagliardi, aesthetics are a power ideological media because actions, norms, and values are shaped by them (Hancock, 2005). The way an artifact is semiotically encoded determines its aesthetic appeal and meaning to each person (Hancock, 2005, p. 38). An aesthetic artefact brings collective and shared meanings to our interpretation and sense of it. Humans create the sensations that surround aesthetic artifacts and the pathos of those artifacts are embodied.

Aesthetic landscaping is the contextual situation that we have consented to be in creates us (Hancock, 2005). The landscape that artefacts reside in organizes them into a certain "regime" (Hancock, 2005, p. 39). Organizational actors bring something to the artefact just as the artefact brings something to them. Organizational aesthetics exposes this powerful media that shapes us and exerts control (Hancock, 2005).

This might seem to be a conceptual reach; however, since over a century ago, it was known that art is a powerful controller (Hancock, 2005). Art has been an aesthetic and moral force, and recently combine the two to become an economic force (Hancock,

2005). Organizational aesthetics needs to engage non-rational space and take a critical view of it.

A semiotic organizational aesthetic finds objects in their full unmediated form (Hancock, 2005). An aesthetically informed semiotic method analyzes objects in their context to understand how their meaning has been made. Organizational aesthetics and semiotics teach access to in the between where signs shape the artifacts we experience (Hancock, 2005).

Aesthetics induces a sense-based interpretation of the structural levels where rhetoric shapes beliefs, values, and spaces (Hancock, 2005). From semiotics, organizational aesthetics gains a methodology to see the shared signs that make up an artifact and to track the change of these signs. Semiotics show how collective meaning to an organizational object is assigned, and how that object also changes the signs used to speak it. The artifacts are surrounded by a landscape of values, beliefs, and attitudes from which they emerge. Transitioning to the next section, semiotics work similarly to color; the meaning of a word is contingent on other words to describe it, and color take on meaning based upon the colors that surround it.

Color as Method

Color is a medium used to understand organizations (Beyes, 2016b). Organization affects color and color affects organization (Beyes, 2016b). The organization of color is "attuned to the mediality, materiality and affectivity of colour" (Beyes, 2016b, p. 5). Color is a "relational phenomenon" (Beyes, 2016b, p. 2). Color has doubleness through contrast and complement, "making possible…sensing and being

sensed, knowing and being known" (Cubitt, 2014, as cited in Beyes, 2016b, p. 2). Color is "awash with affect" (Beyes, 2016b, p. 2).

Goethe's book, *Theory of Colours*, shows that color is always in movement (Beyes, 2016b, p. 4). Goethe's theory of colour was the first aesthetic organizing (Beyes, 2016b). Goethe theorized movement and relationality as the way "colour affects the human body, pulling the perceiver into the perceived" (Beyes, 2016b, p. 6). Since color is a medium it affects how we experience things and the organization of those things. Color shapes and is being shaped through human perception (Beyes, 2016b). A poetics of organization by color concludes that organizational researcher ought to be most interested in the way bodies are organized with aesthetics (Beyes, 2016b). Color changes the relationship of our body to organizations.

Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenological Method

Organizations are researched as modern entities, which exclude embodiment and emotion (Küpers, 2002). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology can open the emotional and aesthetic life-worlds in organizations that the research has yet to do. People connected to organizations, employees and customers for example, know the organization through their perception, and perception is grounded in the body. An organization and bodies interaction to create perception. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy supports the interconnection of body, world, and other in organization (Küpers, 2002).

Perception is an interaction between the external world and the body (Küpers, 2002). The body, although distinct in the world, is not separate from it (Küpers, 2002, p. 22). The intertwinement between the body and the world shape perception. The "lived body" is the body that extends beyond its skin (Küpers, 2002, p. 28). This body "feels

the 'here,' and also lives 'there'" (Küpers, 2002, p. 28). Sense is where self and world converge at the body. "At this level, there is no separation between self, other, and world. This is the self, which emerges from the world and merges with the world because it is the world" (Küpers, 2002, p. 28).

The body is able to interpret phenomena at the site where body, world, and other converge and blossom. Perception is a collective act with others. Perception births a world and makes "*consciousness perceptual*" (Küpers, 2002, p. 22). Consciousness is known through perception, and perception is given through others. "The body is the natural symbol of society, the ontological reference of all human organisation and our unconscious transference of it" (Douglas, 1982, as cited in Küpers, 2002, p. 31). The corporeality of language is heard in phrases such as, ""Did you grasp the idea?" "Your words touched me." "You are rubbing me the wrong way!"" (Küpers, 2002, p. 37). Metaphor indicates the way language touches the body, and perception indicates the way others touch the body.

Narrative captures the process of aesthetic organizing (Küpers, 2002, p. 22). Narrative and aesthetics are both relational process. Narrative units, particularly stories, "are a fundamental form in which people express values and reasons, and subsequently make decision about action" (Küpers, 2002, p. 31). Aesthetics and language are brought together by our creative experience that interprets narratives. Narratives "evoke specific thoughts, feelings, images and communications" (Gagliardi, 1996, p. 566, as cited in Küpers, 2002, p. 32). The emotions of organizational members are grounded in organizational narratives (Küpers, 2002).

Tension is created when employees must shape their emotions to conform to the strategy of the organization. Interpersonal communication is implicated because the aesthetic of an organizational pathos requires that a human change theirs for the organization. The implication of this research for daily organizational life is "…persons and their worlds as well as their *aesthetic experiences are emergent "products" of relational processes*" (Küpers, 2002, p. 27). Organizations are created by bodies in an emergent relational process. Aesthetics makes this relational process visible.

The insight from Merleau-Ponty is that social relations are body relations too. Organizations are created by humans who relate in a social world (Küpers, 2002). Aesthetic organizing views to, attends to, and sees the relationality of bodies in organizations (Küpers, 2002). In organizational aesthetics research, one attends to their own emotions while be in touch with another's emotions. The reflexivity of aesthetic organizing philosophized by Merleau-Ponty would be that "we are acquiring our skills by dealing with things and situation, and in turn they influence how things and situation show up for as requiring our responses" (Küpers, 2002, p. 28). Bodies create organizations and the organizational corpus creates bodies (Küpers, 2002). New situations are enacted from existing situations.

The viewing body and object are an example of reversibility (Küpers, 2002). A new ontology in organization is available in Merleau-Ponty's critique of Cartesian metaphysics (Küpers, 2002). The "body-subject" is interconnected with the world and the things around it (Küpers, 2002, p. 36). Merleau-Ponty's non-dualistic and non-rational philosophy grounds organizational aesthetics methods in continental philosophy. This means methods of interrogation—"reflection" and reflexivity" "receptivity and

corresponding responsiveness"—for organizational aesthetics are attainable. What we know about an object is the extent to which ourselves (Küpers, 2002, p. 36).

Aesthetic knowledge reveal what cannot quite be said or seen and is an important part of organizational aesthetics. The lived body senses the invisible and allows those things to speak and be seen (Küpers, 2002). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology interrogates the "unperceivable and unspeakable in the pregnant silence of our bodily being" (Küpers, 2002, p. 37). The "Invisible" is the "incarnate mystery of life" that sense, not rationality, knows (Küpers, 2002, p. 37). Organizational aesthetics makes visible the intertwinement of bodies in organization with Merleau-Ponty (Küpers, 2002).

Sensemaking in Organizational Aesthetics

Brown, Colville, and Pye (2015, p. 266) make the connection between organizational aesthetics and sensemaking through five lens: "discourse, power/ politics, micro/macro concerns, identities and decision making/change". Sensemaking is concerned with the way humans generate a text and then interpret that text. "Interpretation implies" an object already exists to be interpreted (2015, p. 267). Interpretation is discovery based and sensemaking invention. The texts sensemaking interrogates are practice, language, and communication (Brown et al., 2015). Sensemaking is theoretically grounded in phenomenology, processes, interpretation, and social construction (Brown et al., 2015). The ambiguity and uncertainty that is experienced in organizations is what sensemaking interrogates (Brown et al., 2015). Organizational Aesthetics makes visible the text that humans generate and then interpret from. Organizational aesthetics makes visible the hermeneutic circle, and studies it in real-time.

Clouds

Kenneth Gergen was the first to think about organizations outside structure, and referred to them as clouds (O'Doherty, 2008). Organizations as clouds was theorized around the time of the linguistic turn in philosophy, broadly termed post-modernism. This perspective holds that a multiplicity of paradigms, not just one that explains everything. Organizations function like the blur in clouds (O'Doherty, 2008).

Aesthetic organizing takes into account all the phenomena that contribute to organizing (O'Doherty, 2008). The blur takes into account the inside of a body and how it manifests itself into lived experience. Blur gives us a way

> to explore how the architecture of an 'inside'—our body, thoughts, perceptions, emotions, the physiology of our sense apparatus—folds into an 'empirical outside' via the production of theoretical defences and prosthetics that frame and inhibit that which we take to be 'real'. (O'Doherty, 2008, p. 538)

Blur opens our senses to communication that we have not experienced before (O'Doherty, 2008).

An art exhibit with a cloud over a lake shows the blur of an organization in a cloud (O'Doherty, 2008). People walk through the vaporous cloud on two floating walk ways that stretch to the center. The cloud makes visible the immateriality of an organization. Inside that cloud are bodies. Bodies create organizations. The blur exhibit makes organization visible and proves that bodies are the substance that are in organization. The blur is the space the lived body inhabits. Blur viscerally points out the space we "choose to ignore" (O'Doherty, 2008, p. 556).

The work of Strati is sociological, liberal-idealism, and his attempt to blend phenomenology, hermeneutics, existentialism, and deconstruction into aesthetic organizing is probably too much (O'Doherty, 2008). Strati's insight pointed out that

"embodiment and affective dispositions train an attentiveness to phenomena", which is not looked at in organizational research (O'Doherty, 2008, p. 542). Blur makes visible the multiple acting forces in affective space. Aesthetic organizing is the interpretation of an event compared to a method (O'Doherty, 2008).

"Generative building" focuses on the construction of texts that become the texts that are interpreted from (O'Doherty, 2008, p. 548). At intersections bodies converge in affective space and create organization. The full organization that is created we are not yet seeing. The blur exhibit reveals the visible organizational cloud that everyday perception veils (O'Doherty, 2008). Corporeally, blur makes us aware that our body is the thing within organization; from this posture a text is created from which an interpretation is generated. Organizational aesthetics helps us to see this process.

Why Organizational Aesthetics

Art and Business

The benefit to include arts-based learning to management and leadership training is that students would get tactile training by making art using different mediums (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). In the arts, people think this is a bad idea because art would then be used for profit and capitalistic enterprise. On the other hand, this could legitimize the arts to business and make money to give back to the arts (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). Art help us to see holistically through embodied understanding. Organizations are creative spaces and can art unlock human potential within this space (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009).

Arts-based approaches are popular in management studies because the organizational context is approached differently than with logic and rationality (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). Sense and aesthetics reveal different insights to logic, cognition, and

rationality. Artistic forms present descriptions of phenomena that rational paradigms lose or are not able to access. "This embodied knowing is often tacit, not logical, self-contradictory, and heavily laden with emotionality" (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009, p. 65). There is a significant importance to the process adopted by an organization. An art's-based method would suggest that different interpretations result, when we use clay to LEGOs, water color to crayons, to sculpt organizational strategy (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009).

Moving Aesthetic Organizations into Phronesis

Organizational aesthetics is a phronetic activity (Eidinow & Ramirez, 2012). Phronesis is the tacit skill that organizational aesthetics researches. Phronesis is always an embodied activity because the doing cannot be separated from the one doing it, just like art (Eidinow & Ramirez, 2012). Phronesis can only be studied in the action of its performance, and art is the research of that embodied performance. Aesthetics is an examination of implicit learning (Eidinow & Ramirez, 2012). "This idea of implicit learning through an aesthetic sense leads to another example, which involves the development of phronesis in and through leadership" (Eidinow & Ramirez, 2012, p. 38). Phronesis is developed by the practice of leadership because leadership is a phronetic. Sense pays attention "to the rhythm of conversation" by the ear, or how the skin perceives the tension and stress of voices and decisions in a meeting. These are examples of the forms that organizational aesthetics makes visible (Eidinow and Ramirez, 2012). Communicative contexts are saturated with more than data than logic and rationality can interpret. Sense helps us to see the whole and reach out to find things.

Conclusion

Organization aesthetics developed in the 1990's as response to rationalism and logic in organizational studies research. Strati and Gagliardi initially developed the field of organizational aesthetics. A central question to organizational aesthetic literature is what is the aesthetic object? The aesthetic object is the text that a body generates and acts from and then reflexivity in the act of generating interprets. Aesthetic organization privileges the interpretation of the sense of language, story, narrative, discourse, text and interpreter. The way a body feels these things renders an interpretation different than logic. Through sense, organizational aesthetics engages the interconnection of internal body and external world. The body is constantly changing to render new observations that logic and rationality cannot.

This chapter covered why the current economy is aesthetic and why organizational aesthetics meets the experience of those in organization. This was followed by methods of organizational aesthetics. Julmi (2017) makes the point that atmospheres are a new way to study organization as non-dualistic approaches. Atmospheres are related to aesthetics and hold aesthetic and non-aesthetic qualities.

CHAPTER 4

Atmospheres, Affect, Aesthetics, Body, and Organization

Atmospheres and affect are interconnected that together showcase an aesthetic organization grounded in the body. Building off of chapter two, atmospheres and affect reveal that organizations lack visible structure but are built out of bodies. The blur (O'Doherty, 2008) makes visible the tangibility of organization because a body was brought to the installation. Organizations, as well as all bodies, have dimensions *that* cannot be seen. Organizational aesthetics penetrates that assumption of invisibility to learn the proper interrogation necessary to see. Phronesis signifies the knowledge to adapt and to empathetically see the other side.

The availability of texts that are incorporated in atmospheres by affect are accessed reflexively. Phronesis is generated by reflexivity in an organization. The researcher's lived experience of the text can be juxtaposed against atmospheres and affect. Atmospheres and affect are a co-created phenomenon made from bodies and constitute a corpus of bodies. Atmospheres and affect are like the blur cloud from the exhibit O'Doherty (2008) mentions.

The approach to organizational aesthetics is to simulate aesthetically the intercourse of bodies have to generate atmospheres by affect in organizational contexts. Organizational aesthetics renders a mirror of the mirror. Atmospheres and affect can be made visible. Reflexivity bridges the gap between part and whole, between the interpretation of a researcher and the atmospheres and affect that are a creation of the whole corpus. Organizational aesthetics applies Merleau-Ponty's seeing and being seen, touching and being touched. Textual interpretation is an ontology. The ontology of

painting interprets oscillation from the hermeneutic circle. Atmospheres and affect produce and are being produced by generating bodies.

The first section of this chapter discusses the interconnection between atmospheres and affect (Anderson, 2009). Section two discusses the meaning of atmospheres in organizations through aesthetics, ambiguity, and an application to marketing. Section three discusses atmospheres that are built in urban and city development, performance, architecture, and art. Section four discusses affect, linking affect to atmospheres, art, and bodies. Section five introduces Merleau-Ponty's work in conversation with atmospheres and affect, followed by the conclusion in section six.

Taylor (2013) and Taylor et al. (2012) discussion organizational aesthetics in terms of leadership and management. These communication-based activities signal that an aesthetic theory of organizational communication would make a contribution. Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics from *Eye and Mind* give a description for a sense-based communication. Organizational aesthetics mashes art, philosophy, body, and organization together. The organizational aesthetics literature sought an aesthetic object. In this chapter, atmospheres and affect, are suggested to function as that elusive aesthetic object in an organization. The invisible aesthetic object to be interrogated is the blur. Atmospheres and affect are the blur that bodies create and are being created by.

Aesthetics, Atmospheres, Affect, and Organizational Studies Research

A theory of organizational aesthetic communication takes that statement and builds a concrete way to understand the way bodies converge to incorporate an organization. Gernot Böhme is the scholar who has done the most work on atmospheres (Ott, Bean, & Marin, 2016). Atmospheres are an ambiguous aesthetic context created by

affective bodies (Anderson, 2009). Sensemaking supplies the content such as choice and decision-making (Weick, 1989) that can be used to interpret atmospheres and affect aesthetically. Communication, discourse, verbal and non-verbal language, time, and space are also examples of content.

Sense opens new dimensions to this invisible content. To make invisible to other people methods of organizational aesthetics are to interpret these phenomena. Atmospheres are "quasi-things" (Griffero, 2013), they are material and non-material. Atmospheres are fields of intensity made by bodies (Fotaki, 2017). Atmospheres hold human and non human things in them that bodies hold (Michels & Steyaert, 2017). Rancière's "distribution of the sensible" (Beyes, 2016a, p. 115) is an example of the distribution of affect throughout sensing bodies in an atmosphere.

The etymological roots of atmosphere are Greek and Latin. In Greek the word atoms means "vapour or steam" and "implies a sense of blowing, inspiring, arousing" (Tawa, 2014, p. 12). (Tawa, 2014, p. 12). In Latin the word atmosphaera means "sphere" (Tawa, 2014, p. 12). Atmospheres simultaneously reveal and conceal while being both present and absent (Tawa, 2014). Atmospheres are "the palpable manifestation of a medium, milieu or situation" (Gernot Böhme, 2010, p. 27, as cited in Tawa, 2014, p. 12). Similar to "when rays of sunlight enable us to perceive dust-laden air" (Tawa, 2014, p. 12). Atmospheres position things within spaces and are invisible.

The body is an underdeveloped topic in organizational research, but is slowly becoming an emphasis in the literature through affective studies (Fotaki, Kenny, & Vachhani, 2017). Affect originally was studied as a romantic concept until empirical research took embodiment out of it (Malin, 2016). Affect is "impersonal and objective"

while emotion is "personal and subjective" (Anderson, 2009, p. 80). Affect, is a transmission of intensities among bodies and "exceeds a singular body" (Fotaki et al., 2017, p. 5). The rhythms, intensities, or feelings that bodies produce and transmit to other bodies describes affect. Affect is sensed when, for example, we walk into a room and interpret the atmosphere (Fotaki et al., 2017).

Affect is not the same as emotion (Anderson, 2009; Ott et al. 2016). Affect is different than emotion, in that we consciously are aware of emotion while affect "escapes human awareness" (Malin, 2016, p. 40). Emotion is personal, whereas affect is intersubjective (Anderson, 2009). The intersubjectivity of affect is similar to the distribution of the sensible in that way that it is spread out amongst bodies. These distributions create organizations as atmospheres that blur helps us to recognize.

The body of the researcher is a central component in the research process of organizational contexts (Fotaki, 2017). The use of the researcher's body is a consistent theme within the organizational aesthetics literature (Fotaki et al., 2017; Thibaud, 2011). The body of the researcher is a medium that receives affective responses from other bodies, objects, languages, and emotions. A researcher observes and acts within the research process (Fotaki et al. 2017), and effects interpretation of phenomena. The contribution a researcher makes to affective atmospheres is part of the research bias. In Merleau-Ponty's terms it functions like seeing and being seen, touching and being touched. The researcher's observation and action overlap, like seeing and being seen, touching and being touched.

Organizational research has typically viewed organizations as "static concepts that reify and freeze the complexity and intricacy of embodied experience" (Fotaki et al.,

2017, p. 7). Affect theory can be brought into aesthetic organizational research through critical, feminism, psychoanalysis, and non-humanist philosophical traditions (Fotaki et al., 2017). Feminism is one helpful paradigm due to its emphasis on the body, emotion, feeling, and sense (Fotaki, et al. 2017). Mumby (1996) writes about feminism's ability to trace power, resistance, and communication in the formation of gendered identities in organization. Genealogy and interpretation influence the reading of bodies of research (Mumby, 1996).

Affect is how we "see, anew, the 'texture' of the world, as it is lived and experienced" in organizations (Fotaki et al., 2017, p. 5). Affect is an "extra-linguistic" phenomenon (Fotaki, 2017, p. 6). "From the perspective of organization theory, affect emphasizes the intersubjective transmission of intensity: that which exists between bodies" (Fotaki, 2017, p. 6). Affect is not a singular but intersubjective phenomenon shared among all organizational bodies. Feminism offers ways to access this "intercorporeal transmission" (Fotaki, 2017, p. 7). Labor, production, service, and consumption confirm the transmission among organizational members (Fotaki et al., 2017). From a critical theory perspective, affect is a way to research new practices of labor and production in organizations (Fotaki et al., 2017). Affect is infused into products that ties purchases to the body (Fotaki et al., 2017).

Immaterial labor, production, and use of affect to coerce are ways the Italian Workerists and Italian Post-workerists theorize organizations (Fotaki et al., 2017). Affect is a social and natural phenomenon (Blackman & Venn, 2010). Affective labor is today's dominant mode of production. Affect is a central component of the economy to create

capital. Affect is tied to the bodies and lingers among bodies. Affect is between mind

and body, thinking and feeling processes. Affect is an

> assemblage, flow, turbulence, emergence, becoming, compossibility, relationality,
> the machinic, the inventive, the event, the virtual, temporality, autopoiesis,
> heterogeneity and the informational. (Blackman & Couze, 2010, p. 7).

The body is the tool to conduct affective research. The body is studied to interpret affect.

Affect and body operate as "co-enactment, co-emergence and co-evolution" (Blackman

& Venn, 2010, p. 10).

Atmospheres and Affect in an Aesthetic Economy

An aesthetic economy is based on desire in capitalism (Böhme, 2003). Adorno

and Horkheimer's book, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, was the first to critique the culture

industry (Böhme, 2003). Art and culture are combine into aesthetic production.

Capitalism exploits desires rather than meeting the needs of a population (Böhme, 2003).

Aesthetics carries value into the exchange of products. For example, consumers position

themselves around brand. This self-positioning creates an atmosphere from which value

can be generated.

Atmospheres make our bodies and our lives (Böhme, 2003). Both Veblen and

Sombart critiqued the atmosphere created by luxury. An aesthetic economy intensifies

life. A desire based economy is aesthetic. Aesthetics stages values rather than create use

value (Böhme, 2003). Though desire, capitalism teaches us to aesthetically accumulate.

Labor is immaterial today, and aesthetic production adds value (Böhm & Land

(2012). Communication, language, and aesthetics are examples of immaterial labor.

Value is added to production this way. Communication, language, and aesthetics are the

tools of production in an immaterial economy. "One could even say that the 'production

of organization' increasingly is the business of the 'organization of production'" (Böhm & Land, 2012, p. 220). Communication is the immaterial labor used in the production of an aestheticized economy. Production, the commodity, and labor are aesthetic in the economy (Böhm & Land, 2012). Communication produces a commodity, which itself is communication that is bought and sold, and the labor used to produce it is communication. When production, the commodity, and the labor are all communicative events, one's life becomes work (Böhm & Land, 2012).

For example, communication platforms, such as Facebook or Twitter, are the means of production. To post something on Facebook is a communicative event. The post is the commodity itself and is a free labor produced by communication. In this new economy, aesthetics can study immateriality of communication, language, and labor. An aesthetic theory of organizational communication can make visible immaterial forms of today's organizations that individual and collective bodies are situated within. The rise of linguistic technologies that can analyze communication on the Internet is a way to predict human behavior in an aesthetic economy.

Data Mining in an Aesthetic Economy

The communication potential of a product is its value in marketing and branding (Böhm & Land, 2012). Marketing and internet data mining are important to the conversation of an aesthetic economy (Andrejevic, 2011). Marketing tactics such as "sentiment analysis" and 'predictive analytics' are used in "affective economics" (Andrejevic, 2011, p. 604). Jenkins points this out in the book, *Convergence Culture* (Andrejevic, 2011). The sentiment and communication one inputs into a computer is used for real-time experiments without consent. For example, a mood analysis is where

81

social media, twitter, blogs, etc. are mined for their content. The mining analyzes the language and conducts an emotional analysis (Andrejeciv, 2011). Data is supplied to organizations through our interactions on the internet.

For example, reality TV capitalizes on affective participation and viewership (Campaiola-Veen, 2012). This localizes affect and still maintains a global appeal. The show Idol maintains world appeal and aesthetically localizes the global brand to a French audience (Campaiola-Veen, 2012). Affect attaches viewers at home to the contestants. The contestants are ordinary people like us who could have also been selected. The global brands aesthetically appeal global culture to local audience through affect. (Campaiola-Veen, 2012). Aesthetics cross cultures through a dimension similar to all humans. Conceivably, one could surmise that the similarity is the body and sense.

Atmospheres in Organization

What are Atmospheres

Atmospheres and affect are connected (Anderson, 2009). Anderson (2009, p. 77) asks, how we are "to attend to the collective affects 'in which we live'"? Atmospheres are made up of those collective affects. Ambiguity is how we begin to make sense of affective atmospheres (Anderson, 2009). The ambiguity of atmospheres is the text to be read that can describe their features to us (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres press upon us as we press upon them (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres put us "between presence and absence, between subject and object/subject and between the definite and indefinite" (Anderson, 2009, p. 77). In Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology we are touching and are being touched; both subject and object, presence and absence are in the movement of engagement. Body and world are interconnected in a similar way. Merleau-Ponty's

ontology in *Eye and Mind* elaborates how the painter's body goes between while retaining the other.

Subjectivity is created through the back and forth relation (Anderson, 2009). Phenomenology helps us think about space in between bodies in organizations. Phenomenology is the method that can interpret atmospheres and affect (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres are made from bodies but also exceed bodies, and phenomenology gives a lens to see this (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres "form and deform, appear and disappear, as bodies in relation with one another" (Anderson, 2009, p. 79). Phenomenology can show the process by which atmospheres continually become and change (Anderson, 2009).

Two scholars who have written extensively on atmospheres as an aesthetic concept are Gernot Böhme and Mikel Dufrenne (Anderson, 2009). Atmospheres are quasi phenomena that rationality cannot interpret. When bodies come together they create an intensity. Affect is the intensity that emerges from the body before thinking about acting (Anderson, 2009). Bodies are situated within atmospheres that affective bodies contribute, however an atmosphere generates a greater affect than can be generated on our own (Anderson, 2009, p. 78).

Atmospheric phenomenon such as rainbows, clouds, sky, and wind never "quite achieve the stability of form" (Anderson, 2009, p. 78). Organizational atmospheres are the same; they are contingent, continuing, and emerging phenomena. For example, organizational climate (Guzley (1992) is a similar concept in the organizational communication literature. The communication climate is different than the organizational climate. Organizational climate links the individual to the organization

(Guzley, 1992). Communication climate is a similar concept to atmospheres and affect because it addresses the body.

Bodies give a charge to organizational atmospheres (Anderson's, 2009). Bodies produce the emotion, feeling, mood, ambiance, and sensation that creates an atmosphere. Atmospheres hold collective affects. "Affective atmospheres are a class of experience that occur before and alongside the formation of subjectivity, across human and non-human materialities, and in-between subject/object distinction" (Anderson, 2009, p. 78). Subjectivity is formed alongside and in between atmospheres (Anderson, 2009). Subjectivity is something we contribute to an atmosphere, and atmospheres in turn form subjectivity. Atmospheres describe "the shared ground from which subjective states and their attendant feelings and emotions emerge" (Anderson 2009, p 78).

Atmospheres are alive, changing, dynamic, and in flux based in the bodies that make up the spheres (Anderson, 2009). A constant "reworking" of lived experience is underway (Anderson, 2009, p. 79). Space and time are important dimensions because "the aesthetic object creates an intensive space-time" (Anderson, 2009, p. 79). The aesthetic object creates an intensity that "exceeds lived or conceived space-time" (Anderson, 2009, p. 79). An atmosphere cannot be pinpointed; it has location but no substantial form. Bodies compose affective atmospheres.

Affective atmospheres are something that bodies contribute to while simultaneously affective atmospheres contribute to the making of the body that contributes. Affect lubricates the back and forth relation between bodies and atmospheres. The viewer's contribution to the aesthetic object completes. Bodies, affect, and atmospheres create something that surpasses themselves individually. Atmospheres

can be understood hermeneutically as "quasi-autonomous" spaces. The text and interpreter function to create an experience that surpasses both text and interpreter, and atmospheres function in a similar way.

The interpreter, an interdependent body in an organizational corpus, brings biases and presuppositions (i.e. affect) to the text. The text is the atmosphere of an organization; a communicative context that informs the reading of the text. Text works upon the interpreter and the interpreter works upon the text. Context joins bodies into an ongoing text. The relationship between the body and context is the affect that makes an atmosphere. An atmosphere and the body play with one another.[1]

Atmospheres are created through affect and produce a way to generate the experience of space and time (Anderson, 2009). The quality of an experience is based upon the texture of affective atmospheres (Anderson, 2009). Bodies experience space and time differently based upon the affect that made the atmosphere. Affective material in one atmosphere is different than another. Affective atmospheres are generated by the affect that bodies produce.

Atmospheres are Quasi-Spaces

Böhme (2014, p. 93) researches an "aesthetic theory of atmospheres". Böhme (2014) discovered atmospheres through ecology, and adjusted it to fit the situation of the human being. "By aesthetic categories, I mean everything that arises from the sensory presence of humans in their environment" (Böhme, 2014, p. 92). Sensory experience interprets the categories that natural science cannot. Aesthetics provides those categories that enable us to get into the realm of lived experience; the existential environment that

---

[1] Gadamer's notion of play comes from Truth and Method (2013/1960).

we build and do not see. Atmospheres provide a lens that integrates the "objective qualities of an environment with the bodily-sensual states of a person in this environment" (Böhme, 2014, p. 92). The organizational corpus is the atmosphere that bodies feel and make (Böhme, 2014). Atmospheres are a collective function connecting independent bodies interdependently.

Atmospheres are an in-between phenomenon (Böhme, 2014). Atmospheres bring us in between subject and object. The etymology of atmosphere comes from meteorology. In the 18th century atmosphere was developed as a way to speak about the way weather changes mood, and is why "atmospheres are attuned spaces" (Böhme, 2014, p. 93). Atmospheres are "*pregnant* with a mood" (Böhme, 2014, p. 93). Atmospheres are "quasi-objective and spatially extended feelings…one can apprehend atmospheres only by entering the respective spaces" (Böhme, 2014, p. 93). Atmospheres describe the space where sentiment hangs (Böhme, 2014) in organizations. This sentiment exists in a common space. This space is invisible to most people because typically we don't notice them. For example, personal odor in a house is not smelled by the occupants, however anyone from the outside smells it (Böhme, 2014).

Atmospheric categories include but are not limited to: mood, synaesthesia, "suggestive of movement", intersubjective atmospheres, and ideas or symbols that are "culturally conditioned" (Böhme, 2014, p. 93-94). Theatre is a good metaphor to think through atmospheres because atmospheres can be staged. We create scenes, commodities, advertising and marketing, and art. Performative art, for example, is one area that engages the aesthetics of atmosphere. The body has to be involved for art to be produced. "Sound, noise and music" are major contributors to an aesthetics of

atmosphere (Böhme, 2014, p. 97). An aesthetic economy is grounded in the body.

Aesthetics are used to produce an atmosphere that induces a predicted corporeal

response.

Atmospheres and Aesthetics

Atmospheres are a stage that is set (Böhme, 2013). Atmosphere can be traced

back to psychiatry and Hubert Tellenbach book, *Taste and Atmosphere*. Atmospheres

"imbue everything" and are designed spaces to contain everything. Atmospheres "bathe

everything in a certain light" (Böhme, 2013, p. 2). "Heidegger, has given us access to the

space in which something appears" (Böhme, 2013, p. 2).

Atmospheres function through sense. Atmospheres are an "intermediate

phenomenon, something between subject and object" (Böhme, 2013, p. 2). Atmospheres

influence humans and humans influence atmospheres. Atmospheres are simultaneously a

"reception aesthetics" and a "production aesthetics" (Böhme, 2013, p. 2). Böhme (2013)

says:

> painting [Impressionism] does not aim to copy an object or a landscape, but rather
> to awaken a particular impression, an experience in the onlooker. The most
> convincing proof of this is the technique of pointillism. The colours the painter
> wishes the onlooker to see are not located on the painted surface but "in space", or
> in the imagination of the onlooker (Böhme, 2013, p. 4)

Atmospheres are "*generators*" (Böhme, 2013, p. 3) and a "poetic phenomenology" can

bring things into existence (Böhme, 2013, p. 5). Hermann Schmitz calls this a

"technology of impression" (Böhme,. 2013, p. 5) and Walter Benjamin calls this

"aestheticizing of political life" (Böhme, 2013, p. 6). Atmospheres are located in

between subject and object. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology as

articulated in *Eye and Mind* articulates the ambiguity.

Ambiguity of Atmospheres

Telecommunication networks produce an atmosphere that we cannot see (Rauh, 2017). Rauh (2017) tries to figure out when an atmosphere takes effect and at what moment is it is created. Rauh (2017) looks at the way atmospheres are used in quotidian language. Atmospheres are surrounded by vagueness. Vagueness takes on three forms: semantic, ontological, and epistemic (Rauh, 2017). Language speaks of atmospheres in the here and now, however atmospheres are "always and everywhere" (Rauh, 2017, p. 7). Even though we cannot see atmospheres we speak of them.

Perception is the middle between human and atmosphere (Rauh, 2017). Academic and poetic languages are necessary to understand the vague character of atmospheres. Spotting the transitions among overlapping atmospheres is called "aisthetic fieldwork" (Rauh, 2017, p. 12); a combination of qualitative and empirical research that encourages variation. The vagueness and ambiguity of atmospheres is to be interrogated to understand atmospheric phenomenon (Rauh, 2017). An aesthetic atmosphere means that our body is "involved in affective worlds that color one's own perceptions and steer them in certain directions" (Rauh, 2017, p. 1-2). Atmospheres affect our attitudes, perceptions, and actions and are "precognitive, or at least preverbal, phenomena" (Rauh, 2017, p. 2). Bodies makes atmospheres in organizations and those atmospheres create the body. Atmospheres supply the data from which perception is organized (Rauh, 2017).

For example, the perception of a brand can be created by an atmosphere and used as a marketing tool (Kotler, 1973). Marketing applied atmospheres to business practices to engage the consumers senses. An atmosphere surrounds a product, making it more than its materiality. A product exists in the supply chain, the store, and in the minds and

bodies of consumers. To speak of atmospheres is to speak of sense. Homes, airports, advertising offices, and psychiatrist's office are all examples of atmospheres. Kotler (1973) says the most important change to atmospheres is that they used to be organically created, whereas today we consciously create them because we know their power. The conscious creation of atmospheres increasingly puts us into an artificial environment (Kotler, 1973). Atmospheres are the conscious design (Kotler, 1973) of touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, painting and being painted. The significance of touching and being touched, for example, is that both hands contribute simultaneously to the experience; or seeing and being seen, requires another body. The same holds for atmospheres and bodies. Affective bodies create atmospheres that in turn shape those bodies. Atmospheric phenomena are both/and, non-dual, and non-reducible quasi things.

The body interrelates atmospheres and affect. In atmospheres, bodies mingle in collective organization. Atmospheres give a way for researchers to theorize about phenomena in between subject and object, text and interpreter. Mood, feeling, sense, affect, and ambiance all hang in organizational atmospheres. Aesthetics provides categories to research sense knowledge. Through affect, bodies create atmospheres and atmospheres create bodies. A researcher can interpret the interplay of an atmosphere and their own body to sense what this atmosphere and body produce. This would be deconstruction or hermeneutic interpretation of an atmospheres. The next section discusses design, which is the opposite, of deconstruction or hermeneutic interpretation.

Corporeally Designed Atmospheres

Although we cannot see atmospheres, they touch us (Tawa, 2014). The touching associated with atmospheres is traced back to Greek and Latin. In Greek "*taktike techne*"

is the "art of arrangement" which signifies touch, handle, and set aright (Tawa, 2014, p. 13). In Latin, "*tactus*, *tangere*, mean touch, feel or handle, and techne means the art or skill of weaving, webbing, fabricating or carpentry (texture, text, textile)" (Tawa, 2014, p. 13). The touch of an atmosphere joins and connects different parts into something that exceeds itself. Atmospheres touch the body and without violating boundaries. Atmospheres are weaved among bodies noninvasively. Touch and affect make the experience of an atmosphere (Tawa, 2014).

Atmospheres arrange our bodies in space and time (Tawa, 2014). Through touch atmospheres interweave through bodies but do not cling to us. Atmospheres are grounded in shared sense. "Sense is not a matter of possession but of sharing" (Tawa, 2014, p. 14). Atmospheres announce a "being's internal order or arrangement, its constitutive complexities – in short, its *taxis*: again a matter of touch, tact and ethos" (Tawa, 2014, p. 14). Atmospheres are continually changing as they emerge from our bodies (Tawa, 2014). "Multiple senses or systems coexist without fusing" to create an atmosphere (Tawa, 2014). The structure of an atmosphere is ambiguously "wavering temporality and dilated or aerated spatiality" (Tawa, 2014, p. 13).

Sense is shared and language expresses the sense-based world we inhabit with others (Tawa, 2014). Atmospheres describe the internal world inside us that is projected onto lived experience. Words are metaphors that help us see how atmospheres touch us. The words used to describe an atmosphere are an entrance to the composition of that atmosphere (Tawa, 2014). Our expression of the world creates the description that we live. Atmospheres are like a fog that is always on the verge of arriving (Tawa, 2014). To arrive, comes from the Greek word, *parousia*, an "anticipated prospect of arrival" (Tawa,

90

2014, p. 15). Things within atmospheres are "in a suspended state of potential" and allows for the arrival of emergence (Tawa, 2014, p. 16).

Physical architecture is a discipline that draws on atmospheres to demonstrates how space is designed. The atmosphere in an organization is different than a building that has been designed. The body, language, and sense supply the materiality of an organizational atmosphere. Atmospheric architecture has "multiple co-existent meanings" that simultaneously are both present and separate (Tawa, 2014, p. 17). Similar to architecture a building can have "multiple spatial or geometric systems overlaid within a single building without coinciding" (Tawa, 2014, p. 17). Atmospheres can mean different things to different bodies.

The atmosphere is available as the organizational corpus. The fruitful data for research hangs in the doorways to atmospheres. Humans seek to assemble things and find patterns, histories, and rationalities that are communicated through other bodies. The researcher constructs the organizational corpus by assembling the atmosphere together. An assemblage is human nature because we desire a context that is an "inter-folding of multiple conditions" (Deleuze and Parnet, 1996, as cited in Tawa, 2014, p. 19). We do not desire "a person, a coat, a fragrance" but "a person + a coat + a fragrance" (Deleuze and Parnet, 1996, as cited in Tawa, 2014, p. 19).

Language, affect, and sense build an environment from bodies and is called an atmosphere. The assemblage of the atmosphere is from the bodies that "interfold" upon one another (Deleuze and Parnet, 1996, as cited in Tawa, 2014, p. 19). Aesthetic organizational communication would interpret through sense the assemblages that

91

interfold an atmosphere. Communication is the medium that interconnects the assemblages that bodies produce.

Ambiance

Ambiance comes from the Latin word "*ambire* which means to surround or go around" (Thibaud, 2011, p. 205). Perception and ambiance are interconnected. We must interrogate perception to understand ambiance. The ambiance "blends and unifies the many components of a situation" (Thibaud, 2011, p. 205). To see our perception ambiance reveals the components of a situation. A situation is composed of parts and wholes informed by a unity. Ambiance holds the unity of parts and wholes (Thibaud, 2011) and shows how assemblages are arranged.

Ambiance is a "socio-aesthetic that attunes the researcher to everyday urban atmospheres" (Thibaud, 2011, p. 204). The data to understand an ambiance is contained in our sense experience. The ambiance defines the "quality of the situation" (Thibaud, 2011, p. 208). Human perception is linked to the actions of the body that create qualities of situations (Thibaud, 2011). Organizational aesthetics is a method to understand the qualities of the organizational corpus.

Ambiances affect human behavior and emerge from the body (Thibaud, 2011). Ambiances are "energy systems" (p. 209) linked to bodies through a "shared rhythm" (Thibaud, 2011, p. 210). Ambiance is grounded in the medium of experience, and phenomenology is the method that studies this kind of existential experience. Ambiance provides a "sensory background" from which we can see perception emerge (Thibaud, 2011, p. 212). Ambiance allows the researcher to see beneath the surface the iceberg that is submerged (Thibaud, 2011, p. 213).

Urban Atmospheres

Urban landscapes are a way to see the fabric of ambiances (Thibaud, 2011). Cities are a good example of the built environment that we can see (Giffero, 2013), whereas the fabric of atmospheres cannot be seen. A city is an atmosphere that we can see because of the buildings, materials, roads, trees, and gates. Even the shadows created by the buildings are part of the atmosphere. Atmospheres are made visible when we interrogate perception (Thibaud, 2011). An atmosphere is a shared space that bodies inhabit (Griffero, 2013). Atmospheres are "quasi-things" (Griffero, 2013, p. 1). Atmospheres do not exist in the mind; they exist in the public sphere outside of the body. Cities are a visible model of an atmosphere. Cities have a powerful aesthetic linked to the body. Our bodily experience of a city and the design of that city are inseparable (Griffero, 2013).

Affect is a way to study atmospheres (Michels & Steyaert, 2017). Organizational affect is related to "a spatial ontology of 'being-together-in-a-sphere'" (Michels & Steyaert, 2017, p. 79). Affect research views that human and nonhuman bodies create experience.

> affective atmospheres as a compositional process (Latour, 2010), reveals how they are simultaneously carefully designed and crafted through aesthetic work (Böhme, 1993) and spatial formation (Edensor, 2015; Thrift, 2008), yet also emerge in erratic, ephemeral, and excessive ways (Michels & Steyaert, 2017, p. 80).

Affect organizes and forms atmospheres in simultaneously and emergent design. Michels and Steyaert (2017) research atmospheres as a designed and emergent phenomenon. Art as well, holds design and emergent properties simultaneously. For example, a performative piece of art has been choreographed (designed) and the performance is open

to emergence. Emergent potential is based upon giving oneself over to the performance (Michels & Steyaert, 2017). The urban environment shows how concrete structures create atmospheres with bodies (Thibaud, 2011; Michels & Steyaert, 2017). Atmospheres and affect are invisible in organizations. Organizational aesthetic communication brings visibility to the simultaneous design and emergence of atmospheres.

Performative Art

Art creates a blur between the work of art and the viewer (Bruce, 2016). A dancing performance was photographed and superimposed upon a large building in Philadelphia. The edges of the dancer's bodies is blurred to give the effect that the dancer is moving across the mural. Within blurriness resides a rhythm that connects viewers and the large mural in (Bruce, 2016) uses for an example. Blur creates a movement within the mind and transposes the body back to the original creation of the photos seen on the mural. The blurry bodies bridge the performance and the art (Bruce, 2016). Performance is reinserted back into the mural and continued by viewing the mural. The lived performance the mural shows comes alive due to the body's experience with the work of art. A blurred image invokes our senses to hear and see the dancers. The body and the mural are related in rhythms that exist among bodies. The rhythmic nature of attuned bodies is kinesthetic (Bruce, 2016).

Kinesthetic sympathy bridges past to present to future (Bruce, 2016). Blur eclipses the divides between initial live performance, the mural, and the viewer of the mural. Kinesthetic sympathy is a method to read the multimedia afterlife of a one-time performance. It encapsulates "a diverse spectrum of rhythmic intimacies" (Bruce, 2016,

p. 131). The form of the performative event, although fainter, is preserved in an impression of the actual live performance (Bruce, 2016).

Rhythms dominate life. Blur transcends the dominant and hegemonic tendencies of consumerism and the commodification of life (Bruce, 2016). For O'Doherty (2008) blur is able to reveal the inside structures of our bodies and how they outwardly create an organization. The connection is that the work of art transcends time and space bringing an impression of a one-time event in the past to the present (Bruce, 2016). Through art, blur builds links and bridges between interior and exterior (O'Doherty, 2008) and presence and absence (Bruce, 2016).

Weather

Atmospheres give us language to speak about organizational, dynamics, affect, and organizational politics (Borch, 2009). Atmospheres are "tuned spaces" (Böhme, as cited in Borch, 2009, p. 234). Borch (2009) draws on the work of Sloterdijk and argues that atmospheres are managed. Sloterdijk's notion of foam allows for a "plurality of spheres" to be present at once in "co-isolated associations" as they emerge (Borch, 2009, p. 225). The idea of spheres is that each sphere is encapsulated within a larger sphere. These spheres share boundaries and allow us to attend to larger spheres (Borch, 2009).

All organizational behavior pivots from imitation (Borch, 2009). Sloterdijk makes the move from communication theory to imitation. Instead of communication there are "interautistic and mimetic relations" (Sloterdijk, as cited in Borch, 2009, p. 226). Sloterdijk says we need a new language for social relations (Borch, 2009). Foam theory opens the conditions to see dimensions simultaneously. In foam, consideration for the "air condition" is important (Borch, 2009, p. 225). "…all human being-together, and

hence also foam sociality, is embedded in specific 'air conditions' or atmospheres"

(Borch, 2009, p. 232). Atmospheres are created structures similar to architecture. Power

and management are inextricably part of the construction of atmospheres (Borch, 2009).

Architecture creates atmospheres by which the materiality creates certain

affective responses (Borch, 2009). Atmospheres generate affect and that affect becomes

part of the organizational foam. Aesthetic dimensions of an organization are continually

changing. The aesthetic atmosphere in an organization is a space that holds the affect we

contribute to it (Borch, 2009). Foam theory holds "a simultaneous focus on

organizational dynamics of affective imitation, on the spatial and architectural

dimensions of organizations and, finally, on the politics of organizational atmospheres"

(Borch, 2009, p. 223). Sloterdijk's theory of foam allows organizational dynamics, space

and structure, and politics to be researched simultaneously. Each contributes to the way

each other is made.

Atmospheres are relational, and therefore can be managed. The turbulence of

atmospheres moves things around (Cottrell, 2014). Atmospheres are always happening

upon a threshold while changing, meeting, and touching adjacent atmospheres. The

attention of the researcher needs to focus on the edges where atmospheres interact with

other atmospheres and bodies (Cottrell, 2014). An art installation titled *Cloud Sound*,

produces the in betweeness that a body mediates by allowing one to think through the

way in which this space "situates things simultaneously together and apart" (Cottrell,

2014, p. 64). The installation is a room that engages the senses of the viewer to the

material and immaterial, the interiority of shelter, and the exteriority of weather. The

body mediates the spaces in between as a mesh to hold these different phenomena

together in atmospheres. Mesh has holes but is interconnected by materials. Mesh does not have an inside or an outside, but has both (Cottrell, 2014).

The materiality of architecture is a good resource to conceive tactility of immaterial atmospheres. The former is visible and the latter is invisible but functionally they operate the same way. Wigley (1998, p. 18) puts it succinctly, "atmosphere seems to start precisely where the construction stops". The body and architecture co-create a climate. "Architecture is to be found in the relationship between atmospheres, the play between microclimates" (Wigley, 1998, p. 24). The construction of architecture makes atmospheres that each body experience slightly different.

Atmospheres exist in between a body and the organizational context. "The young designer has to "absorb" architecture "through the pores of his skin" rather than intellectually in a university" (Wigley, 1998, p. 26). Architecture and bodies create atmospheres. As early as 1894 Frank Lloyd Wright considered himself an "architect of atmosphere" (Wigley, 1998, p. 18). Architects have been thinking about the effects of atmospheres in their work, drawings, and materials for a long time (Wigley, 1998).

The Co-Production of Experience: Body, Art, Atmospheres, and Affect

Atmospheres, Affect, and Bodies

An atmosphere is a biopower (Ott, Bean, and Marin, 2016). Atmospheres and affect describe biopower because of the way atmospheres act upon the body and the body acts upon them. Atmospheres exist in between bodies and materials. Affect "describes a transpersonal or prepersonal "intensity" registered by a body when it comes in contact with another body (i.e. matter-energy of any kind)" (Ott et al. 2016, p. 348). The affect is produced by bodies in relation to other bodies and creates an atmosphere. Affect co-

creates with bodies and materials (Kidd & Smitheram, 2014). The atmosphere shapes the bodies within it creating an atmosphere to be maneuvered as a biopower for control (Ott et al., 2016).

For example, an aesthetic space called *The Cell* in Denver, Colorado, shows how biopower works. Their aesthetic research showed an atmosphere of heightened surveillance, power, and submission to be communicated in the installation. In the exhibit, one hears the sound of bombs going off and other military effects. The time and space to ask what is going on does not exist. The body is overwhelmed by the environment and can only act in one way. Together atmospheres and aesthetics design an interactive effect on the body (Ott et al., 2016). Atmospheres move bodies and create space where a certain action is encouraged to occur (Kidd & Smitheram, 2014).

To date, rhetorical scholars have only studied atmospheres through cinema (Ott et al., 2016). For example, Ott (2010) looks at how film produces bodily affect. Ott (2010) uses figure/discourse and ground as theoretical tools to analyze the affect a movie created (Ott, 2010). Embodied affect is an "attitude", "intensity", and "sensation" that creates the larger attitude one adopts (Ott, 2010, p. 50). Museums are another good space to find atmospheres (Ott et al., 2016). Affectivity is passive and active like the Janus face (Schmitz, Müllan, & Slaby, 2011).

Atmospheres and Body

Schmitz, Müllan, and Slaby (2011) connect phenomenology and emotions through atmospheres and the body. Hermann Schmitz started the *Society for New Phenomenology* (GNP) and taught Gernot Böhme and Thomas Fuchs. For Schmitz et al. (2011, p. 244) "the felt body is a feeling body". The lived body is an expansion and

contraction through breath at its most fundamental level (Schmitz et al., 2011).

"…emotions are atmospheres poured out spatially that move the felt (not the material) body" (Schmitz et al., 2011, p. 247). "An atmosphere in the sense intended here is the complete occupation of a surfaceless space in the region of experienced presence" (Schmitz et al., 2011, p. 255). In Schmitz's view "emotions are corporeally moving atmospheres poured out spatially" (Schmitz et al., 2011, p. 257).

Atmosphere, Art, and Body

The experience of bodies in atmospheres created by affect can be understood by art. Art is able to make visible (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a), yet art is not a representation of the life world (O'Sullivan, 2001). Perception is not realism. Art reveal that which you do not see. Art is a part of the world and is apart from it (O'Sullivan, 2001). Art "continues producing *affects*" with bodies (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 126). "Affects are moments of intensity, a reaction in/on the body at the level of matter" (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 126). Affect is always experienced and generated by the body and the same holds for art.

Art is "a bundle of affects or, as Deleuze and Guattari would say, a bloc of sensations, waiting to be reactivated by a spectator or participant" (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 126). The work of art demands that the viewer activates the sensations inherent to the work of art. Affect is created between the viewer and the piece of art. "Art opens us up to the non-human universe that we are part of" (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 128). Art explores "possibilities of being, of becoming, in the world" (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 130). Art shows how bodies participate with atmospheres and affect the organizational context.

Affect, Production, and Body

99

Affect needs to be accounted for in political and cultural theories (Massumi, 1995). Massumi (1995) cites Deleuze & Guattari who refer to affect as an intensity:

> The ability of affect to produce an economic effect more swiftly and surely than economics itself means that affect is itself a real condition, an intrinsic variable of the late-capitalist system, as infrastructural as a factory. Actually, it is beyond infrastructural, it is everywhere, in effect. Its ability to come second-hand, to switch domains and produce effects across them all, gives it a meta-factorial ubiquity. It is beyond infrastructural. It is transversal (Massumi, 1995, p. 106-107).

For this reason, Ott et al. (2016) consider affective atmospheres as biopower. Intensity needs to be included in cultural theories because it takes into account "the expression *event*—in favor of structure" (Massumi, 1995, p. 87). Massumi (1995, p. 87) is in favor of this because " at the level of structure everything has been prefigured whereas "nothing is prefigured in the event"". Affect designates a space where body, sense, time, and space play on each other. Affect has autonomy because it is open (Massumi, 1995). Kidd & Smitheram (2014) write that affect does not have its own full autonomy.

Emergence is "self-organization" which is "the spontaneous production of a level of reality having its own rules of formation and order of connection" (Massumi (1995, p. 93). From the organizational atmosphere a theory about the what is going on can be generated by the body. The organizational actor simultaneously acts from the atmosphere.

Affect and intensity are akin to a critical point, or bifurcation point, or singular point in chaos theory and the theory of dissipative structures (Masumi, 1995). At the critical points are a transition space or "phase space" (Massumi, 1995, p. 93). Multiple mutual exclusive potentials are available only one of which can be selected (Massumi, 1995). Multiple levels of linguistic atmospheres occur at the same time in organizations

(Massumi, 1995; Tawa, 2014). These atmospheres "have different logics and temporal organizations but are locked in resonance with each other and recapitulate the same event in divergent ways" (Massumi, 1995, p. 93-94).

A multiplicity of atmospheric levels occur simultaneously in an organization created by bodies, language, sense, logos, affect. These multiple layers are interconnected and at the same different. Emergence can be measured by the intensity of affect in organizational atmospheres.

Bringing Merleau-Ponty into the Conversation

The relationship between body, perception, and architecture was first discussed in *Questions of Perception: Phenomenology of Architecture* (1994) by Steven Holl, Juhani Pallasmaa, and Alberto Pérez-Gómez (Jelic, 2015). Architecture and design have taken prominent roles in organizational studies (Jelic, 2015). This is due to the fact that architecture creates an experience between the "body and built environment" (Jelic, 2015, p. 1). Architecture is ocular. Vision turns architecture into a cognitive object for study. To design an architect's body is used to imagine new spaces (Jelic, 2015).

Architecture is a pre-reflective dimension (Jelic, 2015). The body communicates with the built environment from which cognition renders an interpretation that shapes the interactive experience. Organisms "enact" and "bring forth" worlds (Jelic, 2015). Perception is developed by sense-based activity (Jelic, 2015). Sensory perception has already defined the categories from which we see things organized (Jelic, 2015). The body creates the organizational atmosphere and in unison that atmosphere creates the body of the organizational member and the organizational corpus.

101

Architecture and movement are related (Jelic, 2015). Emotion moves humans, and design takes into account human, sense, and geometry of space. Vision changes the experience of architecturally designed time and space. Proprioception is a sense that tells us the way our body performs in space (Jelic, 2015, p. 8). Our limbs, eyes, head, and muscles are animated in a constant activity in a situated environment.

> proprioceptive awareness provides an immediate experiential access to our own, pre-reflective, embodied self, independently of reflective thinking, which is essential for all perception since it requires co-experience of self and environment, in order to be a comprehensive informational system. (Mallgrave, 2013, as cited in Jelic, 2015, p. 8)

Plasticity changes the brain changes and embodiment too. The metaphors we use emerge from the body and define lived experience (Jelic, 2015). The re-flexibility to see our body in movement with an environment and to inquire how the environment is affecting one's movement is the focus of Jelic (2015). This occurs in human proprioception and is an important consideration for designing architectural space. "[T]he corporeal schema is one of the most valuable design instruments an architect can use to achieve a desired bodily and emotional state, all according to the functional and brief requirements of a certain architectural space" (Jelic, 2015, p. 8). An architect designs spaces based upon the bodies that will be moving within the space (Jelic, 2015). Architecture has acted upon the body before we experience the structure (Jelic, 2015). The body can gain access to invisible organizational atmospheres.

Interpreting Atmospheres with Aesthetics

Aesthetic education is a method to teach the interpretation of atmospheres (Friberg, 2014). To interpret an atmosphere, we must have "*an awareness of our awareness*, i.e. an awareness not only of the sensorial elements as such but of how they

form our perception thus also form our understanding of the environment we are in" (Friberg, 2014, p. 2). Organizational atmospheres change the behavior and perception of those who touch it and are being touched by it. Friberg (2014, p. 4) points out that "multisensorial awareness", a skill that allows one to attend to multiple perspectives, allows one to attend to atmospheres.

Friberg (2014) following Böhme says the goal is to find an awareness of our perception. What creates what we see and do not see? To find awareness of perception is to engage the presence of something *there* not in perception yet. Organizational environments exercise on us an experience and this experience presents the organizational world to us. To speak of it is to engage aesthetics and simultaneously contribute to it. "What is present is something that comes forth from the thing" (Friberg, 2014, p. 5). Organizations emerge from our perception of them which we have created (Friberg, 2014).

An awareness of awareness "is to be aware of something present and what it does to us, as well as being aware of our own presence among people and things" (Friberg, 2014, p. 5). In terms of leadership, Heifetz and Linsky's (2002) theory of adaptive leadership centers on the ability to be on the dance floor and the balcony simultaneously; thus acting and reflecting at the same time such that each informs the other.

The transition to chapter four and Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics is that a painter's interpretation of the world renders a fuller interpretation than just scientific, analytic, and cognitive methods.

> Merleau-Ponty's specific concern is to understand the artist's perception and its relation to the material of painting, his overall interest is to discuss how an artistic interpretation of the world is a true perspective that supplements the scientific. (Friberg, 2014, p. 5)

Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics of painting offers an aesthetic method that complements

scientific ways of knowing. The idea of aesthetic for Friberg (2014) is rooted in a

"dwelling on things" (Friberg, 2014, p. 9).

> We do not think of how to exercise most daily acts, we simply act. Becoming
> aware of our sensorial and bodily training as well as how it materialises in our
> environment is what the concept of atmosphere contributes (Friberg, 2014, p. 9).

Atmosphere is a way to understand how what we contribute to a context bounces back

and contributes to how we view that context, and then contribute to it. Learning to attend

to this dynamic is Friberg's (2014) argument. Aesthetics ground knowledge in the

context of understanding (Friberg, 2014; Gadamer, 2013/1960). Routine and habits make

us aware of the atmospheres we live in.

Conclusion

Speaking of atmospheres and affect, this chapter has been about how to see what

cannot be seen. How do we see our own act, and how do those acts influence contexts

among other bodies? How does context affect acts? Contexts are created by atmospheres

and affect; these situations are created by bodies. Bodies supply affective material to

create atmospheres. Bodies create atmospheres. Bodies also can through sense perceive

them as visible. Architecture is a material example of a built environment that elicits

affective responses. Atmospheres are an immaterial phenomenon built by affect from

bodies which is reintegrated back into bodies.

Atmospheres and affect create a non-structural environment and exist through the

body. An atmospheric environment creates a structural context that can be interpreted.

The atmospheres and affect of organizations are created through a combination of body

and architecture. The body creates atmospheres through affect. The researcher is

interested in this because their body is implicated in the atmosphere. In real-time, as we change our interrogation of the organization, our perception of the organization changes.

CHAPTER 5

Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of Painting

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy interconnects the lived body to the world through the intertwinement of flesh (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology enables the body, world, language, and other bodies to be intertwined in the same flesh (Waldenfels, 1998). This philosophy and phenomenology enables an ontology of being and nonbeing to coexist (Waldenfels, 1998).

Aesthetic organizational communication pulls from continental philosophy, organizational studies, and organizational communication literatures. Tactile communication is the aesthetic that they all share. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy and phenomenology have been introduced to these literatures, however his aesthetic philosophy from the *Eye and Mind*, has been overlooked. In communication studies and organizational communication Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics has yet to be introduced.

Scholars mention Merleau-Ponty, however, Küpers's (2015) book *Phenomenology of the Embodied Organization: The Contribution of Merleau-Ponty for Organizational Studies and Practice* has made the most significant contribution to Merleau-Ponty and organizations. In continental philosophy, Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics and ontology are gaining momentum with Galen Johnson's essay in the edited book, *Van Gogh among the Philosophers* (Nicholas, 2017), and Sallis' two books, *Senses of Landscape* (2015b), *and Klee's Mirror* (2015a). Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic philosophy is situated as a communicative, organizational, and philosophical perspective.

This chapter discusses Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting from *Eye and Mind* to lead into chapter five. Chapter five discusses the research on Merleau-Ponty and organizational studies. Küpers is the sole scholar making a career interconnecting Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and organizational studies. Küpers (2015) engages Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, perception, ontology, flesh, *écart*, intertwinement, and reversibility and applied them to organizations through aesthetics, creativity, letting be. Amongst Kupers' work is an opening for Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of aesthetics, from *Eye and Mind*, to be applied to organizational communication contexts through art.

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of aesthetics accounts for human agency and non-human agency. Ventriloquism accounts for human agency and non-human agency in an organization (Cooren et al., 2013); however, this dissertation argues that atmospheres and affect, and Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of touching and being touched, account more accurately for invisible and visible phenomena. An aesthetic theory of organizational communication makes the invisible visible through sense. An immaterial and invisible organization is created by affective human agency and non-human agency. Atmospheres hold together these qualities.

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of aesthetics from *Eye and Mind* is an account of a painter's performative approach towards interpretive research. Merleau-Ponty integrates philosophy and art (Johnson, 2013). What takes place in between subject and object, interior and the exterior, visible and invisible is of ontological consideration. The method of painting accounts for human agency and nonhuman agency to coexist simultaneously. The multiplicity of texts, languages, contexts, spheres, objects, bodies, etc. within

organizations can be taken into account using the method of painting written by Merleau-Ponty.

Theories in organizational communication such as CCO, ventriloquism, text and interpreter, performance, and sesnemaing are able to account for some of these phenomena. Painting however is an activity that has already accounted for invisible things and the complexity of interrelationships of objects, bodies, and phenomena in the world. The activity of painting is a method to interrogate the lived experience(s) of human and non-human agents in organizational contexts. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting can contribute a holistic theory of organizational communication.

Sense interconnects body, world, and embodied language. The body and the lived context conjoin in sense for the artist to find something to paint, or the viewer's viewing of the painting. Being exists at the intersections of body, world, and language (Waldenfels, 1998). At the intersections being is the text to be interpreted. Atmospheres and affect literature describes the intersections among body, organizational world or context, and affect. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting provides philosophical, theoretical, and experiential to describe how the method of painting makes visible and allows painters and views of painters to see more.

Painting is a concrete method—non-metaphorical like ventriloquism—because the painter produces a painting that is not representation or metaphor but an interpretation of the object as that object reveals itself to human sense. The boundaries and transitions among bodies, atmospheres and affect, context, text, object, subject, interior, exterior, time, and space in organizations is the interpretive challenge. Organizational communication lacks a holistic theory to account for the organizational corpus that bodies

make, and sense interprets. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting holistically accounts for the ontological complexity, relationality, and intertwining of an organizational corpus.

The lived body binds us to the world and to other bodies (Waldenfels, 1988). For Merleau-Ponty, the language of painting contains what came before and after (Waldenfels, 1988). The communication in an organizational context is access to interpreting what is going on in the present moment as it is informed by the past and points to the future. A painter's performance a hermeneutic. A painter receives data about the past and can also see the future, from the communication given in the present. The past and future are seeded in the body in the present moment.

Bodies constitute organization, as a corpus, rather than communication. There is no communication without a body. Communication supplies the text to be read and the action to be taken upon the text. Affective atmospheres are an invisible text available from sense to interpret the organization aesthetically. Communication makes visible how bodies have already been arranged into an organization. Sense interprets the relation between the interior body and exterior world. Human bodies create the text that sense interprets communicatively in an organization. From a body there is world, organization, and communication to interpret. Bodies create organization.

The first section biographically introduces Merleau-Ponty's life and philosophical thought as they develop together. Section two introduces *Eye and Mind* offering an interpretation of the major ideas from the text. Section three discusses ontology and why Being is connected to Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics. The conclusion in section four points forward to chapter five and how Merleau-Ponty's *Eye and Mind* contributes to organizational studies. Chapter four discusses Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics to bridge to

Küpers (2015) work in chapter five and then to implications for organizational communication in chapter six.

Biographic Introduction to Maurice Merleau-Ponty

Description of Life

Maurice Merleau-Ponty was born in Rochefort-sur-Mer, March 14, 1908 (Waldenfels, 1998). He studied at the École Normale Supérieure with Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Jean Hyppolite (Waldenfels, 1998) and Cluaude Lévi-Strauss, and graduated in 1930 (Carman & Hansen, 2005). In 1939 he enlisted in the French army (Carman & Hansen, 2005). His first academic position was Chair of Child Psychology and Pedagogics at the Sorbonne (Waldenfels, 1998), followed by a short while at University of Lyon (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Then from 1952 until his death in 1961 he was at the College of France (Waldenfels, 1998; Carman & Hansen, 2005) where he held the Chair of Philosophy that Henri Bergson once held (Carman & Hansen, 2005).

Philosophers and Philosophies

Phenomenology and Gestalt Psychology were Merleau-Ponty's two major theoretical influences (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Merleau-Ponty's thought was influenced by Henri Bergson but his main influences came from 19th century German Phenomenology: Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, and Max Scheler (Carman & Hansen, 2005). In 1939, Merleau-Ponty became the first of the French intellectuals to visit the Husserl Archives in Leuven, Belgium, and was also the first French philosopher to engage Ferdinand de Saussure and Roman Jakobson's structural linguistics (Waldenfels, 1998). Merleau-Ponty was influenced by Freudian psychoanalysis and Claude Levi-Strauss' structuralism as well (Waldenfels, 1998).

Merleau-Ponty learned Gestalt psychology from Aron Gurwitsch in the 1930's, and supplemented this with the work of neurologist Kurt Goldstein (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Goldstein and the Gestalt psychology hold that "ordinary perception and behavior are always organized around a *normative* notion of rightness or equilibrium"; this is an important aspect of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology (Carman & Hansen, 2005, p. 9). From Husserl, Merleau-Ponty adopted the "faithful description of phenomena" to his phenomenology (Carman & Hansen, 2005, p. 9). The phenomenological reduction is an ongoing engagement for Merleau-Ponty that is never completed (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Questioning is never finished (Waldenfels, 1998).

Merleau-Ponty's Philosophy of the Body and World

For Merleau-Ponty, "no corner of human life is unmarked by the fact of our situated bodily perspective on the world" (Carman & Hansen, 2005, p. 14). Merleau-Ponty wrote of embodiment and perception through phenomenology, psychology, art, literature, history, and politics (Carman & Hansen, 2005). Merleau-Ponty changed the way philosophers understand body and perception, with the phenomena that "we are always already familiar with before we fit them into conceptual categories, pose questions about them, and formulate theories" (Carman & Hansen, 2005, p. 22). Merleau-Ponty's interrogates the world on the level of pre-categorized phenomena, before bias, perception, prejudice, and assumptions categorize the thing.

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy focuses on access to a world "where the transition from one's own self into the world and to the other occurs; at the place where the roads cross" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 281). His phenomenology merges "*existentialism* into a "phenomenology existentelle" that "shows a power of transmutation which keeps it in

constant movement" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 282). Merleau-Ponty emphasized a third dimension as a meeting place of subject and object, reflection and knowledge, and makes an "*implicit phenomenology*" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 282). This third dimension "takes form in the basic concepts of shape and structure, which are neither things nor ideas but ways of organizing reality itself, matched by a corresponding self-organization on the part of the organism" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 282). The third dimension is where the organization of reality, body, and world inhabit one another. This philosophy applied to organizational contexts is the contribution of this dissertation.

Merleau-Ponty turned his 1938 doctoral dissertation into his first book *La structure du comportement* (1942). In the *Structure of Behavior* and *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945) (*Phénoménologie de la perception*) Merleau-Ponty worked through ideas integrating psychology, the body, and world. In the former book behavior is the focus while in the latter perception is interrogated through the idea that "[s]tructures, shapes, sense, and sensory areas are born of a spontaneous process of organization with no previous model" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 283). The spontaneous organization of bodies, sense, and structures also occurs in organizational contexts and is the contribution this dissertation makes.

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy is a "*both/and and also*" approach to the "being of the body" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 282). The body anchors us to the world and to other bodies (Waldenfels, 1988). Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of intertwining and the chiasma signal an "*indirect* ontology" at the site where the body and world interact (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 289). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology transitions, the middle, and the in between for a reflexive inquiry. A phenomenology of phenomenology being-for-itself

(Waldenfels, 1998). The body amongst other bodies creates a context that is made into an organizational corpus anchored to each body.

Politics and Language in Merleau-Ponty's Thought

Merleau-Ponty's genius lay in phenomenology, yet politics caused his relationship with Sartre to split (Carman & Hansen, 2005). In 1945, he and Sartre began editing *Temps Modernes*, a publication closely aligned with the French Communist Party. Merleau-Ponty critiqued the promises of revolution and sought a middle ground between Marxist, structural history, and politics. *Les Aventures de las dialectique* (1955) (*The Adventures of the Dialectic*) led to the break with Sartre. Merleau-Ponty was not swayed by the firmness and rigidity of Marxism and structuralism. Merleau-Ponty found affinities between Saussurian linguistics and the structural anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss, but he himself was not a structuralist (Carman & Hansen, 2005).

Merleau-Ponty's incorporation of language into his work began with the essays from, *Sens et non-sens* (1948) (*Sense and Nonsense*; Waldenfels, 1998). The move he makes is from a Gestalt organization of experience to the organization of experience through language. Merleau-Ponty differentiates language from signs, and transforms his existential phenomenology to structural phenomenology. The phenomenological reduction brackets prejudices of the natural attitude that are always constructed out language. For Merleau-Ponty, language is what has already been said (Waldenfels, 1998). Language contains within itself everything before it and points to the things to come. "Language is not bound to words" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 288). Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic theory in the essay *L'Oeil et l'esprit* comes from this philosophy of language. For Merleau-Ponty painting takes on a pictorial ontology (Waldenfels, 1998). Language

is never a finished project. Language like truth is something that is made (Waldenfels, 1988).

Merleau-Ponty died May 3, 1961 while writing *Le Visible et l'invisible* (Carman & Hansen, 2005). It was published posthumously in 1964 by Claude Lefort who gave it its title, *The Visible and the Invisible*. Merleau-Ponty had not chosen a title since it was not complete. Merleau-Ponty's inquiry merges interrogative thinking with the "life stream" itself (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 288). A "pure intuition" allows the things at the boundaries of being and nonbeing to be themselves allowed them to speak (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 288).

Merleau-Ponty does not develop a philosophy of consciousness, but revisits Husserl's genetic phenomenology and Heidegger's Being (Waldenfels, 1998). This is further reinforced by Saussure's "theory of diacritical signs", Freud and Lacan's "deciphering unconscious", and Levi-Strauss's "structural concept of history and society" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 288). The *Visible and the Invisible* positions Merleau-Ponty's thoughts about "being" as different from Heidegger's. Merleau-Ponty points to new themes such as "the dispersion of reason, the violent element in all order, shifts of time, disruptions of the ego, and the inevitable claim of the other and the strange" (Waldenfels, 1998, p. 289).

Merleau-Ponty joins elements of psychology, philosophy, phenomenology, language, and aesthetics together. Merleau-Ponty philosophizes about the relationship between body, world, and experience. Transitions and intersections are Merleau-Ponty's focus. His philosophy borders on a non-phenomenology.

Merleau-Ponty's Aesthetic Theory of Painting from *Eye and Mind*

Merleau-Ponty's life and educational training informed his phenomenological perspective. *Eye and Mind* is the most outright aesthetic essay in Merleau-Ponty's oeuvre (Smith, 1993; Johnson, 1993a). *Eye and Mind* opens an aesthetic dimension to his phenomenology through painting. From this, a new dimension of organizational communication can be discovered.

Aesthetics and Ontology

Aesthetics could be found in all of Merleau-Ponty's work due to the connection between sensation and aesthetics (Smith, 1993). Three main texts in Merleau-Ponty's oeuvre considered to be his aesthetic works are: *Cézanne's Doubt* (1945), *Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence* (1952), and *Eye and Mind* (1960; Johnson, 1993a). *Cézanne's Doubt* is an existential phenomenological account (Johnson, 1993a) that gives a "topography of a phenomenology of painting" (Johnson, 1993b). *Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence* is an experiment in structuralism that searched for a "new philosophy of expression, language, history, truth" (Johnson, 1993d, p. 14). *Eye and Mind* is by far the most aesthetic of all his work (Smith, 1993). In July and August 1960, Merleau-Ponty wrote *Eye and Mind* while living in Le Tholonet, France, a town Cézanne once had a studio in (Johnson, 1993c). *Eye and Mind*, published in January 1961, was the last work that Merleau-Ponty published before he died May 1961 (Johnson, 1993c).

Merleau-Ponty taught a few courses on painting, aesthetics, and poetry. In 1946 Merleau-Ponty taught a course on aesthetics and modern painting and in 1947 a course on aesthetics and modern poetry (Johnson, 1993b). Merleau-Ponty was particularly interested in the verb "to paint" (*peindre*) more than paintings themselves (*les tableaus*; Johnson, 1987). Merleau-Ponty's language of intertwinement brings subject and object

together (Singer, 1993). *Eye and Mind* is an original ontology in subtle conversation with Martin Heidegger (Johnson, 1993a).

Merleau-Ponty follows in the line of thought originating in Schelling, carried forward by Nietzsche and Heidegger, "who accord special prominence to artistic work in tracing the ribs and joints of Being" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). Merleau-Ponty's, *Eye and Mind*, puts into writing "*il y a*" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). Through painting Merleau-Ponty explains being and the "miracle or delirium of vision", which is that there is something rather than nothing (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45).

Painting

Eye and Mind takes influence from Paul Cézanne and other worldly painters, and gives a theory of abstract painting through the work of Paul Klee, Nicholas de Staël, and René Magritte (Johnson, 1993c). The two main influences on Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting are Paul Klee and Paul Cézanne. Merleau-Ponty's early work is influenced by Cézanne (Johnson, 1993c). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and Cézanne's art "agree in origin, method, and outcome" (Williams, 1993, p. 165). Paul Klee was the main influence in Merleau-Ponty's later work *Eye and Mind* (Johnson, 2013). Merleau-Ponty was most interested in Paul Klee's "ontology and theory of art" (Johnson, 2013, p. 478).

Some of the things that intrigued Merleau-Ponty about Paul Klee were Klee's interest in how a tree's outer was very identical to its roots (Johnson, 2013). Klee understood that the form of the world that we see right now today will not be the way it is going to always look nor be (Johnson, 2013). "Creation is not finished; it is yet on the way" (Johnson, 2013, p. 478).

> Philosophy is an archeology of the ground as ontological depth, and what we find in the ground is not an origin as singularity but rather, a non-origin in the sense of a singular point since it is a multiplicity, a plurality of threads of perception, practices, and idealities, the very interwoven threads Merleau-Ponty has been enumerating. (Johnson, 2013, p. 508)

The origin of truth is an event with a plurality of things that come together to create it (Johnson, 2013). Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic theory of painting makes visible the interwoven fabric. Being has to be lived (Johnson, 2013). Performance creates being and painting. Art and philosophy are performances that study Being. Philosophy and art "contact" Being by their method (Johnson, 2013). *Eye and Mind* brings "to written expression the silent and mute meanings of prereflective brute Being" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). Art and philosophy are mediums with the necessary resources through which Being reveals itself. "Being is *what requires creation of us for us to experience it*" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Johnson, 2013, p. 512). Humans have to create something to be able to experience Being.

Textual Interpretation

Eye and Mind is divided into five short sections (Smith, 1993). Part one discusses the problem of science in relation to painting. Part two describes "the delirium of vision," which is a characteristic needed by painters (Smith, 1993, p. 206). Part three critiques Descartes metaphysics in *Dioptrics* (Smith, 1993). *Dioptrics* is the "archetype of an operationalist theory of vision" (Grene, 1993, p. 227). In part four, Merleau-Ponty interprets different theories and quotes by artists (Smith, 1993). Part five describes the weird way temporality and works of art function (Smith, 1993).

The text seeks "the originary, the fundamental essence not only of painting, but of all culture" (Smith, 1993, p. 205). Merleau-Ponty develops a new ontology out of a

philosophy of painting through concepts such as "element, Flesh, chiasm, reversibility, depth, transcendence, and vertical time" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 35). He builds a new metaphysics out of painting (Johnson, 1993, p. 35) which becomes "a metaphysics of painting" (Smith, 1993, p. 206).

Eye and Mind develops an "indirect ontology" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). The ontology is implicit to painting itself (Johnson, 1993c). The performance of painting automatically renders this ontology in the medium of paint. Merleau-Ponty developed this ontology to redo the "whole description of our landscape and the lines of our universe" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Johnson, 1993c, p. 37). Painting, better than philosophy, could accomplish the description of our landscape (Johnson, 1993c).

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting is a post-Cartesian ontology outside phenomenology and structuralism (Johnson, 1993c). This metaphysics deals with "perception, the body, language, the world, and meaning" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 174). In the experience of painting richer "articulations" for these philosophical terms are found (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 174). Merleau-Ponty turns to painting because positivism cannot ontologically describe our world (Smith, 1993); nor can it describe organizational experience. The language of positivism has "the effect of lexical sparseness and a jejeune style," whereas the language of painting engages a full description of the world (Smith, 1993).

Being expresses itself through the body (Smith, 1993). The body is the privileged site "in which the world turns back upon itself" to become visible (Smith, 1993, p. 206). Art concretely makes this relationship visible. Art makes visible philosophy. Art makes visible our relationship to Being that we are unable to see. "Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics

of painting is grounded in a metaphysics of vision, and vision, in turn, is an ontological description of the body subject as a seeing seenness" (Smith, 1993, p. 208).

Art, especially painting, shows the body seeing its own seeing. The performance of painting is an ontological reflexivity. The body performs before cognition. Aesthetic organizational communication, this dissertation suggests, is a research capability to see our own seeing; to see how we contribute to making the atmospheres and communication con-texts under consideration, and simultaneously see our being affected by those atmospheres and communication contexts. Painters have a similar affective body to the organizational member's body. The painter's body turns the world in painting (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a) whereas the organizational member's body turns the world into an organizational corpus.

Why Science Fails

Section one of *Eye and Mind* explains the problems with science, and how art, specifically painting, overcomes them. Painting is different than philosophy and science but not outside them, in fact, all three intersect (Silverman, 1993). "Painting is closer to the palpable life of things than science or philosophy" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). In *Phenomenology of Perception,* Merleau-Ponty says, that the practice of philosophy and painting always result in the same conundrum or imbalance "between brute sensation or thought", "intellectualism versus empiricism" (Smith, 1993, p. 200). Merleau-Ponty's philosophy does not stand over things from a detached perspective (Smith, 1993). Phenomena are engaged through embodiment (Smith, 1993).

The interrogation that a painter does by painting is a way "to return "to the 'there is,' to the site, the soil of the sensible and opened world such as it is in our life and for

118

our body" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Johnson, 1993c, p. 44). Our body is anchored in the world, and from that world our "perspectives and points of view" are rooted (Johnson, 2013, p. 484). "The Earth is our horizon, our "root-body," the "basis-body"" from which the world emerges (Johnson, 2013, p. 484). Contact with the earth is from where our rootedness grows from (Johnson, 2013, p. 483). "Operational thinking" and "cybernetic ideology" are problematic for our future and painting overcome (Smith, 1993, p. 207).

Body and Flesh

For Merleau-Ponty, flesh is an element (Smith, 1993). An element "in the sense in which Greek and medieval philosophers used the term—for fire, water, air, and earth: "simple" notions, thinkable in and for themselves" (Smith, 1993, p. 198). Flesh is prior to all objectivity (Smith, 1993). Merleau-Ponty's ontology of flesh is an "ontological framework of the lived body" (Smith, 1993, p. 198). The body and the world are interconnected. The body and world "is a chiasma, an intertwining of movement, sight, and touch…the reversibility of inside and outside, the formative milieu of subject and object" (Smith, 1993, p. 198). The world we inhabit intertwines all these things into an extension of our body.

To interrogate one's perception one must interrogate their own lived body (Smith, 1993). The lived body—one's own body—"becomes the "natural subject" of perception" (Smith, 1993, p. 195). Perception and expression emanate from the body (Smith, 1993). The body constitutes time, space, and perception, rather than undergoes them (Smith, 1993). The lived body constitutes our experience of objects in the world according to space, time, and perception (Johnson, 1993c).

Everything in the world is made out of the same stuff, flesh (Johnson, 1993c). The world, body, and language are interwoven (Johnson, 2013). The world we see has "surfaces, textures, colors, and lines" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 50). Flesh is an ""incarnate principle" of doubling, difference, and desire"" that intertwines everything in the world (Johnson, 1993c, p. 50). Merleau-Ponty calls the world flesh because "it is a pregnancy of possibles" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Johnson, 1993c, p. 51). Flesh, world, and language become something through our body.

The human body brings possibilities into existence through flesh, language, and world. Painting makes us aware that bodies are not separated but in fact interconnect (de Waelhens, 1993). "Thus painting, and painting alone, makes it manifest to us that "different beings, 'external,' foreign to one another, are nevertheless absolutely together, 'simultaneity'" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in de Waelhens, 1993, p. 179). Painting makes visible the flesh of different beings that are simultaneously and always inextricably caught in our body.

Organizations are flesh and have an ontology due to the bodily composition of the organizational corpus. The organizational corpus is an invisible body of flesh. Atmospheres are invisible webs of flesh. Independent bodies are interdependently intertwined in an organizational corpus that is an atmosphere of flesh. As flesh, the atmosphere can be touched through our senses. The flesh of an atmosphere is pregnant with possibles. Painter's allow the pregnancy of possibilities to emerge and in painting make them visible to others.

In an organization, to make visible the pregnancy of possibles is a rhetorical skill. A rhetor-leader brings groups from potential to actual consciousness (Hyde & Smith,

1979). Rhetoric makes known meaning to oneself and to others (Hyde & Smith, 1979).

Painting adds the element of flesh to making visible or making known meaning. The

body brings meaning into the world. Through transubstantiation, a researcher,

consultant, and leader, enters the flesh of an organization. As a body in the

organizational corpus, a researcher, consultant, and leader, hermeneutically enters the

flesh of individual and collective bodies. Different external beings are together at once in

flesh (de Waelhens, 1993). The relationship between one's body and other bodies is the

fleshy text to be interpreted.

Reversing Ontological Bodies

Painting gives the impression that it only concerns the inner life of a painter,

however it transverses both the interior and exterior life (de Waelhens, 1993).

Reversibility is an aesthetic phenomenon that holds interior and exterior (Johnson,

1993c). A painter turns the world into painting by giving their body to the world

(Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The body "bring[s] forth a metamorphosis of the visible"

(Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). The painter's body allows for "an imaginative expression of the

mute meanings and richness of the prereflective world" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45) to

emerge.

Painting does not theorize about reversibility. At the ontological level, painting is

a practice of seeing and being seen, touching and being touched, painting and being

painted. For example, the forest looks at the painter while the painter looks at the forest

(Merleau-Ponty, 1993a); and Cézanne says, "the landscape thinks itself in me and I am its

consciousness" (Merleau-Ponty as cited in Johnson, 1993c, p. 44). Theories of painting

occur in the world and are experienced by the body of a painter. The landscape embodies

itself in the painter. The reason Merleau-Ponty chose painters over any other artist is, "because the painter reverses the ordinary direction of outgoing, practical vision: the world fascinates him, draws him to it…Yet at the same time, through this receptivity, the painter creates the visible world, and himself, its viewer and inhabitant…"(Grene, 1993, p. 221). The world turns and returns into the painter's body.

Painters see the doubleness. The overlapping allows the seer and seen to switch roles (Johnson, 1993c, p 47). The reversibility of subject and object is a "manifestation of Being" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 48). When I touch my right hand to the left hand they are simultaneously touching and being touched. Right and left hand are both subject and object simultaneously (Johnson, 1993c). To see I have to "in turn be capable of being seen" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 48). "[O]ur body announces a kind of "natural reflection"" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 48). Painting is the art or performance that makes visible these "inversions" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 47). Painting shows us "the other side" of what we see (Johnson, 1993c, p. 47). Painting enables us to see that which is seeing us.

In organizational research, the body is caught in between affective atmospheres. The affective atmosphere is a reflection of the organizational context the body is in. Bodies bring organizations into existence as the body does a painting. The painter "expresses on his canvas the schema of one of the manifold relationships of overlapping that the sensible realm weaves with our body" (Taminiaux, 1993, p. 288). The body is the medium through which organizations can be interpreted through the media of senses. An aesthetic interpretation of the organization put onto canvas, paper, or vocalized is the overlapping of the body and the sensible realm. "The artist bears bodily witness to this genesis in the metamorphosis of world into artwork…" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 49). In this

122

same way the researcher's body bears witness to the genesis of the organizational atmosphere that is constantly being changed. In *Eye and Mind* Merleau-Ponty quotes Paul Valéry, "the painter brings in his own body" (Taminiaux, 1993, p. 288).

The ontology of the painter is that they bring their body with into the experience of life. The body is central to painting, and the body is central to organization. The painter's body contacts the rest of Flesh and their artwork reveals this. The painter makes visible the relationship our body has with the world because they have "gone further" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Painting reveals the overlapping of touching and being touched, seeing and being seen. If the researcher, consultant, and leader adopt the ontology of painting they too could bear witness to the genesis of the metamorphoses of the organization. The atmospheric flesh changes.

<div align="center">**Being In Touch with the In Between**</div>

Movement

Vision and movement are intertwined in a body (Smith, 1993, p. 208). "Vision is not like the end of a blind person's cane: it precedes itself, is clairvoyant, "tele-vision"" (Smtih, 1993, p. 208). Movement for Merleau-Ponty indicates that the body is situated within a world of presence (Johnson, 2013, p. 490). Movement thought of as a change of location from A to B is retrospective thinking (Johnson, 2013, p. 490). Movement as presence however grounds a subject in the context and initiation of the world (Johnson, 2013). In the former movement is behavioral, whereas in the latter movement functions to create the world.

Merleau-Ponty argues,

that painting gives us "emblems" of movement that integrate the pictorial space with the movement of time. The spatial element has become temporal. These

"emblems" are "rhythms" or "vibrations" in the work that show or signify by
"gaps" (*écarts*) between elements or scenes (Merleau-Ponty, as cited by Johnson,
2013, p. 491).

Klee's art integrates space and time to create what Merleau-Ponty calls "the trace of movement" (Merleau-Ponty as cited by Johnson, 2013, p. 491). Movement as "trace" is "the energy that lives (naturally) in a line" drawn by a painter (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Johnson, 2013, p. 491). The movement of a line is the energy a painter puts into it and is considered the trace (Johnson, 2013). Revealing "pictorial space as temporal" is the focus of *Eye and Mind* (Johnson, 2013, p. 492).

Merleau-Ponty and Paul Klee were interested in "rhythmic simultaneity" which Robert Delaunay introduced to art theory (Johnson, 2013, p. 492). For example, the Mona Lisa's eyes move and Mark Rothko's "bands…do actually vibrate…within a single work...as well as across several works" (Johnson, 2013, p. 492). Perception and Being cannot be synthesized, which keeps them open to one another (Johnson, 2013). The openness creates movement, so the vibrations move around. Rhythmic simultaneity brings the multiplicity of rhythms into a coherence through vision and movement.

Vision

Of the senses, painting engages vision the most (Grene, 1993). Vision is able to hold "presence in absence" and "in it our very being is fused with distant objects, we become part of them and they of us" (Grene, 1993, p. 225). "Visual perception" expresses the way we live within our bodies (Grene, 1993, p. 225). Perception is always already interpretation (Grene, 1993). There is no break between nature and the "expressive power of humanity" instead there is a "circuit" among "nature, humanity, and expression" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 190).

Vision puts one in touch with what is other than me (de Waelhens, 1993). Vision unifies space into a coherent universal (de Waelhens, 1993). Vision sustains a universal cohesion by melding past and future in the present (de Waelhens, 1993). Sight concretizes what is separate from me with what is me. The disparate part of spaces are reunited by vision (de Waelhens, 1993). Vision enters us into the space that holds past and future, separation and unification. Vision unifies our experience of the world in body (de Waelhens, 1993).

"Vision escapes the weight of origins" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Waelhens, 1993, p, 190). Although visual perception can only see one side there exist a multiplicity of "hidden other sides (Merleau-Ponty, as quoted in Waelhens, 1993, p. 190). The body can address from only from one perspective an object, yet we have access to the multiplicity of possible other sides that exist at the same time. It is the case that we have *this* certain one at this moment. Painting reveals the enigma of vision by making the invisible visible (Silverman, 1993). "Visibility arises out of the conjuncture of the visible and the invisible, out of the making visible of what is invisible to everyday seeing" (Silverman, 1993, p. 266).

Ordinary daily experience arises out of what we see and cannot see. The "question is how to understand the incomprehensible" through new and old signs (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 188). The incomprehensible exists in the world but has "never intentionally appeared"; how to make what is invisible become visible for everyone is the task of painting (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 188). To accomplish this "[i]nevitably the roles between the painter and the visible switch" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 129). This is why "many painters have said that things look at them" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

Rhetoric

How are we to first come into contact with the incomprehensible; then understand it such that we can express it such that everyone can understand is the goal of painting. How are we to speak such that others will be able to see (know) what we see is the goal of rhetoric. Rhetoric makes known (Hyde and Smith, 1979). Rhetoric is connected to the act of interpretation (hermeneutics) ontologically because rhetoric exists so that humans are able to understand (Hyde and Smith, 1979). A rhetor-leader brings human beings into an actual consciousness which started as a potentiality of the group. Potential consciousness is flesh loaded with a pregnancy of possibiles. A rhetor leader identifies the potentiality within affective atmospheres. The organizational corpus is changed from potential to actual consciousness. A shared understanding that leads from a potential to an actual consciousness.

Body Style

Style is an important aspect to painting. "Style is accessible to others, it is interindividual…" (Taminiaux, 1993, p. 291). The style of a painter is something that others can interpret. The object painted cannot be separated from the painter's style. Style intersects the object, the painter, and interpretation. Style is a part of the "objects, and the processes by which it is generated and apprehended" (Singer, 1993, p. 234). Merleau-Ponty focused on painting over other artistic forms because "style appears in painting in a very articulated and accentuated way" (Singer, 1993, p. 234). Merleau-Ponty considers painting a paradigmatic case of style and seeks to transfer the paradigm "to other dimensions of existence" (Singer, 1993, p. 234).

There is no other form of art more connected to the body than painting. Schmidt (2012) cites Heidegger who commented that Van Gogh ripped paintings from his body. Van Gogh went insane due to the relationship his body had with the world (Schmidt, 2012). The connection between painting and the world is transubstantiated through the body. The body is the most important part of being a painter. The lived body and the work of art "are expressive fields which are capable of radiating significances which transcend them, and of intertwining with other significances in the world" (Singer, 1993, p. 241).

Style is the unique performance among the object, interpretation (hermeneutic circle), and painter body. The interactive performance of the three creates a unique style. The mode of communication between the body, object, and interpretation becomes the painting. The communication among world, body, object, and interpretation is transferred onto the canvas. Painting communicates more meaning than just on the surface. A painting "*says* more than the literalness of sensible givens it offers, just as a discourse says more than the literalness of the sentences in which it is couched" (de Waelhens. 1993, p. 189). That "bringing forth of meaning" (Heidegger) is at once an operational mode and a mode of communication (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 189).

Merleau-Ponty is clear that painters are not working from an individualistic framework. The painter's style is not marked by "I" but one "wrested from the world, the work of others, and "his own attempts"" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in de Waelhens, 1993, p. 188). Painters engage multiple texts at the same time intertwined between the world and other bodies (de Waelhens, 1993). The semblance of these things generated by a body creates a painting. Painting takes into account the collectivity.

Style is communicated by the body (de Waelhens, 1993). Style is the unique way a painter interprets the objects, herself, the world, and other bodies. An object demands a certain style is used to communicate itself. Style "is the way what is to be painted must be painted. The painters style is his painterly body. He brings it to perfection in using it" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 188). An object demands to be painted in a certain way, and the painter's body brings this into existence. The painter's body is a conduit through which an object communicates itself to be put onto canvas. The object presents itself to the painter is an expression of itself (de Waelhens, 1993). The observer or listener is informed by the object (de Waelhens, 1993). By letting the object present itself in our participation with it, we come to find an "original truth of things (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 189).

The ontology of an object is communicated by the style in a painting (de Waelhens, 1993). The viewer of a piece of art participates in the experience of the painting, which brings them to a truth of that object. Truth is achieved when the object is interpreted as it is for itself (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 190). The painter's method is to paint as if she were that object. To work on behalf of the phenomenon to real their truth. The viewer of a painting finds that truth by lending their body to the comportment of the object. An embodied feeling of the object is expressed by painting and paintings. A viewer feels the painting like the painter who felt the object and transformed it through their body onto a canvas. The ontology of painting hinges the gap between an object out in the world and the object on the canvas. Through the body a painting brings world, self, and other together

Auguste Rodin's sculptures capture the body in a pose it never actually has (Johnson, 1993c). For example, the body in sculpture is presented at an instant that it never actually achieves (Johnson, 1993c). The body caught in bronze is in between movement; a space never achieved because we are always here and going there (Johnson, 1993c). Sculpture captures occurrences in between the movement from here to there (Johnson, 1993c). The sculpture captures stationary movement in the moment that the lived body does not experience because it traverses here and there (Johnson, 1993c). This "inherent gap" Merleau-Ponty calls écart (Smith, 1993, p. 192). The gap does not separate us from things but in fact "it gives us our only possible access to them" (Smith, 1993, p. 192).

The *écart* describes the gap Being functions. Being is something that we cannot quite grasp because it inhabits that gap. The ontology of a painter studies this gap through painting. Science abstracts us from the gap, and truth. Rather than bring ones lived body into the research as the painter does, science distances itself from the body and truth. The ontology of painting works from the gap of visible and invisible. Style is important because it overcomes the individualism of painting since style joins world, object, and body.

Perception, Innocence, and Paint

For Merleau-Ponty "perception is itself already a language and an interpretation" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 183). Interpretation is informed by language. Perception is formed through language and history, and is a human construction not a law of nature (de Waelhens, 1993). The bias inherent to language that forms perception is best accounted for by painters. Painters interpret the world with "innocence" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

The painter looks at the world with "innocence" according to Merleau-Ponty in *Eye and Mind* (Johnson, 1993c). Innocence means that a painter views the world without biases, and this allows us to see the thing truth of the thing. Innocence is an *epoché* that suspends what we know about science and philosophy "in order to gain access to the essential forms of phenomena as they appear in pretheoretical experience" (Johnson, 1993c, p. 45). Painters are able to interpret the world before bias has clouded perception. Painting gives us a perception of the world before culture, language, and history have biased perception.

Sallis (2015b), puts this another way, when he writes about a conversation Cézanne had with a friend who is a geologist. As they were looking at Mont St. Victoire the geologist could only speak about geological structures of the rocks and mountain. Finally, Cézanne gets so made he blurts out: stop! Have your cave! You are only seeing what is on the surface. You are missing the fire and lava that is still alive in those rocks which created them thousands of years ago (Sallis, 2015b). The point is that Cézanne phenomenologically *still* sees the things that form the rocks. Cézanne sees beneath the surface of scientific understanding.

The painter performs an *epoché* in direct relation to their ontology. The *epoché* enables the painter to interpret the world more clearly than science and philosophy. The innocence of the painter is due to their their ontology. This is how their being performs itself in the world. The *epoché* enables the painter to interpret the world more clearly than science and philosophy. This is because of the innocence with which they see the world.

That adoption of the *epoché* by researchers, consultants, and leaders in organizations would help them see the organizational context with innocence. They allow things to emerge rather than imposing finality and conclusion (Küpers, 2015) upon an interpretation of what is going on. Innocence keeps open possibility and visibility. The *epoché* as an ontology, rather than a philosophy, uses innocence to bracket biases and presupposition of the natural attitude.

Looping Around: Paintings, Painters, and Being

Painting makes visible the dimensions that comprise Being and experience. "Painting shows…"a polymorphism of Being"" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Taminiaux, 1993, p. 291) that exists as *écart*, or the gap (Smith, 1993). The body mediates the gap rooted in the body. There is no division between "the sensing and the sensed" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 125). The action of painting is the example of "the bodily rootedness of all creative activity" (Grene, 1993, p. 234). The rootedness of the body in the world is the most pronounced in the action and process of painting. Painting is *the* performance that generates the creativity of body and world.

The body has an internal equivalent to what is seen on the exterior (Merleau-Ponty (1993a). Everything is made out of the same stuff, Flesh (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a; Johnson, 1993c). A painting makes visible the existence of "the internal equivalent of the world in me" (Smith, 1993, p. 208). A painting is the evidence in carnal form of that internal equivalent (Smith, 1993). A painting is an icon of the "carnal essence" of that thing in me that is out in the world (Smith, 1993, p. 208). Seated in our body is what we see out in the world, and a painting is the evidence that this is taking place in our body. A painting makes visible the internal equivalent.

A painting touches the textures, and imaginations, of the interior of the body. "The painting is the inside of the outside (that "imaginary texture of the real," the essence we discover within the thing, all the facettes of which present themselves as expression)" (Smith, 1993, p. 209). Painting brings the felt texture of experience to corporeality. Being, or the texture of the real, acquires a texture that the body feels. To view a painting is an embodied action (Smith, 1993).

A painting is not a finished event or an acquisition (Smith, 1993). In fact, a painting is an ongoing "advent rather than an event" that opens human perspective to something that will "never again be closed" (Smith, 1993, p. 209). Paintings are entities that are never fully completed. A painting opens into an advent. Each time the painting is viewed, painting, viewer, and understanding changes. The project of painting is never complete. A painting is the beginning (advent) as compared to the thing itself (event). Painting is the creative activity of advents.

Organizations are a body of Flesh, that this dissertation has referred to as an organizational corpus. The flesh of the organizational corpus is composed of individual bodies whose flesh double backs upon others' flesh forms the collective organizational corpus. The organizational corpus is formed by *écart*. The relationship among bodies, worlds and contexts, and flesh for an organization are similar to painting.

The Task of a Painter

The painter explicitly makes us see our own seeing (Grene, 1993). The task of a painter is "to reveal and remake the achievement of visual perception which in our routine lives we perform without focal awareness or reflection (Grene, 1993, p. 220). The painting and the viewer double back upon one another because a painting points out

the "premises" by which we see what is there (Grene, 1993, p. 220). In a painting the viewer sees "not simply the object, but the object as we see it: we reenact our seeing" (Grene, 1993, p. 220). The painter brings to fore the reflective capacity we overlook. Body and flesh enable the doubling back of painter and viewer.

Painting reveals "our openness to being" (Grene, 1993, 223). The task of the artist is to get in touch with the silent ground of being; the "ineffable ground of being itself that the artist seeks to encounter and that addresses us through his work" (Grene, 1993, p. 223). Painters work from the gap where the ground they seek to interpret is ineffable. The in between that Merleau-Ponty calls *écart* is where Being resides. Aesthetic organizational communication research interrogates *écart*. Écart is the intertwining gap between body and the organizational atmosphere (corpus).

The painter's task is never complete because the object to be painted is never completed (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). There is no such thing as progress in painting. Painting shows a research process that is indefinite. Painters trudge along in a circular process that is never quite able to articulate what they want to say. Each painting changes and alters what we know about the institution of painting; because each painting anticipates the next painting to come in the future (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Being is presented to a viewer in a painting.

The Endless Task of Painting

Painting is "an abortive attempt to say what still remains to be said. It is continuous grappling with a problem which remains always still to be solved" (Grene, 1993, p. 231). A painter makes visible by finding something in the world that has not yet been said. Once an object is painted it must be painted again and again (Merleau-Ponty,

1993a). No matter how many times an object has been painted the task will never be

completed (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The task of the painter is to continue painting things

over and over.

The world that we create "haunts" us because we must inhabit the thing we

shaped Grene, 1993, p. 222). A painting haunts us in the same way as the world does.

> The panting is not on the canvas, nor at the place, if there is one, represented by it.
> It is ambiguously and embracing here, nowhere and everywhere. Cézanne's Mont
> Sainte-Victoire, transcending the "moment of the world" when he painted it, will
> be always whenever people have eyes to see. (Grene, 1993, p. 222)

Both a painting and the world surround us. A painting shapes the viewer just as the

world shapes those who live in it. A painting does not live just on a canvas, but exists

here and there and nowhere (Grene, 1993). A painting is not a representation of

something, but the ontology of that thing in the world (Grene, 1993). The painter is the

one who allows us to see this (Grene, 1993). The painter, the painting, and the viewer

interconnect Being in the world.

A painter's interrogation stays truthful to the thing under study, and in this way

the intention of the work remains pure. A painter looks at things with innocence, and via

the body bring forward the style of that thing and puts it into paint.

> The work of art and the painter's ability to create it are inextricably caught up.
> The artist rises toward a "metaphysical view of the world" and is able to "form
> free abstract structures which surpass schematic intention and achieve a new
> naturalness, the naturalness of the work (Paul Klee, as cited in Johnson. 2013, p.
> 484)

Painters work before categories to see the essence of phenomena. Essence "is accessible

only through the seeing and not through a thinking separate from the seeing" (Johnson,

1993c, p. 53).

> Cézanne does not deconstruct, he preconstructs. He does not shatter the fruit bowl, he shows us its genesis that the fruit bowl comes to inhabit is not a predetermined one in which it is able to take form, it is rather a space that springs from it, a dimension of its flesh (Dufrenne, 1993, p. 260).

The genesis of things is not found by deconstruction and or the conditioned categories that science and philosophy construct. In terms of aesthetic organizational communication, the task of the researcher, consultant, or leader is to preconstruct the organizational corpus—the atmospheres—to determine from where power, problems, opportunities, relationships, or cultures in organizations emerge from.

The painter and the canvas work together. The artist's body and the world create things together. The artist's vision is in combination with what she feels on the inside which is what is opening up onto the outside world (Johnson, 2013). A painter's internal body, their vision, and the external world are interconnected. This relationship is the content to be put on canvas. Klee has feelings of "rootedness" and "transcendence" throughout his oeuvre (Johnson, 2013, p. 484). Painters are rooted in the world and simultaneously transcend it.

Painters penetrate to the genesis of things. A painter preconstructs an object to reveal the things in the world that occurred to make that space in which an object inhabits. In terms of the rhetoric and philosophy of communication this would be called a constructive hermeneutic. The painter constructs the object's genesis onto canvas. A conglomeration of fleshes come together to bring into existence a work of art. The viewer sees the object on canvas but their experience transcends the canvas. A painting lives here, there, and nowhere (Grene, 1993). A painter's ontology transcends the canvas because what she has achieved is the work itself.

Painting, Performance, Language, and Truth

The painter's interior body and exterior world infuse meaning into paint; and that is what the viewer sees on the canvas. The meaning that is put into a painting comes from the performance of painting. Until the artist has done this work the meaning does not exist. An artist wants all the meaning to be on the canvas, but since this cannot be achieved the painting is always "in advance, its own failure" (de Waelhens 186). Why would a person interrogate the world in a way that would always fail all that it wanted to include?

This existential angst is explained in *Cézanne's Doubt* (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b). Cézanne's doubt is a doubt that propels him to paint. Cézanne's doubt is a rhetorical phenomenon because to overcome his doubt it was necessary for others to acknowledge his paintings. For others to see what he sees. Cézanne doubted that his choice to paint instead of taking another career was a bad decision. Cézanne doubts that his body led him astray to go paint. He doubts his existence because others do not see him. To see his work is to see him. In the latter part of his life, others began to recognize his work and purchase it and alleviated his doubt. The public said, yes, we see you, we see your work.

This is important for understanding the performance of painting because it is always a performance of doubt. An interpretation of the world that will never include everything it can. Painting has an existential angst that will never leave. Merleau-Ponty (1993a) says that the urge to paint is one of a kind; an urge that has to be met; an urge that overtakes every other single urge in life. Painting is an advent (Smith, 1993). The advent of the urge to paint propels a painter's work. Their work is stimulated from the interiority and exteriority of the body and world connection. According to Cézanne, "Nature is on the inside" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 125).

"The painter's vision is an ongoing birth" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 129). Nature is born every moment and what it is going to do is unknown thus there are no themes to it yet (Smith, 1993, p. 201). The painter's vision interprets things at their origin, in the genesis of birth. Painters "live in fascination" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 129). Painters only have their body, vision, and hands (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Painting privileges vision, and through vision tactical sense, smell, and movement are expressed (Smith 201, 211).

The sensation we feel in paintings sparks our perception; we become aware of our perception because we see our seeing. Painting makes our perception visible and evident to us. In the French language, sensation, means a perception that is both external and internal (Johnson, 2013). The painting reveals *écart*, the internal and the external crisscross the gap (*écart*). The viewer sees according to the painting (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Being inhabits the gap that our body constitutes.

Truth

Cézanne was obliged to paint the truth (Johnson, 2013). Cézanne allowed the painting to speak and tell its story (Johnson, 2013). Cézanne painted "the happening of truth" (Johnson, 2013, p. 493). Cézanne mediated onto canvas the truth that was communicated to him by the external environment which originated within his own body. In the late 19th century French aesthetics tradition, the concept of truth, resonated between nature and the inner emotions of humans (Johnson, 2013). The truth is that our body and world express a truth that the body is able to bring Being into existence. "[T]he truth of expression is disclosure of body and world, and the truth of sense is a truth of language" (Johnson, 2013, p. 500).

Meaning is infused onto the canvas. A painter uses the language, rhetoric, and discourse from the origin of beginnings. A painter expresses the "birth of the visible (and not just of "this" that I see)" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186). In each work a painter is to "address themselves to the genesis of the "All qua visible"" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186). The intent of the painter is to achieve something impossible. It might sounds tragic striving for something that cannot be met however this is what calls for the next work of art. This is what it means to "take up the challenge anew" (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186).

A painter's body is comported to advents, origins, and the genesis, and the bias of their work is to be attempt impossibility. The painter makes visible the origins of truth. The body, world, and perception interact to make things visible that are evidenced on a painting. Merleau-Ponty (1993b) says that Cézanne tries to go beneath the surface of culture. To discover in the gap where the things which humans have instilled upon the world come from.

The task of the painter is to interpret Being, which is what inhabits the origin. If a painting is going to "take root in the consciousness of others" it "has the strange power of being self-teaching" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186). The truth of painting is that it opens up onto human consciousness fragments and bits of "fleeting experiences" that reside in our bodies but have yet to touch (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186). Painting makes the viewer realized that if he too had followed his urge he could have also become a writer, painter, or philosopher (de Waelhens, 1993, p. 186). Merleau-Ponty says that even though painting comes across as confusing the intent is always communicated (Waelhens, 1993).

Conclusion

In summary this chapter has covered the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic theory of painting from his essay *Eye and Mind*. Merleau-Ponty's theory of painting fuses body, world, and vision, such that we can see our seeing. Painting creates a language that is able to interpret the origin of truth. Painting preconstructs and does not deconstruct. A truth of painting is that we can see our own seeing. We re-discover the reflective. The body and world are interconnected Flesh. We touch the world and the world touches us and painting brings this to our collective awareness.

Painting helps us understand how science abstracts and is unable to inhabit the things that it wishes to study. Painting provides an interpretive method that lives in the things that it wishes to study by not abstracting them but being in the gap where they crisscross. Painting makes visible the things that the natural attitude hides. Being is something that we cannot grab but paintings grapple with making Being more visible. Being works with us as it works through us. Painting reveals the ontological relationships among body and world. Painting makes us aware that our body, world, and vision originates inside and outside of my body. This relationship of seeing and being seen, touching and being touched is made evident through painting such that to paint and to be painted becomes the mechanism by which we can make evident the truths of Being.

The next chapter discusses the research that has been done on Merleau-Ponty and organizational studies. In a similar way to the way painting reveals the being of an object, experience, or phenomenon, painting can reveal the ontology of an organization, its Being. The origin of communication in the organizational corpus within a situated context. The performance of painting brings us to the origins of experience such that we are able to view objects, ideas, and nature before they have been clouded by bias,

presuppositions, and historical moments. A holistic interpretation is then informed by those things, like Cézanne who forgot what science taught him, so he could see the thing and allow what he knows to come back into the interpretation. Painting is a method that interprets the advent of things before bias, presuppositions, and historical moments have imposed a form upon them.

The painter's method analyzes the rhetoric and language in organizational communication contexts to begins to make more visible the origins of that communication. The interpretation and the origin are bodily. The method brings to visibility gaps and ways to engage them. It can also make visible the origin of contexts, problems, blurs, boundaries, threats, atmospheres, and opportunities. The spoken and written language and communication is a gateway into a pretheoretical ground from which decision-making and problem solving comes in other people. Sense is the media instrument that studies these things in the body of one self and other.

Learning to be in touch with the origin of other peoples, ideas, and contexts allows us to interpret communication innocently. Through embodiment, innocence, écart, and the internal equivalent are ways for the interiority and exterior of the body to generate a world. Sense interpretation is grounded in the Flesh. Flesh unites the relationship between my body and the organizational corpus, communicative context, and atmosphere. The body and the organizational corpus are Flesh. Our bodies haunt organizations like a painting haunts the viewer, and Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting makes this relationship appear. The interior of the body is collectively comported with all other bodies and is the exterior that we see and name. Cézanne said, "Nature is on the inside" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 125). The objects look at the painter.

At the gap is a malleable interaction among body, world, flesh and Being. From this gap the ontology of an organization can be changed. Bodies are changed to change organizational contexts. Aesthetics gives us the best shot to understand this change because aesthetics engages senses. Sense engages corporeal flesh and the Flesh of the organizational corpus.

CHAPTER 6

Merleau-Ponty's Relational Ontology to Enter Organizational Bodies

This chapter reviews Wendelin Küpers (2015), *Phenomenology of the Embodied Organization: The Contribution of Merleau-Ponty for Organizational Studies and Practice*. Küpers has written the most extensively on organizations and Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, ontology, and philosophy. Creativity, sensation, "inter-practice", letting-be, and "body-forthing" are concepts Küpers (2015) applies to management and leadership theory and practice. Küpers (2015) argues for the integration of the body into practices of management and leadership through embodiment.

Intertwinement, reversibility, flesh, and chiasm are some of the concepts from Merleau-Ponty that Küpers (2015) writes about. These concepts come from Merleau-Ponty's later work in *The Visible and the Invisible*. Through art, aesthetics, and embodiment, Küpers (2015) develops a sense-based approach to interpreting action and theory in organizations. *Écart* sustains a gap for theory and action to be simultaneously reflexive. The body traverses this gap. The gap is necessary for Being to exist. The way we bring things into the world, through our ontology, comes from intertwinement, reversibility, flesh, and chiasm. Aesthetics, and especially painting, concretizes these concepts that cannot be seen. Aesthetics also gives language to sense description.

Chapter five is divided into six major sections. The first is titled Incorporation to Encorporation. This section discusses the composition of organizations as bodies, prereflective dimensions, and sense based research. Section two discusses sense as integral ontology of knowledge. Section three discusses embodiment practices. Embodied researchers, consultants, managers, leaders, and employees are interconnected to other bodies in an organizational context through communicative practices. Section four discusses a sense based interpretive practice that accesses whole through part. The collective organizational corpus through the individual body. Section five discusses the way bodies bring shared realities into existence. The body is the site of interpretation and action in the organizational context. Aesthetics is the discipline that can most closely address this, since the research is sense based.

Incorporation to Encorporation

Bodies

Organizations are collective bodies composed of individual sensing bodies. Organizations are made of bodies (Küpers, 2015). A corporation is a body, i.e. corpus. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy in grounded in the living body. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy gets us to notice the neglected, forgotten, "undervalued", and "ignored" dimensions of the body and its relationship with lived experience (Küpers, 2015, p. 2). Merleau-Ponty's philosophy allows management, scholars, and practitioners to be able to understand pre-reflective activity in organizations as "indeterminate, ambiguous, and opaque" (Küpers, 2015, p. 3).

The majority of organizational research use rational and cognitive models, and gives the appearance that organizations are not alive. These approaches distort our

recognition of the existence of a collective organizational body that our body contributes. Bodies are in movement with surrounding environments (Pallasmaa, 2012). Constantly the self and world change one another (Pallasmaa, 2012). The predominant view of organizations is that they are "…immutable 'objects' that are supposed to operate somehow independent of human embodiment, intentions, unconscious motives or intersubjective agencies" (Küpers, 2015, p. 119). The predominant view is skewed because an organization exist because of the body not independent of the organization (Küpers, 2015). Aesthetics is a way to articulate the collective sense of an organizations (Küpers (2015).

Humans make meaning and understand shared experience together. For example, Küpers (2015, p. 125) writes about "we senses" and "us senses". These terms indicate that organizations are composed of a multiplicity of sensing bodies. Aesthetics and sense are intertwined. The language of aesthetics engages the we, us, collect, and whole. Aesthetics helps us traverse between the real and what is possible. The senses are "inherent unfolding dimensions of embodiment" (Küpers, 2015, p. 125). This is *écart*; the gap that painting discloses Being through.

Pre-Reflective Dimension and Intentional Arc

Küpers (2015, p. 42) writes that our body has "pre-reflective intelligence". For Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology the body has an intentionality that we are not aware of. The pre-reflective domain is our bodily relationship to the world. Habits comport one's movement towards the world in a certain manner. The pre-reflective for Merleau-Ponty is not a claim to the unconscious. The pre-reflective is more like love and melody where the impulse in the body carries us towards a way of being. Something in the present

indicating the future. Melody indicates what is going to come next in a sequence of notes (Küpers, 2015).

Merleau-Ponty's "intentional arc" is helpful to understand the pre-reflective (Küpers, 2015, p. 46). The arc takes into account the past and future, human culture, contexts, ideologies, and morals that situate human action and choice. To be situated is to be standing on the horizon "that is not yet actually realized in relation to what could be done, used, or lived" (Küpers, 2015, p. 46).

Merleau-Ponty's intentional arc reveals bodily intentionality in the context it is situated in (Küpers, 2015). For Merleau-Ponty, "operative intentionality" lives at the level of the kinesthetic "I can" (Küpers, 2015, p. 45). Operative intentionality signals to our body what we can do or feel we cannot do. It operates within a horizon of experience projected towards the future and is action oriented (Küpers, 2015). People in organizations are embodied in the organizational context (Küpers, 2015).

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology engage emergence. As a pre-reflective space, the horizon indicates what could be lived but has not yet emerged. Situating oneself in their body allows one to be aware of their involvement with creating organizational realities. "…[O]ur bodies *are* our perspective on the world" (Küpers, 2015, p. 34).

Corporeal Experience in Organizations

Through the phenomenology and ontology of Merleau-Ponty a theory of organizations as processes of bodies can be developed (Küpers, 2015). The body of the person conducting research becomes an important part in the research process to reflect on. The researcher is part of the experience and needs to be accounted for the

interpretation. The study of organizations by researchers "produce 'bodies' of text" (Küpers, 2015, p. 3).

Phenomenological researchers are "actively passive" (Küpers, 2015, p. 14). Researchers refrain from making decisions that are definite and final. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology gives organizational researchers a lens to see the interrelatedness of bodies in organizations and what bodies are capable of doing together. The body enables organizational researchers to understand the role of sense in organizations. What engages the senses of organizational members (Küpers, 2015). How does sense organize bodies through the interconnectedness of daily work? "What would it mean not only to theorize about the body, but also to use modes of approaching from and with living bodies and embodiments" to do the research (Küpers, 2015, p. 3)?

By body approach, Küpers (2015) means that the body is the medium through which meaning is made. "The living 'reflexive' body serves as a medium of in-between and crossing, where mind and matter, culture and nature, self and world as well as meaning and force meet and unfold" (Küpers, 2015, p. 38). The researcher pays attention to the way corporality is performed in corporations (Küpers, 2015). The reflexive ontology of the painter can be incorporated into the reflectivity of the researcher. To see according to the situation in organizational contexts is the goal; in the way that a viewer sees according to a painting. The text of an organization can be read in that gap. The gap crisscrosses the interior and exterior, the body and world relationship.

Merleau-Ponty's non-dualistic and non-categorical philosophical approach embraces ambiguities and overcomes false dichotomies (Küpers, 2015). It restores embodied interactions among bodies and things in the world (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-

Ponty's ontology is non-reductionist and non-metaphysical (Küpers, 2015). His phenomenology and ontology locate inquiry at the crisscrossing and in between of sense-making in organizations (Küpers, 2015). An organization is a body created by crisscrossing bodies. The researcher joins the crisscrossing and interprets their own body as a way to interpret the organizational body. In an organizational context a researcher could be a leader, a manager, a consultant, an employee, or academic researcher. Sense and aesthetically grounded organizational research tries to understand what is going without answering definitively. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy allows contexts and phenomenon to remain open, letting them be. Merleau-Ponty provides a way to see beneath the surface in organizational phenomena; to see what we cannot see. The body is the medium used to interpret organizations and is also the thing that creates them (Küpers, 2015).

Küpers (2015) introduces phenomenology to management and organizational studies. Phenomenology is a good method for leaders and managers because phenomenology studies the "appearance of things, specifically as they appear in human experience" (Küpers, 2015, p. 9). Merleau-Ponty's work has management, leadership, and scholars attend to the flesh and sense experience in organizations. Küpers (2015) develops a Merleau-Ponty supplies the philosophy and phenomenology for a "multidimensional…embodied 'inter-practice'" for organizations approach (Küpers, 2015, p. 6). Merleau-Ponty invites an "engaged 'letting-be'" (Küpers, 2015, p. 5).

In summary, the ability to touch and be touched, see and be seen is where inter-practice inhabits (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology recognize that the lived experiences from a multiplicity of bodies simultaneously creates

a context. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology hold opposites together and does not suggest a romantic theory of organizations and bodies (Küpers, 2015).

Sense: An Integral Perspective on Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology

Phenomenology is derived from two Greek words, appearance and word (Küpers, 2015). Phenomenology investigates any phenomenon that a human can consciously become aware of. The lived experience of phenomena is the object of study. Phenomenology investigates how phenomena present themselves to consciousness and how they are experienced in daily life. Subject and object are not separated in this inquiry. Phenomenology is a direct response to Descartes' Cartesian philosophy which separated subject and object (Küpers, 2015).

The body and world bring one another into existence (Küpers, 2015). "Merleau-Ponty's philosophy makes the human body the centre of the experiential world" (Pallasmaa, 2012, p. 43). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is "post-metaphysical" (Küpers, 2015, p. 254). A post-metaphysical philosophy is an integral theory that locates origins in practices themselves and is not an abstract metaphysical theory. The point is for researchers to hold all the complexities and see all the possibilities at once; to see like an artist "the multidimensional, complex, dynamic, intersubjective and multi-contextual nature of experiences and realties in organizations" (Küpers, 2015, p. 254). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology gives access to all these dimensions and is "one form of gaining knowledge and truth" (Küpers, 2015, p. 255).

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology holds phenomena in flux, since constant change is where they rest (Küpers, 2015). This is what it means to not abstract but to live with the things that the painter trys to study. This phenomenological practice engenders an

147

awareness of one's awareness (Küpers, 2015). This method of interrogation is inherently "self-reflective and self-critical" (Küpers, 2015, p. 255). This methodology self-reflexively understands that it is one of many approaches that can be taken to understand organizations, bodies, and communication.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological approach creates time and space for responses to emerge. It is an embodied approach that addresses the origin of things which always emanate from the body. This approach yields an access to understanding and meaning-making as a continually "renewed in ongoing 'interpreting' and inter-practising" (Küpers, 2015, p. 255). This kind of research is a "'between-showing'" of meaningful relational unfoldings that remain incompletable" (Küpers, 2015, p. 255). One attends to their lived experience to opens into the shared experiences of an organizational corpus.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is an ability to allow new possibilities, meanings, and insights to unfold without coming to a conclusion (Küpers, 2015). Phenomenology straddles introspection and "intersubjective and interobjective patterns, structures, and processes" (Küpers, 2015, p. 26). The interaction between one's body and the organizational body—composed of an amalgamation of bodies—puts interpretation into a systematic account (Küpers, 2015).

The epoché, bracketing, phenomenological reduction, and free variation are important methodologies in phenomenology (Küpers, 2015, p. 14). However, the important link among all these is the suspension of judgment. The suspension of judgement implies that while we cannot get out of our biases and presuppositions we can distance ourselves from them by "holding off preconceptions, personal knowledge and

148

habitual beliefs" (Küpers, 2015, p. 14). Phenomenology is a way to see the world outside of empiricism and science (Küpers, 2015). Affective atmospheres are a way to interpret the organizational corpus which cannot be quantified. Sense is bodily access to the corpus that the aesthetic has made visible. The organizational corpus is viewed as painting.

Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Practice

To practice this phenomenology in organizations leads to the simultaneous interrogation of personal and social experiences (Küpers, 2015). Personal and social experiences are made of phenomena and saturated with meaning. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is concerned with "socio-cultural life as well as the interplay with external spheres" (Küpers, 2015, p. 26). These spheres, as Küpers (2015) calls them, are scaled. They are broader and broader contexts that we find ourselves situated within. Merleau-Ponty "provides a way to describe rich, in-depth textures of senses and sensations in context" (Küpers, 2015, p. 30). This carnal phenomenology accesses and interprets the sensory experience of an individual body within the collective body simultaneously.

Sense is the "media" humans have to interpret experience (Küpers, 2015, p. 31). Senses are the fundamental building blocks of the life-world (Küpers, 2015). Sense links the body's interior and exterior. The result is a reality that emerges between the two (Küpers, 2015). Sense is important to organizational studies because it enters us into multiple intelligences at once. Senses are a media that have "multiple kinds of awareness and 'intelligences': spatial, visual, musical, logical, linguistic, mobile, naturalistic, kinaesthetic, intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences" (Küpers, 2015, p. 30).

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology pays attention to the "inexhaustible dimensions of meaning and ambiguities from different perspectives" (Küpers, 2015, p. 8). Phenomenology is an account for our lived experience as it is shared and being shared with others in interdependent performance.

Husserl's famous saying, "to the things themselves," can be translated into organizational studies (Küpers, 2015, p. 9). It provides a heuristic to look for ways to practice outside of what the practitioner or researcher knows, yet it remains true to the horizon of the inquiry (Küpers, 2015). To get back to the things themselves is to get back to lived experience in organizational studies which aesthetics, sense, and art can best account for (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology reveals what practically matters.

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology offers to aesthetic organizational communication a method that would enable researchers, leaders, and managers to attend to multiple dimensions as they happen in real-time. "Researchers are called upon to sense the lived experience of phenomena in medias res, and as they are happening, to experience the experiencing (reflective move) of phenomena and be affected by them while in the midst of things" (Küpers, 2015, p. 11). In Küpers (2015) praxis approach to organizational studies, the researcher inhabits the middle letting the phenomena affectively act on their body, simultaneously they are reflecting on the experience. The ability to traverse theory and action, action and theory is the praxis approach of organizational aesthetic communication.

Merleau-Ponty's Responsive Relational Ontology

Küpers (2015) follows Merleau-Ponty's critique of behaviorism and uses responsiveness to understand Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology. Behavioralism theorizes that actions are reactions caused by stimuli (Küpers, 2015, p. 53). For Merelau-Ponty, responsiveness is being agile to respond when "passive receiving and active giving is entwined" (Küpers, 2015, p. 53). Response does not just fill in the gap but actually recognizes its contribution to it. Küpers (2015) calls this is an "embodied responsiveness" (Küpers, 2015, p. 52) where "[s]omething is experienced in responding, which is not actually available in the present state, but in future-directing realizations" (Küpers, 2015, p. 54). To respond we act from future possibilities (Küpers, 2015).

This relational ontology is grounded in the reception of things from other bodies "Responsiveness in practice means engaging with that which comes from an other and from othering sources (Küpers, 2015, p. 54). To respond is to work with data from others. Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology is an other centered approach to organizational responsiveness and works with future oriented content.

To be responsive leaves open possibility and "oscillates on the threshold" of what could be (Küpers, 2015, p. 52). Responsiveness does not close doors nor form definitive conclusions. Responsiveness combines interactive and interdependent processes that function similarly to dialogic question and answer (Küpers, 2015). The data that we work with that comes from others is always unknown and so we have to be responsive to it. Responsiveness is key when organizational members are working through ambiguity.

In the field of leadership studies Heifetz and Linsky (2002) speak of responsiveness as an adaptive versus technical challenge in organizational contexts. A technical problem already has an answer; standard operating procedures explain how to

solve the problem. An adaptive challenge does not have an answer. New ways of living need to be learned in order to find a solution. Organizational members must find new habits and ways to work. When an answer does not exist a group needs to adapt (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

We are interconnected through others in organizations, and through the body bring organization into existence. Flesh holds the community together through "a 'Flesh of history' as an already articulated field of meaning, which gathers the community and holds it together" (Küpers, 2015, p. 51). Phenomenology and the relational ontology find in appearances meanings woven into a net of perceptions and intentions (Küpers, 2015). Intentions are a "reality-opening realm" (Küpers, 2015, p. 13), and are a collection of "social intending and practising" (Küpers, 2015, p. 51).

Küpers (2015, p. 51) describes "we-mode-intentionalities as forms of collective reasoning, responses, actions and commitments". A collection of intentionality is an alive being with an ontology. We-mode-intentionalities are "dynamically emerging and open relationships as an enacted 'we can' or 'we cannot'" (Küpers, 2015, p. 51). We-mode-intentionalities function as "collective reasoning" and "organizing collectively" (Küpers, 2015, p. 141). We-mode-intentionalities emerge out of "being and becoming" (Küpers, 2015, p. 52). The take away is that Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology is an integral theory of the body, organization, and context through Flesh.

Embodied Knowing

Embodied knowing takes into account sensory experiences in the here and now (Küpers, 2015). Our body participates with other bodies and within a context that bodies and context have co-created. To interrogate of perception we can find how other bodies

co-create with our own. Knowledge is intertwined amongst bodies. Embodied

knowledge accesses knowledge of the web. "Such knowing is created by an embodied,

conscious being, fully aware of and grounded in the immediacy of the direct sensory

environment, while it is mindful of the relationship between mental imagery and the real

world as given" (Küpers, 2015, p. 167).

We feel ourselves to be a part of embodied knowing but at the same time distinct

from it. Embodied knowledge engages "all manners of knowing, including tacit and

formal, theoretical and practical, traditional and expressive modes, each in their

interrelationships as situated in organizations" (Küpers, 2015, p. 168). Merleau-Ponty's

ontology addresses those ways of knowing (Küpers, 2015). Embodied knowledge allows

one to find herself in the moment and outside of it. Sense is access to integral ways of

knowing and their interrelationships.

Performance is the text to be read in an organizational context to access embodied

knowing. The performance of managers and employees makes meaning in an

organization. The performance constructs meaning and lived experience in

organizations. Modern corporations economically organize social relationships in a

"functional rationality" and invent performance in the organization (Küpers, 2015, p.

169). Bodily performance creates organization (Küpers, 2015). Embodied knowing is

the ability to read the text between one's own body and the experience of an

organizational corpus or context through those different ways of knowing and sensing.

Embodiment Practices: Entering Other Bodies

Sense

Embodiment enters us into the unity of the world (Küpers, 2015). Embodiment is not a singular subject that contains only my body but "extends" to all other bodies (Küpers, 2015, p. 57). "[T]he 'subjective' body allows access to and extends into other bodies and entities that make up the world" (Küpers, 2015, p. 57). Merleau-Ponty's aesthetic theory of painting, as discussed in chapter four of this dissertation, said the body of a painter enters the world and other bodies. This complements Küpers (2015) and can explain ontologically how a painter enters the body of other things and those things enter hers.

Küpers (2015) relies on aesthetics and art but does not specifically pull from the text *Eye and Mind*. In *Eye and Mind*, Merleau-Ponty (1993a) writes about the "ontological formula of painting" which he gets from Paul Klee (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 147). For Klee, it means that he cannot be held to just immanence (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a) but that he also transcends. Klee's words

> affirm art's capacity to extend life beyond the living, to open communication with the unborn and the dead. For they are the words of the artist, words attesting that in and through his art he lives beyond the here and now, not only posthumously, but already in his life as an artist, already in the here and now. (Sallis, 2015a, p. 3)

Küpers (2105) future-oriented ontology is what the ontological formula of painting explains. Painter's live beyond the here and now and live with the dead and the unborn (Sallis, 2015a).

We share perceptions, intentions, and responsiveness that makes us "co-habiting and co-emerging agentic bodies" (Küpers, 2015, p. 58). "We are media of a primordial social recognition, who are bound up and communicating with others in the flow of life" (Küpers, 2015, p. 58). Our senses entangle with the senses of other immaterial and material bodies. We have "shared embodiment as inter-corporeality" (Merleau-Ponty, as

cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 58). Through sense we enter into all bodies. Macke (2015) makes this point clear. We call our body our own, however it does not belong to us. One day death will come and our flesh will no longer belong to us (Macke, 2015). We share flesh (Macke, 2015).

Aesthetics is the entrance to other bodies in organizational communication. The aesthetic enters us into the world of sensation, and is the philosophical tool to interpret atmospheres and affect. "As the inter-modality of the senses work together in bodies, the senses allow us to understand the actions of others as we understand our own. During this understanding a tacit bodily recognition of other persons is always present" (Küpers, 2015, p. 58). Sense gives us the reflexivity to act and reflect at the same time (Küpers, 2015). Due to sense we can enter other bodies as they enter ours. Tacitly, we understand our body and the bodies of others (Küpers, 2015).

Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology brings together aesthetics, atmospheres and affect, and "co-habiting and co-emerging agentic bodies" (Küpers, 2015, p. 58) and non-human agencies. These phenomena live within the interrelations human bodies share. We have to see ourselves as an integral part of the organizational world that we form and are being formed by (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's philosophy gives us the tools to view the dynamic web of relations that our bodies are caught and situated (Küpers, 2015). A world of "sensual, unfolding and creative relationships" surround us (Küpers, 2015, p. 88).

Communication

The web of relationships consummated by communication emanate first from the sensing body. Communication is central to understand how we enter the worlds of others

155

(Küpers, 2015). Communication, community, speech, and language enter us into a common world. Communication is dynamic and corporally organizes.

> [C]ommunication can be seen as a function and emergent process of a bodily subject and embodied intersubjective and corporeal processes, in which communicating selves and agencies are already situated and in which they take part actively and transformationally within their context. (Küpers, 2015, p. 61)

Communication is a corporeal process that transforms contexts (Küpers, 2015). Sense is the ground from which humans create worlds and organization emerges from. A body gives access to the world. The tactile nature of communication enters us into a common and shared world. Others "are my twins in Flesh through their situatedness in embodiment and processes of bodily perception…" (Küpers, 2015, p. 62). Communication is shared and organizes bodies according to the way they enter one another. Communication organizes performance in the experience of reality.

Communication cannot exist without first a body. For an organization to exist, bodies have to first be there for it to emerge from. A sensible world exists among interconnected bodies. The communication is tacit based. "For Merleau-Ponty, the living body and embodiment are media of or mediated by Flesh, which signifies a polymorphous, open system, thus a multivalent, horizontal, ambiguous Being and foundation of the possibility of expression" (Küpers, 2015, p. 64). If communication constitutes organization, then a body is not needed to communicate. A body must first exist to be brought into organization. Bodies constitute organization. Before linguistic communication (verbal and nonverbal) organizes, sense-based communication has already organized bodies. Tapping sense-based corporeal organization is what tacit knowledge achieves. An independent body correlated into a sphere of other interdependent bodies constitutes organization. Sense enters us into a common

communication situation. Tacit knowledge interprets the body of the organization through shared corporeality.

Shared Corporeality

Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology of Flesh overcomes dualisms integrating "body and mind, self and other, nature and culture" (Küpers, 2015, p. 64). Flesh gives access to the whole that is mediated through our body as a part of it. World and body are made of the same stuff (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Flesh is an element like earth, water, air, and fire (Küpers, 2015). As an element, Flesh

> can be conceived as a surface of sensibility, a skin or fabric, into which 'en-Fleshed' sensitivities—the sight of our eyes, the sound of our ears, the scent of our nose, the depth of taste on our tongues and languages, the touch on our skins—are indivisibly interwoven or enmeshed. (Küpers, 2015, p. 65)

An organization as Flesh and emerges by interwoven bodies and senses. The purpose of an aesthetic theory of organizational communication is to reveal the surface, skin, and fabric of the sensible organization, which in the literature is called an atmosphere. The way the body touches and is being touched by organizations is reflexive to the way we organize and are being organized.

Flesh brings together subject and object and mediates the world to us (Küpers, 2015). Flesh is the original fabric. Flesh comes before bifurcation of inside and outside, subject and object, and passivity and activity. Flesh mediates these relationships. At the nexus is a hallow that is able to swivel contradictions and opposites. Flesh "interconnects the pre-reflexive sentient and sensible body" (Küpers, 2015 p. 66). Organizations emerge out from the *écart* (gap) of Flesh. At the interconnective nexus of Flesh gives a "texture of Being" (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 67). The practice sense and aesthetic based research brings the researcher closer to understanding Being (Küpers,

157

2015). The ontology of an organization would be its atmosphere, that is made of Flesh.

Since it is a nexus of Flesh, it gives a texture of being, which is the ontology of the

organization.

Crisscrossing

Body and world intertwine in flesh and sense (Küpers, 2015). The body is an

extension of the world and the world is an extension of the body (Küpers, 2015, p. 65).

We "affectively envelope with others" (Merleau-Ponty as cited by Küpers, 2015, p. 66).

Flesh is the texture of Being. Although Being is invisible, it is tactile in nature.

Merleau-Ponty writes about Flesh through concepts such as dehiscence, écart,

reversibility, and folding (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). These concepts signify togetherness, in

the sense of, seeing and being seen, touching and being touched. Dehiscence crisscrosses

body and object as a "simultaneous contact and distancing" (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). Écart

and dehiscence are "non-space," where we see and are being seen, touching and being

touched, speaking and being spoken to (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). Non-space is a gap where

contact and distance simultaneously "crisscross" (Küpers, 2015, p. 68). Reversibility is

where Flesh recoils back upon itself (Küpers, 2015).   Folding means, that in order to

touch and to be touched, the toucher comes back to her own body to understand the other

body (Küpers, 2015).

Chiasm integrates écart, folding, reversibility, and dehiscence (Küpers, 2015).

The chiasm holds the totality of all crisscrossing possibilities where there are no fixed

relations, sets, or spaces. Flesh crisscrosses subject and object, body and mind, self and

world, and inter and outer relationships (Küpers, 2015, p. 75). Chiasm shows all sides

are held in dynamic relationship; thus, to touch and to be touched, to see and to be seen,

to hear and to be heard, to speak and to be spoken to all display the dynamic crisscrossing of organizations (Küpers, 2015).

In the collectivity of organizational flesh, we have "joint-agency" and "self-agency" (Küpers, 2015, p. 51). Previously discussed theories, such as, ventriloquism, organizational aesthetics, and atmospheres and affect all try to understand and/or account for human and non-human agency in organizations. Flesh holds the agency of the individual and the collective agency, and the non-human agency is accounted because it is also made in Flesh. A we-mode-intentionality opens space to understand the creation of organization by human and non-human agents. Bodies in organization perform "processes and actions that are co-evolved and co-evolving capacities of human beings" (Tuomela, as cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 51).

Sense interconnects bodies in our shared world and creates non-space. The body interprets and communicates the organizational world with other bodies in non-space. Flesh interconnects bodies and nonhuman things in organizations. The ability to access other bodies, and for other bodies to access ours, signals a hermeneutic entrance to part and whole. A hermeneutics of Flesh allows our sense to enter the Flesh of the world. The flesh of the body is the part, which enables access to the whole Flesh of the world.

Whole and Parts: An Interpretive Practice

The integral or holonic practice of a practitioner is to understand what is happening in the here and now, as they reflect simultaneously on their contribution to that emerging context Küpers (2015). This is to perform a phenomenology of the phenomenological practice. It is the reflection of the reflection, returning the practitioner to the genesis of the "fundamentals" of the practice or event (Küpers, 2015, p. 174). The

fundamentals "of what is going on and appears practically" is what this practice interprets (Küpers, 2015, p. 174) is what Weick and Heifetz and Linsky (2002) ask, what is going on. Sensemaking (Weick), leadership (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002), and Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology for organizations (Küpers, 2015) all want to know the same question, what is going on.

Küpers (2015) brings to leadership and management a phenomenological interpretation to what is going on in an organizational context. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting contributes the painters interpretive and communicative methods. The painter interprets and communicates and does this simultaneously. To interpret and communicate organizational contexts into existence is praxis. To act from a perspective that is informed is an advantage. One sees things before they happen. To make it an advantage corrupts the innocence that a painter brings to the hermeneutic.

The painter also asks, what is going on, from a space of innocence. A painter lets the context, communication, situation, bodies, trees, and forest look at her and in that interaction form a world that is continually changing. Küpers (2015) supplements the understanding of Weick's sensemaking, because Weick is unclear about how to return to the genesis of things. Weick knows the correction question, but is unable to deliver on the interpretation of the here and now and how to act from it as well. The key, is to go directly to lived experience; "to 'go to the roots' of experience as it happens, that is, as experienced space, time, body, both material and human, as well as beyond human relations just as they come across and unfold and are hence lived" (Küpers, 2015, p 174). Painting takes into account the painter, world, and body that mediates their relationship,

and through that body births a painting. How can the invisible here and now be made visible?

Organizational communication, organizational aesthetics, atmospheres and affect all consider that a multiplicity of texts, bodies, phenomena, and human and non-human agencies create an organization. The practice is called "en-fleshed inter-practising in organization" considers that a multiplicity of things are occurring, which need to be included in organizational interpretation and change (Küpers, 2015, p 174). Practices such as this, reveal that phenomena are occurring on dimensions and are intertwined with bodies and "processed in organizational life-world" through "practices of leading and following" (Streeck et al., 2011, as cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 175). The way bodies, artefacts, and discourses orchestrate themselves can be seen in by an en-fleshed inter-practice (Streeck et al., 2011, as cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 175). Non-human agency makes itself visible in the fabric of atmospheric flesh. Holonic practices oscillate part and whole.

Holons

Holon is a theory of spheres that sees wholes as parts of larger wholes (Küpers, 2015). "Holons are integrative entities or processes, which are both whole and parts of bigger wholes at the same time" (Koestler, 1967, as cited in Küpers, 2015, p. 177). A phenomenon can be viewed from a spherical perspectives to see interior and exterior of other perspectives (Küpers, 2015). Küpers (2015) critiques Ken Wilber's four quadrant theory because, "it objectifies the first-person body as an 'it' and needs to be extended to enfleshed interrelational dynamics" (Küpers, 2015, p. 178). An integral practice grounded in flesh brings together "intrasubjective, intersubjective, and 'interobjective'

161

dimensions in and of organizations as co-constitutively interrelated" through spheres and links (Küpers, 2015, p. 179). Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology is the simultaneous interpretation and communication of organizations in real-time existence.

Relational intelligence shifts the focus of attention "from what is 'contained' within individuals, communities, or organizational systems with their artefacts and knowledge-bases, to what transpires between beings and their selves, artefacts-in-use and sociocultural-systemic realities" (Küpers, 2015, p. 180). The non-space is where being, self, social, and cultural systems interact through a relational ontology.

The interrelations among spheres, links, and contexts show that organizational practices create a certain organizational experience (Küpers, 2015). The choices of interventions available for a style of management to perform are given by the moment in which a context arises (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology is a research practice. It engages multiple spheres to reveal how organizational practices shape spheres of meaning. This practice uncovers knowledge that hangs in the atmosphere. What is happening in the here and now that informs an interpretation and a response (Küpers, 2015). Access to embodied knowledge is through trans(re-)lations (Küpers, 2015). A relation that moves in between as a "travelling concept" (Küpers, 2015, p. 180).

Küpers (2015) combines phenomenology and pragmatism to form a situated creative action in practice. Küpers (2105) connects pragmatism to Merleau-Ponty's embodied organizations. "[T]o practice is to experience directly, immediately, implicitly and comprehensively… practitioner, practice and practical actions are not separated but relationally intertwined in actual experiences" (Küpers, 2015, p. 184). Küpers (2015) connects "action" to an "action of inquiry" (Küpers, 2015). The relationship of

interpretation and action reveals "the interrelationship between being, feeling, knowing, doing and effectuating on both individual and collective levels" (Küpers, 2015, p. 184).

Through the work of Merleau-Ponty Küpers (2015) invites us into chiasm, the gap of non-space, touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, hearing and being heard, speaking and being spoken as phenomena simultaneously present for lived experience and observation. From these ideas a theory of "living praxis" can be created (Küpers, 2015, p. 185).

Living Praxis

Living praxis is situational embodiment (Küpers, 2015). Living praxis, is a theory of action generated from what is happening in the moment. Praxis is lived through not theorized. Lived experience is the text that action and interpretation are based upon in an organization. The experience of the here and now supplies the necessary data to figure out, what is going on, and what a decision-making can be grounded on. Organizational contexts act upon us as we act upon them. The chiasmic gap of non-space reveals praxis. Praxis is an integrative movement that considers bodies in situated contexts (Küpers, 2015, p. 185).

Inter-practice within a holonic perspective considers the multiplicity of bodies, actions, histories, and futures (Küpers, 2015). To act amongst other bodies in organizations we access others' intelligence and reasons for being. We access other bodies (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a; Küpers, 2015). Bodies are creative together.

The body is the site of creativity and through other bodies we become creative. Our body is organized among other bodies. A living praxis is not just acting upon one's reflection (Küpers, 2015), because that would impose; instead a living praxis "is

constituted by an embodied acting being that is simultaneously acted upon in creative

interactions and transactions" (Küpers, 2015, p. 185). This is Merleau-Pomty's

understanding of painting and the painter.

Merleau-Ponty calls the chiasm the non-space origins that exist. Bodies converge

in non-space and dynamically folded over in the context. Living praxis is a "continuous

spiral of unfolding" as a simultaneously reflective and active activity (Küpers, 2015, p.

186).

Merleau-Pontian praxis takes into account the past-present-future, other bodies,

contexts and histories, rationalities, and choice-making. Praxis is learned in the here and

now and extends into the future. In each moment knowledge exists for the body to

interpret. This becomes the theory upon which action is based upon. In non-space

embodied knowledge exists.

> [P]raxis and practices include simultaneously the context, the processes and the
> 'outcomes' of interconnected material, personal, interpersonal, institutional and
> sociocultural-systemic dimensions or relationships that transpire through them.
> (Küpers, 2015, p. 185)

Praxis interconnects pragmatism to Merleau-Ponty (Küpers, 2015). Küpers (2015)

supplies the continental philosophy to ground the practice of leadership from Heifetz and

Linsky (2002) in Merleau-Ponty. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting offers a way to

theorize real-time praxis. The painter and leader perform similar interrogations of Flesh.

The connection between painting and organizations is not necessarily a piece of art work,

but that artists and leaders use their body to bring something into the world. Painting is a

concrete way to see praxis happening in the world.

Praxis and Leadership

The metaphor of the dance floor and balcony describes how one simultaneously dances (acts) and is on the balcony (reflects) at the same time (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Leadership is about being in multiple places at once through reflexivity. The perspective one has on the dance floor, *where* one acts, is different than the perspective one has on the balcony, *where* one reflects. The question is proposed: What is going on? (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Heifetz and Linsky (2002) describe an embodied interrogation because one is always on the dance floor while reflecting from the balcony.

A different set of biases, prejudices, and assumptions inform the perspective from the part and the whole. This means that a different set of data is found in the experience of the part and the experience of the whole. The leader or researcher assembles different ideas about what is going on in the here and now. Painting adds the extension into the past and the future. The body is the instrument through which all of this is performed. The data that is gained from the part and the whole perspectives comes through sense. Vision such as this intertwines part and whole perspectives anchored in the body.

The oscillation of part and whole is an embodied hermeneutic into the here and now, adding painting extends the hermeneutic perspective into the past and the future. The hermeneutic circle oscillates action and theory, action and reflection, in addition to the text and interpreter. Praxis is a simultaneous part and whole relationship made in the oscillation of text and interpreter, theory and action, and action and reflection. Reflection from the balcony allows one to see the text which a part and whole perspective creates. Praxis allows one to see themselves in action on the dance floor. To see ourselves in action on the dance floor comes from the reflective capacity to attend to the whole from

165

the balcony. The oscillation alleviates abstraction keeping the body gravitated in the moment.

Küpers (2015) combines phenomenology, pragmatism, and practice to form a relational method that "looks into the in-between, perceiving the patterns of connected inter-relationship of creative practices" (Küpers, 2015, p. 186). The text to be interpreted is formed at the interspaces of bodies. The text that to be read in these gaps requires one to read their own body's senses. One has to figure out the data that the atmosphere is supplying (like oxygen), while understanding how one's interpretation of that data is biased. Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology gives access to other bodies in the organizational context (Küpers, 2015).

Praxis considers "multidimensional and interrelational events" at the same time from a holonic perspective (Küpers, 2015, p. 185). A holonic perspective accounts for part and whole (Küpers, 2015), holographically. Praxis is "about why, how and when to act or not in a given situation while facing tasks, challenges and problems" (Küpers, 2015, p. 185). Praxis is reflexive, because it gives one data about when to speak, listen, and act in ambiguity, uncertainty, crisis, and risk.

Heifetz and Linsky's (2002) dancefloor metaphor also seeks to find the *kairos* of a moment. One has to see how their contributions are affecting context and how the context is affecting the action of the individual, group, organization, or nation state. All parts are organized within larger wholes, spheres, as Sloterdijk thinks of them (Borch, 2009). The knowledge about how and why one acts is tacit knowledge, given by sense, anchored in the body. The literatures discussed in this dissertation (organizational communication, organizational aesthetics, atmospheres and affect) connect sense and

166

aesthetics to tacit knowledge, but fail to explain its corporeal whereabouts. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting, ontologically describes the ground of this tacit knowledge. While it is a metaphysics of painting, it is an embodied metaphysics. Painting describes the corporality of being.

Things in the world change and praxis adapts to this (Küpers, 2015). Praxis is based in contingency, multiplicity, and uncertainty. Praxis accesses what is amongst the interspaces in the polyphony of everything. Flesh, chiasm, and praxis are integral terms because they hold a multiplicity of things together reflexively. Praxis orders chaos without reducing it. Praxis is able to live in the things it inquiries about. Organizations are molded out of bodies. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology does not reduce things to "constructivism" or "practicalism" (Küpers, 2015, p. 187). The task of phenomenology is to describe the world before reflection and construction (Küpers, 2015). Praxis makes a gap needed to be on a bunch of different sides of a context, object, or phenomena.

In(ter-)between and Letting Be

"Letting be" and the "in(ter-)between" are connected concepts (Küpers, 2015). To let be is to use one's body to allow things to emerge. This is different from Eisenberg's (1984) strategic ambiguity, because (Küpers, 2015) allows ambiguity to present itself. Emergence is allowed to happen. In the Buddhist tradition, "pratîtya-samutpâda" means a "dependent co-arising of phenomena" (Küpers, 2015, p. 81). The Buddhist traditions of Nhat Hanh's "inter-being" and Kimura's "in-be-tweenism" (p. 81) and Qi (p. 82) are similar to Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology (Küpers, 2015).

Merleua-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology are a spontaneous "self-organizing emergent be(com)ing…as a dance of co-creation" (Küpers, 2015, p. 81). The world is in us and we are in the world. The world arises out of us and we arise out of it (Küpers, 2015). Flesh is like Qi, the "life-force" that animates and shapes growth (Küpers, 2015, p. 82). We get out of habitual ways of thinking and performing, understanding that "perception and perspectives are mutually interdependent" (Küpers, 2015, p. 85). By practicing this understanding—as I argue the painter does—one gains access to a "[m]ulti-dimensional, sensory, polymorphic and social perceptions are entrenched and enacted in historico-linguistic contexts and perspectives" (Küpers, 2015, p. 85).

Managers and leaders enter interdependent perceptions and perspectives of history, language, contexts, and bodies in organizations. These interdependent bodies, interpretations, and perceptions are held together in painting not language. Paul Klee (2012) said in, *On Modern Art*, that painting is able to hold together many things at once. Language cannot because it is linear, only one word can be said after another. Painting can hold a "multiplicity simultaneity" (Paul Klee, 2012, p. 10). Living praxis points towards seeing everything all at once (Küpers, 2015). Painting adds clarity to the praxis methodologies. The interrogation of organizations, bodies, and affective atmospheres is an embodied praxis in organizations.

Living praxis is a "mediating science [that] allows the experience of a discourse and enactment of the in-between, liminal and the ambiguous" to emerge (Küpers, 2015, p. 85). This is a way to be with phenomena to find an emergent threshold or "space" of research (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). Science has to possess, hold, reduce, or control

phenomenon under a microscope. Everything in the life world as its being lived, was lived, and will be lived is available text to be interpreted. In organizations, spaces for research emerge in contexts (Küpers, 2015), and that is where Merleau-Ponty's painter is able to interpret.

This is an "engaged letting" of things be as they appear (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). Poetic relations come through presence and meditation (Küpers, 2015). Phenomena are not manipulated or controlled but observed as they occur and we ourselves occur (Küpers, 2015). Rhetorically, this is how argumentation is to be laid out, such that the audience understand the potential and the actual consciousness (Hyde & Smith, 1979). By an "active non-doing" we achieve and engaged letting (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). An "engaged releasement" is entered into that does not totalize or colonize but dances with phenomena as they organize (Küpers, 2015, p. 89). We are watching organizing as we are being organized, and the gap is the ontology of how that organizing works and achieves life through bodies. This does anthropomorphize of organizations, but that since organizations are made of bodies and Flesh they take on an ontology. Bodies and phenomena co-create and become an organization and its communication. Praxis creates and interprets the gap where Being exits, where bodies and things, spring forth.

Body-Forthing

Habits

Habits are a good example of "body-forthing" (Küpers, 2015, p. 188). The habits of interdependent bodies bring things into the world. Habits are an example of body-forthing, since our body moves before we "reflect" on a situation (Küpers, 2015, p. 190). Habits are developed by our engagement with the world (Küpers, 2015). Habits structure

the life world. For Merleau-Ponty, habits exist in the body and Küpers (2015, p. 188) terms this "habit-based 'body-forthing". For example, the knowledge for typing exists in the fingers (Küpers, 2015). The habit only exists when the body is in the performance of doing it. Habits emerge from our interaction with the world; we live in our habits. This is similar to the ontology of painting, where the interrogation only emerges in the action of painting.

The body and the world intercourse to make an inhabitable world. Habits are both in us and the world (Küpers, 2015). Habits are dynamic and change. Bodies are shaped by "quasi-reflexive structures" called habits (Küpers, 2015, p. 191). Habits form and are reformed. Habits "emerge from a variable to-and-fro of individual and social inter- and trans-actions" (Küpers, 2015, p. 192). Habits take shape—they become what they are—by our relationship to the world.

Innovation and creativity allow for new habits to emerge. A habit we can develop is to be pregnant with innovation, creativity, and spontaneity (Küpers, 2015). Body-forthing is the knowledge that comes from within liminal space—non-space—where "the fertile dynamics of liminality" are located (Küpers, 2015, p. 192). "The liminal is a condition that is 'neither here nor there' but 'betwixt and between' (Turner, 1969, p. 95); and this very state is highly relevant for organizations (Küpers, 2011a)" (Küpers, 2015, p. 192).

A painter inhabits the liminal space according (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Thus, the painter's ontology can be helpful for management and leadership because of the ambiguity and liminal space in these roles. The literatures this dissertation engages—communication, organizational aesthetics, atmospheres and affect, Merleau-Ponty's

philosophy of painting, and Küpers (2015) relational ontology for organizations—each engage the liminal space. This dissertation brings together the embodied understanding of these literatures through aesthetics.

The dance floor and balcony metaphor of Heifetz and Linsky (2002) locates the body in the liminal space of praxis: to act and reflect. On the dance floor acting, and also on the balcony in reflection. Action and reflection are how we come to find a theory in action, which then informs action based in theory. To body-forth is to make them happen at the same time; that would be praxis and phronesis.

A body-forthing comportment attends to multiple places at once. Embodied improvisation challenges rational, objective, and cognitive theories of organizations (Küpers, 2015). Embodied improvisation has structure and flexibility simultaneously. Improvisation allows for learning to happen accidentally. Learning occurs in spaces and times different to the normal, but improvisation does not   Learning happens in play itself. Improv does not disrupt choices or stifle structural kinds of knowledge (Küpers, 2015).

Emergent strategy creates in this way. Improvisation "implies anticipated or imagined present-future relationships" (Küpers, 2015, p. 196). "[C]hiasmic organizing" is an inter-practice that takes into consideration the comportment of bodies, their actions, and institutional operations (Küpers, 2015, p. 196). The entire organization is "incorporated" within our bodies (Küpers, 2015, p. 196). Merleau-Ponty's chiasmic organizing captures all these complexities in organizations (Küpers, 2015). Bodies allow things to emerge by holding non-space, gap, *écart*, as the site of intertwining, reversibility, and chiasm.

Negative Capability

Keats' "negative capability" is a way to think through Merleau-Ponty's chiasmic organizing (Küpers, 2015, p. 231). Keat's "negative capability" can hold chiasmic tensions. Negative capability is "the capacity to wait without expectations" (Küpers, 2015, p. 231). "Negative capability indicates the capacity to live with ambiguity and paradox in a way that holds or contains them in order to be a medium" (Küpers, 2015, p. 231). This means that ambiguity and uncertainty are the medium through which things are birthed. To remain open to uncertainty, blur and vagueness one has to practice with the medium. Negative capability indicates when "to catch the ripe moment of kairos" (Küpers, 2015, p. 232).

Negative capability can be applied to the right time to act in an organizational communication. The practice becomes the medium *itself* through which realities arise (Küpers, 2015). The practice makes the gap out of itself, ambiguity and uncertainty, and then springs forth through the gap via the body's performance in the world.

Negative capability "creates intermediate spheres" and patience is important for "attending to the deeper patterns of meaning that may unfold" (Küpers, 2015, p. 232). Waiting, patience, and holding enact organizational change (Küpers, 2015). Researchers, organizational members, and consultants need to "develop a high level of personal skill to use themselves as catalysts of self-organizing forces inherent in the team or organization" (Küpers, 2015, p. 233). The body of the researcher is the instrument that collects, interprets, reflects, and actions upon information. The body is used to bring organizations into existence. A painter's body brings painting into existence. The

painter turns the world into painting through their body (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The painter takes their body with them according to Paul Valéry (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

A painter also brings visibility to invisible things (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Painters bring possibilities into existence and paint them on a canvas. In organizations, leaders and managers bring potential ways of being into actual. This occurs in the lifeworld and bodies experience the results of decisions and choices of actual consciousness. Painters do the same thing. Through the body the painter brings potential into actual form on the canvas. The canvas for managers and leaders is lived experience itself in organizations. Bodies in organizations sway, rhythm, and pulsate as "membranous media" (Küpers, 2015, p. 233). Instead of making music, organizational bodies make "learnings, creativities, and actions" (Küpers, 2015, p. 233). A critical perspective would show that bodies today are aesthetically chimed for profit, reports, and capital.

In these practices we find a way to interpret organizational rhythms that have not been discovered or spoken yet. It is a practice in "enduring" compared to "active intervention" (Küpers, 2015, p. 231). "It is the ability to find thoughts that are available, but as yet do not have a thinker…" (Küpers, 2015, p. 233). For Hyde and Smith (1979) this is how rhetoric makes known. Rhetoric identifies what is pregnated within a situation as potential consciousness. The process of making known actualizes consciousness. Consciousness hinges on finding a thinker to think what has not yet been thought (Küpers, 2015). A rhetor-leader brings potential possibilities into actual concrete experience (Hyde and Smith, 1979).

Hyde and Smith (1979) write that a rhetor-leader moves groups from potential to actual consciousnesses. The rhetor-leader attends to the potential consciousness in a group to gain all the possibilities and potentialities. The argumentation of the rhetor-leader makes known the group consciousness, so it can be transitioned, moved, and changed into actual consciousness. Actual consciousness is our lived corporeal experience and reality. This is to bring the invisible visible; to rhetorically make known. A reality, once potential, is now concrete lived reality for a human being.

Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology is an inter-practice and living praxis grounded in chiasmic organizing (Küpers, 2015). The chiasm is the in between space of non-space where bodies are organizing and being organized. One needs to live in existential openness to live in paradox and tension and not seek to eliminate them. Chiasmic organizing withholds judgment, action, and decision. Chiasmic organizing is similar to the *époche* of the painter and the innocence with which they see the world. "Chiasmic organizing allows one to take a dynamic view of integration…" (Küpers, 2015, p. 234). Chiasm is a way to have an integral view of everything in a situation and context.

The organization and its members need to be adaptable to allow business strategy to fit with environmental changes (Küpers, 2015). The practical skills necessary to interpret organizations such as chiasmic organization are:

- being paradoxically engaged/detached enough to make interventions that are in tune with the emergent situation;
- noticing how participation shapes and is shaped through interaction;
- holding the emergent space without trying to make anything happen;

- building the web of relationships as an organizational container for holding the anxiety of such turbulent change processes. (Küpers, 2015, p. 233)

Inter-practice is an embodied performance. To let be or hold negative space, allows for things to emerge and keep options open. Inter-practice allows practitioners to read their own body to find data about what is happening. The body is the access point to negative space, non-space, and the gap. From non-space body forthing springs and comes into movement. The vision to see the possibilities and body-forth them into existence is Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology. In an organization, organizational actors birth a text from their body in lived experience.

A painter performs this same feat but puts it onto a canvas. The feat, is the act of being a painter makes visible. To be able to act, speak, sense, and experience in the world is Being. The painter makes Being visible. The body that speaks, acts, senses, and experiences in the presence of Being in organization. Being is made visible in organizations, however painting is needed to make it visible. Aesthetics can make voice, sense, and the body and world relationship visible in organizations. To interpret the organization as it emerges is to pay attention to its ontology, which is found interconnected in bodies.

Conclusion: Leadership and Body

Joint intentions are meshed in atmospheres and affect. These joint intentionalities hang in non-space. Our body inhabits non-space as the mediator where atmospheres and affect reside. Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology enable organizational members to theorize and act from the origins of things. To live in the origins of the world is to live in one's own lived body. This is an existential body *techne* from which

leaders, managers, consultants use their body to interpret what is going on? Upon interpreting the present moment, negative capability allows the body to hold potential for the multiplicity of things that can emerge from bodies. The body turns the world into organizations, via bodies organizational change.

Body Tacit Knowledge

Bodies bring organizations into existence (Küpers, 2015). An incorporation is a body. The body has access to part and whole interpretations in Flesh. This hermeneutic, gives data about what is going on in the exterior by paying attention to one's body and the corporality and comportment of others. Sense is the hermeneutic entrance to the body as medium. "Living bodies serve as tangible media through which various forms of leadership practices are negotiated, fractured, resisted or integrated" (Küpers, 2013, p. 336). The body's comportment to the world "includes aesthetic sensibilities and competencies" (Küpers, 2013, p. 336).

The human body shares the world with other bodies. Organizations exist in between subject and object, and the internal and external dimensions of contexts and in practices (Küpers, 2013). "We-can" because we have "shared situations" (Küpers, 2013, p. 338). Merleau-Ponty's philosophy accounts for "individual behavior, social relations and material dimensions, artifacts and institutions" (Küpers, 2013, p. 338). Language is the "communicative and expressive medium" (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, and Küpers, 2012, as cited in Küpers, 2013, p. 338). Through language, sense is able to understand the world.

Leadership is exercised with bodily tacit knowledge (Küpers, 2013). Bodily tacit knowledge finds the interrelations of individual and collective behavior, materiality,

context, and institutions in situations. Aesthetic sensibility is used to engage embodied tacit knowledge. Bodily tacit knowledge interrogates the interspaces of organizational experience using aesthetic sensibilities (Küpers, 2013). Art, especially a painting, is a text that pulls one's corporeal knowledge in order to see what the painter makes visible. To find the truth in a painting requires the body. The language used in the medium of communication shows the interrelationship of individuals, groups, and organizations. Art makes visible the invisible web of interconnections in communication among bodies.

Bodily tacit knowledge is an implicit knowing and sharpens decision-making and sense-making (Küpers, 2013). The lived body is the entrance to implicit knowing. Inter-practice is possible due to Flesh. In Flesh human beings organize themselves in language through the medium of communication. Flesh mediates and flows in between body, world, and other bodies. The dimensions that create an organizational inter-context are unified through bodies, interpreted by senses, and acted upon with language.

Flesh "helps to reveal and interpret the relationship between being, feeling, knowing, doing, structuring and effectuating" (Küpers, 2013, p. 341). In Flesh, individual and collective ontologies create an organizational corpus. The ontology of the organizational corpus can be read as the atmosphere of an organization affectively created by many bodies. Sense ignites our interpretation of being, feeling, knowing, and doing. Sense engages ontological features interwoven among material and non-material features, such as, behavior, relations, institutions, and artifacts. An integral interpretation exists because of Flesh. Body, organization, and organization corpus are made of the same stuff. The access of the whole from part is possible in Flesh. The liquidity of Flesh oscillates bodies of flesh.

Inter-practice

Inter-practice allows for "constant perception organizing, dis-organizing, and re-organizing" while simultaneously moving "between material, subjective and interpersonal realms" (Küpers, 2013, p. 342). My body and the body of others mediate an organizational context that carnal leadership interprets (Küpers, 2013). Sense and sense-making can be learned as "art-based research practices" (Küpers, 2013, p. 347). Leading and following are an "inter-practice" through shared responsiveness (Küpers, 2013, p. 348).

It is important to note that inter-practice also concerns paying attention to what is not said and what is not practiced (Küpers, 2013). Silence, non-rational and non-purposive activity contribute as much to interpreting organizational contexts as language, intentionality, and purposive activity (Küpers, 2013). Inter-practice births new organizational realities through "incarnation" and "unfoldment" (Küpers, 2013, p. 349). Inter-practice makes new political, economic, social, and ethical relationships possible (Küpers, 2013).

Inter-practicing engages our body and the bodies of others through intertwinement, and brings something, rather than nothing, into existence (Küpers, 2013). Merleau-Ponty's ontological philosophy of embodied leadership changes the way organizations are experienced, and how they perform. Embodied leadership changes the ontology of organizations through the individual and collective body. Inter-practice interprets and acts organizational contexts into reality through embodiment (Küpers, 2013).

Inter-practice is similar to practical wisdom, or *phronesis* (Küpers & Statler, 2008). *Phronesis* is an integral concept that engages "multiple dimensions and levels of human experience" (Küpers & Statler, 2008, p. 380). Phronesis is experiential and situational and and is a practical knowledge for Aristotle (Küpers & Statler, 2008). Practical wisdom in leadership is based on a relational model (Küpers & Statler, 2008). We do not individually possess wisdom. Wisdom resides within the matrix of organizational relationships, other bodies, and actions (Küpers & Statler, 2008).

The researcher's body merges with the organizational skin and all the things within affective atmospheres. The self-awareness to read one's own "inter-subjective relationship with organizational actors" is how to embody others experience (Küpers & Statler, 2008, p. 390). The probing of one's body is checked against other "bodily movements and demeanor…to experience the Other's body" (Küpers & Statler, 2008, p. 390).

The body is the Flesh tool to conduct research in organizations (Küpers & Statler, 2008). The body is the medium through which realties are brought into existence (Küpers, 2013). Through empathy the lived experience of others is available in an embodied knowledge (Küpers & Statler, 2008). Flesh enters us into the commonality of a shared body called organization. Organizational context is enacted by bodies. Bodies together in a context of work affect one another (Küpers, 2015). The body is the context and ground of interpretation. The body is the medium (Küpers, 2015). The body has ontological reflexivity.

CHAPTER 7

Implications for Organizational Communication and Future Research

179

A painter's ontology is *the* research process**.** The body plays the central role in the production of incorporations (Küpers, 2015). Interdependent bodies make the whole of an organization constituted in bodies. Bodies form an organization and make it visible by communication. A body is a prerequisite for organization and communication. Communication is the text aesthetically made visible in the medium of paint.

Embodiment allows us to enter the lived experiences of others in an organization. Leadership, this dissertation argues, is the ontological practice that works with the experiences of others. The manage and design of organization and experience is sophistic. To make known, to make visible, and judge with innocence communication ethics for rhetor-leaders. Management and design have purposes: to increase profits and return on investment or save on a well-designed supply chain; whereas a rhetor-leader that makes known biases, presuppositions, and assumptions in their argument opens communication and channels of understanding. In terms of painting, one could discuss the same approach to disclosure. Painting makes visible Being and truth.

Aesthetics is a way to interpret what cannot be seen and has been underutilized in organizational communication. Aesthetics and sense-based methodologies are good to interpret organizations because organizations are grounded in bodies. Communication cannot exist without a body. The body is always already *a priori* to words, language, communication, and organization. Organizational contexts are created by a body (Küpers, 2015). Organization comes from bodies that communicate. Communication organizes. Bodies constitute organizations. Sense and aesthetics are paradigms for the study of body, and in that case, incorporation, today's organization. Sense, aesthetics,

and painting, as discussed in *Eye and Mind* (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a) all use the body to perform inquiry of the world, other bodies, and organizational bodies.

Bodies create an aesthetic organizational communication interpreted by sense. The organizational corpus is the ontology of the organization interpreted through sense. Aesthetic organizational communication is a sense based hermeneutic into the phenomenological experience of organizational members. Verbal and non-verbal communication, non-human agencies, materiality, histories, texts, narratives, language, comportment, discourses, institutions, and bodies all contribute to the interpretation of, what is going on, in the present moment.

Organizations are bodies and can be entered, because the flesh of its membership contributes the flesh that makes an organizational corpus. The organization is Flesh—whole—and the individuals body is flesh—part—of that whole. An organization is a body of Flesh made by a multiplicity of bodies and non-human agencies that create affective atmospheres. The atmospheres bring together many different dynamics and holds the different things that make events (Beyes, 2016a). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology opening an integral understanding to the factors that affect bodies in organizations through the concept of chiasm (Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology (Küpers, 2015) complements Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting, whose painter interrogates the world through sense, and uses the body to turn the world into paint (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

This chapter has four main sections. The first section discusses why aesthetics is relevant to organizational communication and the reflexivity of a researcher. The second section discusses Merleau-Ponty's ontology through Cézanne's germinating with the

landscape, and Klee's multiplicity simultaneity approach to painting. The third section

discusses three implications for aesthetic organizational communication: letting be as an

ontological leadership practice, art as pedagogy for the body, heart, and mind, and the

connection between painting, aesthetics, rhetoric, and organizational communication.

The final section is a short conclusion.

Organizational Aesthetic Communication

Embodied Economy

Sense and aesthetic based methods are called for in organizational communication

today because of the broadly defined aesthetic economy that organizations are situated in.

Aesthetic theories of management and organization are needed to meet the current

environment (Beyes, 2016a). Organizations are situated within an economy, and today's

current economic environment has been called an "experience economy" (p. 115),

"creative industry" (p. 115-116), "aesthetic capitalism" (p. 116), and "design-economy"

(p. 120; Beyes, 2016a). This kind of capitalism suggests that organizations demand sense

and aesthetic knowledge from their members (Beyes, 2016a). An artist performs the

creative labor that organizations today want (Beyes, 2016a). If the labor that creates and

sustains organizations is aesthetically based the research paradigm to interrogate that

work ought to be sense-based.

Organizational research needs to study the way aesthetics organizes bodies

(Beyes, 2016b). Organizational aesthetics researches the way humans consciously

transform their body to appear a certain way, evoke the ethos of a brand, and

performance within an organizational context (Beyes, 2016b). Aesthetic organization

interrogates the way bodies shape, engineer, and create lived organizational environments

182

(Beyes, 2016a). Sense based knowledge is a collective—not individual—practice (Beyes, 2016a). Organizational aesthetics challenges the cognitive, rational, and analytic organizational paradigms (Beyes, 2016a). Collective bodies are interconnected by sense.

Merleau-Ponty's work interconnects sense, world, and body. "Merleau-Ponty's approach offers a real chance to work on organising aesthetics" (Küpers, 2002, p. 36). Touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, painting and being painted (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a) reveal that sense data is never exclusively our own. Sense is always shared amongst other bodies in the world.

Painting is the practice for Merleau-Ponty that reveals embodied research. Embodied research studies organization ontologically, through one's body and the other bodies. The painter only has their body and vision to bring things into existence (Merleau-Ponty, 1993). Through their body, a painter turns the world into paint (Merleau-Ponty, 1993). The ontology of a painter reveals the way creativity, research and inquiry, and sense-based interpretation can be performed by managers, leaders, and employees. An ontology of organization can be studied by the way bodies are being in an organization. The performance of bodies being organized can be captures by the painter.

Sense Knowledge and Aesthetics

We live in an aesthetic based economy and aesthetic organizational communication inquiries about the experience of organizing bodies. Aesthetics reveals how our body comports itself to organizational communication and affective atmospheres. Aesthetics offers another approach to rational, analytic, and cognitive models of knowing. Sense is the ontological entrance to embodied knowing. Sense

interrogates the body for clues and data about what is going on in an organization. Sense

finds data among bodies that rational, cognitive, and analytic models cannot. Bodies

create organizations and aesthetics allows us to return to the origin of organizations in

sensing bodies.

Merleau-Ponty (1993a) writes about seeing and being seen, touching and being

touched which gets at the simultaneity of the experience we create. Being, aesthetics,

and sense all interpret simultaneous experience. The question organizational

communication, organizational aesthetics, atmospheres and affect all fail to answer is

how does a researcher, leader, manager, or employee actually access their body to gain

data on what is happening? How does one tune their body to the emergence of situations.

Opening our body to letting be is how organizational aesthetics interrogates phenomenon.

The aesthetic object is also one's own lived body.

Aesthetics "is a form of *knowing by acting*" and incorporates "*personal*

knowledges" (Strati, 2005, p. 920). Language is the "communicative and expressive

medium" (Merleau-Ponty, 1962; Küpers, 2012, as cited in Küpers, 2013, p. 338) that

boundaries organizations (Strati, 1995). Painting is the medium that renders a visible the

affect creating lived experience in organizations. The organizational context is molded

into an organization (Taylor, 2013) and is sculpture out of the body. "[O]rganizational

members are the creators and artists" of the organizations they inhabit (Taylor & Hansen,

2005, p. 1226). In is necessary for organizational members to be aware that their body

creates the scenarios, contexts, and communication that becomes organizations. The

organization is an inhabitable body.

An aesthetic theory of organization gets us outside rationality, instrumentalism, and analytic procedures to understand organizations (Taylor, Bathhurst, Ladkin, Meisiek, & Wood, 2012). Aesthetics preserves the richness and integrity of the things we study in organizations, because aesthetics are outside profit and efficiency (Taylor et al., 2012). Aesthetics does not neglect cognitive and rational knowledge, and includes more. Aesthetic sensibility is "intertwined" with rationality and cognitive ways of knowing (Beyes, 2016a, p. 118).

Aesthetics enables us to see our seeing (Taylor, 2016). Aesthetics gives sensibility to reflect upon our body and its relation to other bodies in the world. Aesthetics gives the ability to see our frames of reference and perception (Taylor, 2016). There is an aesthetic quality to all communication (Thyssen, 2011). The aesthetic quality enables access to whole through part. A painter, it has been argued, also enters the whole by accessing the part. Communication itself is a "sense based media" (Thyssen, 2011, p. xiii). Aesthetics makes visible communication, texts, biases, discourses, and rationalities.

Organizations are atmospheres that contain "objects, stories, technologies, texts, human bodies and their affective capacities" (Beyes, 2016a, p. 115). Sense allows the leader is to see these things as they emerge in the moment. The body is the medium through which sense and tacit knowledge occur. To make visible problems, opportunities, threats, and ways to change is one of the tasks Merleau-Ponty's theory of painting can assist researchers and practitioners with. The flexibility and adaptability of the painter's interrogation of the world shows the liquidity of leadership. Leadership can be exercised by anyone at any time and is not tied to authority or role (Heifetz, 1998). Leadership is an exercise that one decides to take up or to not (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

Aesthetic organizational communication enables us to see the depth and dimensions to an organizational corpus.

Reflexivity

The paradigm for the researcher to have reflexivity and attend to their own bodily experience of the interrogation is aesthetic organization. Sense traverses the gap between the experience of organizational members and the experience of the researcher who tries to figure out their experience (Taylor & Hansen, 2005). The gap between what, 'I feel' and what the other feels is meshed through sense. An intertwinement of oscillating bodies is constantly swiveling the gap, *écart*. Chiasm brings all these disparate fleshes into an ontological relationality that can be interpreted. The interpretation of *that* moment exists in the here and now and then vanishes into past and future.

The chiasm is that flash, when everything was interpreted, *almost*. We learn from the painter that the quest to know Being, to paint the entirety of the object, will never ever be fulfilled; yet in that gap, in that inability to be able to put everything there on canvas and achieve a pure masterpiece is the call for the next quest to come (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The failure of the project of painting to ever be able to be completed is the call of next quest. This ontology of painting has sustained itself from day one since Lascaux. Although "all creations" pass painting has continually put itself in the future, and in *that* sense never dies (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a), and Paul Klee's ontological formula of painting makes more sense: I cannot be held to the here and now, I live as close to creation as possible but not close enough (Sallis, 2015a). Painting and painters, because of this kind of ontology, inhabit the past and the future.

Leadership is a research performance process that constantly takes account of the changing text from an integral part and whole perspective. The question posed in the here and now to gain access to the past and the future is, "what is going on". Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting gives the continental philosophical ground to conceptualize a theory that access past and future in the present. Reflexivity is needed to perform this paradigm and can be understood through metaphor of the balcony Heifetz and Linsky (2002). Acting and reflecting simultaneously is the ontology of Merleau-Ponty's painter. In the present moment, the action of painting accesses the roots to all past paintings and always points to the future (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). A researcher, leader, or manager can adopt the ontology of a painter to find an ontological interrogation of the organizational setting.

Germinating with Organizational Contexts

The ontology of a painter hermeneutically enters through their body, the part, to see the genesis of the construction of the whole, and from the whole reflect on the parts acting in their localized contexts. The medium of paint makes clear the formation of perceptions, bodies, and being. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting provides an embodied interrogation that does not abstract. Painters attend to the whole as it constantly emerges in the parts. Aesthetic organizational communication research makes tacit and sense-based knowledges held in the body available for use in daily life.

Cézanne's Leader Embodied Research

Sense and tacit are tactilely understood in Merleau-Ponty's description of the way Cézanne paints. Cézanne's painting is an embodied process. Cézanne would begin by staring at the geological structures of the landscape in front of him to become one with it

187

(Merleau-Ponty, 1993b). Then, Cézanne would forget everything science taught him in order to "germinate" with the elements and structures of the landscape (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b). He would then use those sciences "to recapture the structure of the landscape as an emerging organism" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). When the time was ripe he would stop and ""germinate" with the countryside", according to Mme Cézanne (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b, p. 67).

Cézanne would find his motif by germinating with the things as he studied them. The motif is the whole that signifies all the parts used to pre-construct it. "To do this, all the partial views one catches sight of must be welded together…" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b, p. 67). The interior and exterior form the gap—*écart*. On the canvas is the inside of Cézanne's and the outsides of a world. "The landscape thinks itself in me," he [Cézanne] would say, "am I am its consciousness" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b, p. 67). The exterior landscape has a valence within the body of Cézanne. The body and world give birth to what is there, and Cézanne captures it in paint by experiencing it.

Sense allows the body to germinate within the organizational context. The countryside, an organizational context, and world, are all example of texts, available to be interpreted. The scale of a text can be increased and decreased. The body is the medium through which a text can be entered hermeneutically through sense. The body germinates with the organizational corpus to interpret the text. The necessary gaps between interior and the exterior are signified by *écart*. Reversibility in Flesh allows the individual body to germinate with the organizational corpus, formed by many interdependent bodies. The chiasm holds the organizational elements necessary to consider at the same time: text, bodies, language, discourse, histories, institutions, power, etc. Merleau-Ponty's

philosophy of painting describes the ontological ability painters have to make things visible through a feat of their body. The method as an ontology signifies being able to co-create the world. The body is a creative tool to use for research lived experience.

Merleau-Ponty (1993b, p. 67) describes this embodied process as an "intuitive science". Cézanne's germinating is similar to letting be for Kupers (2015). When we germinate with an organizational context we let it be as we are also one with it. To let be is both a passive and active performance. Painting is an intuitive science because the sensing body is the research instrument. The painter's body is the research instrument. The body is their access to researching lived experience, data, sensations, and aesthetics. They take their body with them into what they inquiry about. They interpret what is going on by germinating with the countryside letting it think itself in me. The painting is the painter's interpretation.

The generation of theory generation from the text in front of you comes by germinating with the landscape, the world, or the organizational context and flesh. The theory generated by a painter's body germinating with the landscape becomes action when the painter paints. This is an ongoing praxis loop of theory and action in lived experience. The lived experience is what a researcher, leaders, consultants can interpret and create in organizations. The painter interprets the landscape and communicates it as she paints. An organizational corpus thinks itself in an individual's body like the countryside does. Cézanne functions as the consciousness for the countryside; how it is sensed and to be communicated in paint. The praxis of a painter is grounded in their body.

Praxis allows for seeing from where things emerge in our body and how bodies become in communicative situations. Germinating with the organizational corpus we discover origins of communication, contexts, ideas, historical decisions, and possible choices. Sense communicates data to our bodies for this intuitive science to work. Aesthetic communication in organizations takes the method of a painter and applies it to organizational research and leadership.

Cézanne believed that painting was an "exact study of appearances" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b, p. 61). To develop tacit and intuitive knowledge the body's senses need to be engaged. Aesthetic organizational communication grounded in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting discovers tacit, intuitive, and sense knowledge through the intertwinement of one's body with other bodies in the world. Intertwinement creates lived contexts, communication, relations, and decisions. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting helps to understand the complex origins of these things in organizational bodies. Merleau-Ponty provides an ontology and philosophy of painting that allows us to see the many phenomena that come together in the body to shape lived experience, or in this case organizations.

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting describes a hermeneutic ability of the body to transcend the whole. The whole is transcended to arrive at the parts that create the whole which perception presents itself to us. Through germination Cézanne enters the whole to find the origins of the parts of the whole. Aesthetic organizational communication follows this same method. Researchers, leaders, and manages lend their body to the organizational corpus. Interpreting the organizational corpus is a sense-based activity. Sense exists in the Flesh; in between my body and the body of Other. A painter

interrogates their own sensing body, which is never just their own, since the bodies of the things they look at are looking at them. Senses traverse interior and exterior, part and whole, and are corporeally shared. Sense is never individualistic, but collectively relational.

The story involving Cézanne and his geologist friend puts this philosophy of painting into a practice. Cézanne points out to him, the fire that brought the rocks into existence thousands of years ago is still alive, but the natural attitude misses it (Sallis, 2015). To speak only of the geological features, organizationally is to speak of organizational culture, structure, and climate taking the presupposition that communication constitutes organization. The sweat, blood, voice, text, affect, and emotion that produce organizations always comes from a body. To study something other than the body is to study something once removed—an abstraction—from the organization itself. Embodiment organizational research goes deeper than the surface of organizations.

The origin of communication, aesthetics, and atmospheres and affect, Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting, and Küpers relational ontology is the body. To be able to get out of Plato's cave—as Cézanne demanded that his friend do—is to see the fire that created the rocks, and still burns there. Painter's ontology, contributes to organizational studies, the depth to see the fire still burning in the rocks. Through sense, a body sees the ontological depths communication, aesthetics, and atmospheres and affect play in organizations. Reflexivity is built in because the body creates the text that it is in turn reading. Reversibility creates reflexivity through *écart*. The geologist who lived in

Plato's cave only knew the world in a limited way. He could only see the human constructs imposed onto the world (Sallis, 2015).

Cézanne discovered "the lived perspective, that which we actually perceive" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993b, p. 64). In the action of painting, we see our seeing. Aesthetic organizational communication uses sense to research organizational contexts. The researcher's body contributes to the lived experience in organizations and can therefore be an independent observer. By taking notice of one's contribution to the organizational context through reflexively, one is able to see their contribution and its effects. Painting takes the contribution of the researcher (painter) and brings it directly into the research process and avoids individualism, because sense is also co-created. The imprint of a painter is her style. The object or phenomena dictates to her body the lines to draw and colors to use. The landscape thinks itself in me, and my consciousness gives it life. The organization thinks itself in me and my body gives life to it. The body of a painter always touches the process of inquiry and knowledge. The painter's ontology brings their body into the research process—and in so doing—gains holistic perspective.

Reflexivity, is the attention to one's own body, corporality, and senses. To see and be seen, to touch and be touched, to paint and to be painted, to organize and to be organized are relational ontologies that allow a holistic perspective. Attention to the body and world, or body and organizational context relationship—the gaps—is where sense finds data in the body. The relationship between affective atmospheres and our body has the same gap touching and being touched in organizations. In between is the gap of all sides. Chiasmically, almost everything is included.

Merleau-Ponty solves the question Heiftez and Linsky (2002), Weick et al. (2005), Küpers (2015) ask, what is going on? The complexity of that question, and difficultly of forming a theory is clear. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting and the ontology of a painter provide an embodied inquiry that is reflexive, adaptive, and reflective. It also accounts for agency and non-materiality issues from the organizational communication, organizational aesthetics, and atmospheres and affect literatures, and furthers Küpers (2015) work on the body adding Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting to the conversation.

Merleau-Ponty's ontology of painting accounts for all the phenomena in an organization: the context, discourse, language, body, institution, aesthetic, choice, belief, object, and narrative because all these things are interconnected in Flesh. Bodies make the organizational text to be interpreted. The job of a leader is to be a researcher of the lived experience of their body and the gap between the organizational corpus. The lived body creates organization and language boundaries the experience. There is no incorporation without a body. There is no organization without bodies. Bodies bring organization into existence. Communication is the text for the body to read to make *sense* of the organization. Words, language, and communication in organization spring from bodies.

Paul Klee's Multiplicity Simultaneity Research

Paul Klee (2012) writes in his essay, *On Modern Art*, painting takes into account the multiplicity simultaneity of experiences that language cannot. Language is linear whereas painting is dynamic, simultaneous, and takes into account multiplicity. "For we

lack the means to discuss synthetically a multidimensional simultaneity" (Klee, 2012, p. 10). Painting discusses all once multiplicity.

Klee connects the understanding of painting and language through a part to whole metaphor. Klee (2012) writes about the difficulty of getting someone else to see what you do. Spatial images are treated differently than language in temporality because language lives in time (Klee, 2012). Language has temporal limits. Painting however attends to many things at once because it works outside of language (Klee, 2012). Form gives life (Sallis, 2012). Form finds the formative forces behind an object that appears. Painting reveals the force behind the "forming by which the form is installed" (Sallis, 2012). The form of painting guides and is guided by its own ontology.

Painting is an interrogation that integrates a multiplicity of simultaneity of advents; things coming into being. Language is linear and cannot see the whole. The artist's ontology—to paint a multiplicity of things all at once—adds to the organizational communication literature as a way to interpret the complexity of organizations through texts, bodies, objects, language, communication, and discourses. The body's senses are media to understand how a body, among other bodies, and a world co-create organizational experience.

Implications for Organizational Communication Practice

Letting Be: An Ontological Leadership Practice

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology grounds the practice of letting be in body, aesthetics, and relationality (Küpers, 2015). A practitioner's body hangs, holds, and sits with phenomena to let them be themselves, *free* of human bias. The researcher, consultant, or leader holds the space for things to emerge without casting judgment

(Küpers, 2015). Merleau-Ponty's painter interprets what he sees with innocence. To let objects, communication, bodies, and phenomena become on their own is how one's body is used to birth these things into *being* into existence.

 To let be is a different practice than Eisenberg's (1984) strategic ambiguity. The difference is, in the case of the former, the practice is cognitively induced, and in the latter bodily (Küpers, 2015). To let be reveals the intertwinement of bodies and sense in organizations (Küpers, 2015). Flesh is shaped. To let be is a practice that holds space for things to reveal themselves on their spatial and temporal terms. In other words, by letting be, problems solve themselves.

A painter's inquiry "is total even where it looks partial" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 148). Their body is compelled to study something. When an "impasse" happens and they are hung up on the question their attention is taken elsewhere. Then, one day in the future the problem is remembered, because it has been solved in the work that the painter had has been doing since the problem arrived (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The initial impasses and the random inquiry that sparked the insight are an interconnected event. Inquiries are interconnected and weave a pattern that is taken in order to find a solution (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a).

The painter searches for something in the future that "remains to be sought out; the discovery itself calls forth still further quests" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 148). To let be in an organization is to allow inquiries to take place and at the same time see the patterns of different approaches taken. To interpret an affective atmosphere the conditions for this inquiry take place in the body, and also outside it. To create a gap, *écart*, for reversibility and intertwinement to be visible. The gap becomes the text to be

read by a body because *écart* is ontological. Merleau-Ponty adds to Weick's (1989) sensemaking a way to see the obvious each day. To notice one's noticing. The reflexivity to follow one's attention Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology enable us to do (Küpers, 2015).

Mintzberg's (1987) offers a way to think about letting be in organizations. Mintzberg (1987) writes about organizational change from an art-based perspective connecting organizational change and pottery. Organizational change occurs in a like manner to the way a potter makes a pot on a wheel. Clay is put onto the wheel and shaped by an embodied activity. The interaction between the body and the material begins to take a shape which can then be retransformed into a vase, then into a cup (Mintzberg, 1987), *whatever*. Whatever, is the point; within a structure certain things can happen and an organization can be shaped like a piece of clay on the wheel (Mintzberg, 1987). In the structure of Flesh, organizations can be put onto the pottery wheel and sculpted. The ethic is that flesh can be shaped into almost anything. Organizations are a flesh, similar to clay that can be shaped. Merleau-Ponty's to touch and to be touched is echoes because the clay and the hand shaping one another.

This "is processing an embodied knowing while going instead of knowing before going" (Küpers, 2015, p. 174). The body brings us into contexts like the painter who take his body with him. To follow where the body is leading is the ontology of the painter. Organizations exist because of bodies and bodies undergo constant change themselves to change organizational contexts. Sense, aesthetics, and painting are interconnected and add depth and texture to organizations. How to learn to let be is a question of pedagogy.

Merleau-Ponty's ontology of painting offers a compelling argument that spells out a method of tacit and intuitive knowing through sense in the body.

A Pedagogy for the Body, Heart, and Mind

Taylor and Ladkin (2009) suggest an arts-based curriculum for business students. Artistic skills are resources managers can learn too (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). Art's skills can be used to manage organizational change (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). To teach business and arts side by side engages the whole person in the learning process. The heart, mind, and soul are a part of arts-based inquiry (Küpers, 2015). A painter brings a painting into existence through their body (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Organizational change in organizations occurs through embodiment. The reflective capacity necessary for organizational aesthetics research can be taught to business students in art classes (Strati, 2010).

A painter is constantly engaged in embodied praxis. The philosophy, ontology, and painting are always "yet to be elaborated" because Vision and gesture ground the practice of painting "in that instant when his vision becomes gesture, when in Cézanne's words, he "thinks in painting" (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a, p. 139). When we think in paint, what we see and what we do are creating one another. In terms of organizational aesthetic communication; it can be thought of under the same conditions. When our vision becomes gesture in organizations our body is bringing us into tacit and intuitive knowing.

We communicate the advent of organizational texts and actions. Theory and action shape one another simultaneously. The painter's body is the medium of action and theory in the world. A painter turns the world into painting through their body (Merleau-

197

Ponty, 1993a). Organizational members turn the world into organization through their body. Aesthetic organizational research traces the origin of organization by its members using sense. The possibilities of movement into the future also hang in the interspaces and gaps between bodies.

The implications for growth and learning in arts and sense-based education "are near limitless" (Küpers, 2015, p. 254). The "human spirit and its energies" is the only thing to hold back "their power to inform and provoke action" (Küpers, 2015, p. 254). Arts are a praxis approach to business course pedagogy. Embodied praxis occurs in the practice of art. One counter argument to an arts-based business course is that it would colonize art and aesthetics for capitalism (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009). To teach business students artistic resources would make businesses creative and put profits back into the arts (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). Artistic skills can be harnessed in business contexts without limit (Taylor and Ladkin, 2009).

Painting, Hermeneutics, Rhetoric, and Organizational Communication

Painting, hermeneutics, rhetoric, and organizational communication are connected. Paul Klee wrote that the task of painting is to make visible (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The painter makes visible the invisible for others to see (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology invite a reflexivity to see one's seeing by noticing everyday lived experience (Küpers, 2015). Aesthetic organizational communication is a sense-based inquiry based upon Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting. Aesthetic research is not limited to categorical boundaries and is "a way of seeing" the everyday (Beyes, 2016a, p. 116).

The connection between painting and rhetoric is that they do the same thing. Painting makes visible, and rhetoric according to Hyde and Smith (1979, p. 348) "makes known meaning both *to oneself and to others*." A rhetor-leader appeals to the potential consciousness of a group. They make known to the audience the possibilities that a course of action upon being chosen will become actual consciousness. Lived experience is mediated by rhetoric. Painting like rhetoric discloses meaning to oneself and others. Aesthetics induces a sense-based interpretation of the structural levels where rhetoric shapes beliefs, values, and spaces (Hancock, 2005). Rhetoric can be interpreted by sense through aesthetics.

To make visible is to bring what is not understood, or invisible, to understanding and visibility. To see is to understand. A rhetor-leader and painter help others to see, make meaning known, understand, and discover truth. Painting uncovers truths (Johnson, 2013) that rhetoric and hermeneutics which ontologically interconnected (Hyde & Smith, 1979) supports. Painters and leaders work in the possibilities and potentiality of the future, while embodied in the present.

The difficulty is learning sense-based, tacit, and intuitive inquiries to access the moment. Painting, leadership, communication, and aesthetics all share one similarity: the body is central to their production. Organizational members are unified in sense. The organizational corpus is created with intertwined bodies. The movement and abrasion of bodies creates atmospheres and affect.

Artistic skills, sense, embodiment are bodily resources that allow us to interpret invisibility. Aesthetics as a method can illuminate our understanding of organizations due to its bodily character. Opening up access to artistic resources in the body is one goal

of aesthetic organizational communication. A second goal is to locate the origin of organizational dynamics, structures, powers, rationalities, cultures, and problems into full visibility. Independent bodies that are an interdependent corpus bring these things into existence. Aesthetics engages our senses to see invisibility and painting brings it into visibility with other bodies.

An arts-based curriculum teaches the difference between structure and flexibility (Taylor, 2013). Organizational aesthetics is a method of inquiry that teaches one the correct times to be rigid and when to let things emerge (Taylor, 2013). The ability to use the body to know when to implement structure and flexibility can be learned (Taylor, 2013). Gadamer's concept of play is at the intersection of structure and flexibility (Chytry, 2008). Organizational aesthetics is playful like Gadamer's hermeneutics (Taylor, 2013).

Organizational aesthetics teaches practitioners how to let things be (Küpers, 2015). The dance between structure and flexibility can be articulated in terms of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology as being in between. This embodied activity can be explained by Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and ontology of touching and being touched, seeing and being seen, speaking and being spoken to, listening and being listened to (Küpers, 2015). Sense is created between the gap of the hands touching and being touched. The body covers that gap in organizations when figuring out flex and structure. The painter's body is a media that brings things into visibility. The painter's body is situated here and there (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). Learning how to work in between material and non-material phenomena is the promise of organizational aesthetics. The body lived body is caught in this matrix.

Conclusion

This dissertation builds a theory of aesthetic organizational communication. It is an embodied theory grounded in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of painting from *Eye and Mind*. Merleau-Ponty's aesthetics have been missing from the organizational communication literature. Independent bodies are woven interdependently into a corpus. Flesh holds these relationships together. Flesh is the text our senses interpret. Communication has flesh that can be made visible and understood by aesthetics. Bodies birth organizations into existence. They exist across borders and in humans and outside of humans, connected and also separate from humans. The body is the medium that plays a part to create language, interpretation, perception, history, culture, power, texts, objects, discourse; and it also holds together these things. Sense, aesthetics, and painting make visible the origins of communication, and make visible the ontology of organizations.

Ventriloquism discusses the way in which human and non-human agency create organizational communication (Cooren et al., 2013). Aesthetics pushes ventriloquism towards embodiment. Painting takes into account the internal and external, human and non-human agentic functions simultaneously (Cooren et al., 2013). Art is the evidence that opposites, tensions, and contradictions are part of an ontology of the Flesh and inherent to it. It is to be witnessed, and not overcome.

Organizational communication forgot about the body. The body is the foundation of organization, and a body is a prerequisite to communicate. The organizational aesthetics literature introduced a theory of organizations contra to rationalism. The paradigm intertwines material and non-material things through bodies (Beyes, 2016a). The painter's body germinates with the site, soil, and origin of the things they paint

201

(Merleau-Ponty's, 1993a). The body is also the site, soil, and origin of material and non-material experience in organizations (Beyes, 2016a).

Organizational aesthetics, and atmospheres and affect are literatures focus to take account of the multitude of things within an interpretation. Atmospheres and affect are interconnected to the body and are meshes that hold human and non-human dynamics together. Paul Klee's multiplicity simultaneity captures the essence this concept and way to research, interpret, and act in organizations. To see one's place in the whole, and how their communication affects the whole Klee's theory of art understands.

A painter's body turns the world into paint (Merleau-Ponty, 1993a). The human body turns the world into organization. Communication is the text that the body interprets. Aesthetic communication in organizations is an interrogation of that bodily interpretation to make visible and contribute to the organization and what it contributes to me. The invisible form of organization can be interpreted by the body. Sense is the knowledge that allows organizational members to collect data about what is going on (Weick, 1989). Aesthetics in organizational communication makes visible the text, which is sense itself. Senses act and interpret at the same time. Bodies constitute organizations. Aesthetic organizational communication, grounded in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy and ontology of painting is a hermeneutic entrance into the origins of the incorporated organization, which is always already, an inquiry into the body of Flesh.

References

Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2, 77-81.

Andrejevic, M. (2011). The work that affective economics does. *Cultural Studies*, 25, 4-5, 604-620.

Beyes, T. (2016a). Art, aesthetics and organization. In B. Czarniawska (Ed.), *A Research Agenda for Management and Organization Studies Northampton* (pp. 115-125). Northhampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Beyes, T. (2016b). Colour and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*, 1-16.

Blackman, L., & Venn, C. (2010). Affect. *Body & Society*, 16, 1, 7-28.

Böhm, S., & Land, C. (2012). The new hidden abode reflections on value and labour in the new economy. *The Sociological Review*, 60, 2, 217-240.

Böhme, G. (2003). Contribution to the critique of the aesthetic economy. *Thesis Eleven*, 73, 71-82.

Böhme, G. (2013). The art of the stage set as a paradigm for an aesthetics of atmospheres. *Ambiances*, 1-8.

Böhme, G. (2014). The theory of atmospheres and its applications. (A.-Chr. Engles-Schwarzpaul, Trans.). *Interstices*, 15, 92-99.

Borch, C. (2009). Organizational atmospheres: Foam, Affect and Architecture. *Organization*, 17, 2, 223-241.

Brown, A. D., Colville, I., & Pye, A. (2015). Making sense of sensemaking in O*rganization Studies*. *Organization Stud*ies, 36, 2, 265-277.

Bruce, C. F. (2016). "How Philly Moves": from urban branding to kinesthetic sympathy through an aesthetic blur." *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 36, 2-3, 115-136.

Campaiola-Veen, J. (2012). From affective to aesthetic economics: Globalization and the Commodification of difference on French Idol. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 5(2), 89-105.

Carman, T., & Hansen, M. B. N. (2005). Introduction. In T. Carman & M. B. N. Hansen (Eds.). *The Cambridge Companion to Merleau-Ponty*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Cheney, G. (2001). The organizing property of communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* Nov, 87, 4, 453-455.

Chytry, J. (2008). Organizational Aesthetics: The Artful Firm and the Aesthetic Moment in Organization and Management Theory. *Aesthesis: International Journal of Art and Aesthetics in Management and Organizational Life*, 2(2), 60-72.

Cooren, F., & Fairhurst, G. T. (2009). Dislocation and stabilization: How to scale up from Interactions to Organization. In L. L. Putnam (Ed.) and A. M. Nicotera (Ed.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 117-152). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. *Organization Studies*, 32, 9, 1149-1170.

Cooren, F., Matte, F., Benoit-Barné, C., & Brummans, B. H. J. M. (2013). Communication as Ventriloquism: A Grounded-in-Action Approach to the Study of Organizational Tensions. *Communication Monographs*, 80, 3, 255-277.

Cottrell, C. (2014). Interior turbulence and the thresholding of atmospheres. *Interstices*, 15, 59-68.

de Waelhens, A. (1993). Merleau-Ponty: Philosopher of Painting. (M. B. Smith, Trans.).

In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 174-191). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Dufrenne, M. (1993). Eye and Mind. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 256-261). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Eidinow, E., & Ramirez, R. (2012). The eye of the soul: Phronesis and the aesthetics of organizing. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 1(1), 26-43.

Eisenberg, E. M. (2006). Karl Weick and the aesthetics of contingency. *Organization Studies*, 27, 11, 1693-1707.

Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 3, 227-242.

Erbert, L. A. (2016). Organizational Sensemaking: Interpretations of Workplace "Strangeness". *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53, 3, 286-305.

Fletcher, R, (2008). The Artist-entrepreneur in the New Creative Economy. *Aesthesis: International Journal of Art and Aesthetics in Management and Organizational Life*, 2(3), 144-150.

Fotaki, M., Kenny, K., & Vachhani, S. J. (2017). Thinking critically about affect in organization studies: Why it matters. *Organization*, 24, 1, 3-17.

Friberg, C. (2014). Performing everyday practices. *Ambiances*, 1-12.

Gadamer, H. G. (2013). *Truth and Method*. Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published in 1960).

Grene, M. (1993). The aesthetic dialogue of Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. In G. A. Johnson

    (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 212-

    232). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Griffero, T. (2013). The atmospheric "skin" of the city. *Ambiances*, 1-16.

Guzley, R. M. (1992). Organizational climate and communication climate: Predictors of

    commitment to the organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5(4),

    379-402.

Hancock, P. (2005). Uncovering the Semiotic in Organizational Aesthetics. *Organization*,

    12, 1, 29-50.

Heiftz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

    Business School Press.

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the Line*. Boston, MA: Harvard

    Business School Press.

Holt, R., & Cornelissen, J. (2014). Sensemaking revisited. *Management Learning*, 45, 5,

    525-539.

Hyde, M., & Smith, C. R. (1979). Hermeneutics and rhetoric. A seen but unobserved

    relationship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65, 4, 347-363.

Jelic, A. (2015). Designing "pre-reflective" architecture: Implications of

    neurophenomenology for architectural design and thinking. *Ambiances*, 1-16.

Johnson, G. A. (2013). On the origin(s) of truth in art: Merleau-Ponty, Klee, and

    Cézanne. *Research in Phenomenology*, 43, 475-515.

Johnson, G. A. (1987). Merleau-Ponty's Early Aesthetics of Historical Being: The Case

    of Cézanne. *Research in Phenomenology*, 17, 1, 211-225.

Johnson, G. A. (1993a). Preface. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. xiii-xv). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Johnson, G. A. (1993b). Phenomenology and Painting: "Cezanne's Doubt". In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 3-13). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Johnson, G. A. (1993c). Ontology and Painting: "Eye and Mind". In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). The *Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 35-55). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Johnson, G. A. (1993d). Structures and Paintings: "Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence". In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 14-34). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Julmi, C. (2017). The Concept of Atmosphere in Management and Organization Studies. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 6(1), 4-30.

Kidd, A., & Smitheram, J. (2014). Designing for affect through affective matter. *Interstices*, 15, 82-91.

King, I. W. (2003). Reassessing Organizational Structure as a Painting of Space. *Culture and Organization* September, 9(3), 195–207.

Klee, P. (2012). On Modern Art. In J. Sallis (Ed.), *Paul Klee: Philosophical Vision: From Nature to Art* (pp. 9-14). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Kotler, P. (1973). Atmospheres as marketing tool. *Journal of Retailing*, 49, 4, 48-64.

Küpers, W. (2015). *Phenomenology of the Embodied Organization: The contribution of Merleau-Ponty for Organizational Studies and Practice*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Küpers, W. (2002). Phenomenology of Aesthetic Organising—Ways Towards

    Aesthetically Responsive Organizations. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 5(1),

    21-46.

Küpers, W. (2013). Embodied Inter-Practices of Leadership—Phenomenological

    Perspectives on Relational and Responsive Leading and Following. *Leadership*,

    9(3), 335-357.

Küpers, W., & Statler, M. (2008). Practically Wise Leadership: Toward an Integral

    Understanding. *Culture and Organization*, 14, 4, 379-400.

Macke, F. (2015). *The Experience of Human Communication: Body, Flesh, and*

    Relationship. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP.

Malin, B. J. (2016). The path to the machine: affect studies, technology and the question

    of ineffability. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 13, 1, 40-57.

Massumi, B. (1995). The Autonomy of affect. *Cultural Critique*, 31, 83-109.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1993a). *Eye and Mind*. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.), M. B. Smith (Trans.

    Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 121-

    149). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1993b). Cézanne's Doubt. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.), M. B. Smith

    (Trans. Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp.

    59-75). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Michels, C., & Steyaert, C. (2017). By accident and by design: Composing affective

    atmospheres in an urban art intervention. *Organization*, 24, 1, 79–104.

Mintzberg, H. (1987). Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65, 4, 66-75.

Mumby, D. K. (1996). Feminism, postmodernism, and organizational communication

    studies: A critical reading. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9(3), 259-

    295.

O'Doherty, D. (2008). The Blur Sensation: Shadows of the Future. *Organization* 15,4,

    535-561.

O'Sullivan, S. (2001). The Aesthetics of Affect: Thinking Art Beyond Representation.

    Angelaki, 6(3), 125-135.

Ott, B.L. (2010). The visceral politics of V for Vendetta: On Political Affect in Cinema.

    Critical Studies in Media Communication, 27, 1, 39-54.

Ott, B. L., Bean, H. & Marin, K. (2016). On the aesthetic production of atmospheres: the

    rhetorical workings of biopower at The Cell. *Communication and*

    Critical/Cultural Studies, 13,4, 346-362.

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1983). Organizational communication as

    cultural performance. *Communication Monographs*, 50, 2, 126-147.

Pallasmaa, J. (2012). *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses* (3rd ed.). West

    Sussex, UK: Wiley.

Rauh, A. (2017). In the clouds: on the vagueness of atmospheres. *Ambiances*, 1-15.

Rogers, R. A. (1994). Rhythm and the performance of organization. *Text and*

    Performance Quarterly, 14, 3, 222-237.

The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in theory, research,

    and methods (3rd ed.) (2014). Putnam, L. L. (Ed.) and D. K. Mumby (Ed.).

    Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Sallis, J. (2015a). *Klee's Mirror*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Sallis, J. (2015b). *Senses of Landscape*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Sallis, J. (2012). Klee's Philosophical Vision. In J. Sallis (Ed.), *Paul Klee: Philosophical Vision: From Nature to Art* (pp. 15-23). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Schatzki, T. R. (2006). On organizations as they happen. *Organization Studies*, 27, 12, 1863-1873.

Schmidt, D. J. (2012). *Between Word and Image: Heidegger, Klee, and Gadamer on Gesture an Genesis*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.

Schmitz, H., Müllan, R. O., & Slaby, J. (2011). Emotions outside the box—the new phenomenology of feeling and corporeality. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 241-259.

Silverman, H. J. (1993). Cézanne's Mirror Stage. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 262-277). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Singer, L. (1993). Merleau-Ponty on the Concept of Style. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp.233-244). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Smith, M. B. (1993). Merleau-Ponty's Aesthetics. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 192-211). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Sørensen, B. M. (2010). St Paul's Conversion: The Aesthetic Organization of Labour. *Organization Studies*, 31(3), 307-326.

Sørensen, B. M. (2014). Changing the memory of suffering: An organizational aesthetics of the dark side. *Organization Studies*, 35(2), 279-302.

Strati, A. (1992). Aesthetic understanding of organizational life. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(3), 568-581.

Strati, A. (1995). Aesthetics and organizations without walls. *Organizations and Societies*, 1(1), 83-105.

Strati, A. (1996). Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics. *Organization*, 3(2), 209-218.

Strati, A. (2000). Putting people in the picture: Art and aesthetics in photography and in understanding organizational life. *Organization Studies*, 21, 53-69.

Strati, A. (2005). Designing organizational life as 'Aesth-hypertext': Insights to transform business practice. *Organization*, 12(6), 919-923.

Strati, A. (2010). Aesthetic Understanding of Work and Organizational Life: Approaches and Research Developments. *Sociology Compass*, 4(10), 880–893.

Taminiaux, J. (1993). The Thinker and the Painter. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 278-292). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Taylor, S. S., & Ladkin, D. (2009). Understanding Arts-Based Methods in Managerial Development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 55-69.

Taylor S. S., & Hansen, H. (2005). Finding Form: Looking at the field of organizational aesthetics. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(6), 1211-1231.

Taylor, S. S. (2013). What is organizational aesthetics? *Organizational Aesthetics*, 2(1), 30-32.

Taylor, S. S. (2016). Seeing more or seeing less. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 5(2), 1-2.

Taylor, S. S., Bathurst, R., Ladkin, D., Meisiek, S., & Wood, M. (2012). Welcome to Organizational Aesthetics. *Organizational Aesthetics*, 1(1), 1-4.

Tawa, M. (2014). Vaporous circumambience: Towards an architectonics of atmosphere. *Interstices*, 15, 12-23.

Thibaud, J.P. (2011). The Sensory Fabric of Urban Ambiances. *Senses & Society*, 6(2), 203-215.

Thyssen, O. (2011). *Aesthetic Communication* (Russell Dees, Trans.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Waldenfels, B. (1998). Merleau-Ponty. In S. Critchley & W. R. Schroeder (Eds.), *A Companion to Continental Philosophy* (pp. 281-293). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Williams, F. (1993). Cézanne, Phenomenology, and Merleau-Ponty. In G. A. Johnson (Ed.). *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader: Philosophy and Painting* (pp. 165-173). Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP.

Warren, S. (2008). Empirical Challenges in Organizational Aesthetics Research: Towards a Sensual Methodology. *Organization Studies*, 29, 4, 559-580.

Weick, K. E. (1989). Organized improvisation: 20 years of organizing. *Communication Studies*, 40, 4, 241-248.

Weick, K. E. (2003). Organizational Design and the Gehry Experience. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12, 1, 93-97.

Weick, K. E. (2006). Faith, evidence, and action: Better guesses in an unknowable world. *Organization Studies*, 27, 11, 1723-1736.

Weick, K. E. (2011). Organized sensemaking: A commentary on processes of interpretive work. *Human Relations*, 65, 1, 141-153.

Weick, K. E., & Browning, L. D. (1986); Argument and narration in organizational Communication. *Journal of Management*, 12, 2, 243-259.

Weick, K. E, Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16, 4, 409-421.

Wigley, M. (1998). The architecture of atmosphere. *Daidalos*, 68, 18-27.

Witz, A., Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D. (2003). The labour of aesthetics and the aesthetics of organization. *Organization*, 10(1), 33-54.

Wright, A. (2016). Organizational routines as embodied performatives: A communication as constitutive of organization perspective. *Organization*, 23, 2, 147-163.