

An Apprenticeship to Pleasure: Aesthetics Dynamics in Organizational Learning

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to show what we can learn from an aesthetics perspective on organizational learning, and especially about some power dynamics unseeable with other perspectives.

Approach: An exploratory ethnographic study based on the turn-to-affect on the case of a theatre play in which many of the bearings that usually guide theatrical creation were removed.

Findings: Analysis highlights that 1/an a priori distribution of the sensible that locks routines, representations and roles is seldom questioned in organizational learning programs; 2/the motion enabling organizational learning is less likely to be brought about by a change in power distribution than with the removal of some elements of power that freeze situations; 3/organizational learning diffusion does not only go through norms, rules, values and repositories, but also through affects; and 4/learning runs through a fragile communication of movements, always under the threat of becoming major knowledge and power distribution.

Research limitations/implications: Based on a single case.

Practical implications: A too tight and close management of organizational learning is likely to thwart and limit its very learning possibilities.

Originality/value: Several findings are in contradiction to technological or too managerial approaches to organizational learning. The study hopes to contribute by providing a supplement of complexity in our analysis of organizational learning, notably advocating for taking into account the role of affects, sensibility, and the politics of aesthetics.

Key-words: Organizational learning, aesthetics, affects, theatre play, distribution of the sensible

Research paper.

An Apprenticeship to Pleasure:

Aesthetics Dynamics in Organizational Learning

In the knowledge society, at the nation, firm and worker levels, competition is always fiercer in acquiring, developing and exploiting knowledge. In this context, many companies have developed strategic programs of knowledge management and organizational learning. Organizational learning is the process of improving actions through better knowledge and understanding (Fiol and Lyles, 1985). Political aspects of knowledge management and of organizational learning have been emphasized. For example, Ferrary and Pesqueux (2011) notes that they promote elite reproduction and the enclosure of knowledge which becomes less and less a common good. Easterby-Smith *et al.* (2000) warns that if debates tended to be consensual and conflict-free, it has to be recognized that learning processes take place in a landscape of interests and differential power positions and relations.

A few studies have underscored the role of aesthetics and arts in promoting and enhancing organizational learning and creativity, for instance showing the role of taste (Gherardi, 2009), corporeality (Bertolin *et al.*, 2014), sensitivity (Strati, 2007), emotions (Elm and Taylor, 2010), aesthetic reflexivity (Ewenstein and Whyte, 2007), gesture beauty (Bazin, 2013), etc. in learning processes. However they often overlook the power elements going along with aesthetics as well as what creativity programs may unleash (Gilmore and Warren, 2007).

This paper presents an exploratory study about some power dynamics involved in organizational learning uncovered by an aesthetics perspective. From the case study of a theatre play we highlight firstly the role of an a priori distribution of the sensible that locks routines, representations and roles, and that is seldom questioned; secondly, that the motion enabling organizational learning is less likely to be brought about by a change in power distribution than with the removal of some elements of power that freeze situations; thirdly, that organizational learning spreading does not only go through norms, rules, values and repositories, but also through affects; and fourthly, that learning runs through a fragile communication of movements, always under the threat of becoming major knowledge and power distribution. We conclude that a too tight and close management of organizational learning is likely to thwart and limit its very learning possibilities.

Our reflection will draw on a contemporary theatre play, *Prazer*, in which apprenticeship and learning was pervasive and multifarious, noticeably as the play's theme, in the creation process, on actor's development and as a research endeavor.

The first part identifies two streams of literature at the crossroad of organizational learning and aesthetics and underscores how much the aesthetics and politics perspectives are intricate. In congruence to our perspective, the second part presents our ethnographic method resting on the turn-to-affect. The following parts analyse the case pointing out the presence of an a priori distribution of the sensible, the unlocking role of restraining some power elements, the communicative aspects of affects, and the threat of becoming major that would impede learning. Conclusion contrasts our findings with more technical or managerial approaches and suggests that a too tight management of organizational learning is likely to thwart and limit the learning possibilities.

Organizational learning and aesthetics

Research on organizational learning has now a long history, dating back at least to the '30s (Argote, 1999). Most often cited are Argyris and Schön (1978)'s three levels of learning: single-loop learning occurs when finding new or better ways to achieve objectives and policies; double-loop learning when objectives, policies and values are reassessed; and deutero-learning when learning how to carry out single- and double-loop learning. And Senge (1990)'s five characteristics of the learning organization, and his advocacy for systems thinking. Researches have either emphasized the change in representations and interpretations, or the change of routines and behaviors brought about by organizational learning (Fiol and Lyles, 1985). Some have tried to measure learning globally through the learning curve, while others have minutely described its social construction through interactions and conversations (Easterby-Smith & al., 2000). Organizational learning is not an easy phenomenon to grasp, and Dodgson (1993) called for the need of a multi-disciplinary approach.

Among these needed multiple approaches, the aesthetics perspective has triggered only few studies, however the number seems to be growing lately. A first stream of studies reveals some aesthetic dimensions occupying an underestimated center stage in organizational learning. One of the pioneers was undoubtedly Strati, pointing at the role of aesthetic judgments (1999), proposing that our understanding of organizational learning could be enlarged by using aesthetic categories such as the grotesque, the ugly or the sacred (2000), and demonstrating the proximity between knowing or learning in practice and sensible knowledge (2007). To him, organizational learning cannot be confined to the sphere of cognition, and for example tacit knowledge is very much alike aesthetic knowledge (2003). This stream demonstrates for instance that practice, and learning of new practices, are pervaded by aesthetic reflexivity (Ewenstein and Whyte, 2007), or by discussions on taste that are crafting a community identity (Gherardi, 2009). It reinstates the role of the five senses and of the body in learning and understanding. If knowledge is not only cognitive but also sensible, then corporealities and subjectivities are both constituted by, and constituting of organizational learning (Bertolin & al., 2014). Hence this first stream enlarges our perspective on organizational learning. Learning does not operate only through cognitive reflection, loops fueled by analysis of results, or systemic wisdom. Learning also, and significantly, derives from aesthetic experiences, from our embodied, sensitive contact with situations, enmeshed with aesthetic and taste appreciation. Experience does not only provide data, but also tacit understanding, feelings, emotions, impressions, aesthetic judgments, it addresses not only our brain, but our whole being.

A second stream of literature studies how arts, or artistic interventions, impact organizational learning. Berthouin Anthal (2011), drawing on six examples of artist interventions inside companies, insists on the potential of such fruitful encounters to discover different business and social solutions. Orr (2009) depicts how artistic media are used in collaborative learning, triggering including, sensemaking, embracing complexity, creating shared vision, expression of organizational emotion, and breakthroughs in knowledge. However, other authors are more critical about the outcome of such programs. Mack (2015) illustrates the potential disturbance of organizational aesthetics on what is knowable, thus breaching the "management learning peace". Mairesse (2014), using an artistic device to breach the rules of discussion, highlights how speech is governed and policed, impeding more democratic and creative expressions. Gilmore and Warren (2007) warns that the unconscious unleashed by programs designed to enhance employees aesthetic expression is of a contested nature and that such programs often lead to anxiety. Hence this second stream highlights the potential of

aesthetics-based devices for organizational learning. By breaching, disturbing or deriving organizational processes, they may uncover power arrangements, tacit distribution of roles and places, goal incongruence, exclusion processes, informal decision patterns, etc. They reveal otherwise unknowable patterns and give opportunity to learn from it. They may increase a sense of organizational community or trigger debates and disagreements (Mairesse, 2014), both providing supplementary occasions of learning.

These studies illustrate the extent to which organizational learning rests on a vast number of aesthetic dimensions, but also how much the aesthetic processes are confronted to and enmeshed with power and political dynamics. This is this crossing between aesthetic and political processes that our research endeavors to study.

Method

Our study rests on the case of a contemporary theatre play, *Prazer*, created by the Brazilian troupe Cia Luna Lunera, that toured all across Brazil from December 2012 on, with more than 130 shows. The play was chosen because in it learning is pervasive, from creation to play's theme. What is more many spectators reported having learned much from the play, several testifying it helped them make dramatic personal decisions. The two researchers had long and complementary contact with the creation process. One researcher is actress and co-creator of the play. She did participant observation from within, and was thus involved in first person into the studied processes. The second researcher lived two weeks with the troupe, and had regular contacts with many stakeholders of the play. Multiple discussions and debates were organized with the audience, other actors, scholars and critics.

In order to gain maximum exposure to aesthetic dimensions, the approach is based on the turn-to-affect. This turn requires from the researchers to "be here" trying to reach the maximum openness to present experience (Letiche & Lightfoot, 2014). Inspired by texts like Stewart (1996), Lingis (2003, 2000) or Berlant (2011), we paid special attention to moments when we happen to be moved, feeling for example joy, surprise, fear or anger, and tried to reflect from these experiences. However, because of the limitations of an article, only a few of such moments will be described in the following, and it was necessary to jump directly to the conclusions of analysis.

Using theatre as a way of better understanding organizations and organizational learning, whilst fairly uncommon, has gained wider recognition in the last two decades. First theater and dramaturgy have been increasingly used as a metaphor for organizational behavior (e.g. Goffman, 1959, Mintzberg, 1989; Boje, 1995; Linstead & Höpfl, 1999; Cornelissen, 2004). Second, theatre plays, theatre training, theatre techniques are used either to mirror organizational problems as post-merger confusions, sexual harassment, work alcoholism, etc. (Schreyögg and Höpfl, 2004), or as a mode of control (Nissley et al. 2004). Thirdly, theatrical organizations have been presented as model or food for thought for other types of organization (e.g. Guillet de Monthoux, 2004; Duhlin & Linkvist, 2009). This study belongs to the third perspective.

The distribution of the sensible in motion

One actor slapped another's face on the stage. Tension was probably too high, uncertainty too great, maybe the process was too demanding for everyone. Without the usual bearings of theatrical

creation process, the actors had to learn a novel, singular way to create the play. One week before the *première*, despite there was more than a hundred shows already sold, one actor threatened to leave the project, shouting: "There is no spectacle! We cannot present this. We are going to sink. We need to change everything!" If the play was to deal with learning, learning to live, the participants had put themselves in a situation where they had to learn and invent everything: the play, their role, the creation process, etc. without the frames and distribution of roles that normally guides the creative adventures.

Indeed, much of the usual sources of authority that help organize the creation of a play, the usual guidance and organization that provide bearings and tacit understanding of each other's role and place had been removed. First there was text. The creation process started with the four actors sharing ideas about their ten years of company experience, and they realized that several testimonies resonated with impressions triggered by a book from Clarisse Lispector (*An Apprenticeship or the Book of Pleasures*), but the book eventually imposed no constraint to the construction. There was no director either. Directorship was taken over in turn by each of the four actors, with an adviser holding a mirror for creative reflection. Very occasional inputs were proposed by a playwright, a choreographer, a senior actress and a digital artist, with no one controlling the outcome. Several theatre professionals and critics had repeated contacts with the troupe during the creation processes and participated with some friendly spectators to an "observatory of the creation". Feedbacks and ideas from this observatory were discussed in group, and led to amendments all along the process. "Text" and staging continued to evolve during the one-year tour across Brazil, and probably after. Many spectators wrote long feedbacks and reviews right after the show or on social networks that brought about changes in elements of acting and staging. Lights, scenery, video effects... also resulted from a participative process.

Besides this, there was no one narrative, central plot or 'message' to organize or give direction to the show. There was no distinct beginning and end, with for example the actors sharing the soup made during the show as well as their impressions with spectators after the final dance and applause. The distinction between life and stage was in many ways blurred. The actors performed many of their actual biographical experiences, or expressed their own deep existential convictions. They were actually baking cheese bread and cooking a soup on the stage, with flavors invading the room. The spectator oscillates between the impression of corporally living a normal life among the actors and of attending to very extraordinary, liminal moments.

In short, many theatrical conventions had been removed, and the company let no one authority to take control over, or shape, the creative process. The authority of text, director, narrative, actors, public, critics, habits were re-distributed, or rather were held in constant suspension and negotiation, being more resources than constraints, more servants than masters.

Said differently, the distribution of the sensible was not the frame according to which the creation was to take place, but was a somehow malleable variable for the creation. By distribution of the sensible, we of course refer to Rancière (2004), and his contention that all aesthetic experience is organized by a set of shared conventions, both enabling the experience and attributing shares and positions. Indeed this distribution determines "the very manner in which something common lends itself to participation and in what ways various individuals have a part in this distribution" (2004: 12). At one and the same time, this distribution enables something to be shared, and organizes parts and

places for all participants. It operates ahead of sense experience, and acts as a delimitation “of spaces and times, of the visible and the invisible, of speech and noise, that simultaneously determines the place and stakes of politics as a form of experience” (2004: 13). For instance, the creation of a theatre play classically is governed by a rather strict attribution of the roles between the playwright, the director, the actors, the audience, critics; and by a division between room and stage, frontstage and backstage, and so on. This ensures that everyone can perform her role and make sense of what he watches.

Organizational learning usually takes place inside a set distribution of the sensible. Projects have a definite beginning and end, authority is given to some directors, key players and champions, everybody knows more or less what to expect from the others, and the importance of some rules, norms and principles. The organization keeps some flexibility to allow for adaptation and learning, however within the confine of a frame made of tacit rules and understandings. For the play, on the contrary, many of the frame components were removed or loosened, and the positions were shared or moved, demanding much more efforts for experimenting (transient) organizations, but making room for the possibility of more radical innovations.

What is known, what is learnt, what is organized are necessary for knowing, learning, and organizing. But at the same time, they impede or hold back the dynamics of the latter. Organizational learning offers the opportunity to reset some elements in motion, but usually this movement takes place inside the same distribution of the sensible: a distribution which at the same time enables a collective reflection and understanding, but also limits its range and possibilities to a bounded set of routines and representations.

The distribution of the sensible is a tacit pre-arrangement of the aesthetic contact with the organization. Organizational learning usually unfolds within such an aesthetic frame: feedback loops and experimentation take this framing for granted. In this case, breaking many elements of this frame rendered learning necessary, and opened the way for less constrained organizational learning. Participants were placed in a situation where they had no choice but trying and learning new organizational forms, with far less tacit constraints, far less a priori distribution of power and places.

Restraining elements of power

The actress walks on the front of the stage, composing some ritual for herself. She seems to seek the courage to let go with a few elements that were determining her life: her lasting loyalty towards a finished relationship, her certitude of not being able to reach climax, sexually and existentially, etc. It is five in the morning, she is on the beach, and the water seems freezing cold. She floods herself with a bucket full of cold water, as entering into the sea in one shot, as one would scream an immense ‘yes’, as washing her from all what used to darken her past : a movement of her whole body that may propel all her existence towards another fold, in a leap of faith in life. A moment of liminality where the removing of some power elements that used to organize her life is opening the path to new arrangements and compositions. Then the play shows some developments that could not happen before because of the blocking forces, but that could now be invented and lived.

The play was not only suspending conventions and redistributing places and roles, but in the developments on stage, in the creation process and probably in relation to audience, it tried to

remove some power elements to let new arrangements to unfold and be kept on the move. This can be explicated by turning to Deleuze's analyses of theatre.

In *One Less Manifesto*, Deleuze notices that in Carmelo Bene's plays some elements of power are removed, and this opens the way for unprecedented becomings. For example, in his *Romeo and Juliet*, the character of Romeo was neutralized, allowing the development of Mercutio and new insights over the play. In *Richard III*, the whole royal system of power is amputated. Then the king gets hold by a process of constant variations and deformations, from which he composes himself as a man of war, and accordingly all the other characters also enter in a process of change, proposing new perspectives, adding new themes, creating new aspects of the classical play. A new material and a new theatrical form take place that would have not without this amputation.

Many organization learning approaches emphasizes the role of leaders in inducing, promoting and shaping learning. Leaders have to infuse power in order to make the learning processes run, acting as transactional (Vera & Crossan, 2004) or transformational leaders (Jogulu, 2011), as designers, teachers or stewards (Senge, 1990). The Deleuzian reading of the case suggests the reverse. In the case, power and organization do not produce change and motion, on the contrary they appear as what impedes and blocks becoming and movements. It is on the contrary through subtracting elements of power and of organization that many fixed aspects were being re-set in motion, triggering evolutions, becomings and learnings at many levels. Not to be submitted to the control of the text, of a director, of a message, of a hierarchy among participants... enabled not only interesting drama developments but above all the possibility of another way of doing theatre, of exploring other modes of expression and of creating together. Organizational learning was forced in, not by an act of power, rather by the removal of power forces.

Then the participants tried to keep the play in motion, for organizational learning to keep on, even far after the first representations. The text and its performative elements changed dramatically during the play construction, and kept on moving substantially afterwards. Scene order, choreographies, lights, texts... many elements evolved after the first shows, as if the play was of a living material. Some actors testified that this experience was like an apprenticeship for them too, and that in many respects they were transformed by it. The actors have been interns with Odin Teatret, a famous Danish group, where they were trained to continuously change acting techniques. The practice of shared directorship was also discussed and altered during the process. These were among a multitude of movements preventing the representation to freeze up, and to stop the learning process. As the director Brook (1995) said, once a staging is set, an invisible something starts to die. To him, theatre needs to remain an auto-destructive art, written on sand. It is probably because the actors, the organization, the 'play' was kept in constant variation and need for learning, that this play about learning has had so much impact on public.

Learning is about motion. Some elements have to be allowed to move is some learning is to take place. Power tends to establish an order, and whilst power is needed for some change to happen, power rapidly tends to inhibit further change. In this case, power and leadership were not ruled out, but the organization was set so that power and leadership were constantly shifting, and partially placed in hands outside of the main participants. Hence the team was not placed in a situation where they had to learn a new organization, but where they constantly had to go on learning, experimenting with different settings and guidance.

Affects and movements

At the end of the show, the actors were eager to read the comments let by spectators. Each time the audience was proposed to react, to leave their impressions on a sheet of paper, or else by emails or on the Facebook page, and sometimes during a debate in the theatre. Many comments mentioned that the play was touching, resonating with personal present experiences, questions or angst, and that people felt something had moved inside them. But the most striking is the very significant numbers of testimonies declaring that, a few time after having attended to the show, they made important moves in their lives. Many spectators wrote that the show played as a kick-up, making them reflect on their lives or in some cases giving them the courage or lucidity for important existential choices: to split-up, to change occupation towards a radically different profession; or more simply to dance and sing in the rain after the show. Movement, transformation, liminalities happened far beneath and beyond the stage, as if movement communicated movement to all related parts. Learning sets in motion, and motion sets out learning.

Usually, organization learning is depicted as being spread through organizational memories and repositories (Robey *et al.*, 2000), norms and procedures, routines (Levitt & March, 1988), communities of practices or possibly new myths, stories and culture (Fiol & Lyles, 1995). One of the main goals of knowledge management is to render knowledge as explicit as possible so that it can be stored, retrieved and shared, mainly because the diffusion of tacit knowledge is full of hurdles (Haldin-Herrgard, 2000).

The play does not propose any explicit knowledge. There are sentences written on the walls, words said by authors, situations, but no explicit messages, at least that could explain the power of the effects on audience. Our guess is that the movement produced on the stage is communicated through affects. Words on the walls assemble with music, lights, gestures, phrases, smells and variable degrees of actors' presence, they communicate the stage energy and mark an impress. The audience is moved, but not only in the sense of emotion, rather in the sense of transformation, of individuation. Affects confront with the unknown, and force us to experiment, to think, they spread a movement. "The automatic emotion is safe, by definition it is not new, it is easily recognizable whereas the unfamiliar and defamiliarizing affect is capable of taking the ground away." (Uhlmann, 2009, 63-64).

The role of affects in organizational learning has been evoked, but as a state of arousal (Levin *et al.*, 2010) or as emotion (Elkjaer, 2004), but not in this Deleuzian sense of communication of intensities, of capacity of being affected and acquiring heightened capacity to act. Being affected is an encounter, an adventure, we attend experience-in-the-making (Massumi, 2015), and we learn from it. We do not learn any information, any piece of knowledge, rather an experience of life, and the intensities on the stage communicate intensities of such experiences.

In this case, motions and learning were not only processes to better the outcome, they were part of the show, they belonged to the performativity of the play. Via affects, learning and aesthetic were not in a means-ends relationship. They were like two sides of the same coin. Spectators were not offered a representation of learning. The play tried to affect them, to set them in motion for them to experiment learning. They encountered both an aesthetic experience and learning, and this was triggered by aesthetic devices and all the learning elements before and during the performance.

Fragile minority

From a determined move, the actor chalks on the wall his friend's figure, as to prevent it from becoming, as if he were afraid of what the other would no longer be. Later, the friend refuges himself back in his chalk outline, as to meet again with himself or to protect himself from the world around. These chalk lines remain drawn on the wall, as the position of the victim is marked after a murder, as if evolving would mean the death of a past identity. The contour remains there, looking like a ghost haunting the future meetings of the four friends, a ghost staring at them but a ghost that a simple hand gesture can erase. And when the friend is no longer here, redrawing his silhouette with the chalk seems a caress that implores his coming back. Going on, stepping ahead, becoming seems so difficult when hardships knock your existence down – it takes courage, it seems easier to earth oneself in what one used to be, in the image we want to display. It takes the courage to become, the courage to learn, to learn to live, to find pleasure in spite of everything that happens to you. This chalk drawing, marking as a hesitation before daring, perhaps, to go forward, features the fears and desires of four friends who decide to meet, far and close to themselves, each at a key moment of his life.

What affects the spectators and sets them in motion, is not the presentation of any uplifting narrative, of heroic unfolding or melodramatic situations. They are attending to performers struggling against identities imposed on them, trying to find pleasure and joy besides and behind the major streams that threat to hold them away from their existence. They see hesitations, trials, regrets, happenings, inventions, explorations, liminal spaces. They do not enter a structure, they are rather invited to experiment lines of flight. The actors try to resist being carried away or absorbed by their characters, actions by the narrative, speech by definite meaning.

What happens a few meters in front of the spectators, is not an instance of any general rule that they ought to interpret and learn from it. Such a general knowledge would end the learning process, bringing solutions instead of questions or possibilities, blocking the circulation of movements. Probably in this case, the movement's strength is kept because knowledge is kept as minor. For Deleuze (1997), raising upto major consists in constructing from a thought a doctrine, from a way of life a culture, from an event History. It is normalization. Inversely, rendering minor is the operation of extracting becomings against history, lives against culture, thoughts against culture, graces or disgraces against dogma.

Power, representation, judgment, identity, knowledge... all impose a stasis, draw boundaries, prevent becomings. In the play, in the creation process, in the relation to spectators, major elements of power are restrained, identities tend to be replaced by experimentations. And the absence or the bypassing of explicit major knowledge leaves the way for learning.

We feel that it is this circulation of movements that carries learning from the creation process to the play and on to spectators, and from individuals to the group and from the group to individuals. However, this movement always threatens to stop, for all elements have the tendency to be erected in major: the creation process in a method, the performance in drama and characters, the play in an oeuvre, the affects in a theatrical technique or mannerist affectation, the learning in knowledge.

In this case, we see that motion, learning and aesthetic experience are all the most fragile. Every organization tends to become major, and to lose its auto-subversive elements, its drive for change,

experimentation, and the reinvention of itself. In this case, in regards to learning, aesthetics played two main roles. First as an a priori distribution of power, roles and tacit knowledge, it may inhibit learning or make it necessary. Second, with the dynamics of affects, it fuels and maintains learning, and enables it to spread across organization.

Conclusion

In this paper we looked at organizational learning from an aesthetics perspective, highlighting the share of aesthetical processes as a complement to other perspectives. We drew on a singular case, the theatre play *Prazer*, in which we saw learning as being pervasive, from creation process to performance theme and spectators' experience. In congruence with the perspective, we chose an ethnographic mode on inquiry, based on the turn to affect.

The artistic choice of withdrawing many bearings that usually guide theatrical creations placed the participants of having to unlearn certain habits and to experiment so as to find an adequate organization. Suspension of the usual conventions and distribution of places and roles, what we referred to following Rancière as the distribution of the sensible, unlocked unaccustomed avenues for organizational learning. Restraining certain elements of power enabled organization, roles, relations, subjectivities to be put in motion. Actors were placed in a constant state of learning, of not knowing, of being affected, of becoming and this communicated a similar movement to the audience. This communication mainly ran through affects. By each time repeating the learning path, by striving to be actually affected on stage, by reviving the situation in the staged present, their affected and vulnerable presence communicated an actual and intensive movement to the spectators. Learning triggered learning, becoming triggered becoming, affectivity triggered affectivity. Learning at all level (organizational, technical, existential...) was self-reinforcing however communication of learning as motion was fragile, always under the threat of becoming major knowledge, power redistribution, technique as recipe, answer instead of question.

As a contrast, the case highlights that we usually try to foster organizational learning first inside of a (re-)distribution of roles and places and a set of agreed-upon conventions without reflecting on the effects of such an a priori distribution of the sensible; second by inventing ways of managing and leading organizational learning, thus increasing power over the process, rather than removing power elements to allow more room for movement and learning; third by researching explicit, technical, procedural ways to spread and retain learning, doing the best to rule affects out of the process; and fourth by looking for the best method to keep control of the process instead of questing each time anew for the fragile path in which some learning can be spared from knowledge petrification. A too tight and close management of organizational learning is likely to thwart and limit its very learning possibilities.

Of course, this article does not provide a new one-best-way for organizational learning. It tries, among several others, to keep some movements inside the organizational learning and knowledge management research. For Letiche (2009), there is a dark side of knowing, rightly because knowing may impede thinking and learning. Thought rather operates via the eternal return of questioning, doubting and wondering. It is the prerequisite for learning.

Although we hope to have brought a contribution in better understanding some aesthetics dynamics at play in organizational, and especially in their relation to power, we are aware that our conclusions

are based on only one case and limited to a particular look at affects, movements and power. Many more researches are needed to better understand the aesthetics dynamics in organizational learning.

References

Argote, L. (1999), *Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge*, Kluwer, Boston.

Argyris, C. and Schön, D.A. (1978), *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.

Bazin, Y. (2013), "Understanding organisational gestures: Technique, aesthetics and embodiment", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 377-393.

Berlant, L. (2011), *Cruel Optimism*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Berthouin Antal A. (2011), *Managing Artistic Interventions in Organizations: A comparative study of programmes in Europe*, 2nd ed., TILLT Europe, Gothenburg.

Bertolin, R., Cappelle M. and Brito M. (2014), "Corporeidade e Estética na Aprendizagem Organizacional: Insights Emergentes", *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 15-37.

Boje, D. M. (1995) "Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as Tamara-land », *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 997-1035.

Brook P. (1995), *The Empty Space: A Book about the Theatre: Deadly, Holly, Rough and Immediate*, Touchstone, New York.

Cornelissen J.P. (2004), "What Are We Playing at? Theatre, Organization, and the Use of Metaphor", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 5, pp. 705-726.

Deleuze, G. (1997) "One Less Manifesto", in Murray, T. (Ed.), *Mimesis, Masochism and Mime: the politics of theatricality in Contemporary French Thought*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 239-258.

Dodgson, M. (1993), "Organizational Learning: A Review of Some Literatures", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 375-394.

Duhlin, O. and Lindkvist, L. (2009), "Administrative Artists and Artistic Administrators: The Case of Theatre", in Koivonen, A. & Rehn, A. (eds.), *Creativity and the Contemporary Economy*, Liber AB, Malmö, pp. 165-189.

Easterby-Smith, M., Crossan, M. and Nicolini, D. (2000), "Organizational Learning: Debates Past, Present And Future", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 6, pp. 783-796.

Elkjaer, B. (2004), "Organizational learning: The 'third way'", *Management Learning*, Vol. 35, No.4, pp. 419-434.

Elm, D.R. and Taylor, S.S. (2010) "Representing Wholeness: Learning via Theatrical Productions", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 127-136.

Ewenstein, B. and Whyte, J. (2007) "Beyond words: Aesthetic knowledge and knowing in design", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp. 689-708.

Ferrary M. and Pesqueux, Y. (2011), *Management de la connaissance : Knowledge management, apprentissage organisationnel et société de la connaissance*, 2nd ed., Economica, Paris.

Fiol C.M. and Lyles M.A. (1985), "Organizational Learning", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 803-813.

Gherardi, S. (2009), "Practice? It's a Matter of Taste!", *Management Learning*, Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 535-550.

Gilmore, S and Warren, S. (2007), "Unleashing the power of the creative unconscious within organizations: A case of craft, graft and disputed premises", *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 106-122.

Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Anchor Books, New York.

Guillet de Monthoux, P. (2004), *The Art Firm: Aesthetic Management and Metaphysical Marketing*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.

Haldin-Herrgard T., (2000), "Difficulties in diffusion of tacit knowledge in organizations", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 357-365.

Jogulu U., (2011), "Leadership that promotes organizational learning: both sides of the coin", *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 11-14.

Letiche H. (2009), "The Dark Side of Organizational Knowing", *Emergence: Complexity and Organization*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 59-70.

Letiche H. and Lightfoot, G. (2014), *The Relevant PhD*, Sense Publisher, Rotterdam.

Levin D.Z., Kurtzberg, T., Phillips, K.W. and Lount, R.B. (2010), "The role of affect in knowledge transfer", *Group Dynamics*, Vol. 14, No.2, pp. 123-142.

Levitt B. and March J.G., (1988), "Organizational Learning", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 14, pp. 319-340.

Lingis, A. (2000), *Dangerous Emotions*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Lingis, A. (2003), *Trust (Theory out of bound)*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Linstead S. and Höpfl, H. J. (1999), *The Aesthetics of Organization*, Sage Publications, London.

Mack, K. (2015), "Breaching or disturbing the peace? Organizational aesthetic encounters for informed and enlivened management learning experiences", *Management Learning*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 156-174.

Mairesse, P. (2014), *Reversal: le partage de la parole comme expérience sensible, esthétique, et politique*, Editions Accès-local, Paris.

Massumi, B. (2015), *Politics of Affects*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Mintzberg, H (1989), *Inside our Strange World of Organizations*, The Free Press, New York.

Nissley, N, Taylor, S.S. and Houden, L. (2004), "The Politics of Performance in Organizational Theatre-Based Training and Interventions", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 5, pp. 817-839.

Orr D. (2009), "Aesthetic Practice: The Power of Artistic Expression to Transform Organizations", *Revue Sciences de Gestion*, No 70, pp. 63-82.

Rancière, J. (2004), *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Bloomsbury Academics, London.

Robey, D. Boudreau M.-C. and Rose, G.M. (2000), "Information technology and organizational learning: a review and assessment of research", *Accounting, Management and Information Technologies*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 125-155.

Schreyögg, G. and Höpfl, H. J. (2004) "Theatre and Organization: Editorial Introduction", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 5, pp. 691-704.

Senge, P; (1990, *The Fifth Discipline: Mastering the Five Practices of the Learning Organization*, Doubleday, New York.

Stewart K. (1996), *A Space on the Side of the Road: Cultural poetics in an 'other' America*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Strati, A. (2007), "Sensible Knowledge and Practice-based Learning", *Management Learning*, vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 61-77.

Strati, A. (2003), "Knowing in Practice: Aesthetic Understanding and Tacit Knowledge", in Niccolini D., Gherardi S., Yanow D. (Eds), *Knowing in Organizations: A practice-Based Approach*, M.E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 53-75.

Strati, A. (2000), "The aesthetic approach in organization studies", in Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (Eds.) *The aesthetics of organization*, pp. 13-34.

Strati, A. (1999), *Organization and Aesthetics*, Sage Publications, London.

Uhlmann, A. (2009), "Expression And Affect in Kleist, Beckett and Deleuze", in Laura Cull (ed), *Deleuze and Performance*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 54-70.

Vera D. and Crossan M. (2004), "Strategic Leadership and Organizational Learning", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 222-240.