

## EGOS 2016, Organizing in the Shadow of Power

Sub-theme 50: The Power of Performing in Performing Arts Organizations

# Studying performativity in performing arts through affects<sup>1</sup>

**Jean-Luc Moriceau, Institut Mines Telecom/Telecom Business School (France), jean-luc.moriceau@telecom-em.eu**

**Isabela Paes, Luna Lunera, isabelapaes@gmail.com**

The question of performativity has recently received a renewed interest in organization studies, using very different takes on the concept (e.g. Spicer et al., 2009; MacKenzie *et al.*, 2008; Cabantous & Gond, 2010; Hodgson, 2005); with some of them directly referring to the arts (e.g. Tyler & Cohen, 2010; Steyaert *et al.*, 2012; Cornelissen, 2004).

Performative arts can be seen as an organization of performativity: they rest on an organization that seeks to be performative by providing aesthetic experiences. This performativity entails many political aspects, among them a distribution of the sensible that assigns places and roles (Rancière, 2004), a minor usage of major norms (Deleuze, 1997), an address to the audience that triggers affects and estrangements, etc. Hence studying performativity in performing arts may help broaden our interpretation of organizational behaviors.

However, how can we study the performativity of the aesthetic experiences brought about by performative arts in a way that could help us make sense of organizational and political

---

<sup>1</sup> This text is a first version and suffers from various weaknesses. We welcome any comments that could help us transform it into a more robust and performative text.

aspects involved? One could consider the experience as a collection of signs to be studied semiotically, or as the effect of specific performative devices, but we have the feeling that, proceeding in this way, parts of the experience qua experience could be lost. An alternative endeavor raises serious methodological difficulties because aesthetic experiences are made of a very strange stuff. Their dual nature, as experiential and as aesthetic, challenges our most common approaches more used to deal with meaning rather than with experience and the sensible. Trying to catch the aesthetical experience in one concept or to look at it from too much distance, trying to consider it as a mere object or as only carrier of signs and meanings, we risk losing it as experience and forget its aesthetic power. Some aspects may be lost, twisted, too quickly transformed into something else. How then to compose an approach that tries to capture and describe the whole of experience in its aesthetic dimensions, but also think it and communicate it? This is what we try here using some resources of the "turn-to-affects" to study organizational and political aspects of performativity in performing arts

An affect-led approach has the advantage of placing the researcher in a quasi unmediated contact with the aesthetic experience, of opening her or him up to a wide range of performative dimensions, and of forcing her to reflect on the organizational, political and ethical dimension of the experience. This text will be a constant dialogue between aesthetic experiences triggered by and around the play and methodological reflections on the possibility of grasping and thinking from such an experience. We will first present the case of the theatre play on which we will draw, and then reflect on the possibilities of a method inspired by the turn-to affect about the type of contact with the aesthetic experience, political reflexivity, ethical reflexivity and writing modes.

### **The case of Prazer, a theatre play**

Still utterly tired from their effort, dressed in their play costume or quasi naked after a quick shower, both anxious and eager to see their effects, the four actors and their assistants were jumping over the pile of paper sheets, the comments just let by spectators at the end of the show. Each time the audience was proposed to leave their impressions, be it in a debate, on a small sheet, or by emails. 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 dramatic personal decisions or added small but rewarding changes. Many spectators wrote that the performance

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.

Such strong performative effects came from this theatre play, *Prazer* (Pleasure), which was created by a Brazilian troupe Cia Luna Lunera, and toured all across Brazil from December 2012 on, with more than 130 shows. The play was all the more interesting that the creation process was organized in such a way that many bearings that usually organize a theatrical production were removed or changed. There was no text written in advance, no director, no one narrative, central plot or 'message' to organize or give direction to the show, no distinct beginning and end, no real distinction between life and stage, and regular reactions and comments of outside spectators were fed back into the play, even well after the *première*. The play's performativity did not seem to come from purposeful, well thought through and realized performative devices or tricks, made up by the director or the playwright. And we were lucky to have exceptional access to the play performativity: we could observe it both as spectators, recipient of the performative effect, and as producer of the effects. Indeed 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. Many times was he able to attend to the show as spectator. In addition of these observations, multiple discussions and debates were organized with the audience, other actors, scholars and critics.

Hence the play provided us with a case in which the performativity in performing art was high and probably unexpected, where organizational and political were given much opportunity and were visible, and with which we had multiple types of access. However, the question was how to inquire about the performativity of the aesthetic experience, and here we would like to present our choice for an affect-based method. For this text, we will write from the spectator's position (not from the actress producing the aesthetic performance), and concentrate on the methodological aspects rather than the discussion of learning from the play.

### **Uncatchable aesthetic performances**

I smell the cheese bread and the soup actually being made on stage, I am like invited at their table where friendship is touchable, I attend to moments of ritual and to explosions of joy, I am taken by the poetry of projected birds flying on the walls, I am intrigued by the words

written on these walls acting like a doubling of the play and referring to a book of Clarice Lispector, I get invited to intimate reflections of actors unsure whether it is the character or the person who is speaking... As a spectator, I am not facing the representation of a drama or of a story. Nothing is played or explained. Something is performed, something actually happens on the stage, and is given to be experienced. There is no meaning or narrative to be deciphered or understood, I am rather immersed in aesthetic experiences.

But how to study such aesthetic experiences? If we want to know them qua experiences, qua events that affect us and move us, we can not extract ourselves in order to observe them from a distance. It is certainly preferable to live them, to let them touch us, affect us, eventually be changed by them. Without pretending to be reaching the experience in itself, we can at least describe and reflect on our "experience of the experience" (Massumi, 2015).

How to study what is happening less at the level of meaning or sense-making than at the level of the sensitive/sensible? The aesthetic experience has no one meaning, or its effect always exceeds the intended meaning. It is not only the transmission of a meaning or of a message to be decoded. If it can encompass words, signs or symbols, it addresses us through our body, through emotions, impressions and feelings. Beyond its sense, what puts us in motion are effects of pleasure or displeasure, of strangeness or remembrance.

And how to think what passes through a succession of forms in front of us, what differs from one moment to the other, in its perpetual becoming? Wanting to fix it, to freeze it, to grasp it in a single concept or representation, to position it in a category does not account for the experience. The experience addresses us from its singularity, its unexpectedness, by being unknown. To sort it into set typologies or to reduce it to what is already known may prevent us from really being in contact, from grasping its newness.

### **Turning to affect**

Confronted by such a methodological challenge, we chose to follow the turn-to-affects, and in turn to avoid drawing a representation, to take distance from the representative slope with a double movement of more immediate sensitive presence and of reflexivity. To follow this turn is to let ourselves being guided by the affects, to let ourselves being moved by the situation, as the starting point of reflexivity. Not in order to reach a more comprehensive representation, but, by agreeing to delve into the concrete, lived, partial, local, specific, experienced, relational (Letiche et Lightfoot, 2014) and by « *consenting to ride the waves of affects on a*

*crest of words, drenched to the conceptual bone in the fineness of its spray* » (Massumi 2015, p.vii), to try and think and write anew from such an experiential bathing.

We are seeking a quality of presence to the experience: we try to inhabit it as it appears, to touch it, to taste it, to listen to it. And to let it affect us: feeling this mark, this reaction, this momentum that it triggers, to let these impresses work inside of us, to welcome them for what they are, curious to see where it leads both in our body and in our thinking. We try to open ourselves in a manner as unmediated and engaged with the experience as possible. For Letiche and Lightfoot (2014), affectivity connects us with the direct presence of life. And such an openness requires courage, because we do not know in advance where it will lead us to – it can be joyful affects of triumph and creativity but equally of jealousy, envy or revenge. The authors add that being here, with such a quality of presence and openness, prevents us from repeating the same concepts and the same models again and again. For Stewart (2007), the affect arrives rather in the way of an event. "Something throws itself together in a moment as an event and a sensation; a something both animated and inhabitable" (p.1). All at a sudden we are deterritorialized, confronted to what bears no obvious meaning, but which takes density and texture, moving through the bodies, dreams, dramas, our ways of building worlds. The significance of ordinary affects, those who cross us in the corner, stands in the intensities they build and the thoughts and feelings they render possible.

After this contact as immediate as possible, a second movement entails to think from and through these affects. To follow traces and political, memorial, ethical, existential effects. The affects tell us that something is happening, something is at stake, something that does not fit with what is expected or naturalized. Taken in our narrative of progress, efficiency, democracy, public space, there are things that we no longer see, or we no longer want to see and that get reminded under the form of affects. That sometimes only exist as a potential (Massumi, 2015) or as specter (Clough, 2007) but that imprint in us fear, disgust, anger or desires. These affects help us destabilize these representations that we take for granted, that distribution of roles that looks so natural, these habits that seem self-evident. The affects may not impose a new model, they rather invite us to re-launch the inquiry, to imagine other ways of seeing, to re-examine the justice and fairness of the ordinary course or the singular experience. These affects invade our interiority but they say something about structures, history, biopolitics, effects of subjectivity, the collective imaginary. They repeat themselves in the others or are spread by contagion. They do not give the solution, they are seldom the cause, but they are with what, through what, we feel compelled to restart to think. To

rethinking the distribution of roles, power relationships, effects of our actions, our relationships with others, what animates our lives.

However, instead of thinking a priori or position this method, we had better experiment it...

### **Experiencing the experience**

The flavor of the bread, the colors projected by the lighting, the impress from a gesture, the tone of a voice, the waving atmosphere induced by a music, the shapes of a handwriting. The aesthetic contact with the experience passes through our senses. But the senses are no neutral and transparent media that would carry a sense already there. The sense we create from our senses is full of sensitivity, sensorialness, sensuality, and the whole range of sentiments (Nancy, 2011). In order to study the aesthetic experience we could not ignore an irreducible materiality and corporeality, a dynamic and efficacy of the sensory and the sensitive mingling itself with the sensible. The aesthetic experience produces percepts and affects, and not just signs and symbols. We had to start with a phenomenology of the sensory contact, attentive to the lights, colors, sounds, tastes, smells, touches it produces in us. Aesthetic experiences can have the ability to play with our senses and thereby undo the frozen sense of the landscapes in which we move, to make us relearn to see, to get surprised or frightened. They undo the sense already there, recreate the enigma. They have this ability to affect us, to transform us, to individuate us.

By opening ourselves up to the experience, our first surprise was that the contact with the experience does not seem to come primarily from the sight, as our role as spectator or observer would have suggested. We feel as if touching experience, as if entering into contact without media, at its closest, so close that it enables exchanges at a point where to touch and to be touched seem the two sides of the same coin. To affect is to touch, and to be affected is to be touched. Sedgwick (2003), in her *Touching Feeling*, explains that the touch always brings us into a non-dualistic position (abolishing the subject-object distinction) and that terms such as touching, feeling, texture, affect are irreducibly phenomenological, that describing them in terms of structure could only lead to bad qualitative representations. We must first tell the singularity of this contact.

To guide us we had in mind Jean-Luc Nancy's texts. To him, the contact with the sense is rightly a touch. Sense has a weight and a density - allowing it to be touched. For example, for Nancy, photography is tactile, palpating the whole of the surface, of the skin, the crust of the

place: its integument, his lineaments, his envelopes while not being able to be more than an approach (Nancy, 2008). In the same way, dance produces sense without medium, it pays with gravity and rhythm in a manner analogous to thought (Monnier et Nancy, 2005). For Nancy, the sense already there, our "reservoir of sense" is like a mantle that protects us from the contact with the sense of what presents itself. We must learn to expose ourselves to the sense, what he writes "ex-peau-ser" (from *peau*: skin), to emphasize the tactile, sensual and embodied contact with sense. In what we experience on the stage, sense seems to get reinvented, some sense seems to be found anew.

However the experience in theater is not limited to a sensory contact. By exposing us, we try to let the experience act with the fewest protections and preconceptions possible. We wanted to let the experience work inside of us. The affect is both a signal that something happens and the effect of the experience. It shows that we are in touch with the experience and it is what teaches us about it. To experience, is not to capture in order to analyze, but to react and interact. To be affected, it is also being called to engagement. We were already aware that exposing ourselves, to touch and to be touched, was opposed to some idea of objectivity and distance that leads researchers to immunize themselves against their own affects. Here insensitivity would not be a proof of rightness but of avoidance of the experience. The point is not to immunize oneself to better take distance, instead it is of letting oneself being contaminated - affected or infected – by the experience. To let ourselves being affected by the experience was accepting to be changed by it. We had to accept to only have access to "contaminated" knowledge as Stewart (1991) calls it. Such a contamination, we were convinced of it, was not a sign of the researchers' indolence rather of a genuine contact with experience.

It is not easy to move forward confidently on such a territory. Were we still researchers? Yet we were convinced that being overwhelmed by experience rather than trying to decode it, would be what Deleuze (1990) would invite us to. For him, in fact, art is not to be interpreted, it rather has to be experienced, we rather have to experience it, to let it affect us. It is an encounter, an experience that makes us become. The affect not only alters our mood, he enjoins us to reconstruct us: our thoughts, our position, our certainties, our mode of existence are called into question. The affect forces us to think, to create new concepts or new attitudes, and to become. Critical and clinical, the aesthetic experience diagnose our modes of existence and tracks the forces that drive them, requiring that we not only analyze but that we reconfigure our relation to the world and to existence. Deleuze invites us to move towards the

places and times when some sense occurs, on its very production, and feel what such a production produces in us, what it produces of us. Sense is not to be found, it is power to affect. Affect is sign and source of sense. We are invited to experiment the aesthetic experience, to taste its effects on our lives, and to think from it.

### **Organizational and political reflexivity**

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.

After this moment of experimentation of the experience, came the following moment of reflexivity. As is shown in the preceding description, the aesthetic experience comes at once as affects and as reflections with elements of context, of history, cultural links, political embedding. Whereas affects seem to surge from the present, from interpersonal interactions, the aesthetic experience is grounded in the historical and political context, making it a valuable source of reflexivity on organizations. For Massumi (2015), the affects' immediacy itself is rightly what makes contact those more global contexts, at the source of fear, anger, shame or guilt. This direct contact is precisely what puts us in touch with what we no longer see, buried, repressed or tabooed: what remains « *on the side of the road* » (Stewart, 1996), « the disavowals constitutive of Western industrial capitalist societies, bringing forth ghosted bodies and the traumatized remains of erased histories. » (Clough, p.3). The affects let show the scars and revolts, identity constructions in response to the hate speeches (Butler, 1997), the battles around the control of subjectivities (Hardt et Negri, 2009). In these moments of

affects produced by the play, we feel alternately or simultaneously rushing around issues of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, age, social class, nation, religion, political affiliation, etc.

Yet the point is not only to show how major political frames are impacting affects and subjectivities in order to give flesh and poignancy to major general theories. When Stewart (2007) describes a series of "ordinary affects" that arise in her daily existence, she intends to cast a critical eye on the contemporary USA. But such concepts as capitalism, globalization and neoliberalism appear to her no more than dead effects superimposed on an innocent world. Each small vignette of his book, which describes a moment affect, rather intends to highlight the immanent forces strengths, the vivid, scattered, ubiquitous effects, their rooting in the everyday and the simplest. Power and ideology are all around, but it is in their ordinary and mundane appearances that they become palpable, overwhelming, threatening. To be sensitive to them and worried about their consequences is already political. We do not get back with a critical and encompassing model, but with the oppressive impression of a dull and sensitive power that penetrates our lives. Our contact with the political forces is not only cognitive, it is present and affective, our existence is already contaminated, we are always already engaged.

However, the play alternates between moments of ordinary affects and of extraordinary situations: unfamiliarizing disturbing or of exultation. We feel that something unusual is at play in our experience of spectators. We usually understand what is acted in front of us by knowing the role of the actors, author, director audience, critics, etc. as a set of codes and certain works to which the show refers. The aesthetic experience is based on what Rancière calls a « distribution of the sensible » (2004). What enables us to understand the experience is what at the same time assigns roles, places and rights: what one can see and what we can say, who has the right to speak, who organizes space and time, etc. Here the aesthetic experience is what both reproduces the distribution of roles and shares, and simultaneously departs from it. We perceive mobility in the relationships, that is what allows the characters to learn. Places, positions, and conventions are more fluid because the friends meet in a foreign country, but we also feel the impact of the organization of the play creation. What we tried to think in terms of subtraction of power elements thanks to Deleuze (1997) in another text (Moriceau & Paes, 2016).

### **Ethical reflexivity**

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.

If the play had one theme, it was about an apprenticeship of finding pleasures in spite of hardships and difficulties of existence. There were no clear division between life and stage. The actors had brought in some of their most intimate anxieties and problems: a difficulty to reach climax, anguish about one's health, mourning after a split-up, impression of being ugly... The play had not just to be understood. Possibilities of existence were presented, tried or not by spectators, that could project their own existential questions. The play was about finding the courage of moving out of a dead-end situation, and put oneself on the move again. The actors reported having been changed by such an experience, many spectators too. The researchers probably as well.

For Letiche and Lightfoot (2014), the turn-to-affect, from its opening to the encounter, requiring us to be here, sensitive to the affective intensities that pass through the place, is based on the philosophy of Levinas, on the experience of facing the other's face. Affects are relational. They decenter us and reposition us in a larger configuration, which we are only a part. The affect forces us out of our way to make the world, our way of encapsulating what we meet in readymade stories. The aesthetic experience immerses us in a bath of affects and effects, of sensations and senses that force us out of the usual. To let oneself being affected by a different experience may require us to recompose our position, our convictions, our idea of justice.

And it is precisely this fluidity in relationships, this simplicity and probably authenticity of a search for joy and pleasure that cause such effects on the public, that bring the strength of the play's performativity. We are not witnessing a great story, but we see the actors confronted with existential questions and their faces interrogate our own lives.

We feel an urge to be engaged. In a second way, this affective encounter with the experience of the other can make us feel compelled to engage ourselves. Veissière for example tells us his experience of a *gringo* ethnographer in hottest spots of Bahia, along with street children, prostitutes and petty criminals. When he sees their daily struggle to earn money to live on, he

realized that he himself earns his salary and his career exploiting the suffering and violence of others (Veissiere, 2010). With horror he feels like a pimp. Yet, in this encounter with the other, he feels morally committed to do something for the social struggle of the people of the margin (Veissiere, 2009). In the course of his action, he feels shame when local educators complain that the NGOs' action may ultimately be detrimental, he realizes that his compassion is manipulated by some children in order to get some resources they so desperately need. Many children are on the street because they were aware of their fate in the favelas, and fled. To take them out of the street and to bring them back to the conditions against which they had rebelled, what the NGOs are trying to accomplish, is going against their autonomy in the sense of Freire. If he were to engage, it is not for acting in the name of subalterns deprived from their voices according to his good conscience guided by representations of the North. It would be by exposing himself to this violent world, hearing awkwardly expressed words to accompany them in the construction of their own voice.

Letiche and Lightfoot (2014) insist that affects do not necessarily lead to a positive ethical position. We may find ourselves surprised by feeling "negative" affects such as rejection, disgust or contempt toward those we study, and these should not be dismissed. The aesthetic experience creates a complex of affects, and it is this complexity that we have to think, even if it does not deliver a positive image of ourselves or of the experience studied.

## **Writing**

The fourth moment of the inquiry occurs when writing up the research. Labeling an affect, categorizing the experience, does not do justice to the wholeness of an aesthetic experience. And it closes performativity. One redoubtable difficulty is to find a way of writing the experience so that it conveys the experience, and it allows performativity to go on, to affect the reader in his turn. The aim is not to pronounce an aesthetic judgment. It is not to analyze and explain the springs of performativity.

If affects lead us towards a sensible, contaminated, often engaged approach of the aesthetic experience, then the research writing should not only give a representation of this affective experience, even including the researcher in this landscape. The critique of representation in the 80s (see Clifford et Marcus, 1986) has already highlighted the authoritarian and limited nature of such frozen paint, brushed from the outside, leaving the

researcher apart and monopolizing the speech. Already Stewart (1996) distrusted the very desire that motivates academic research: the desire for a decontaminated meaning, which sets us apart and leaves them inert and powerless to act.

The jostling of the distribution of the sensible that drives research must not only concern the relationship between the researcher and the experience studied, but also the one with the reader. The point is not only to name, describe, analyze the experience, which could not do justice to the whole of the aesthetic experience, but also to make the reader feel it, trying to affect the reader in his turn. The goal is not to impose an aesthetic judgment but, at least initially, to expose the reader to the performative power of the experience in order to discuss it with him or her. To try to preserve the movement, the constitutive intensities and the acting powers, to the multiple becomings of the aesthetic experience and of affects. For Stewart (2007), affects being moving things, they demand a constant and frustrating effort to restore them through various forms of composition and language events. And for this, she recommends not give in to the temptation of too rapid and too easy leaps towards representation. This also is to remain on the side of the road.

Thus writing must become performative. It will not be possible to reconstitute all the amplexness and nuances, all the facets of the aesthetic experience and affects. But considering the aesthetic experience as a performance, the writing can try to become a performance in its turn: to give to feel, to try to touch not only the experience but also the reader. The point will not to target exhaustivity but the "rightness" of the atmosphere and of affective effectiveness, to describe moments and events of affects, thus keeping their power to affect. One way to illustrate this endeavor is to follow the interpretation of Pavis (2014) in his Dictionary of performance and contemporary theater that is based on Deleuze.

For Deleuze, the style in philosophy or in the arts is stretched to three areas: the concept, or new ways of thinking, the percept or new ways of seeing, the affect or new ways to experience. The performative writing will attempt to articulate the three. It will describe the sensations that arise as a block of percepts and affects, showing the unit or the reversibility of feeling and be felt (Deleuze and Guattari, 1990). The aim is not to list or codify affects, but to restore their consistency and organization, their arrangement, the voluntary or involuntary logic of surprises, emotions and shocks, and to try to retain something of the relationship between bodies and the world that affects them, between the conscious and the unconscious, the visible and the invisible, the manifest and the latent. This description has to be

complemented by a set of concepts. The concepts do not intend to represent or explain the blocks of percepts and affects but to contract them, to make them readable or to repeat in another territory. The performative writing will try to arrange all this in a way that makes sense, pleasure and effect.

The author who went the furthest in this approach of text as performance is certainly Lingis. His presentations, but also his texts are performances, they create an aesthetic experience. Remembrance. The room is plunged into darkness. A music from Bach puts us in a soothed and curious listening availability and transports us to a very special emotional Stimmung. Suddenly his voice rises above the sound, almost like a scream, with the same intensity as the narrated emotions, and at other times the voice becomes softer, like a confession or meditation. Images with vivid colors are projected in big sizes: pictures of his trips, artwork or diverted photographs. They do not illustrate the words, they repeat or deviate, for a polyphony of words, but above all, intermingling with the sounds and voices, they bombard us with arrangements of percepts and affects. The text reflects distant journeys and emotional encounters. A trained ear will recognize, masked, concepts from Levinas, Merleau-Ponty or Heidegger. They are not mentioned or explained but reinvented to reflect the experience recounted. And, while we expect an explanation in a more academic language, his voice stops suddenly, leaving us with several more minutes of music. The flow of affects, percepts and concepts have time to take effect in us. In the question and answer period, he never explains the sense he wished to assign to its text or his performative effects. Instead, he tells new stories, improvising from testimony or leads that offered. He is not the one who knows and explains, he is just bearing witnessing of adventures that have affected him, and have him think

## **Conclusion**

The paper has proposed an affect-based method to study the performativity of aesthetic experiences in performing arts, sensitive to its organizational, political and ethical aspects. To understand the performative possibilities in performing arts, a semiotic analysis of the codes and devices is not the only way. We can complementarily let oneself being affected to experiment the performative proprieties and then reflect politically and ethically from first-person this experience.

## References

- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Cabantous L., Gond J.-P., Johnson-Cramer M., 2010, “Decision theory as practice: Crafting rationality in organizations”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 31, No 11, pp. 1531-1566.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography : a School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. University of California Press.
- Clough, P. T. (2007). *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social* (1st Ed. edition). Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- 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.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1991). *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie ?* Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2009). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Hodgson D., 2005, “Putting on a professional performance: Performativity, subversion and project management”, *Organization*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp. 51-68.
- Letiche H. and Lightfoot, G. (2014), *The Relevant PhD*, Sense Publisher, Rotterdam.
- MacKenzie D., Muniesa F. & Siu L., 2008, *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of Affects*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Monier Mathilde & Nancy Jean-Luc, *Allitérations : Conversations sur la danse*, Paris, Galilée, 2005.
- Moriceau & Paes, 2016
- Nancy, J.-L. (2011). Making Sense. In L. Collins & E. Rush, *Making Sense: For an Effective Aesthetics* (pp. 209–214). Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Nancy, J.-L. 2009. “*Making Sense*”, Text presented at Making Sense conference, Cambridge.

- Nancy, J.-L. 2008. *Corpus*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Pavis, P. (2014). *Dictionnaire de la performance et du théâtre contemporain*, Paris, Armand Colin.
- Rancière, J. (2004), *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. Bloomsbury Academics, London.
- Sedgwick E.K. (2003).. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Spicer A., Alvesson M., Karreman D., 2009, “Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 62, No 4, pp. 537-560.
- Steyaert C., Marti L. & Michels C., 2012, “Multiplicity and reflexivity in organizational research: Towards a performative approach to the visual”, *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 7, No 1, pp. 034-53.
- Stewart, K. (2007). *Ordinary Affects*. Duke University Press.
- Stewart, K. (1996). *A Space on the Side of the Road: Cultural Poetics in an “Other” America* (1st pbk ptg). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stewart, K. (1991). On the Politics of Cultural Theory: A Case for “Contaminated” Cultural Critique’. *Social Research*, 58(2), 395–412.
- Tyler M., Cohen L., 2010, “Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 31, No 2, pp. 175-198.
- Veissiere, S. P. L. (2009). Notes and Queries for an Activist Street Anthropology: Street Resistance, Gringopolítica, and the Questfor Subaltern Visions in Salvador da Bahia, Brazil. In D. Kapoor & S. Jordan, *Education, Participatory Action Reserach and Social Change. International Perspectives* (pp. 209–222). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Veissiere, S. P. L. (2010). Making a Living: The Gringo Ethnographer as Pimp of the Suffering in the Late Capitalist Night. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 10(1), 29–39.