Rethinking the. Absthetic of Research & Pushing the. Boundaries of Art



**Dysfunction** is a research based art installation and performance that proposes to the viewer/participant to experience the process of connecting artists researchers methodology to management mutations.

Dysfunction presents the journey of the "Dissemination & Valorisation" team, a group of three management and artists researchers, in charge of value creation within the ABRIR Collective research project. The D&V team confronted two very different methodologies in order to produce experimental research forms.

Dysfunction unveils the process followed by artists and researchers, whose objective was to create a method for producing results of a different kind.

Some artists' researchers work on their own artistic practice, in a dynamic of exchanges between theory and

Le 28 juillet 2016 22:19 antoine lefebvre < lejournalquinavaitpasdetitre@gmail. com> a écrit: Hello Philippe. When the ANR ABRIR (Art and critical mutations : what stakes for management

> and for art?) project started, you convinced me to jump in by saying that it would be a great occasion to guestion what research can be. As an artist researcher, I was curious about how management researchers would react to our artistic propositions. Some artist researchers work on their own artistic practice in a dynamic of exchanges between theory and practice; personally I have always been working this way. I thought it would be interesting to propose this type of methodology to management researchers, and to invite them to be actors and observers at the same time.

As an artist publisher, you know that my artistic practice usually takes the form of publications, so I was thrilled that my role in this research project was to make research publications as artworks. My first idea was to create strange printed object that would generate a small dysfunction in the research group. After producing three of these publications, I don't know if we achieved this goal, the publications and installations we produced

might be considered as uncanny or intriguing by our fellow researchers, but are they dysfunctional? Truly yours

Gilbert introduces the idea of creating "Publishing Studies" as a consequence of the recent "practical turn" in the social science. I think it is important to show how the knowledge within our publications does not only reside in the content, but also in the shape and the process through which we made them.

Le 30 juil. 2016 à 13:55, philippe mairesse pmairesse@acces-local. com> a écrit :

P.S. In the introduction of "Publishing as Artistic Practice", Annette

Dear Natalitochka. Antoine's question raises the issue of the functionality (or dysfunctionality) of a research group in management science. Our group, focused on the phenomena of critical mutations in organizations, aimed from the start at producing knowledge of different kinds: epistemology, methodology, and theory. Do we come close to these goals? Inviting the researchers to be actors and observers at the same time was already the purpose of our previous project, "Art and restructuring", where a heterogeneous community gathered practitioners, researchers, artists and stakeholders. Studying films, novels, poems, songs or photography about restructuring enabled us to "look at the glasses we were looking through." As we put it: observing the observation, more than researching the research process, could be a method for producing results of a different kind —art-forms and theory at the same time. It could be called a "meta-functionality of research;" a dysfunctional process that permanently mixes the object and the method, the process and the result. Interchanging results and processes in art has been a trend since the 1960's, and it was already linked at the time to critical, political, aesthetical and sociological questions. At stake is the reversal of power towards more democratic ways of producing research and evaluating it. Can research lead and accept such a "dysfunctional" program? Steven Linstead, in a recent paper to be published, speaks of "Critically Affective Performance Texts" as such kind of results: "useful illusions" that "embrace negativity without rejecting positive possibility". Our conversation is an attempt to b such an in-between object, what Winnicot described as an transition between the created and intermediary area, a zone of t h e given, the objective and the subjective, between being-in-the-world a n d researching it. Between the functional and the dysfunctional: an area where the issue of functionality is suspended and replaced with a state of emergence and acceptance. Kind regards, Ph Note: have you seen the film "Stalker" by Tarkowsky? perfect illustration of how researching the world is paradoxical and never ending task leading back to its starting point: mystery (which is by the way a key word Linstead's text).

Let Data Affect. YOU

practice. In order to go from practice to theory, one needs to step back and to transform experiences into concepts. Dysfunction proposes this type of experimental methodology to management researchers, and invites them to be actors and observers at the same time. Dysfunction stems from forms of art that use language, ideas and concepts as raw material.

To raise the question of functionality, Dysfunction is an invitation to rethink the aesthetic of research while pushing the boundaries of art. How to make our research results to account about the experience and as in arts, produce results that account for the process?

How can we produce objects that make sense both as artworks and as knowledge forms? Can we, as researchers question the very nature of our publications to seek wider and more democratic distribution? Can paradigms shift

Le 31 iuil. 2016 à 8:03 Hola Antoine. understand the To taking place. We was downsizina. lay-off, those mutations affect the In our academic culture, most overall quantitative methods) effects of management At the beginning of our research, tools for understanding as materials to understand those existing methods and suggested which could open the "black box", It has been now six years since we the original idea I can testify about challenges we have faced. I think working with arts has allowed

us to grasp those hidden but major aspects of management mutations emotions. as identities.

PM. Natalia Bobadilla <bobadillanatalia@gmail.com> a écrit :

issues it is important to recall the setting in which the experience are management researchers interested on complex issues such delocalisations and management mutations at a large and on how individuals, teams and urban areas. of our methods are based on empirical studies (qualitative and

focused on trying to identify the causes (or motives) and the decisions, process and strategies. we had the intuition that works of art could be used as educational management mutations; we mobilized artworks to our discipline issues. From the start, we had the conviction of going beyond that management mutations needed other approaches to complement inevitably over-simplified models.

started our journey, as a main contributor of our learning process and the

temporal dimensions and lived experiences. The encounter between artists and researchers has been a very rich human and professional experience,

In our interactions and intersections, one of the biggest challenges that we have faced is the way in which we represent our work. How do we make our research results accountable to our experiences, and as in the arts, produce results that show the process? Artists tend to work with visual formats, whereas management researchers, who tend to "reside" within academic institutions and rules use language and standardized formats to represent their findings.

Looking back at what we did with our exhibition at "La Maison de Métallos" in 2012, I realize today that somehow we were craving for independence and originality. Certainly this craving for independence had a political coloring, or at least that is the way I see it now. We struggled with the regular academic format and thus, we searched for "alternative spaces" for management research. Our « dysfunctional » ABCD+ method claims a different mode of existence and representation of the scientific research and highlights the need for wider distribution and dissemination. Our conviction is that knowledge embodied in visual representations is generally

underrepresented in scientific practice and management studies. However, visual representations constitute objects that play a role in mediating knowledge and knowing.

We now propose new ways of embracing knowing and disseminating. From an epistemological standpoint, we want to reconnect production and knowledge transfer. However, we still face the problem of the legitimacy of our productions in both the managerial and artistic fields. What is the actual significance and legitimacy of our productions, how can those productions be considered artworks? Is that really relevant??

Stay tuned

Nats

Le 2 août 2016 à 11:55 AM, antoine lefebvre <lejournalquinavaitpasdetitre@gmail.com> a écrit :

Hello Natalia,

Indeed, asking if our productions can be considered as artworks is important to me too. But what is even more important is whether they are interesting artworks or not. When we first started, I had to accept the fact that the public for our productions would be our fellow researchers. So it was surprising to see how art people were very interested in this collaboration between management researchers and artist researchers.

If think they were able to relate because the process that we went through leaves space for a non-specialist "spectator." In academic research, there is no such thing as a "spectator" like in an art exhibition. The spectator is neither a specialist nor an ignorant, neither a teacher, nor a student. In order to address to this potential "spectator", we went through a transformation process of our research facts and data, we confronted the challenge of explaining simply complex issues.

When we started creating the ANR publications, the first problem that we encountered was the type of material we would use in them. As we were publishing after each seminar, we questioned what could be the data collection of these debates, and often worked with the notes of our fellow researchers.

Fictionalize the Experience in order to Grasp it.

- enough that progressively self-publishing research findings could be considered as a suitable research outcome?
- Dysfunction may not achieve this goal, but it is a step towards wider access to academic knowledge. As we analysed our own production, we unveiled four key steps that present the process:
- **DATA** = (ir)Relevance: choice, range No raw data but always already transformed: interpretation, point of view Put to the test, shared Emergence vs. decision (themes, issues) Experience data (visioning the artworks, immersion in events...): collective and individual critical affective experience.
- **TRANSFORMATION** = Of the selves (individual, collective): identification, rejection Translation as production

Our first publication is a collective mind map of the ANR ABRIR research group that was made on the spot during the debates. It shows every subgroup in the ANR, every case and artworks studied in the project. It is a starting point.

But, we cannot always work with raw data, so the next step we went through was to transform this data collection into something more meaningful. By editing the notes of our fellow researchers into a dialogue, a play, we revealed the theatrical aspect of a seminar, making each researchers and participants actors of their own self.

As we are getting closer to presenting our work in a management conference, I must ask:

As we are getting closer to presenting our work in a management conference, i must ask.

Artworks are not usually considered as producing knowledge or as knowledge by themselves; they are primary information, which is discussed by specialists in order to create knowledge, as gallerist/publisher Seth Siegelaub stated. By doing research that would take the shape of artworks, aren't we deliberately excluding ourselves of the debate? Yours truly

C

## Le 13 août 2016 à 4:29 PM, philippe mairesse epmairesse@acces-local.com> a écrit: Antoine,

Reading Natalia I realize we have a situation: on the one hand we strive to produce scientific research outputs that also have an artistic quality; and on the other hand, we try to stay tuned with the contemporary art world where art productions are not usually considered as knowledge.

Weren't you ever surprised by the fact that the press releases, or the curators' presentations of international art

exhibitions often have the quality of social science research papers? Generally, when I discover the art works, I cannot find the same quality —as if they were pre-texts for the specialists' theoretical texts. You point the same issue when asking if we exclude ourselves from the debate by producing research in the shape of artworks: can we be considered as relevant by the specialists of both fields (art and science)?

We encounter here an old dichotomy between the specialist and the average man, the later ignoring what is "really"

at stake in his life, the former being the one able to reveal the hidden determinisms underlying the daily life of organizations. Both artists and scientists pretend being specialists able to reveal reality to the average man, and both look for specialist-spectators. Despite claims for addressing anyone, art like science is a peer-to-peer address, a special domain for specialists, socially constructed and defended. The idea of a non specialist but aware spectator would help both fields to break free from their their golden cages where only insiders can access. Entering the artworld as an outsider, I have myself been for a long time enacting a form of "art" that could be practiced and understood by anyone outside the field, beyond the difference between applied and fine arts, or amateur and professional. In the same way I entered human science research as an artist-outsider. Outsider in the art world,

legitimate in the research world as an artist, I find myself repeatedly in a strange position kind of an inside stranger.

Strangeness from the inside should be the object of an artful research or of a "knowledgeful" art. It is linked with "inside peripheries": there are parts of the outer worlds that constitute us (or the organizations) from the inside, and this is where resides the strangeness form the inside. We need to be strangers from the inside of research – and form the inside of art. Producing research as artwork needs to re-consider artworks outside the orthodoxy of the art world.

In fact, it has already occurred: contemporary art is permanently pushing the boundaries separating art as a specialized field from the average practice of living. Contemporary "critical studies" in human science research are pushing the boundaries between "objective" knowledge and enacted daily practices.

Another name for exploring the strangeness from the inside is knowledge-as-practice, or practice-as-knowledge (a counter-dominant knowledge as de Certeau explains). This is where art can help and where the distinction knowledge-art faints. Addressing the average spectator then would means to co-create together (art or knowledge) and be all "spectactors." Then we could meet our initial goal: to invite researchers to be actors and observers at the same time.

But as you note, the risk is to be illegitimate in both fields. There is no good answer: our proposal is to take a risk. Only by producing "Critically Affective Performance Texts" —that can be understood as "weave of voices, perspectives, images, techniques, materials and actions"— can we overcome the risk and gain the only and true legitimacy: the one of the strangers from the inside…

Irrelevantly yours,
phi

Le 27 août 2016 à 11:08 AM, antoine lefebvre <lejournalquinavaitpasdetitre@gmail.com> a écrit : Dear Natalia

The questions that Philippe raises made me think about one of the best book I read recently. It is a small very beautiful case-bound book with covers lined with burlap cloth and a Mondrian painting glued on it. The book reads likes a mystery novel, as it raises mind-blowing issues about contemporary art in a way that is really intriguing. Its title is "Walter Benjamin — Recent Writings," as the book gathers talks, texts and conferences written by the author since he reappeared in 1986 "many years after his tragic death."

Build Commons on Agreeable Disagreements

- Mise en abyme Time: lived (succession), rhythm, irruption (interruption) Fiction Enabling reflexivity and dialogism
- **COLLECTIVE** = Heterogeneity, differences (skills, backgrounds, personality) Common language Interests, specific or/and shared Empathy, agreement vs. resistances, conflicts Gradually building a community
- **STAGING** = Reception: evaluation (utility?), production (the receiver is producing part of the work) Performance (performativity of the process, result, "movingness", e-motion) Presentation vs. representation (non-representational knowing)

At stake is the reversal of power into more democratic ways of producing and evaluating. Artists tend to work with

I came across this volume in exhibitions that restaged famous exhibitions, and it took me a while and some investigation to understand that these reenactments were the work of a single artist. In his work, this anonymous artist —who is probably Serbian from what I gathered - stages exhibitions and talks that recreate or revive old works of art and their authors. He uses multiple aliases, mostly Walter Benjamin, who is most known in the art world for his essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" and Alfred Barr Jr. who was the first director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Under these new identities, the artist re-creates exhibitions and demonstrates in his texts how they were key milestones to build a narrative that we now call History of Art as if it were the only possible one. His work becomes even more interesting when he questions the very nature of what he does. By saying that the reproductions of works by modern masters that he shows shouldn't be considered as art, he places them in another field: « Instead of being perceived as the story, Art History should become a story while the work of art should be treated as an artifact, a product of a certain kind of Western Culture that came out of the Enlightenment and has been shaped by Romanticism, and the art museum would then become an ethnographic museum. » (p. 108) For this artist, what he does is part of what comes after Modern Art. His art is even more conscious than Modern Art and lays the ground for what he believes to be the next Revolution in art. The artist demonstrates how the Art History encompassed all the artifacts that were made before it was invented, and transformed them into Art, even if they were created for other means. The Artist takes the example of Copernicus who wrote his treatise on the movements of celestial bodies as a theological paper because science didn't exist yet and that there was no infrastructure or specific language to express what he really meant.

Looking back to our printed productions, the question of the nature of these printed objects seems essential. Should they be considered as Art or Research, as Meta-Art or Meta-Research (methodology or epistemology)? What happens when art is mixed with science, when the result is estranged as much from art as it is from science? What do we call it? Sincerely yours,

а

Le 29 août 2016 à 12:59 AM, Natalia Bobadilla <br/> <br/> dillanatalia@gmail.com> a écrit :

Hey!

Dysfunction relates mainly to Meta-Research (methodology & epistemology). We mash up, which is the process of taking different things and mixing them together to create a new, unique thing. At the end we produce ready-made objects that take place between art and research.

ABCD + presents a way to approach the search for knowledge, we propose the foundations of a new art-based method that goes beyond experience to allow not only critical thinking and systemic inquiry but to bring and TO DISSEMINATE answers in and out our fields of action (Art & Management).

As in organizations, scientific innovation requires not only mobilizing forces inside, but also predicting forces outside of it; this is all about encounters and horizons, our intellectual and artistic narrative is not linear but fragmented, conscious and unconscious. Reading our discussion, I thought about

Joseph Beuys who once told his students: "You cannot wait for an ideal situation. You cannot wait for a tool without blood on it." This was not to say a compromised tool could be made to serve all interests, but that a compromised tool can be weaponized to dismantle any interests. For art to integrate with society does not mean that art should serve the interests of society. Neither does it mean that art should serve the interests of art."

With its epistemological, political, theoretical interests, and with its emphasis on an interdisciplinary methodology, Dysfunction reminds the readers and spectators that even if art based methods applied to management have exploded as a research field, today there are complex topics such as functionality, legitimacy, means of production, dissemination, positioning that remain unsolved and which should not be dealt with lightly. Dysfunction should be viewed as a glowing example in the maintenance of that sense of urgency, which the pursuit of knowledge should arise. Our increasing preoccupation for the art & management research encounter has been a bit peachy until now, how about and art & management relationship which could end bitterly

as a result of a total conflict of interest?

J-3 for AoMo conference in Bled......

Lets continue this conversation,

Take Care

Nata

Greating Hybrid Forms That Stage. their own. Production.

visual formats, whereas management researchers, who tend to « reside » within academic institutions and rules use language and standarized formats to represent their findings.

As researchers and artists are usually craving for independence and orginality, and certainly this craving has a political colouring. Confronting our methodologies, within regular academic formats, lead management research towards « alternative spaces » and other form of political colouring. Dysfunction shows how knowledge within our publications does not only reside in the content, but also in the shape and the process through which we made them.

Conception of Dysfunction: Natalia Bobadilla, Antoine Lefebvre et Philippe Mairesse, for the Valorisation and Dissemination Team. Reference: Dysfonction (2016) Bobadilla N., Lefebvre, A., Mairesse\_P. Art of Management Conference, Bled, Slovenia, September 1-4. (2016)\_29082016\_ANR-ABRIR\_28 Aôut. See <a href="https://abusproject.org/">https://abusproject.org/</a>. This Publication is financed by the ANR CONVENTION N° ANR-13-BSH1-0007-02.







