ADVANCES IN ORGANIZATION STUDIES

SERIES EDITORS:
Stewart R. Clegg &
Ralph Stablein

Edited by
Stewart R. Clegg and
Martin Kornberger

Space, Organizations and Management Theory

Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press

Stewart R. Clegg and Martin Kornberger (eds.)
Space, Organizations and Management Theory

1st printed edition 2006
The e-book is published in 2013

Series editors: Stewart R. Clegg and Ralph Stablein
E-book production: PHi Business Solutions Ltd. (Chandigarh, India)

ISBN (e-book edition): 978-87-630-0309-4
ISBN (printed edition): 978-87-630-0164-9

CBS Press
Rosenoerns Allé 9
DK-1970 Frederiksberg C
Denmark
slforlagene@samfundslitteratur.dk
www.cbspress.dk

Advances in Organization Studies

Series Editors:

Stewart Clegg
Professor, University of Technology, Sidney

Ralph E. Stablein
Professor, University of Otago, New Zealand

Advances in Organization Studies is a channel for cutting edge theoretical and empirical works of high quality, that contributes to the field of organizational studies. The series welcomes thought-provoking ideas, new perspectives and neglected topics from researchers within a wide range of disciplines and geographical locations.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Without the support of the many people involved in this project, this book would have remained an idea.

First, we would like to thank the contributors to our session at EGOS 2003 in Copenhagen, and second, most especially, we must acknowledge the redoubtable contributions of Cleusa Lester – Cleo is simply essential and fantastic and without her assistance this project could not have unfolded as smoothly as it did. We must also acknowledge the input from people who inspired us in different ways, at different stages in this project: Andreas Maier from the architecture lab SUN; Simon Hoerauf and Johannes Weissenbaeck, Martin's partners at PLAY; – all contributed, whether they know it or not, to the overall shape of this book.

Finally, our biggest thanks, however, should go to the people in our lives that transform spaces into the places we enjoy: especially Lynne, Jonathan and William on Stewart's side, and Jessica for Martin.

Chapter 1

Introduction: Rediscovering Space

Stewart R. Clegg and Martin Kornberger

Space is the machine

Bill Hillier

The idea of editing a book on space, management and organisation theory was born out of our shared interest and passion for artefacts, aesthetics and architecture, phenomena that contribute in many different ways to the social reality in which we work and live. As with every idea, this one only became real through its embeddedness in a productive and intriguing context.

It all began when, one day, Martin suggested that we propose a session for the 2003 EGOS Conference in Copenhagen. We had many interests in common and it took a little discussion to zero in on something: there were just so many things we were interested in exploring. Eventually, we decided that we wanted to explore Space! The urge was borne out of a common perception that, as a result of a recent American Academy of Management theme, time had been systematically addressed. But who was really interested in space? Well, for a start, architects were, and so initially we thought that it would be interesting to bring together great architects and smart organisation and management theorists. But, on the whole, the life-worlds (and economics) are somewhat different. Not as many architects as we might have envisaged made the event – but those that did were able to make significant and interesting contributions.

Eventually we got a group of like-minded researchers from different disciplines together. After three days of listening, discussing and reflecting on space and its relations, meanings, and implications for organising, we invited selected speakers, as well as a couple of colleagues who could not make it to Copenhagen, to submit the papers included in this volume. We then reviewed and edited the contributions that you will read here. After briefly delineating how we situate this volume on the wider map of organisation studies we will introduce the different contributions in more detail.

Space, management and organisation theory

Speaking generally, management and organisation theory is preoccupied with two related issues: first it focuses on processes unfolding in time, the management of these processes, and its critique. This view stresses the dynamic, fluid character of management opposed to its ostensibly more stable patterns, the focus of the discipline for much of the latter half of the twentieth century. The second preoccupation can be seen in the cognitive orientation many organisation theories have adopted in recent decades. Organisations are for the most part understood as cognitive entities that think, learn, make sense, and behave similarly to humans. In fact, at its extreme, the sensemaking approaches suggested a view of organisations that was almost entirely decorporealised and dematerialised: minds floating in equivocal spaces reduced the presumed conditions of their own cognitive existence with nary a thought for the facticities of materiality. Focusing on processes unfolding in time and on cognition as the core essence of organisations, management thinking turned away from concrete spatial and material reality. Largely ignoring the physical reality of organisations, especially their spatial features, researchers wrote about power, change, and organisations without referring to the spatial, material reality that constituted these phenomena. In editing this volume we have sought to explore this gap; more precisely, the contributions in this volume discuss the relation between space, architecture, management, and organisation theory, as introduced in the next section.

The contributions

The book is divided in five parts: part one, *Conceptualising Space* deals more broadly with theories of organisations and their relation to space. Following this general introduction by the Editors, the book starts with Chapter Two, Jean-Francois Chanlat's contribution *Space, Organisation and Management: A Socio-Historical Perspective.* A characteristically cosmopolitan piece of theorising by probably the most international of the current generation of Francophone scholars (which is to say, far more cosmopolitan than the majority of Anglophone contemporaries), Chanlat's chapter is divided into three parts: the first briefly presents some key elements in the consideration of organisational space; the second presents how organisational space has been treated by the major currents of management thought (Taylorism, Fayolism, Fordism, Bureaucracy, Human Relations, etc.), while the third explores the main tendencies of the last few years.

In Chapter Three Tor Hernes, Tore Bakken and Per Ingvar Olsen, outline an account of *Spaces as Process: Developing a Recursive Perspective of Organizational Space.* In their contribution they propose understanding

organisations as recursive spaces of systems, teams, and technologies that are simultaneously stable and changing. They explore the recursive nature of space with the help of works by Luhmann, Giddens, Latour and Bourdieu, assessing these contributions in the light of Whitehead's process philosophy. Their recursive perspective focuses on the interaction between space as a structure that shapes action and action that re-shapes and reinforces space. This approach avoids the fallacies of thinking organisation either in terms of structure (and stability) or change (and agency); rather, it reflects on their interplay as a driving force behind both. Looking at spaces of financial control and monitoring, as well as spaces of learning, they describe the dynamics at work in a tangible way.

In Chapter Four, Frank Go and Paul C. van Fenema analyse transportation and information technology that have transformed human interaction with spaces. Their contribution, entitled *Moving Bodies and Connecting Minds in Space: It is a Matter of Mind over Matter*, argues that new technologies enable people to move their bodies almost effortlessly and continuously splitting their mental world from the physical time-space presence. Developing a typology of spaces, they suggest that people are included and excluded in multiple spaces, categorised as mind space, information space, material space, and social (relational) space. Interaction in these spaces or worlds leads to complex if not chaotic patterns and novel opportunities. Go and Fenema discuss three examples to provide a clear understanding of these new spaces: First, immigrants in Western Europe who remain partially connected to their home culture in Turkey or Morocco through satellite TV and cultural networks and artefacts. Second, professionals who engage in a virtual lifestyle of travelling while staying tuned to their business and social reference points. And third, offshore call centre services in India where people take on quasi American or British identities (such as an "Anglo" name and accent) and are fed with cultural knowledge (movies and news) and customer information (including local weather) to serve customers in the US and UK without customers knowing they are talking to someone from India. They conclude that new technologies enabling bodies as well as minds to move offer unprecedented access to "other" worlds, cultures, ideas and spaces. Researchers are challenged to explore, understand, and help make sense of these spaces and intricate patterns.

The second part of the book explores the relation between *Space, Power and Management*. The chapters included in this section share a focus on the social implications of space and the power exercised through spatial organisation. In his chapter on *engineering the landscape: engineering management?* Michael Brocklehurst argues that the way in which space is partitioned and regulated is a significant factor in influencing which ideas are embraced within a given society. He supports his thesis by first, examining how the United States landscape came to be constructed during the nine-

teenth century and second, by showing how that construction was mirrored both in the rise of industrial management during the twentieth century and in the particular form it took. Common to both the landscape and the ideas of industrial management was the desire to plan comprehensively, and measure in detail. But, as he shows, it is the form that the planning took in both cases that was crucial – notably the use of the "square". The result was the standardisation and uniformity of land and labour, an outcome that was to prove crucial to their commodification.

Patrizia Zanoni and Maddy Janssens take a different perspective on power, management and space. In their contribution *Rethinking diversity through productive processes: space, time and the body on the car factory shopfloor* they approach diversity management as a mode of managerial control through identity regulation within the post-Fordist productive space. According to them, such space is characterised by spatio-temporal discontinuities at the international, organisational and work levels, discontinuities that render traditional direct modes of control increasingly ineffective. Management increasingly controls labour indirectly by regulating workers' identities as to make them develop a sense of self that is conducive to the attainment of organisational goals. Diversity management regulates identity in three main ways, by defining workers as: individual entrepreneurial subjects, members of specific socio-demographic groups, and members of the organisation. While the first and third ways draw respectively on HRM and organisational culture, the second way typifies diversity management. Management combines these complementary definitions in order to construct a flexible diversity management policy. However that is no reason for despair, as they argue: the simultaneous use of three definitions introduces tensions in the identity regulation process that can be exploited by workers to resist their subordination. Therefore, while it might hamper the development of class-consciousness across socio-demographic differences, diversity management does not prevent resistance *tout court*. Rather, it seems itself to provide conditions of possibilities for the emergence of new forms of workers' resistance.

In Chapter Seven, Michael Muetzelfeldt focuses on *Organizational space and organizational civility,* to explore the role of space in producing and reproducing organisational civility. He suggests that the functioning of organisational life depends upon civility between its members. This is obvious when looking at organisations that emphasize trust, shared vision, and congeniality as organising principles. As he argues, civility's complex and contradictory features include constraint and interpersonal attunement, drawing on sentiment as well as reason, to govern relationships with others who are both allies and competitors. These features are characteristic of organisational life, as well as of society at large. Spatial arrangements in organisations establish distinctions and express meanings about organis-

ational power and authority, but do so in ways that appear independent of the people as actors, who can then present themselves as familiar social equals. This applies to large spatial arrangements, as well as small-scale organisational spaces such as private offices, semi-public meeting rooms and public areas. Each has its markers, its rules of interaction, and its place in reproducing civility within authority by mediating their contradictory features and by providing resources for people to manage their difficulties.

Chapter Eight features an essay by Thomas A. Markus entitled *Built space and power* that is, in many ways, intriguing. As an architect and social scientist Markus' argues that buildings are, first and foremost, social objects that structure human relations. His contribution explores the concept of buildings as social objects – it describes and analyses three major discourses of architecture: form, space and function. It looks at the way these produce and reproduce social relations of two types in buildings: power and bonds. It elaborates formal critiques, the description of spatial structures using the methods of space syntax, and function-related texts, especially insofar as they create and use systems of classification. Moreover, he discusses the way that buildings may have a meaning by mapping the answers to questions from each of the three discourses into a common field: that of social relations. In doing so, he traces the history of the alternative discourses of buildings-as-art-objects and buildings-as-technical objects. This puts forward an explanation of how, in the last two hundred years, the concept of buildings-as-social objects has been suppressed, the reasons for this, and the purpose of this suppression for building developers, owners, and sponsors. Finally he analyses the effects on organisations, and their systems of space management, of not making adequate provision positive for social relations using the potential of the buildings form, its spatial structure and its functional programme.

Chapter Nine is written by Stewart Clegg and Martin Kornberger. The simple title, *Organizing Space*, reflects its aspirations – to link organisation theory with concerns related and deriving from space and architecture. The contribution argues that the organisation of space still remains a relatively under-specified but nonetheless important question for the processes and practices of organising. While organising is often represented in immaterial, cognitive terms, when it is connected to a concern with space, then it has to concern the body of an organisation, that is, its materiality. Similarly to Markus, they suggest understanding space not just as a container waiting to be filled: for them, space and buildings are social objects creating social spaces whose forms provide implicit answers to crucial questions of power, order, classification, control and function, while simultaneously implying theories of aesthetics, creativity, innovation and freedom. Interestingly, they use architectural theory as well as short stories by Kafka to address questions concerning organisation and its spatial dimension as issues for organ-

isation theory thinking that problematize the relation between inside and outside and central power and periphery. Employing Rem Koolhaas' "strategy of the void", they explore strategic implications for the ways in which space and organisation interact.

The third part of the book explores *Organizing New Spaces for Organization*. Nina Kivinen opens this section with her chapter, entitled *In Virtual and Other Spaces – Expressions of Nomadic Organisations,* which discusses the spatiality of organisations on the Internet. She does so specifically in terms of websites and suggests that the nomadic expressions of organisations can be seen in and through the virtual spaces of the Internet. The "virtual" spaces of the Internet are analysed using Lefebvrian and Foucauldian notions, as these spaces can be described as material, imagined, and social. She finds parallels between the fluid boundaries of organisations today and the arguments by Rosi Braidotti on nomadic subjects. Taken that the Internet is a space within which people, as well as organisations, construct their identities, Kivinen explores tensions between a situated subject and a nomadic, travelling subject. In these new spaces people become more dynamic and fascinating. She concludes that the expressions on the Internet can perhaps be used to show the nomadic nature of organisations.

Stephen Little and Margaret Grieco follow *Electronic Stepping Stones: a mosaic metaphor for the production and redistribution of skill in electronic mode,* in a chapter the purpose of which, is to draw attention to the creative flexibility provided by the new technical forms of communication. The metaphor of a mosaic is governed by the wish to draw attention to the relevance of each and every unit of creativity or patterning – the tile – available through the World Wide Web. Each web author places their "tile" in a space whose dimensions are beyond their control. "Tiles" lying adjacent to one another on a search engine at one point in time do not necessarily conserve this relation. At another time they may be fundamentally separated from one another. Space and informational adjacencies are subject to constant revisions of the kaleidoscope. As they argue, constant alertness and fine tuning can bring these segregating patterns into adjacency again: shadowing the action of others and shaping own "tiles" to achieve adjacencies to the desired target are also a pattern that they repeatedly have found in the use of the web by progressive social movements. The shape of the new knowledge mosaic is constantly shifting but the mosaic provides electronic steppingstones that continue to ensure the importance of "strategy" in communication. This chapter exemplifies, reflexively, the topics that it addresses.

In Chapter Twelve Søren Buhl Pedersen analyses *Trains, planes and people in a space of travel: Relating "the local" to "the global" in Copenhagen Airport Station.* In his contribution he conceptualises the spatial aspect of place branding, that is, to capture the importance of a mundanely built environment to the production of social identity. As he argues, this aim is met

through a theoretical grounding of brand management in the spatial trialectics bequeathed by Lefebvre, which constitute a theoretical argument for the organisational importance of spatial design. His Lefebvrian analysis points in two directions: first, towards the conflation of the expressive and functional aspects of built environment, and second, towards a consideration of the potential for users to inhabit or acquire the built environment in question. The empirical object of Pedersen's study is the Copenhagen Airport Station. His analysis suggests that the station space communicates a particular relation between local belonging and global identity, linking the local to the global in a comprehensive brand ideology, both drawing from and breaking with established narratives of territory, gender, ethnicity and travel.

The fourth part of the book has a practical focus on *Managing organizations through space*. The section is opened up by W. Trexler Proffitt Jr. and G. Lawrence Zahn's contribution *Design, but Align: The Role of Organizational Physical Space, Architecture and Design in Communicating Organizational Legitimacy.* They argue that organisational physical space and architectural design have important, but often ignored impacts on organisational legitimacy. Through viewing space and design as communication, particularly nonverbal communication, the authors highlight the importance of consistency between the organisation's verbal messages and the nonverbal messages conveyed through architecture and design. They suggest that integrating the physical and communication perspectives could provide a more complete appreciation for the impacts of design and architecture and clarify their relationship to organisational legitimacy. Proffitt and Zahn propose several postulates as direct effects of the impact of design and architecture on legitimacy, including: the credibility of organisational messages for internal audiences; the impact of claims made to external constituencies, and organisational claims of conformity and progressiveness. All of these have material and spatial dimensions. They conclude by suggesting that each of these propositions presents challenging research problems in need of empirical relating to issues of legitimacy.

Chapter Fourteen by Cecilia Gustafsson argues for *Triangulating Office Design: Towards an Eclectic Theory of Office Design.* Gustafsson argues that while the relationship between organisation and physical space is evident, it has been left unquestioned in the organisational literature. Thus, in her contribution, she aims to open up a discussion about the relationship between organisations and physical space, and how to manage the physical space (especially office space) in an organisational setting. In doing so she addresses the apparent lack of a coherent theoretical framework and proposes a cross-disciplinary reading as a foundation for a more holistic theoretical framework based on three basic factors: the physical setting, the organisational factors, and the people factors. Aligned with the other con-

tributions to this part of the book, she concludes by discussing practical implications and develops some practical guidelines.

In Chapter Fifteen, Jean Bellas, founder and CEO of SPACE, an international leader in workplace strategy, design, and management consulting, offers insights into the *Interface between Organizational Design and Architectural Space*. In his essay he focuses on the interface between organisational design and architectural space. Using intriguing examples from his practice, Bellas offers a holistic perspective on the role that space, design and architecture play in organisation. We find this contribution from a highly reflective practitioner especially valuable – it moves us much closer towards the dialogue that we seek to initiate.

The fifth and last part of the book is devoted to *Other Spaces* – heterotopias or spaces that might not exist on cartographically correct maps of the world yet are still real. In Chapter Sixteen, Chris Steyaert explores *Cities as Heterotopias and Thirdspaces: The example of ImagiNation, the Swiss Expo02*. In his contribution he departs from the question of how creative development is connected to and "takes place" in cities. His essay argues that specific, "potential" or "other", spaces and timings, which stay out of the force of organising, allow transition and transformation: they allow becoming (instead of being), capturing creativity and decadence, life and death. These transitional or third spaces, which are conceptually connected to the notions of potential space and heterotopia, can be illustrated in relationship to the organising of cities, and how this connects to people's everyday life practices. He uses Expo02, an exhibition on the future of Switzerland, which took place in 2002, as a concrete example. He establishes a research agenda defined through formulating three propositions for a so-called heterotopological analysis based on: deterritorialising, queering, and smoothing space.

Chapter Seventeen is written by Nils Wåhlin and deals with *Transcultural Encounters in Cities: Convergence without Becoming Coincident*. His chapter aims to develop a critical sensitivity and a conceptual framework that bridges the tensions between identity and alterity construction. The text connects to a study of cross-cultural movements and special interest is dedicated to cultural encounters in cities. By travelling to other places Wåhlin suggests that we can acquire perspectives on ourselves. This encounter with a new environment generates reflection and review of ingrained understandings. Consequently, entering into dialogue with "the other" can illuminate the shadows of personal identity, especially as these may be narratives for a new belonging, which rebel against the discourses imposed on people. As people move through spaces they bring with them cultural sensitivities that are important to consider. Articulations and translations in critical boundary zones trigger a new vocabulary where reflexivity breaks out and fills the "discursive void". Wåhlin defines one of the biggest challenges in studying

emerging spaces of language transgression as being how they do justice to individual and cultural patterns in societal development. The two aspects are inextricably intertwined and it is important to understand transculturality and reflexive identity construction in spaces of flows that mix cultural influences. These spaces hold a dynamic and open-textured process of unifying that allows plurality and difference – convergence without coincidence.

Last, but not least, Peter Dobers explores *Empty Spaces or Illusionary Images? Stockholm as a Mobile Valley,* in chapter eighteen he states that spatial areas such as Silicon Valley have a clear image, with both "silicon" and "valley" having been the source of many other creative city images. When hearing of "Mobile Valley", for instance, it becomes harder to imagine which regions in the world we think of: Aalborg, SAN de Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, Finland and Stockholm/Kista are regions at times imagined as a "Mobile Valley". After discussing the use and travel of a few IT-related images of Stockholm in Lefebvrian spatial terms, Dobers argues that the creative use and imitation of regional images results in *empty spaces*. However, as he reminds us, an empty space at the disposal of other space fillers enables its user to be creative.

Conclusion

At its inception, space was important for a discipline that first developed its ideas in architecture (with Bentham) and engineering (with Taylor). Yet, as the discipline developed, a concern with space seemed to recede. Space became increasingly marginal to its concerns – even when topics that were intrinsically spatial, such as globalisation, emerged for discussion (Parker 2003). In this volume, and a previous contribution to the same series of publications by Tor Hernes (2004), we announce, unequivocally, that it is time to bring space back in (Kornberger and Clegg 2004).

Chapter 2

Space, Organisation and Management Thinking: a Socio-Historical Perspective

Jean-François Chanlat

Introduction

Space has always been a fundamental dimension of living beings and, of course, of the human experience. As a locus of biological survival, psychological existence and sociability, space is a key issue for human organisation. Despite its existential importance, it is interesting to see that it has not been, until recently, a central issue in management thinking (Chanlat 1990; Hatch 2000; Hernes 2003) even if we can register some footprints in the history of management literature. The chapter will consider how several schools of management and organisation thinking have treated space. It will be divided into two parts: in the first part I present some keys elements concerning Organisational Space and Social Behaviour; in the second part, the spatial conception of some main management schools (Scientific Management, Fordism, Bureaucratic thought, Human Relations, Cognitive, Systemic Theory, Culture and Symbolism, Critical Perspectives, Political and Psychosociological currents). In the conclusion, I discuss the tendencies we can observe in contemporary management thinking in terms of their spatial consequences for individuals, organisations and societies.

Organisational space: some key elements

In the field of organisation studies, space has been the preserve mainly of researchers drawn from psychology, social psychology, sociology, anthropology and geography (Steele 1973; Moles and Romer 1977; Lefebvre 1974; Fischer 1980, 1989; Gagliardi 1990, 1996; Chanlat 1990; Fischer et Vischner 2000; Sundstrom and Sundstrom 1986; Duffy 1997; Hatch 2000; Strati 1992, 1999; Lautier 2000). Their reflections present some key characteristics of what constitutes organisational space. We can sum up these elements as representing themes that suggest that organisational space is best

thought of as simultaneously divided, controlled, imposed and hierarchical, productive, personalised, symbolic, and social.

Organisational space as divided

Every organisational space presents a double division: on one side, a division between internal and external worlds and on the other, a division inside the organisation itself. This divided universe is more or less apparent. If it was very clear in the past, when we think, for example, of the traditional automobile plant, it is not so apparent today, notably in the virtual organisation. In effect, this historical division was clearly embedded in space.

There were doors, walls, barriers, guardians, clocks, buildings, etc. This separation between inside and outside was fundamental for the identity of the workers, foremen, employees and managers. Today, these physical limitations still always exist; nonetheless, one meets some differences in the division of organisational areas. We can think of people working at home or in a teleworking centre. They could work for an organisation without being inside it. But again, this reality is not new in the history of industrial capitalism. We can remember the putting-out system at the end of the eighteenth century. Division also exists within organisations: as we all know, when we are visiting an organisational setting, we face a spatial division, which is horizontal on the one hand, between offices, workshops, cafeteria, toilets, corridors, halls… and vertical on the other hand, between the different floors. These physical boundaries have always been at the core of management's traditional practical reflections on space.

Organisational space as controlled

Each organisational space is by and large controlled. There are different types of control: visual, in the presence of the working persons, as when the foreman surveys his work group; visual and distant as when a guardian looks at a video in a supermarket or a bank, or electronic, as when a manager remotely checks and controls the work of employees. We can also experience the three systems simultaneously, when, for example, we enter a supermarket. It has been suggested that the feeling of being controlled has been growing in work places in recent years. Some suggest that Orwell's "Big Brother" metaphor is becoming a reality for many of us. Since Bentham's Panopticon, the concept of surveillance has been a key element of the historical enclosing movement described by Foucault (1976). Such control organises and monitors communication, imposes specific circulatory routes and formal channels as it structures information on a functional basis. That we do not necessarily formally communicate with whom we want is the reason why we observe in every organisation other channels that are more informal, which structure information and communication on the basis of social and personal links.

Organisational space as an imposed and hierarchical space

When we work in a business firm, or in any organisation, people rarely have the choice of job location. The managerial hierarchy, perhaps in past time, imposes most spatial design on the work place, according to whatever criteria were once fashionable (function, status, unit, geographical location, etc). As we can see, this disposition of space is, furthermore, closely related to a hierarchical system. In effect, every organisation is more or less hierarchically divided and each hierarchy is visible in space. The location of an office, its size, the number of windows, the type of furniture, and the decoration are generally related to the status associated with the person. Of course, this aspect also relates to the culture of the organisation, the nature of the work, the philosophy of management, the regional or the national cultures (Hall 1978; Chanlat 1990; Hofstede 2002; Trompenaars 1994; d'Iribarne 1998; 2003).

Organisational space as a productive space

All organising occurs in a productive space considered it is something that has to fulfil its objectives. Formal organisations are defined as goal oriented social systems (Blau and Scott 1962). So, in each organisational setting, the personnel produce goods or services to fulfil their goals. In that sense, a hospital, university, research centre, public office, or a plant are different productive spaces because of their own objectives. The organisation of the space will be designed in relationship with the requisites of the productive system of each of these organisations. For this reason a faculty will not be spatially organised in the same way as a plant or a medical clinic. In management, this element was largely taken into consideration because of the effectiveness orientation of any managerial process, but not always in a successful manner.

Organisational space as a personalised place

If organisational space is designed and constrained by all the preceding aspects, it is also the locus of an affective investment. Historically, human beings have been territorial beings. So, workers or employees invest the workplace with personal meaning, trying both to live in it and transform it. Such a process of appropriation, where the person develops a sense of intimacy, is important to well being at work. The workplace can be personalised by territorial limits and through visible processes of appropriation, such as a name on the door or office, or by way of a particular decoration and styling of an office or workshop. Even in the most difficult situation, such as that of a worker on a production line, we can notice a form of spatial appropriation in the way of a photo pasted on a wall or a pillar nearby. In all these cases, we observe privatisation in a context in which, by and large,

somebody else more or less always owns space. The individualisation process is a spatial regulation influenced by many things: the orientation of spaces, their size, and the presence or not of walls, the quality of materials used, as well as organisational norms and policies. For example, visual or acoustic isolation can create a kind of home feeling but can also be felt by others as a person making some distance evident between themselves and others. Every spatial change will have some of this kind of nesting effect (Fischer 1990). Now we can understand why the closing of a plant must be difficult not only for socio-economic reasons but also for spatial ones. People lose their social and personal inscription in a space that simultaneously contributes to the identity that others assume belongs to the person in question (Fischer 1990; Francfort et al. 1995).

Organisational space as symbolic

Each organisation has its own culture. This culture is the product of many internal factors, such as the nature of the activity, its ownership (private, public or associative), the characteristics of the personnel (age, sex, level of qualifications, social origin, ethnic origin, etc.), technology, philosophy of management, personality of the key executives, and the result of influence by external factors (economic context, political regime, social structure, educational system, values and culture). The sense of culture feeds the organisational identity, spatial configuration, and aesthetics, which, together, participate to create the symbolic universe of the organisation (Turner 1990; Gagliardi 1992; Strati 2000). It is for this reason that the spatial forms, architecture, aesthetics and materials of the buildings, offices and plants are full of meaning. A Fordist plant in Detroit, a Chrysler Building in New York, or the European parliament in Strasbourg are all examples that illustrate this thesis. The organisational space contributes to the symbolic representation not only of the personnel but also of the people outside (clients, passers-by, competitors, suppliers, etc.). Space is an emblem, an icon, which produces the organisation, contributing to the universe of meanings that encode the organisation.

Organisational space as social

Every organisational space is a social milieu. In it, we find different people organised in a social system. According to the nature of the organisation, we are going to find a certain type of division of labour (sexual, age-based, professional and ethnic) which not only plays a role in the production of an organisational culture as we have mentioned before but also very often structures the organisational space. We can regularly hear comments such as: "There is the black's workshop; here, is the women's corner, while this building is full of Portuguese and Arabs" or perhaps that "This Parliament

is a men's place". Of course, such divisions of space will be influenced by some cultural categories (system of meanings) and by the power relationships that exist between the different social actors. It is the reason why, when we visit an organisation, we will discover through our circulation in it that there exists diversity in the social relations system. From this point of view, any space reveals something about the sociology and anthropology of the organisation itself. As we can see, each organisation can be understood according to a spatial reading. In the next part, we will discuss some of the main readings of space in management thinking since its inception.

Organisational space in management thinking: main readings

Modern management thinking is now more than a century old. As we know, the first systematic forms and principles appeared at the end of the nineteenth century (Wren 1994; Lécuyer et Bouilloud 1994). It is related to the rise of what the American historian of Business, Alfred Chandler (1977) has qualified as the visible hand: that is management and the appearance of the social actor in charge of the enterprise – the manager. Since then, we have observed an institutionalisation of management as well as a variety of intellectual contributions to management thinking. We are going to analyse the place of space in the reflections of some main currents.

Space in the scientific organisation movement (Taylorism, Fayolism and Fordism)

Some of the first systematic reflections on management were Taylor's books: *Principles of Scientific Management* (1911) and *Shop Management* (1919). In the first book, Taylor proposed a method for improving work efficiency with which to resolve the problems of production, productivity and wealth. When we read his publications, we can easily see that space is not explicitly discussed except in terms of the physical setting. But, we can also notice that space in spite of everything is implicitly present. In effect, space in Taylor's thinking is a productive, controlled, divided, hierarchised space. Obsessed by optimisation and rationalisation of work through the analysis of tasks, Taylor organises the workshop space according to his views. This implies that we can observe a strict division of labour (specialisation of tasks, division between execution and conception), a control by the supervisor and the creation of the methods office. "The use of these scientific data requires the installation of an office where the elements are classified and where the person who uses them can settle down quietly to determine the elements he needs" (Taylor 1911:93). The treatment of space in Taylor's writings emphasises the productive element and the necessity for management to organise

scientifically the work in a physical context. Its space of reference is the *workshop* in a discontinuous process of production. The power figure is the methods engineer, who organises the labour process precisely. As some specialists of the scientific movement have noticed, Taylorism is a political economy of the workshop (Hatchuel 1994). This economic vision has produced some great results from a productivity point of view. But, as a utopian, Taylor had a social goal too. Because of the use of scientific method, the workshop could become a space where a reconciliation of interests between the workers and the bosses occurred. We know how Taylor strongly criticised bosses who did not give salary rises when productivity increased. As an American engineer with great scientific hopes, Taylor was a good representative of the scientism evident at the turning point of the nineteenth into the twentieth century. In a period of class struggles, workshops organised scientifically were his hope for a more rational and less conflictual future.

At the same period of time as Taylor in the US, in France, another engineer, Henri Fayol was active in the field of management thinking also. As a general and successful director of a mining company, he was illustrative of the rise of the managers in business firms described by Chandler (Saussois 1994). In his most well known book, *Administration industrielle et générale* (1956), Fayol presents his main managerial ideas. Unlike Taylor who focused on workshop management, he put the emphasis on the firm as a whole. His focus is on the general manager and the administrative function: the organ and instrument of the administrative function is its social body (*Le corps social*). While matter and machines may be brought into play, the administrative function acts only on personnel. As with Taylor, space is implicit in Fayol's thinking but he widens the conception of organisational space from the shop to the enterprise. We can also notice the appearance of a social concern. The firm maintains a corporate spirit through providing stable jobs and by the paternalist attitude of the boss. The organisational space is of course a divided, controlled, disciplined, hierarchised space but over all, an administrative and social milieu in which the obligation is to put the right person in the right place. So, we find a strong preoccupation with social harmony. Fayol, even though he was an engineer, thought like a manager, with a conception of space clearly embedded in the administrative vision through which he tries to bring the whole staff together. Space is implicitly an element of this policy.

As in other French companies of that period, personnel were housed by the business, close to the plant or the mine, as in Fayol's case. In other words, there was a spatial inscription of the firm outside its physical limits. Paradoxically, Fayol's thinking was less popular among the French engineers than Taylor's, in part because of the role played by the Taylor Society in France, animated by a very influential French engineer, Henri Le Chatelier (1928; Hatchuel 1994). It was the English translation by Urwick that pop-

ularised Fayol's management thinking in North America (1949). As we know, his main principles were at the basis of American management introductory books from the fifties onwards (Koontz and O'Donnell, 1955; Wren, 1994).

If Taylor was the task analyst of the workshop and Fayol, the administrative thinker of the business firm, Henry Ford was the man who changed not only the production system but also the whole society (Boyer, 1994). With Fordism, we have the apparition of the huge plant and mass consumption society. In effect, the creator of the production line work system has produced one of the great organisational space figures of the twentieth century: the automobile plant. In doing so, Ford built a divided, controlled, hierarchised space but he has also founded a new manner of production and a new industrial space. Unlike Taylor's spatial reality, which was essentially one of workshops in relation to each other in a discontinuous process (Hatchuel 1994), Ford's spatial universe was a big plant in which we find thousands and thousands workers doing their jobs in a fixed place on a production line and watched by a hierarchy. Chaplin, in *Modern Times,* immortalised this image. Because of its massive size, the Fordist plant also produced a social density associated with such a size, which became the locus of union movements and the development of worker consciousness all over the industrialised world. Sartre's famous sentence in the fifties: "Do not despair Billancourt", is a good illustration of the importance of a big automobile plant at that time. Billancourt was the Paris suburb in which Renault was situated and was, for decades, symbolic of the worker's struggle in France. Furthermore, the proximity and sharing of this human experience generated literature criticising the processes of domination, exploitation and alienation associated with this Fordist universe (Weil 1951; Friedman 1954). The plant was not only a productive building but also a place of suffering.

Space in bureaucracy

Among the classics of organisation and management thinking, bureaucracy theory plays an important role (Mouzelis 1968; Séguin et Chanlat 1983; Morgan 1989; Clegg 1990). A product of the history of modern societies, bureaucratic thinking is an illustration of the process of rationalisation of the human modern experience (Weber 1947). Analysed by Max Weber at the turn of the twentieth century, this model has been very popular among not only public and state organisations but also large-size private and associative organisations. In the well-known description of the characteristics of the order of bureaucracy, what is the place of space?

When we read the literature on the subject, we can notice some elements in common with classical administrative thinking, which result in a divided, controlled and hierarchised space. Also, however, we can see some distinctive themes. Bureaucracy as a model applied to public service creates some

new things. First, it creates a new spatial representation, the *bureau* and its architectural envelope the *office building*. So, this spatial reality is quite different from the workshop, the plant or the firm. In comparison with the workshop and the plant, we are in a services-productive space. The more recently dominant image of a bureaucrat in a clean white shirt or blouse, seated behind a desk, contrasts with the older image of dirty, blue collar male workers with their mechanical tools, machines, and production line associated with the workshop and Fordist plant. Second, unlike family and private businesses, bureaucracy separates the private sphere from the public. Third, it insists on the neutrality of the bureau and on the impersonality of the bureaucrat according to the egalitarian rules prevailing in such a system. Fourth, it symbolises the defence of the common good and the general interest (du Gay 1994) in contrast with the private and commercial interests associated with the market system. Fifth, it helps create a social space, which produces new work identities: the public servant in the UK or in France, *Le fonctionnaire*. In other words, it is a space that gives personnel a professional identity, often in opposition to other identities: notably, it provides job security and impersonality. As Weber states: "Rather, entrance into an office, including one in the private economy, is considered an acceptance of a specific duty of fealty to the purpose of the office in return for the grant of a secure existence. It is decisive for the modern loyalty to an office that, in the pure form, it does not establish a relationship to a *person*" (Weber 1968). State bureaucracy is clearly related to a notion of protected space, a notion also extended to large size private or associative organisations after the Second World War. Finally, it is a space of efficiency founded on expertise in contrast to the ancient forms of administrative work based on family and money ties.

The bureaucratic space, which was a reference during almost the entirety of the last century, has been criticised for its inefficiency or its numerous dysfunctions, especially in recent decades (Crozier 1964). As Paul du Gay (2000) has shown, however, we have to be careful with such a criticism. For, we can throw out the baby with the bath water if we do not come back to Weberian thinking on this issue. Bureaucratic space is not always an inefficient space. On the contrary, when we deal with public interest goods or services, it can be much more effective than its counterpart, the market (Kuttner 1999; Stiglitz 2002). Health, environment, water, urban metro and national train transportation systems are good examples of this (Chanlat 2003). The attitude towards it is also different in different societies. Historically, Europe in general, and France in particular, have a better appreciation of bureaucracy than the US. For in the construction of the nation state, bureaucracy has played a central role in the development of these societies, something that, by comparison, is lacking in the case of America (Meyer 1995; Zinn 2000).

Space in the Human Relations School

In the thirties, Taylorism was the object of criticism on the part of some organisational researchers (Mayo 1933; Roethlisberger and Dikson 1939). This criticism became an intellectual movement known as Human Relations (Mouzelis 1968; Séguin and Chanlat 1983). It started from the famous Hawthorne experiment at the Western Electric plant in a Chicago suburb and it developed a new vision of human beings in organisation, one that was very influential in the following three decades, from 1940–1970. This movement was very diverse. It included industrial and social psychologists, sociologists, ethnologists and managers (Mouzelis 1968; Desmarez 1987; Sorge and Warner 1997). Its spatial conception began with a Taylorist inspiration in the first Hawthorne experiments and from the first inconclusive results, and then built a new conception of human behaviour in organisational settings. Even though historians have discussed the data on the Hawthorne experiment critically for the last forty years (Lécuyer 1994), it is clear that the Human Relations movement was a key factor in the development of organisational behaviour. Its contribution has been diverse, influencing both the orthodox approaches of Mayo, Warner and the Chicago school as well as the interactionist current.

The classic work of Mayo and his main collaborators, Roethlisberger and Dickson, introduced the idea of a relationship between work performance and group dynamics. Through the Hawthorne experiments and other studies, they showed that the formal organisation could not provide a real picture of what was going on in the organisation. They developed the idea of informal relations among workers and employees. While others may already have known that cliques and networks could exist in organisations, they were the first to link this aspect with morale and productivity. The values shared by group members became a key element of the social dynamics of an industrial organisation. So, the management must take into account this informal reality. By such an analysis, Mayo and his main collaborators focused on organisational space as a social space. The physical design of space became a factor in the construction of social links by spatially organising the formal and informal relationships in a plant. Moreover, it created a feeling of belonging that permitted a symbolic investment not only in the job done but also in working life more broadly. For Mayo, this knowledge leads to a better organisation that could realise social harmony. The firm becomes a locus of social integration and achievement and because of that, an efficient organisation. In the crisis of the thirties, we can understand such a preoccupation as being inspired by earlier Durkheimian and Paretian thinking. If Mayo played an important role in the emergence of the Human Relations School, bringing the concerns that he had already developed earlier in his career in Australia to bear on the social and human problems of industrial civilisation, other researchers also contributed to this movement.

W. L. Warner and the Human Relations in Industry committee of the University of Chicago emphasised aspects linking the firm or the plant and its social environment (Warner and Low 1947). In effect, unlike Mayo, who did not look carefully at the social determinants external to the plant, Warner, an anthropologist and a former participant in the Hawthorne studies as well, was interested in seeing how technology, market and firm size, and social stratification influenced not only the community but also determined behaviour at work. His students widened the focus on family education, race, social class, religion, and workers unions, an important element for analysis. Neglected by Mayo and his collaborators, unions became accepted and integrated in organisational and managerial dynamics (Gardner 1957). By such reflection, Warner and his students widened the social space of the organisation and introduced the idea of negotiation in the internal space of formal organisation. From this point of view, organisational space is the result of a negotiated order. For the management, the social climate between the different actors is a consequence of this social negotiation and becomes a key factor of success and organisational performance. In other words, organisational space becomes a social and negotiating space, an idea that became the main characteristic of Fordism in terms of the interpretation of the French regulation theoreticians (Boyer 1994).

Interactionist theory was also influenced by Mayo's seminal work but it developed in another direction. It was developed first by Chapple and Arensberg at Harvard (1940). W. F. Whyte (1946, 1948), G. Homans (1951) and L. Sayles (1957) became the most famous scholars associated with interactionism in organisation theory. Even if we notice some differences in the adherents of this stream of thought, all of them agreed that Human Relations work had focused too much on thinking about people and too little on people's activities or on the manner in which they interact. For them, interactions, activities and sentiments formed the social system. Any change in one has an effect on the other two. Interaction models played an important role in the internal dynamics. The most important work in this stream was to observe and identify the structure of the system interactions (identification of the actors, interaction order among the actors, measures of the interaction frequency and length). Whyte's (1948) application of human relations in a restaurant is a good illustration. By observation, on a daily basis, Whyte shows how the interaction system relates to work organisation and technology. The physical conditions cannot be neglected any more than the insistence he places on interpersonal relationships – in marked contrast to Taylor. Space is a social interaction system conditioned by the physical and contextual settings. Changing worker attitudes involves the modification of the interaction and technological systems. By using ethnographic methods and by having a more global vision of the social system in an

organisation, this current brought a greater sensitivity for spatial issues to the understanding of human behaviour at work. If among adherents of this diverse stream, the main vision of space is surely a social conception, one criticism was its functionalist vision and its micro-approach. Many theorists forget that the social system of a plant is also a power field in which conflicts of interest and values are common. From this point of view, change cannot be realized without a political process (Mouzelis 1967; Clegg 1989).

Space in the managerial thinking of Follett and Barnard

In this section, we are going to present two key influential management thinkers. We begin with Mary Parker Follett who was rediscovered in the last decade in both the English (Graham 1995) and French (Mousli 2002) languages. Very well known in the early twentieth century, Mary Parker Follett's thought disappeared almost completely after her death in 1933. Her writings became popular again in the second half of the nineties because of a new edition of her main articles in a book edited by the Harvard Business School Press (Graham 1995). In these collected papers Follett develops some ideas related to space even though space is not explicitly mentioned. For this political scientist, very involved in the social issues of her time and in political reflection on the state, management became a key idea. Influenced by pragmatism, she defends experimentation as a process of creation. For her, organisations appear as social experience spaces within which the observer is part of the experience in which one can never be a spectator because we are always part of life itself. But these experiments will be successful only if they are compatible with the organisational culture and the social system.

In defining, formally, *the law of situation*, Mary Parker Follett placed emphasis on organisational contingency, a long time before contingency theorists. Contrary to Taylor and Fayol, she insisted on the role played by groups and the importance of knowledge that managers use. Considered today by many authors (Graham 1995; Mousli 2002) to have been far ahead of her time, Follett has developed a constructivist perspective on organisational space as a product of the actions of different actors, not only from the perspective of managers' decisions. It is for this reason that she had a positive vision of conflict. So, Follett, by her modernity, deserves recognition in such an overview on space because this Bostonian lady, through her intense social and professional life, raised many contemporary issues.

Barnard is another key figure of American management thinking. A business manager, as was Fayol and a great admirer of Mary Parker Follett, he wrote a very influential book, *The Functions of the Executive* in 1938. His work is still considered an important link between the classic school and post Second World War currents (Andrews 1971). Reedited regularly since then, he develops an implicit conception of organisational space. His great idea was to build a theory of organisation in which cooperation is given a

central place. So, in his managerial conception, organisation is overall a cooperative space through which to achieve survival in a changing environment. For that, he became one of the defenders, with Alfred Sloan, of the multidivisional structure.

Space in systemic management thinking

After the Second World War, we observe the development of a systemic current in management thinking. Inspired by the progress of the life sciences (Von Bertalanffy 1973), it imports the idea of organic systems and applies it to management and organisational analysis (Morgan 1986). Unlike the classical management thinking of the first part of the twentieth century, which uses a mechanical and closed conception of the organisation, the system theoreticians focus on the relationship between the organisation and the environment and on the relationship between the internal elements of each organisation. They emphasised notions of adaptation, homeostasis, requisite variety, entropy, and equifinality. In doing so, they changed the spatial vision of management. In effect, from now on, we have to think of different links uniting the diverse components of the organisational system and the relations of this system to its own environment.

The systems view became very popular and generated numerous studies. We can think of the socio-technical systems approach (Trist and Bamforth 1955; Miller and Rice 1967), of contingency theory (Burns and Stalker 1962; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings 1968; Donaldson 2001), of the Configuration school (Kwandallah 1977; Mintzberg 1979; Miller and Friesen 1984; Miller 1990) of population ecology (Hannan and Freeman 1977; Baum 1996). Additionally, the idea of system has been incorporated into common sense thinking about organisations. With ecological criticism, it once again has a growing popularity. The natural environment is not an unlimited resource space.

Space in cognitive managerial thinking

Around the same period, we observe the rise of a new cognitive approach to management thinking. Herbert Simon, a psychologist, is a pre-eminent representative of this current. His first important publication *Administrative behavior* (1961) was influenced by Barnard's conception of organisation. In successive publications, he reflects on artificial sciences (Simon 2003). He worked on decision-making, artificial intelligence and organisations. From this important work, we can select two reflexive elements on organisational space. The first one concerns the frontiers between market and organisations. Demonstrating that 80 % of human activities within the American economy are embedded into the organisation's internal environment and not into the external environment or in the interorganisational relationships,

Simon shows the strength of the internal organisational space (Simon 2003). The second deals with the cognitive role of the organisational context. It has also shown how loyalty, which he called organisational identification, played an important role in the organisational members' cognitive framing. He was not alone in this process. With other important Carnegie school researchers such as March and Cyert, he founded the new administrative sciences in the fifties and gave a central role to cognition processes (March and Simon 1958; Cyert and March 1963). Since then, notably influenced by the enormous development of neurosciences, artificial intelligence and computer sciences (Dupuy 2000), others have followed in his footsteps to give to the management field a strong cognitive current (Weick 1995; Tenbrunsel et al. 1996).

According to Hernes (2003), this movement can be broadly divided into three major streams. The first group worked on choice and managerial decisions. They proposed bounded rationality as a key notion. In doing so, they show that the decision maker is rational only in its own spatial context based on the information at his disposal. Decision-making is consequently a spatial embedded process (March 1978). The second group is interested in organisational learning. In this stream, learning and apprenticeship are also closely related to spatial considerations of knowledge. Can we go beyond the limits of our existing knowledge or not? This is the question raised by March, and Cyert when they contrast simple mind search behaviour with more complex search behaviour, which transforms the underlying goals (1963) or the distinction between single loop and double loop learning (Argyris and Schön 1978). The third group is related to the neo-institutional stream. As stressed by Hernes, they locate "explanations of organisational processes in the cognitive frameworks of actors rather than in their social context". They include the consequences of the institutional environment, notably coming from state, markets, social movements, and professions (Scott 2001). As Hernes (2003) writes: "Neo-institutional approaches introduce their own form of spatiality into organisation studies through the notion of fields, which according to DiMaggio and Powell, consist of organisations that constitute a recognised area of institutional life by virtue of similarity." For this stream, organisational cognition is a mental space that permits the emergence of new contexts. By sharing common mental space, actors can understand themselves and develop collective action. When mental space allows for transgression of physical and social spaces, new ideas and new possibilities can exist. But the mental space can be conservative too, when it contributes to the consolidation of existing patterns. Cognitive cartography is a means of discovering the thinking schemes of the organisational actors and managers (Weick and Bougon 1986; Cossette 1994), by which a reflexive process may be produced from among the actors in order to try and ameliorate managerial action (Audet 1994).

Space in critical management thinking

The history of management thinking is largely dominated by functionalist, utilitarian and instrumental reason. An external critique of management thinking has always existed, led by sociologists, philosophers and representatives of diverse social movements (workers, consumers, feminists, ethnic groups, ecologists). More recently, we have observed the development of internal criticism within management since the end of the seventies. Today, this movement is recognised and institutionalised in the English-speaking world under the designation of critical management studies (Casey 2002). This movement focuses on the negative aspects of organisation and managerial practices (Alvesson 2003). It exists in the French speaking countries as well (Chanlat and Dufour 1985; Aktouf 1989; Collectif 1987; Chanlat 1990; Le Goff 1996). As a movement, critical management thinking is very diverse. Only the most important elements, as they relate to space, developed by the most influential currents, will be discussed. We can select five great critical currents: anarchist, Marxian, feminist, ecological and postmodern.

Organisational space has been mainly viewed as productive, functional and social. The main characteristics of organisational settings are based on production, division, control, imposition and hierarchical ideas. Critical management thinking discusses this functionalist and utilitarian vision of organisations. Historically, the first criticisms came from thinkers influenced by anarchism and Marxism. For the former, the capitalist firm is a non-democratic organisation in which individual will and desires are forgotten. It is for this reason that the anarchists, inspired by nineteenth century thinkers such as Proudhon, Malatesta or Cesar de Paepe, supported new organisational democratic forms such as unions, cooperatives, credit unions, and socio-economic communities and fought for federalism against all market and state organisations conceived as undemocratic spaces. The objective of the revolution is to transform them into structures that permit the rise of democracy. These ideas have been influential in several countries, notably ones in which anarcho-syndicalism was strong. Cooperatives, Credit Unions, Communities and Workers Unions are some of the organisational creations of this movement. It is a stream that is not well known by organisation theoreticians because of the mainly Latin and Russian origins of this movement (Séguin and Chanlat 1983).

Marxians were inspired by Marx, and by currents that, by and large, were influenced not only by some Marxist ideas but also by other twentieth century intellectual contributions, such as the Frankfurt School, Psychoanalysis, Existentialism, Foucault, etc. Marxian critics were pretty active in organisation theory at the end of the seventies and at the beginning of the eighties, notably in the UK (Clegg and Dunkerley 1977) and the US (Benson 1979). Even if they remained marginal in the field of organisation studies they

brought with their thinking another vision of organisational space: business firms became seen as a space of domination, exploitation and alienation. If this vision was not original in social sciences, inside the field of management and organisation studies, it was clearly new.

Another important critical group complemented this social criticism: the feminist movement. Inspired by different intellectual traditions (Calas and Smircich 1996), they emphasized gender issues. Prior to these works, organisation was an asexualised space, and management a masculine sphere. Even if much research, including the Hawthorne experiments, involved working women, it was rare to see gender in these classical works. So, feminist research has transformed the traditional vision of space. Now, the organisation man, to take a well-known book title of the fifties, also had to be considered as a woman! Consequently, organisational space is the locus of power relationships between the sexes. This contribution has changed many things in organisational behaviour teaching, notably in Scandinavian (Aaltio and Kovalainen 2003) and the Anglo-Saxon countries (Calas and Smircich 1996). Gender issues are nowadays integrated into management education. In Latin countries, except in Quebec, this movement seems to be slower in percolating into management spheres.

If the feminists have sexualised organisational space, pushed also by a strong social movement among the most developed countries, the ecologist critics have brought another element into the discussion: the environment. This issue is not new as we can find it in the Meadows report or Club de Rome publications at the beginning of the seventies. Since then, ecological criticism has demonstrated the importance of the ecosystem and the influence of the firm's activity on environmental equilibrium (Cromwell 2001). Such an issue is particularly legitimate today, and is discussed in many forums. By introducing this consideration, space has been brought outside into practical management thinking. Before this ecological criticism, which emerged during the Sixties and Seventies, it was totally ignored by management thinking (Clarke and Clegg 1998). Today, it is popularised under the name of sustainability, and brings ethics of responsibility into the business sphere.

Critical management thinking is working mainly on organisational dominance (sexual, professional, social, and ethnic), on discourses (distortions, introversion, symbolic violence, ideology), on ethics and on subject alienation. Unlike a generally traditional positive vision of the firm, the works of this current insist on questioning and presenting organisational space as a social field, in Bourdieu's sense of a terrain structured by the power of the actors in it, in relationships in which what it is at stake is socially legitimate dominance (1987). To achieve this goal, actors mobilise their different capital (economic, social, political, cultural, and symbolic). In the world today, we observe more and more conflicts around the role of these in processes of

globalisation and positioning of national space. Social domination is always rooted in a territory.

Postmodern thinking in organisation studies is a stream that emerged at the end of the Eighties, mainly in Scandinavian and British intellectual traditions (Burrell and Cooper 1988; Clegg 1990; Hassard and Parker 1993). Influenced by French philosophers such as Derrida, Lyotard, Baudrillard, and Foucault, the organisation scholars deconstruct the modern conception of organisation and put the emphasis on representation, reflexivity, writing, *différance*, and decentring the subject. Thus, they want to move on from a conception of correspondence and precise reference as an unequivocal relation between forms of representation and an objective organisation. In their vision, as John Hassard stated "There is no real space for the voluntary actor as, instead, the actor's space is found in the notion of action as 'play' rather than as 'agency'" (Hassard 1993:2).

In contrast with organisationally modern thinking, which promoted Reason, Objectivity and Progress, in organisational forms such as Bureaucracy, Taylorism, Fordism, etc., organisational social reality from the eighties, according to Postmodernist thinkers, began to change, promoting flexible specialisation, networks and post-Taylorism, post-Fordism and post-bureaucratic structures. From this observation as well as conceptual borrowings from Cultural Studies, Architecture, Art, Literature and "French Theory", organisation becomes a *textual space*, subject to diverse interpretations, in which human beings play language games, a trend already anticipated in 1975 by Clegg's *Power, Rule and Domination*, a pre-figurative discourse analysis. The space of formal structures cannot be controlled only by one meaning and be seen as fixed as they were before – instead, positions should be seen to exist in relation with the feeling of disorientation and disorganisation noticed by many analysts (Lash and Uurry 1987; Bauman 1988; Touraine 1990) and with the popular literature in management with its claims for decentralisation, flexibility, involvement, horizontality, initiative, and creativity (Handy 1989; Peters 1987). It is a new narrative on organisation and a criticism of the former modernist narratives of organisation, notably those stressing bureaucratic order. It insists on the market and new consumers' requisites as a key factor in its changing trends. The movement, paradoxically, is almost invisible in the French-speaking organisation studies field, even though it derives from French philosophy and has gained some popularity within the English-speaking field in the last decade. It seems to have declined in recent years. Beyond the intellectual fashion we can notice how some reflections about space rejoin the cultural and symbolic current.

Space in cultural and symbolic management thinking

At the turning point of the eighties, there emerged a new current in management thinking, which gave culture and symbolism a central role. This movement followed two major streams: one managerial, the other anthropological. The first, mostly produced by American consultants and Business Faculty professors, put the emphasis on the link between culture and managerial performance (Deal and Kennedy 1982; Peters and Waterman 1982; Ouchi 1982); the second was diversified, according to the geographical sphere, and tries to understand what is going on in an organisation from a cultural and symbolic perspective. This interest gave birth to a movement in organisation studies – SCOS. Founded by Europeans, mainly British and Scandinavians, it groups a great number of non-conformist researchers coming from a variety of countries. Their works focus on myth, rituals, ceremony, discourse, architecture, aesthetics, subjectivity, etc. (Turner 1990; Gagliardi 1992; Strati 2000; Czarniawska 1998; Van Maanen 1998; Weick 1995; Linstead 2000).

In the Francophone field, this movement has also produced important works, mainly in three directions: 1) the understanding of organisational cultures and identities (Sainsaulieu 1977; Francfort and Coll 1995), 2) the importance of language at work (Girin 1990; Boutet 1995; Pene, Borzeix, and Fraenkel 2001), 3) the influence of national cultures on management practices (d'Iribarne 1989, 1998, 2003; Chevrier 2000). Space is clearly and explicitly present in these works as a factor in identities and meaning construction at work. It is also the object of imaginary social projections and dreams. They are *lieux de mémoire* as we say in French (memory places), which means that they incorporate historical meanings attached to these places. Space organisation produces and structures social relations and also feeds the images of the organisational members as well as those of outsiders. Space is also aesthetic. Beauty, grace, harmony are elements of the organisational experience of every personnel member, just as are ugliness, disgrace and disharmony (Strati 2000). Unlike most of the classic works on management, such thinking places an emphasis on the meaningful universe peculiar to each organisation. This universe is a framework for interpreting the observed behaviour and space is an element of this framework. We leave the terrain of cold rationality and functionality to enter into the world of words and symbolic order. Space becomes an element of the organisational language and of the symbolic order. Spatiality enters into the world of management as an element of systems of meaning.

From this point of view, we can better understand why different social spaces have produced different managerial discourses and thinking. Historically, the production of American management thinkers has been obsessed with contract, pragmatism, and market logic, giving pride of place to business firms. Scandinavian production put the emphasis on community

organisation and a collective vision of the firm (Byrkjeflot 2003). German production focused on the social market economy and a power-sharing vision for the business firm, while the French remain sensitive to the state and public services. Given this variety of organisational modes, we can see how society, history, culture and social structure shape the mind of management thinkers. Such differences can also explain why there are so many misunderstandings between all these traditions and how the dream of there being only one management model is not ready to materialise in any near future (Inglehart, Basanez, and Moreno 1998; d'Iribarne 1998; Hofstede 2002; Chanlat and Barmeyer 2004).

Space in political organisation theory

Organisation is a social and cultural system that is regulated by power relationships. Most management thinking is reluctant to integrate and discuss power (Chanlat and Séguin 1987; Clegg 1989; Chanlat 1997). Unlike social scientists (Crozier and Friedberg 1977; Lukes 1974; Courpasson 2000), management thinkers see power more as a problem than a necessity (Mintzberg 1983). For this reason they prefer, generally, to discuss authority. Largely inspired by a functionalist vision of organisation, they deny interest and value conflicts. Harmony is a slogan. Critical thought has shown how this discourse was masking social reality. But some non-Marxian researchers have developed a political vision of organisational space, which greatly influenced some management knowledge. In the Latin world, so-called strategic analysis has played an important role. Developed by Crozier and Friedberg in France, it presents organisations as a space of power relationships in which each person or each social group is an actor mobilising different resources, developing strategy in a context of uncertainty, according to the rules of the game, seeking to keep their position or realise their objectives (Crozier and Friedberg 1977; Bernoux 1985). It is a perspective that sees organisation as a political space. In the USA, Pfeffer and Salancik have developed an approach centred on the relationship between organisation and its environment (1978). Resource dependency theory tries to understand how the organisations can insure and maintain control of the resources they need. Any organisation needs a variety of resources (physical, financial, human, technological, etc.), which it must draw from its environment. To reduce their dependence, each organisation will develop strategies to realise this goal. Controlling materials, people, money, and techniques becomes an imperative. The means are diverse, too: social and interpersonal relationships, language and symbols, rules and structures.

A recent work on the Cluny monastery has shown how organisational space was an element in reducing the dependence on the environment in the past. Historically, monastery space was positive and opposed to an external space under the sway of the Devil. There were "White Churches and Black

Castles", according to a time-honoured expression. It was also a space with a divine character. This positive space was also an expanding space. According to Clunisian authors, the word Cluny comes from the Latin *cluere*, which means increase. It is the reason why Cluny saw a large development in the western and oriental world. Another spatial element was the symbolism of the building (size, decoration, artefacts). Up until the construction of St Peters of Rome, it was the most important religious building in the Christian world. The goal was to exalt Clunisian potency in the stones and the decorative splendour. Anybody passing by would immediately be impressed by such a construction. Cluny used also horizontal integration and diversification to be more independent (Nizet 2003). As we can see, this spatial control was at the base of the first organisation too, and, in contrast with the closed traditional vision of the monastery system; Cluny was also an open system.

Space in the psychosociology perspective

The last element to be introduced is work done by psychosociologists of organisations. The stream was introduced by disciples of the Human Relations movement, such as Likert, who defined the notion of morale, or Lewin, who developed the link between types of leadership and group performance. There were other sources of development such as the Tavistock research done by Bion (1959) on group dynamics or Elliot Jaques (1952) on socio-technical analysis. More recently, some researchers have used psychoanalytical concepts to build a psychodynamics of organisation life, work and managerial leadership (Sievers 1994).

In France, such currents emerged at the end of fifties and have since constituted one of the most important Latin contributions to the field. Influenced by some American and British work, notably Lewin, Moreno, Bion, and Jaques, as well as by psychoanalysis and critical sociology, the French psychosociologists have produced important and diverse publications on the relationship between the individual and the organisation (Barus-Michel, Lévy, and Enriquez 2002). Some of them, regrouped under the appellation of pschodynamics of work, have explored the relationship between psychic life and work organisations (Dejours 1993, 2000). The psychosociologists, despite their diversity of thinking, bring a new element into the comprehension of organisations: the role of psychic processes in organisational and work dynamics. Organisational space is an important aspect of the individual psychic life.

Organisational structures constrain individual desires but are also produced by affective and psychic dynamics. For example, a CEO can be a megalomaniac, paranoid or obsessive-compulsive; each of these profiles can lead to a distinct type of structure and influence the strategy (Zaleznick and Kets de Vries 1985; Schwartz 1990; Pitcher 1994; Lapierre 1995; Enriquez

1997). Organisational space becomes an element of projection, identification, and idealisation by individuals (Morgan 1986). In these works, space is a psychic reality and organisations a production of the human psyche and social imaginary (Castoriadis 1979; Giust-Desprairies 2003). People become actors when managements address their subjectivity.

As we can see, the diversity of management and organisation thinking has produced different representations of space. The world has experienced great changes in the past 15 years, and these changes have produced effects on organisational space, notably with the destruction of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Because of this historical event, capitalism has won new national spaces and became the only dominant economic space. Such a change has transformed organisational life and redesigned organisational parameters as well as economic geography. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is now interesting to conclude with some spatial reflections on recent management thinking.

Space, organisation and management in the last decade

Most of the classical thinking on management we have mentioned developed its ideas in a very different socio-historical context; either in the first part of the twentieth century; or during the Glorious Thirties, as some analysts describe that period. From the end of the 1940s to the second part of the 1970s, we were in a virtuous circle in the industrialised world: economic growth, increased education, inequality reduction, rise of wealth, etc., but we were also in a competition with another system: communism. An iron curtain divided the world space into two parts: East and West. The other part of the planet, the third world, had to choose its camp. This division played a central role in the spatial structuration and representation of peoples and policies. Management was clearly engaged in this struggle through the Marshall Plan and all the productivity missions sent to America, notably in the Fifties.

If the disappearance of the Wall in 1989 was a major event in modern history, the last fifteen years have been the theatre of other big changes in organisations management. The globalisation of exchanges by the creation of commercial unions, the strong development of communication and information technology, the weight of the financial markets, the change in consumer behaviours, the rise of new sites of production (China, India, Eastern countries in transition, etc.) have pushed many business firms to be more flexible at all levels (stock, production, manpower, technology). The main consequences are fragmentation of work, de-localisation of production, flexibility of structures and processes as well as massive uses of electronic information technology. New organisational forms such as network systems and virtual organisation are popularised (Bellier et al. 2002), and all the old forms are criticised. At the same time, we observe change at the workplace.

The development of virtual offices and nomadic tools (telephone, computer, palm pilots, etc.) permits a fragmentation of work time-space. These effect not only human experience at work but also, more generally, organisational life and society.

In his 1989 book *Frameworks of Power*, Stewart Clegg states: "The stabilisation and fixing of the rules of meaning and membership, and techniques of production and discipline, in an organisation field which is capable of extensive reproduction over space and time are the central issue." The statement is certainly as true for today's organisations as it was 15 years ago, but current trends make such a goal more difficult. In effect, unlike last century's organisations and notably, those of 1950–70, the socioeconomic landscape has changed. The new imperatives of flexibility, reactivity, quality, financial value creation, and competitiveness have created a new atmosphere in many organisations, in particular among the stock business firms and their affiliates (suppliers). The development of externalisation practices, the rise of atypical employee contracts (part-time, temporary, casual, etc.) and the zero stock policy have transformed spatial relationships. Many organisations have developed fragmented organisational spaces. The issue and the challenge now are to build a collective dynamic in this divided organisational context. The changes are so rapid at all levels that it is not easy to develop social trust, keep experience and memory, while building a minimum of collective consciousness indispensable for ensuring good organisational performances. In many cases, industrial goals and client needs are sacrificed on the altar of finance. Recent economic scandals in North America and Europe are good illustrations. But some aspects of management thinking and training contribute to the process of this social disembeddeness.

The over-financialised vision of the business firm and its teaching in Business School programs has developed an abstract conception of business activity. Enron is an example of such a vision. Electricity was only a question of buying and selling energy yet the material reality of being an energy producer (dams, plants, generators, water, gas, etc.) disappeared in favour of fluid and abstract relations in a virtual energy space. The result was a derealisation, pushed by greed and collective illusion about the reality of the model. Almost everybody involved shared beliefs in unlimited wealth growth in this new economic space. The dreams of some economist and financial executive came true: market mobility and fluidity were at their best. The dream became a nightmare, however, and the awakening was terrible: 7000 billions of dollars and Enron, the new model, disappeared in a few months. The concrete reality of economic activity came back, as a reality rooted in territory, dealing with real objects and real persons, re-emerged.

Organisational dynamics have social implications, require cohesiveness, and involve long term time spans of discretion (Mintzberg 1989; Collins

2003), which shape the spatial world in which we live and work. We come back to the basics even in a changing world: an embodied management rooted in society, industry, and professional experience is still needed. The management thinking of the twenty-first century must put the emphasis on social processes that keep management grounded and embodied. In a century that faces great challenges of social and environmental equilibrium, these are a requisite not only for wisdom, but also for our own survival.

References

Aktouf, O. (1989). Le *management: entre tradition et renouvellement*. Montréal: Gaétan Morin éditeur.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Critical Organization Theory. In Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevon (Eds.) *The Northern Lights Organization Theory in Scandinavia*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Altio, L. & A. Kovalainen (2003). Using Gender in Exploring Organizations, Management and Change. In Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevon (Eds.) *The Northern Lights Organization Theory in Scandinavia*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Argyris C. & D. Schön (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Audet, M. (1994). Introduction. In Cossette, P. (Ed.) *Cartes cognitives et organisation*. Ste Foy: Les Presses de l'université Laval, Paris, Eska.

Barnard, C. (1938/1968). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1988). Viewpoint: Sociology and Postmodernity, *Sociological Review*, *36 (4)*: 790–813.

Barus-Michel, J., E. Enriquez & A. Lévy (Eds.) (2002). *Dictionnaire de psychosociologie*. Paris: Érès.

Bellier, S. & al (2002). *Le E-management: vers l'entreprise virtuelle?* Paris: Éditions Liaisons.

Bernoux, P. (1985). *Sociologie des organisations*. Paris: Seuil.

Bion, W. (1959). *Experience in Groups*. New York: Basic Books.

Blau, P. & W. R. Scott (1962). *Formal Organizations: a comparative approach*. San Francisco: Chandler.

Boutet, J. (1995). *Paroles au travail*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Bouilloud, J.-P. & B. Lécuyer (1994). *L'invention de la gestion*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Boyer, R. (1986). *La théorie de la regulation*. Paris: La découverte.

Byrkjeflot, H. (2003). Nordic Management: From Functional Socialism to Shareholder Value? In Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevon (Eds.) *The Northern Lights Organization Theory in Scandinavia*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.

Burns, T. & G. M. Stalker (1961). *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock.

Calas, M. B. & L. Smircich (1996). From The Woman's Point of View: feminist approaches to organization studies. In Clegg, S. R., C. Hardy & W. Nord, *Handbook of Organizations Studies,* 218–258. London: Sage.

Castoriadis, C. (1979). *L'institution imaginaire de la société*. Paris: Seuil.
Casey, C. (2002). *Critical Analysis of Organizations*. London: Sage.
Chandler, A. D. (1977). *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Chanlat, A. & M. Dufour (1985). *La rupture entre l'entreprise et les hommes*. Montréal: Québec/Amérique.
Chanlat, J.-F. & F. Séguin. (1987). *L'analyse des organisations*. Montréal: Gaétan Morin éditeur.
Chanlat, J.-F. (1997). Conflict and Politics. In Sorge, A. & M. Warner, *The Handbook of Organizational Behavior,* 472–480. Thompson Business Press.
Chanlat, J.-F. (2003). L'action publique, l'éthique du bien commun, l'efficacité et l'efficience: un regard croisé. In Emery, Y. & D. Giauque (Eds.) *Sens et paradoxes de l'emploi public au XXIe siècle,* 13–28. Lausanne: Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes.
Chanlat, J.-F. & C. Barmeyer (2004). Présentation, numéro spécial/special issue on Cultures, nations et gestion, *Management International*, Montréal.
Chapple, E. D. & C. M. Arensberg (1940). Measuring human relations: An introduction to the study of interaction of individuals. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 22:* 3–147.
Chapple, E. (1953). Applied Anthropology to Industry. In Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology Today.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Clarke, T. & S. R. Clegg (2000). Ch*anging Paradigms, The transformation of management knowledge for the 21st century.* London: Harper Collins.
Clegg, S. R. (1975). *Power, Rule and Domination*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of Power.* London: Sage.
Clegg, S. R. (1990). *Modern Organizations*. London: Sage.
Clegg, S. R., C. Hardy & W. Nord (1996). *Handbook of Organizations Studies*. London: Sage.
Collins, J. (2003). *Good to Great*. New York: Harper Collins.
Cooper, R. & G. Burrell (1988). Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: an introduction, *Organization Studies*, *9 (1)*: 91–112.
Cossette, P. (Ed.) (1994). *Cartes cognitives et organisation*. Ste Foy: Les Presses de l'université Laval, Paris, Eska.
Courpasson, D. (2001). *L'action contrainte*. Paris: PUF.
Cromwell, D. (2001). *Private Planet: Corporate Plunder and the fight back*. Charlbury: Jon Carpenter.
Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. London: Tavistock.
Crozier, M. & E. Friedberg (1981). *The Actor and the System*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Cyert, R. & J. March (1963). *A Behavioural Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevon (Eds.) (2003). *The Northern Lights Organization Theory in Scandinavia*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
Deal, T. & A. Kennedy (1982). *Corporate Cultures: the rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading: Addison Wesley.

Dejours, C. (1993). *Travail et usure mentale*. Paris: Bayard.
Dejours, C. (2000). *Souffrance en France*. Paris: Seuil.
Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*. London: Sage.
Emery, F. E. & E. L. Trist (1960). Socio-Technical Systems. In Churchman, C. & M. Wand Verhulst, *Management Sciences, Models and Techniques,* 83–97. London: Pergamon Press.
Duffy, F. (1992). *The Changing Workplace*. London: Phaidon Press Limited.
Du Gay, P. (2000). *In Praise of Bureaucracy.* London: Sage.
Dupuy, J.-P. (1996). *Introduction aux sciences cognitives*. Paris: Gallimard.
Enriquez, E. (1997). *Les jeux du pouvoir et du désir dans l'entreprise*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
Fayol, H. (1956). *Administration industrielle et générale*. Paris: Dunod.
Follett, M.-P. (2002). *Diriger au-delà du conflit*. Paris: Village Mondial.
Fischer, G.-N. (1990). Espace, identité et organisation. In Chanlat, J.-F., *L'individu dans l'organisation: les dimensions oubliées*. Ste Foy: Les Presses de l'université Laval, Paris, Eska.
Fischer, G.-N. (1994). *Psychologie des espaces de travail*. Paris: Armand Colin.
Friedman, G. (1954). *Le travail en miettes*. Paris: Gallimard.
Gagliardi, P. (Eds.) (1990). *Symbols and Artifacts*: *Views of the Corporate Landscape*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Gagliardi, P. (1996). Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life. In Clegg, S. R., C. Hardy & W. Nord (1996) *Handbook of Organization Studies,* 565–580. London: Sage.
Gardner, B. (1957). *Human Relations in Industry.* Homewood: R. D. Irwin.
Girin, J. (1990). Problèmes du langage dans les organisations. In Chanlat, J.-F., *L'individu dans l'organisation: les dimensions oubliées,* 37–77. Ste Foy: Les Presses de l'université Laval, Paris, Eska.
Giust-Desprairies, F. (2003). *L'imaginaire collectif*. Paris: Érès.
Graham, P. (1995). *Mary P. Follett Prophet of Management a Celebration of Writings from the 1920s*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
Hall, E. (1966). *La dimension cache*. Paris: Seuil.
Handy, C. (1989). *The Age of Unreason*. London: Hutchison.
Hannan, M. T. & J. Freeland (1977). The Population Ecology of Organizations, *American Journal of Sociology*, *82, (5)*: 929–940.
Hassard, J. & M. Parker (1993). *Post Modernism and Organizations*. London: Sage.
Hatch, M.-J. (2000). *Organization Theory.* London: Sage.
Hatchuel, A. (1994). Taylor: l'ingénieur, l'expert et le doctrinaire. In Lécuyer, B. & J.-P. Bouilloud, *L' invention de la gestion*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Hernes, T. (2003). Organizations as Evolution of Space. In Czarniawska, B. & G. Sevon (Eds.) *The Northern Lights Organization Theory in Scandinavia*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
Homans, G. C. (1950). *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
Hofstede, G. (2002). *Cultures' Consequences*: *Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. London: Sage.
Inglehart, R., M. Basanez & A. Moreno (1998). *Human Values and Beliefs: A Crosss-Cultural Sourcebook*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
D'Iribarne, P. (Ed.) (1993). *La logique de l'honneur.* Paris: Seuil.
D'Iribarne, P. (Ed.) (1998). *Cultures et mondialisation.* Paris: Seuil.

Khandwalla, P. (1977). *The Design of Organizations*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.
Koontz, H., & C. O'Donnell (1955). *Principles of Management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Kuttner, R. (1999). *Everything for sale: the virtues and the limits of markets*. Chicago: The Chicago University Press.
Lapierre, L. (Ed.) (1995). *Imaginaire et leadership*. Montréal, Québec/Amérique.
Lash, S. & J. Urry (1987). *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Lautier, F. (2000). *Ecotopie*. Toulouse: Octares.
Le Chatelier, H. (1928). *Le Taylorisme*. Paris: Dunod.
Lécuyer, B. & J.-P. Bouilloud (1994). *L' invention de la gestion*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Lécuyer, B. (1994). Deux relectures des expériences Hawthorne: problèmes d'histoire & d'épistémologie. In Lécuyer, B. et J.-P. Bouilloud, *L' invention de la gestion*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Le Goff, J.-P. (1999). *Les illusions du management*. Paris: La Découverte.
Likert, R. (1967). The *Human Organization: It's Management Value*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Linstead, S. (Ed.) (2001). *The Language of Organizaion*. London: Sage.
Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: MacMillan.
March, J. G. (1978). Bounded rationality, Ambiguity and the Engineering of Choice. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, *9 (2)*: 587–608.
Mayo, E. (1933). *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilisation*. New York: MacMillan.
Mayo, E. (1949). *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilisation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Meyer, H. D. (1995). Organizational Environments and Organizational discourse: Bureaucracy between two worlds, *Organization Science*, *6, (1)*: 32–43.
Miller, D. & P. H. Friesen (1984). *Organizations: A Quantum View*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Miller, D. (1990). *The Icarus Paradox*. New York: Harper Collins.
Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on Management: Inside our Strange World of Organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
Moles, A. & E. Rohmer (1977). *Psychologie de l'espace*. Paris: Casterman.
Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. London: Sage.
Mousli, M. (2002). Introduction. In Follett, M.-P., *Diriger au-delà du conflit*. Paris: Village Mondial.
Mouzelis, N. (1967). *Organization and Bureaucracy*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
Nizet, J. (2003). Les ordres religieux du Moyen-Âge: des organisations fermées? Le cas de Cluny, *Archives de sciences sociales des religions, 123:* 41–60, juillet–septembre.
Noon, P. & P. Blyton. *The Realities of Work*. London: Palgrave.
Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z How American Business can meet the Japanese Challenge*. Reading: Addison Wesley.
Peters, T. (1987). *Chaos Management*. New York: Harper & Row.

Peters, T. & R. H. Waterman 1982). *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.
Pfeffer, J. & G. Salancik (1978). *The External Control of Organization: A Resource Dependance Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
Pitcher, P. (1995). *Artistes, artisans et technocrats*. Montréal, Québec/Amérique.
Pugh, D. & D. Hickson (1963). A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 8*: 289–315.
Roethlisberger, F, J. & W. J. Dickson (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Sayles, L. (1958). The *Behavior of Industrial Work Groups: Predictions and Control*. New York: Wiley.
Schronen, D. (2003). *Le management à l'épreuve du bureau*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Schwartz, H. (1990). *Narcissistic Process and Corporate Decy: The Theory of Organizational Ideal*. New York: New York University Press.
Séguin, F. & J.-F. Chanlat (1983). *L'analyse des organisations Tome I: Les théories de l'organisation*. Montréal: Gaétan Morin éditeur.
Simon, H. (1961). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
Simon, H. (2003). *Les sciences de l'artificiel*. Paris: Gallimard.
Sievers, B. (1994). *Work, Death and Life Itself*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Steele, F. (1975). *The Open Organization: The Impact of Secrecy and Disclosure on People and Organizations*. Reading: Addison Wesley.
Sorge, A. & M. Warner (1997). *The Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. London: Thompson Business Press.
Stiglitz, R. (2002). *La grande disillusion*. Paris: Fayard.
Strati, A. (2000). *Aesthetics and Organization*. London: Sage.
Sundstrom, E. & M. G. Sundstrom (1986). *Work Places: the Psychology of the Physical Environment in Offices and Factories*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Taylor, F. W. (1919). *Shop Management*. New York: Harper Collins.
Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper Collins.
Tenbrunsel, A. & Als (1996). Cognitions in Organizations. In Clegg, S. R., C. Hardy & W. Nord (1996). *Handbook of Organizations Studies*, 313–337. London: Sage.
Touraine, A. (1992). *Critique de la modernité*. Paris: Fayard.
Trist, E. & K. Bamforth(1951). Some social and Psychological Consequences of the Long Wall Method of Coal-getting, *Human Relations*, *4 (1)*: 3–38.
Trompenaars, A. (1994). *L'entreprise multiculturelle*. Paris: Maxima.
Turner, B. (Eds.) (1990). *Organizational Symbolism*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Van Maanen, A. (1988). *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Von Bertalanffy, L. (1973). *La théorie générale des systèmes*. Paris: Dunod.
Warner, W. L. & J. Low (1947). *The Social System of the Modern Factory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press.
Weick, K. & M. G. Bougon (1986). Organizations and cognitive maps: charting ways to success and failure. In Sims, H. P. & D. A. Gioa (Eds.) *The Thinking Organization: Dynamics of Organizational Social Cognition*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. London: Sage.
Weil, S. (1951). *La condition ouvrière*. Paris: Gallimard.
Westwood, R. & S. Linstead (Eds.) (2001). *The Language of Organization*. London: Sage.
Whyte, W. F. (1948). *Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry*. New York: MacGraw Hill.
Wren, D. (1994). *The Evolution of Management Thought*. New York: John Wiley.
Zaleznick, A. & M. Kets de Vries (1985). *The Corporate Mind*. Chicago: Bonus Books.
Zinn, H. (2003). *Histoire populaire des Etats-Unis*. Paris: La Découverte.

Chapter 3

Spaces as Process: Developing a Recursive Perspective on Organisational Space[1]

Tor Hernes, Tore Bakken and Per Ingvar Olsen

In the world of organisation, spaces in the form of systems, groups, teams and technologies are continually being created and re-created, where stability and renewal exist side by side. Contemporary sociology harbours schools that provide us with analytical frameworks for studying how spaces emerge, evolve and transform. This is what we refer to as a "recursive view" of space. A recursive view of space implies that we see space as existing through its production and reproduction. While space is what shapes action and inter-action, it is reshaped by actions and inter-actions in turn. Once produced it cannot be reproduced except through actions and interactions. Such a view encompasses both stability and renewal; in the sense that once produced, the space forms a context that previously did not exist, hence new understanding and insights will emerge. In other words, while the production and reproduction of space is done in order to create stability, the creation of stability contains the seeds of renewal.

The idea of recursive processes has been prevalent in mathematics and has been carried further by cyberneticians such as von Foerster (2003) and Bateson (1972). Positions have developed in sociology to provide understanding of processes of production and reproduction. Examples are autopoietic theory (Luhmann), structuration theory (Giddens), the theory of habitus and reproduction (Bourdieu), as well as Latour's work on scientific knowledge. Positions such as these differ considerably in aim, scope and substance, yet they converge upon the idea that systems exist through their own production and reproduction. We borrow from these schools in the present chapter and work from the idea that spaces are produced and reproduced recursively. At the same time, we acknowledge that space is not a privileged term for these theorists. Luhmann and Latour, for example, do not refer to space *per se*. For Latour, space does not seem viable as a concept for

[1] The chapter is in part based on Hernes (2004).

analysis. Instead, he draws upon the idea of networks, which are not perceived in a spatial sense. Still, Latour acknowledges that actors construct the contexts within which they operate, and it is primarily his ideas of *actants* and *circular referencing* that we draw upon in developing a recursive view of space. While Luhmann does not operate with the notion of space, he does, however, draw extensively on the idea of boundaries, which are drawn by systems to distinguish themselves from other systems.

We analyse two types of space from a recursive perspective. First, spaces of regulation, from which we select more specifically budgets, financial monitoring and control systems. These are seen as regulatory spaces created to ensure some degree of functional stability, which again enables planning and prediction. Second, spaces of cognition and learning, which include the very spheres of meaning by which actions are conceived and interpreted. Finally, we discuss briefly how these two types of space may be seen to interact in producing organisational change.

Space and organisation

Space forms as a result of boundary setting and from what we may call distinction-drawing operations. For example, identity formation is a way of forming a social space of belonging different from other social spaces of belonging. Identity, however, is not a mere thing in itself. It cannot exist except in relation to something else, and it cannot be sustained except through continuous operations that serve to uphold the distinction from something else. The army, for example, upholds its distinction through myths, through rituals, through uniforms, through technologies and many other types of operations. Whereas the example relates to identity, it can be extended to include several other organisational phenomena. For example, the collective knowledge from which organisation members operate may be understood spatially, in the sense that it forms a boundary differentiating what is important, meaningful and relevant in relation to a specific organisation from that which is not. The knowledge applied in a Wall Street broker firm, one would imagine, is largely that of how to make more money and to secure clients' portfolios, and less about what is ethically right, what is good for the wider society or for the natural environment. We would expect routines and rituals in a Wall Street broking firm to support the particularities of the knowledge used by those working in the firm and to consistently draw lines between what should be practiced as knowledge from that which should not be practiced. The space in this case which we may perfunctorily refer to as the space of understanding – is repeatedly drawn and redrawn through a series of operations that serve to mark distinctions, not just in relation to the world outside the brokering profession but also in relation to competing broker firms.

The argument in this chapter is premised on four tenets, which are interconnected and serve to demarcate a space for theorising about space and organisation.

Tenet 1: Organisation is essentially about stabilisation of actions and expectations

We take the generative principle of organisation to concern, essentially, the stabilisation of actions and expectations over time and space. We contend that organisation can only be manifest as a stabilising mechanism. This does not mean that it is stable in the sense that it is immutable. What it means is that stabilising processes are at work all the time, but that these stabilising processes are not seen as finality converging towards some determinable state, such as what would be a tenet of an equilibrium view of organisation. What seems paradoxical in relation to most organisational literature concerned with imperatives of change is that stabilising processes, far from being inhibiting, actually offer scope for change. In other words, stability enables change, and it is not the antithesis to change. Others follow a similar line of argument, such as Feldman and Pentland (2003), who explore organisational routines as sources of change.

Stabilising processes may take different directions. Therefore, when we speak of organisational change, we are not just talking about changing from something that is stabilised, but also about stabilisation around a new order. Nor do we see stabilisation as the antithesis to change. Rather, we see stabilisation as a prerequisite for change – even part of changing.

Tenet 2: Stabilisation takes place through space formation and reproduction

Stabilisation may be conceptualised as the formation and reproduction of space, and space is a basic construct for understanding stabilising mechanisms. That action and inter-action is framed by context is a generally accepted axiom in the social sciences. Giddens (1984:17) refers to time-space, and ties "structure" to the "… binding of time-space in social systems, the properties which make it possible for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space and which lend them 'systemic' form". All action and inter-action, according to Giddens, is somehow framed by context. Context, in Giddens' (1984:282) words, involves:

> (a) the time-space boundaries (usually having symbolic or physical markers) around interaction strips; (b) the co-presence of actors, making possible the