Organisational Space and Beyond

Kingma, S.F.; Dale, Karen; Wasserman, Varda

2018

ORGANIZATIONAL SPACE AND BEYOND

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HENRI LEFEBVRE FOR ORGANIZATION STUDIES

Edited by
Sytze F. Kingma, Karen Dale, and Varda Wasserman

Organizational Space and Beyond

Through the focus on organizational space, using the reception and significance of the seminal work on the subject by sociologist Henri Lefebvre, this book demonstrates why and how Lefebvre's work can be used to inform and elaborate organizational studies, especially in view of the current interest in the "socio-material" dimension of organizations.

As the "spatial turn" in organizational research exposed the importance of spatial design in inducing power and cultural relations, Lefebvre's perspective has become an inspiring, theoretical framework. However, Organizational Space and Beyond explores how Lefebvre's work could be of a much wider relevance, especially given his profound theoretical engagement with diverse schools of philosophical and sociological thought, including Nietzsche, Marx, Sartre and Foucault.

This book brings together a range of authors that collectively develop a broader understanding of Lefebvre's relevance to organizational studies, including areas of management concern such as strategy and diversity studies, and ultimately draw on Lefebvre's work to rethink, reimagine and reshape scholarship in organizational studies. It will be of relevance to researchers, academics, students and organizational professionals in the fields of organization studies, management studies, cultural studies, architecture and sociology.

Sytze F. Kingma is a senior lecturer in the Department of Organization Sciences at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Karen Dale is reader and director of teaching in the Department of Organisation, Work and Technology at Lancaster University, UK.

Varda Wasserman is a senior lecturer in the Department of Management and Economics at the Open University of Israel, Israel.

Routledge Studies in Management, Organizations and Society

This series presents innovative work grounded in new realities, addressing issues crucial to an understanding of the contemporary world. This is the world of organised societies, where boundaries between formal and informal, public and private, local and global organizations have been displaced or have vanished, along with other nineteenth-century dichotomies and oppositions. Management, apart from becoming a specialised profession for a growing number of people, is an everyday activity for most members of modern societies.

Similarly, at the level of enquiry, culture and technology, and literature and economics, can no longer be conceived as isolated intellectual fields; conventional canons and established mainstreams are contested. **Management, Organizations and Society** addresses these contemporary dynamics of transformation in a manner that transcends disciplinary boundaries, with books that will appeal to researchers, student and practitioners alike.

Recent titles in this series include:

Socially Responsible Capitalism and Management
Henri Savall, Michel Péron, Véronique Zardet,
and Marc Bonnet

Counterproductive Work Behaviors
Understanding the Dark Side of Personalities
in Organizational Life
Aaron Cohen

Relational Research and Organisation Studies
Charlotte Øland Madsen, Mette Vinther Larsen,
Lone Hersted and Jørgen Gulddahl Rasmussen

Organizational Space and Beyond
The Significance of Henri Lefebvre for Organization Studies
Edited by Sytze F. Kingma, Karen Dale, and Varda Wasserman

For a full list of titles in this series, please visit www.routledge.com

Organizational Space and Beyond

The Significance of Henri Lefebvre for Organization Studies

Edited by Sytze F. Kingma, Karen Dale, and Varda Wasserman

Contents

Contributors

Timon Beyes is professor of sociology of organization and culture at Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany, and Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. His research focuses on the processes, spaces and aesthetics of organization in the fields of media culture, art, cities as well as higher education. Recent publications include "Colour and Organization Studies" (*Journal of Organization Studies*, 2017), *The Routledge Companion to Reinventing Management Education* (with M. Parker and C. Steyaert, 2016), *Social Media—New Masses* (with I. Baxmann and C. Pias, Chicago 2016) and *Performing the Digital* (with M. Leeker and I. Schipper, Bielefeld, 2017).

Karen Dale works at Lancaster University in the Department of Organization, Work and Technology. She has written on embodiment, materiality, space and architecture in relation to organizations and organizing, including *The Spaces of Organization and the Organization of Space* (Palgrave) with Gibson Burrell.

Gili S. Drori is associate professor of sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. Her publications speak to her research interests in institutional theory of organizations and world society theory; globalization and glocalization; science, innovation and higher education; and, culture, knowledge and policy regimes. Gili earned her academic education at Tel Aviv University (BA 1986; and MA 1989) and Stanford University (PhD, 1997, sociology). She served as Director of IR Honors Program and taught at Stanford University for a decade. She also taught at the University of California Berkeley (USA), the Technion (Israel), and University of Bergamo (Italy) and was a guest scholar at Uppsala University (Sweden).

Sytze F. Kingma is senior lecturer in the sociology of organization at the Department of Organization Sciences of the VU University Amsterdam, the Netherlands. His research interests involve the material and virtual dimensions of organizational networks, and the way risk and responsibility are implicated in organizational contexts. He published extensively in

the field of gambling and is the editor of *Global Gambling: Cultural Perspectives on Organized Gambling* (Routledge, 2010). His publications deal with risk, responsibility, organizational space and technology; most recent articles are about 'third workspaces' and 'new ways of working'.

Daniel S. Lacerda is lecturer of management at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Brazil. He received his PhD in Organization Studies from Lancaster University and has published articles in journals such as *Discourse and Society* and *Third World Quarterly*. His recent work examines the management practices of civil society organizations with an emphasis on the political economy of space

Jeanne Mengis is associate professor of organizational communication in the Faculty of Communication Sciences at the University of Lugano (Switzerland), where she is director of the Institute of Marketing and Communication Management. She is a senior research fellow at the research unit for Innovation, Knowledge and Organizational Networks (IKON) at Warwick Business School (WBS). Her work has appeared in *Organization Science* and *Organization Studies,* and she has recently published research on space in *Organization* and *Organizational Research Methods.* Her current research explores the role of spatiotemporality in identity translation work, in the context of film industry festivals.

Louise Nash is a lecturer in management at Essex Business School. Prior to this she worked in a variety of marketing-related management roles in financial services and more recently in university administration. Her research interests are in interpretative, qualitative studies of the lived experience of work, particularly in the spatial and temporal rhythms of everyday working life, and in exploring and developing sensory and embodied methods of research.

Inbal Ofer is a professor of Modern European history at the department of History, Philosophy and Judaic Studies at the Open University of Israel. She specializes in 20th century Spanish history with an emphasis on gender, urban history and social movements. She is the author of *Señoritas in Blue: The Making of a Female Political Elite in Franco's Spain. The National Leadership of the Sección Femenina de la Falange (1936–1977)*, Sussex Academic Press, 2009; and of *Claiming the City and Contesting the State: Squatting, Community Formation and Democratization in Spain (1955–1986)*, Routledge, 2017.

Tuomo Peltonen is professor of organization and management Åbo Akademi University, Finland. He also holds a docent (adjunct professor) appointment at Aalto University and University of Turku. His current research interests include organization theory and philosophy, wisdom, spirituality and religion; and history of management thought. Tuomo's books include: *Organization Theory: Critical and Philosophical Engagements*

(Emerald); *Spirituality and Religion in Organizing* (Palgrave), *Origins of Organizing* (edited with Hugo Gaggiotti and Peter Case; Edward Elgar) and *Towards Wise Management* (Palgrave; forthcoming).

Fabio James Petani is assistant professor in the department of Management and HR at INSEEC Business School and researcher in the chair on Digital Innovation & Artificial Intelligence at INSEEC Business School in Lyon (France). He holds a PhD from the University of Lugano (Switzerland). His research on organizational space has appeared in *Organization*. He is interested in discursive and sociomaterial practices of justification and critique in organizations. His latest research studies how digital technology and urbanization are jointly transforming business organizations, work and social relations more broadly.

Briana Preminger is a teaching fellow at the Department of Management at Bar Ilan University and teaching assistant at the Department of Sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, in Israel. Briana earned her academic education at Bar Ilan University (MBA 2001) and at The Hebrew University (BA 1995; MA 1998; PhD 2017). Her PhD is conferred jointly with SKEMA Business School, in France. Briana's research interests are in institutional theory of organization; value and cocreation; and organization of social space.

Arja Ropo is professor of management and organization at the Faculty of Management, University of Tampere, Finland. Her continuing interest is leadership from an embodied and material perspective. Recently, she has studied leadership and physical workplaces. She advances leadership theory as a sociomaterial phenomenon, as an embodied relationship between the human and material. Her work has appeared in the *Leadership Quarterly*, *Leadership*, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management & Organization and Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, among others.

Perttu Salovaara is an adjunct assistant professor at Stern School of Business, New York University, USA, and a leadership researcher at the School of Management, University of Tampere, Finland. Having a background in philosophy, his research focuses on leadership's epistemological and ontological questions. He has recently studied and published on embodiment in leadership, leadership in spaces and places, Lefebvre's triadic space concept, and coworking movement. He has also produced three academic documentary films on leadership and is at the moment studying coworking spaces, craft breweries, and plural and leaderless forms of leadership. Perttu draws inspiration for his research from alpine skiing, guitar playing and home brewing.

Harriet Shortt is an associate professor in organization studies at Bristol Business School at the University of the West of England, Bristol, UK.

Her research focuses on organizational space, artefacts and identity and she has an expertise in qualitative research methods including innovative visual methodologies, specifically, participant-led photography. Harriet has led several research projects in both public and private sector organizations that examine spatial change and the impact of work space on employees' everyday working practices. Her research has been published in journals including *Human Relations, Organizational Research Methods, Management Learning, Visual Studies* and the *International Journal of Work, Organization and Emotion.* She is a member of 'inVisio' (The International Network for Visual Studies in Organization) and part of the ESRC RDI funded team that developed 'inVisio *in*spire', an online resource for visual researchers in business and management.

Sarah Warnes is a Senior Teaching Fellow at the UCL School of Management and holds a Doctorate from Essex Business School, University of Essex. Her PhD explored the lived dimension of organizational space in an English Cathedral. Sarah joined the School of Management in 2013 and leads on three courses: Understanding Management, Business Research Methods and Dissertation. Sarah has tutored and lectured across both undergraduate and post-graduate programmes in the subjects of management, leadership, strategy, organizational change, research methodology and dissertation completion. Prior to joining the public sector, Sarah worked for a private training company committed to workplace training; here Sarah spent two years setting up operations in the UAE.

Varda Wasserman is senior lecturer at the Open University of Israel in the Department of Management & Economics. She is an organizational sociologist, and her research interests are: organizational aesthetics, organizational control and resistance, (un)doing gender, masculinity in organizations, embodiment, religion and organizations, excluded social groups and the army as an organization. She has published in *Organization Science*, *Organization Studies*, *Culture and Organization, Organization* and other journals.

Zhongyuan Zhang currently works as an associate professor at the School of Management, Zhejiang University. He obtained his PhD in organizational studies from Warwick Business School. He has previously worked and published on the social space of organizations in journals such as *Human Relations* and *Culture & Organization*. Currently, he is studying the social construction of creativity in the cartoon and animation industry.

1 Introduction

Henri Lefebvre and Organization Studies

Sytze F. Kingma, Karen Dale, and Varda Wasserman

Introducing Lefebvre

One of the most important points to make right at the start of this book is the need to not stereotype Henri Lefebvre solely as a theorist of space, as Shields (2001) puts it. Thus we begin with a very brief overview of Lefebvre's life and work, in an attempt to avoid the "mis-recognition" that has tended to characterize Lefebvre's categorization by Anglo-American readers, as Aronowitz (2015: 73) argues, where he is 'placed' only in relation to a very partial view of his work and life.

Henri Lefebvre was born in 1901 and died in 1991, his life thus covering most of the twentieth century with its profound changes and disruptions. He was born and died in the south-west of France, near the Pyrenees, in the intervening decades seeing the transformation of the rural peasantry and the growth of urbanization processes, becoming a key observer and theorist of both. Lefebvre's life and work span not just time, but also academic space. He originally graduated in philosophy from the Sorbonne, but later took up a post in sociology at the University of Strasbourg. In other words, his work defies easy definition and categorization; he speaks and has had influence across multiple academic disciplinary boundaries. As Shields notes, in the 1950s and 1960s, Lefebvre was one of the most translated of French theorists, known predominantly at the time for his work on dialectical materialism. His later work on the production of social space has had a different reception (not originally well received in France and in the context of Marxism, but taken up from the 1980s as a central theory in relation to studies of urbanism) and 'translation' (not being translated into English until 1991, and taken up in relation to critical geography and through this route tending to wend its way into other disciplines in the English speaking world). And his work is much broader than these two examples. He wrote over 60 books and 300 articles. Stanley Aronowitz (2015) comments that the relevance of his work to ecology and to art and aesthetics has still not been recognized. Many of his works were dictated and he did not tend to return to edit them. This makes them challenging to read and interpret. But Lefebvre's life was not confined to academic debates. His whole life was one of activism and is

criss-crossed with the influences of this. He joined the French Communist Party in 1928, and provoked his expulsion from it in 1958 after finally acknowledging the influence of the work of Sartre. He then became one of the critics of the continued Stalinism and structuralism of the Communist Party, and was associated with other activist groups including the Situationists and Maoist groups. He was an active opponent of the Vichy regime during the Second World War, and he was centrally involved with the student occupations of 1968, and the political events during the 1960s which led up to this. Among his students can be counted Jean Baudrillard and Manuel Castells. Both his activism and his diverse working life—at various times he was a factory worker, a taxi driver, the artistic director of a radio station, and did military service—feed in to his approach to his writings. His development of acutely perceptive theory is underpinned throughout with political consciousness and a deep concern for everyday life.

Many details about his life and work can be found in already available excellent introductions to Lefebvre. We will focus on how the significance of Lefebvre and his approach have been portrayed and could be made relevant for organization studies. The most systematic and comprehensive of the introductory texts include Rob Shields his *Lefebvre, Love & Struggle* (1999), Stuart Elden his *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the Possible* (2004), and Andy Merrifield his *Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction* (2006). In addition, we refer to an edited volume by Kanishka Goonewardena et al., *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre* (2008), which offers 15 chapters by a range of authors discussing various aspects of Lefebvre's work. These publications (re)present different versions of Lefebvre's ideas, and together, we believe, offer a thorough introduction to Lefebvre's work. In some respects, the works are complementary, although there is, of course, great overlap in the themes covered. As a crude indication, one could perhaps say that Merrifield offers a more emphatic entry to Lefebvre, Shields focusses on the internal coherence of his work, Elden is very comprehensive in interpretations and contexts, and, if you specifically are after particular aspects and backgrounds, Goonewardena et al. would be a good start. The introductions all offer overviews and insights into Lefebvre's ideas and intellectual life, his broad philosophical interests, his dialectical materialist methodology, his lifelong engagement with a broad range of topics, including everyday life, time, space, the urban, politics, the state and globalization. Introductions necessarily offer fragmented impressions of the original works, summarize, prioritize, reorganize and schematize arguments, and frame the work in a different context of scientific debates. This in itself is a valuable and necessary contribution, and a precondition to make original works accessible and understandable, especially in the case of Lefebvre.

The works mentioned are all meant to be introductory texts and, for that reason alone, organization scholars who seek to contribute to Lefebvrian organization studies are well advised to consult the original Lefebvre texts

they refer to. This is not only because 'second hand' accounts may raise crude, partial or even false impressions of the original, but also because of the nature of Lefebvre's work: his methodology, use of concepts and particularly his style of writing. His complex philosophical style makes his works difficult to read. The major arguments and concepts are also often difficult to grasp because Lefebvre almost never presents these in a straightforward way. Concepts and insights are gradually developed throughout the texts in which they are empirically and philosophically grounded and contextualized, and repeatedly nuanced, redefined and elaborated upon. In this respect, Lefebvre's writing style is demanding to readers who want to grasp and deduce the basics of his ideas from the text as a whole. This means that the introductory volumes not only come in handy but, paradoxically, may even be considered necessary for readers to grasp the meaning and significance of the original texts. Indeed, for readers who are not yet familiar with Lefebvre's work, it is recommended to start with a good introduction, especially Elden's (2004), not only because this introduction is the most comprehensive but also because it offers a good entry to Lefebvre's work because of its enriching and insightful endnotes. Zhang (2006), one of the contributors to the current volume, explicitly advocated Elden's introduction as an 'indispensable commentary as well as general guide' for organization scholars.

This introductory chapter proceeds as follows. We start with a brief sketch of the influence of Lefebvre's work and how this can be made relevant for organization studies. Secondly, we discuss how Lefebvre was adopted and gained a new relevance in organization studies. Finally, we offer an overview of the studies presented in this volume, and indicate how they might be pertinent for spatial organization studies as an emerging field of interest. In this introduction we do not offer suggestions for future research. Instead, we decided to end the volume with a separate chapter on possible future directions for research into spatial organization.

Lefebvre's Influence

The Production of Space (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]) is by far Lefebvre's most influential work and will also be frequently referred to in this volume. Lefebvre almost never writes in a programmatic way, that is, a way in which the major contributions, ideas, concepts, arguments and methods are outlined in advance, and subsequently explained and substantiated in a linear fashion. In this respect, his style is essayistic and very French. A notable and important exception concerns the first chapter of *The Production of Space*—explicitly titled 'plan of the present work'—in which Lefebvre provides the reader with a formal account and definitions of the three epistemologically different but always complementary spatial perspectives his work is renowned for—often briefly addressed as Lefebvre's 'spatial triad'.

For Lefebvre, there are always two opposed understandings of space, the *mental space* referring to the images of space as conceived by experts, such as

a map, and the *concrete space* referring to the real material properties of space we may all perceive. However, and this is the key of his approach, Lefebvre argues that, in addition, there always is a third understanding of space, which combines the two and mediates between the two. This is our understanding of the simultaneously *real-and-imagined* space we deal with in everyday situations. The logic behind this third perspective, the 'lived space', is that Lefebvre recognizes that all social actors combine the two poles and entertain ideas about the concrete spaces which constitute their life—this logic is akin to that of the living brain, a thinking substance. Lefebvre's triad thus consists of three distinct but related spatial perspectives, the 'conceived', the 'perceived' and the 'lived space'. Zhang (2006) usefully highlights Elden's reading of this, that the lived space addresses our purely subjective informal knowledge of space—which always relates to the conceived and perceived—and that the three perspectives should be understood as particular points of view on the whole space and in this respect overlap, not juxtapose, one another.

However, and the authors of the introductory texts agree, this does not mean that the background and meaning of this deceptively clear classification of perspectives, and the way the perspectives relate or can be put to use, is immediately evident from the first account. This one can find out only by following Lefebvre's uses of the concepts, discussions of the philosophical backgrounds, his comments and applications in the subsequent chapters of the book. For instance, Schmid (2008) argues that Lefebvre's triad can best be understood with reference to 'the trinity of Hegel, Marx, and Nietzsche'. What is more, *The Production of Space* can be understood as a culmination of a large part of Lefebvre's previous work, which constitutes a voluminous but in many respects closely connected oeuvre. In his previous works, especially his works on 'everyday life' (Lefebvre, 1991 [1947]), 'the rural' and 'the urban' (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970]), he gradually developed and grounded various aspects of his arguments and already offered basic rationales and provisional formulations of his spatial perspectives. This implies that one should ideally read a significant part of Lefebvre's work in order to reach a proper understanding of his spatial theory. Furthermore, this argument applies not only to the works previous to *The Production of Space*, but also to the subsequent works; his masterpiece on 'the state' (not translated into English and out of print in French), and especially *Rhythmanalysis* (Lefebvre, 2004 [1992]), which he himself addressed as 'an idea that may be expected to put the finishing touches to the exposition of the production of space' (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]: 405). For this reason, one can hardly do without good guides such as the introductions mentioned. Although in these ways necessary, the introductions are, of course, not sufficient for developing Lefebvrian organization studies; they need to be supplemented with a close reading of relevant parts of the original work and with contemporary applications in organization studies, such as the ones discussed further on and the ones written for this volume. Finally, in order to actually bring Lefebvre's approach to life, this will have to be tested, applied and specified

in actual organizational research practices. The proof of the pudding ultimately lies in the eating.

Another important observation about Lefebvre's work is that his work was taken up on a significant scale by international social science only after his death in 1991, also the year the English translation of *La Production de l'espace*—already published in French in 1974—was released. In the 1990s, this work had a significant impact in the field of social geography and was assigned a prominent role by, in particular, Mark Gottdiener (1985), who discussed *The Production of Space* seriously; David Harvey, who wrote an afterword to *The Production of Space*; and Edward Soja, whose book *Third Space* (1996) in title and content was directly inspired by Lefebvre's approach. Soja was also instrumental in connecting Lefebvre's work with the broader expansion of the interest in space in the wider social sciences, particularly in the cultural studies field. This 'reassertion of space in social theory' (Soja, 1989) was part of a general post-modernist critique of modern social science because of its prioritizing of time and history over space and geography (cf. Jameson, 1991). Kipfer et al. (2008: 3) regard the political-economic geography reading as a 'first' and the post-modern cultural reading as a 'second' reading of Lefebvre. They argue for a 'third' more comprehensive reading which overcomes and combines the two and fuses and balances Lefebvre's political-economic considerations with those of subjectivity and identity. We suggest that the appropriation of Lefebvre in organization studies can by and large be inserted in this third stream of readings of Lefebvre. The first tranch of organization studies papers to make reference to Lefebvre's triad, which we will further discuss below, appeared only in 2004 and 2005 (Ford and Harding, 2004; Dobers and Strannegård, 2004; Dale, 2005; Watkins, 2005).

The late, post-mortem, recognition complicates the application of Lefebvre's work in organization studies. First, by the time that the significance of Lefebvre's work had been recognised in organisation studies, the field had developed sophisticated contemporary approaches in a different direction, of which, for example, neo-institutional theory is a strong example (see Drori and Preminger's discussion in the current volume). Consequently, the more organization studies evolved into alternative directions and developed a framework of reference of its own, the bigger the gap—in time and empirical topics—between organization studies and Lefebvre's approach became, and subsequently the more difficult to overcome. Second, this effect was aggravated because also outside the field of organization studies, and even in the French context, the work of Lefebvre was not systematically built upon, applied and developed further conceptually and empirically. His work seems somewhat frozen in time.

This does not mean that Lefebvre's work was not influential. On the contrary, Lefebvre's work should be regarded as highly influential both upon contemporaries and successors, but this influence was largely indirect and hardly recognizable. On the one hand, Lefebvre did not follow a standard academic

career. Although he wrote for a large part of his adult life, his interests and work often were not directly connected to academic positions. Lefebvre was a controversial figure, as Merrifield (2006) points out in some detail, and as much a neo-Marxist thinker and intellectual outside of academia as inside. He can also be considered a left-wing activist, although with his writing and commentaries he was an activist in words rather than deeds. He was an active member of the French communist party (PCF) for 30 years (from 1928 to 1958). He is also known for his support and analysis of the May 1968 student movement (Lefebvre, 1969 [1968]). In French sociology courses, so we have been told, Lefebvre is mainly mentioned with reference to *The Sociology of Marx* (1982 [1966]), a rather straightforward introduction to Marxism but not a significant part of his own contributions. The enormous range of Lefebvre's writings also makes his work difficult to classify. Lefebvre's work went in many directions. He advocated and practiced multidisciplinary approaches, and incorporated economics, politics, philosophy, psychology and the arts. His work was as much grounded in phenomenology as in semiology. His major contributions concerned not only spatial analyses but, equally important, the history of ideas, particularly the ideas about space (remember, there are always two spaces, the 'mental' and the 'concrete'). In his thinking and writing, he extensively engaged with Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Heidegger, Sartre and many more. All these factors make his work difficult to classify and to access.

On the other hand, there are also reasons external to Lefebvre's person and work which may account for the poor integration of Lefebvre's work in mainstream social science. This has to do with a particular feature of French sociology, or for post-World War II continental European sociology as contrasted with Anglo-Saxon sociology—this feature may even be typical for a specific phase of development of social science. Leading sociologists developed almost egocentric conceptual frameworks with attached series of studies, which resulted in largely self-referential and closed theoretical systems. This scientific practice characterized Lefebvre's oeuvre but equally that of, for instance, Baudrillard, Foucault or Bourdieu. This practice may lead to a strong internal coherence, diachronic grounding and depth in concepts and studies. However, at the same time, this leads to weak external coherence, synchronic grounding and superficial connections between the various schools of thought. The various sociological schools developed their insights in relative isolation and virtually ignored each other, with some exceptions. A notable exception would be Lefebvre's comments on Foucault's work, which he regarded as particularly 'powerful' but criticized for its neglect of the wider spatial context of the state (Elden, 2004: 240). At the same time there are all kinds of hidden connections in contacts and themes.

As opposed to Baudrillard, Foucault or Bourdieu, Lefebvre's approach remained academically isolated and was hardly translated, applied, elaborated or debated by others. Although not in an explicit manner, large parts of the work of Manuel Castells—in the late 1960s an assistant of Lefebvre—and David Harvey can easily be portrayed as a continuation of Lefebvre's

interests and work on the urban. Ironically, both Castells and Harvey initially thought that Lefebvre had developed a flawed Marxist approach to the city, and sought to correct this with a more structuralist focus on the economic forces of production (Elden, 2004: 142). However, in their later work they revised their Marxist position and their work evolved in a direction which was arguably more in line with Lefebvre's approach. In the 1990s, as mentioned above, Harvey was also instrumental for integrating Lefebvre's sociology of space in Anglo-Saxon social geography. By that time, Castells had shifted his interests from the city to a new material phenomenon, that of information technology and the network society, and wrote an ambitious and voluminous sociology of *The Information Age* (Castells, 1996); this development and topic definitely would have fascinated Lefebvre—and he undoubtedly would have commented upon the book. And although without reference to Lefebvre, Castells's work on the information age very much resembles Lefebvre's approach, in style, method and neo-Marxist reasoning. Another intriguing, but different, kind of parallel between Lefebvre's work and contemporary social theory concerns his ideas about the 'colonization of everyday life' by the market and by the state. This is a prominent theme in Lefebvre's three volumes of *Critique of Everyday Life* (2014 [1947, 1961, 1981]) but also a key concern, albeit much more abstractly developed, in German sociologist Jürgen Habermas's *Theory of Communicative Action* (1984 [1981]), a resemblance explicitly pointed out by social geographer Miller (2000: 42–43). Lefebvre surely would have criticized Habermas's approach for not being rooted in materiality; at least this is what he criticized Hegel, Nietzsche and Heidegger for.

Comparing various sociological approaches and schools of thought, and how they do or do not relate, we can better leave to historians of science. Suffice it to note here that the distanciation of Lefebvre's work from organization studies, both because of the time gaps and the intellectual space gaps noted above, raises hindrances which make it comparatively difficult to pick up and integrate Lefebvre's work and develop Lefebvrian organization studies. In any case, in order to apply Lefebvre to contemporary contexts, as suggested by Brenner and Elden (2009), who sought to apply Lefebvre to the field of international political economy, 'Lefebvre's key concepts and analyses must be pushed, challenged, updated, and rearticulated in order to be made relevant' (Brenner and Elden, 2009: 374). The difficulties, perhaps, make it understandable (but not justifiable) that the most abstract parts of Lefebvre's work, such as the triad, appeal to contemporary scholars of organization.

The Influence of Lefebvre's Work in Organization Studies

In this section we discuss how Lefebvre's work has been appropriated in organization studies. The objective here is not to describe in detail the research which has utilized Lefebvre nor is it able to cover all of such studies

(and we apologize now to readers for our omissions and for foregrounding our own work), but to delineate some of the main themes and also, importantly, to consider what strands have not been paid as much attention to thus far.

The interest in Lefebvre's ideas and their application to organizational studies does not constitute a linear history. There are some references to Lefebvre's work in organization studies from the 1990s, such as in Mary Jo Hatch's (1997) *Organization Theory*, which was novel in including a chapter on 'the physical organization' which refers to Lefebvre along with David Harvey and Edward Soja. However, possibly the first paper to draw significantly upon Lefebvre's spatial triad in order to derive a new approach to organizations, is Yeung's (1998) paper in *Organization* on 'The social-spatial constitution of business organizations: a geographical perspective'. Yeung argues that organizations are not only socially but spatially embedded, and that their geographic relations need to be understood because the networks of relations that businesses engage with in order to exist are linked to specific territories. This paper goes further than solely considering the physical location of organizations, in applying Lefebvre's spatial triad to understanding how the practices of organizations are embedded within and transform spatial relations beyond the entity of the organization itself. In this way it connects with Lefebvre's broader concern with the capitalist relations of production, and how these are spatially produced and reproduced.

Lefebvre's triad has certainly found a central place in the literature on organization space, although much of the literature which has taken this up has tended to apply it at the level of the organization itself, with less concern for the perspective across different spatial scales that characterizes Lefebvre's writings. Yeung's (1998) paper therefore marks a less common approach within organization studies (as opposed to economic geography), in arguing for a move from the 'spaces of firms' to understanding how companies are embedded in geographically specific ways within 'spaces of network relations'. In a related though different vein, the second part of Dale and Burrell's (2008) book follows Lefebvre in arguing for a 'political economy of space' that moves beyond 'the spaces of organization' to consider the bigger picture of 'the organization of space'. To date, this has not really been taken up within organization studies. In this way, we can see that there have been restrictions not only in the narrowness of the range of Lefebvre's work which has been taken up within organization studies, but also in the tendency to decontextualize the spatial triad from the broader framework of the abstract spaces of capitalism within which Lefebvre clearly places it.

A further related but different kind of restriction in the early appropriations of Lefebvre's work concerns the often subsidiary role attached to Lefebvre's approach. There is a tendency for Lefebvre's approach to be 'merely' used as a tool. Instead specific organizational processes, such as processes of meaning making, control and resistance are considered to be the main objectives of the analysis. This is understandable, but there is a risk here of

imposing a separation between method and theory. This may paradoxically lead to a discussion of organization processes without taking space sufficiently into account. In other words, space can come to be seen merely as 'influencing' organizational processes, simply 'adding in' space rather than developing an integrated account about for instance 'spatial control' and 'spatial meanings'.

However, it is perhaps not surprising that certain elements of Lefebvre's work become foregrounded and others are relatively neglected within organization studies. The papers which have drawn upon Lefebvre's work have tended to articulate it within those issues and debates which have currency within the discipline of organization studies, and perhaps particularly around areas of lived experience, embodiment, sociomateriality, aesthetics and identity. It is also consistent with the dominant approach within the discipline that most studies which use elements of Lefebvre's work focus at the level of the spaces of the organization. It is apparent in many of these papers that a key impetus is to try to get to grips with organizational life as lived experience and to move away from more abstract notions about organizations. Thus, even though Lefebvre's writings on the critique of everyday life are not often explicitly cited, his concern with the quotidian communicates and resonates with many of the concerns of contemporary organization theory. This is also why, as discussed earlier, we would classify much of the appropriation of Lefebvre in organization studies as being part of a third reading of Lefebvre, combining the 'geographical' and 'cultural' reading.

Whilst it is Lefebvre's spatial triad that has generated the greatest interest in organization studies, the ways in which this central analytical device has been taken up are extremely diverse. Watkins' (2005) analysis of theatrical performance has the explicit purpose of introducing Lefebvre's work into organizational analysis, arguing that all three elements of Lefebvre's spatial triad need to be integrated for a deeper understanding of organizational space. He connects the constrictive nature of the dominance of a conceived or of a perceived space with the concerns raised in critical organization literature against the dominance of mental constructions which are detached from their physical and social context (Knights, 1992). According to Lefebvre, such an approach may lead to 'descriptions of' or even 'discourses on' space but it cannot contribute to a true 'knowledge of' space (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]: 7). Thus Watkins uses Lefebvre's triad both as a critique of organization studies and as an alternative tool for a comprehensive understanding of the actual organization and use of space.

The dialectical relationship between the different aspects of the spatial triad articulated by Lefebvre has been used by a number of writers to cast light upon organizational-spatial dynamics. For example, Kingma's (2008) analysis of Dutch casino spaces shows how a logic of pleasure was historically and spatially produced through the perceived space (in dynamic interaction with the conceived and lived) by a dual process of the 'dissociation' of gambling from the urban environment by the casino building, combined

with the 'association' of the casino building with an urban entertainment district. In the conceived space, this logic was spatially achieved through 'scripting' gambling as entertainment combined with the physical 'constraining' of gambling behaviour through access strategies and game area divisions. Lastly, in the lived space this logic was reinforced by constructing professional gamblers and addicts as 'exceptions' and by reducing the gambling experience to 'illusions' of profit and luxury which are confined to the premises of the casino. This work further argues that the controversial entertainment view of casinos can only be fully understood with reference to the wider scale levels of the nation state, of urban space, and of capital accumulation in consumer society (Kingma, 2004, 2011).

Some more recent studies have developed reflections of Lefebvre's work beyond the spatial triad. For example, Wapshott and Mallett's (2011) discussion of home-working is unusual in that it adapts Lefebvre's ideas about dominated and appropriated spaces to discuss multi-dimensional aspects of home/working spaces, and how these co-exist in a state of dialectical tension. This argument also recognizes the Marxian history of the concepts in Lefebvre's work, and addresses how the boundaries between 'home' and 'work' are constructed and dismantled in ways which typically relate to the broader relations of production.

A number of studies use Lefebvre's concepts to explore aspects of control and resistance within organizations. This can be seen in Dale's (2005) study of a new building for a privatized electricity company, which attempted to integrate a new set of organizational values into the design of the space and thus to influence the ways in which employees might 'live through' these spaces. Changes within the company influenced changing experiences of the building, illustrating how conceived, perceived and lived aspects of space are not fixed but in a dynamic interaction with each other. Wasserman and Frenkel (2011) also utilize the spatial triad to analyse attempts to build certain sorts of organizational, cultural and national identities through organizational aesthetics, the lived experiences of this, and the resistances it produces. Aesthetics expressing a desire to connect with modern Western-European culture and distinguish itself from traditional Israeli culture were incorporated into a new Ministry of Foreign Affairs building. The attempt to impose these aesthetic and cultural values generated various acts of resistance, especially through acts of 'culture jamming'—for instance by 'ridiculing symbols' and 'disturbing order'. These can be interpreted as reflecting inherent contradictions between the conceived and lived spaces of the Ministry's building. Zhang, Spicer, and Hancock (2008) examine the relations between control and resistance in social space through the use of J. G.Ballard's novels. The interactions of the dialectical relations of social space are shown when they discuss how hyper-organized—strictly designed and regulated spaces—forms of planned space may in themselves produce novel forms of lived space. Their paper also provides a useful corrective for a sometimes almost romantic assumption of the superiority of 'lived space'

over conceived and perceived space, as through the novels of Ballard what we see are 'the seemingly antithetical rationality of debauched lived space' (p. 900) taking over whole communities. 'People's ability to re-interpret and creatively misuse planned spaces' (p. 904) is not necessarily positive.

A number of papers have explored how power relations are reproduced not only through the conceived spaces of organizations, but through spatial practices and lived spaces. Zhang and Spicer (2014) argue that spatial practices are not solely about expressing resistance to dominated spaces. They analyse how minute practices such as walking and daily rituals, as well as apparently ironic stories and mocking jokes, contribute to *reproducing* rather than challenging hierarchical and bureaucratic power relations. This continues the thread of a number of writers who have pointed to the significance of the micro-relations of social space, such as Beyes and Steyaert's (2012) discussion of the importance of bodily movements, successions of actions and affects, and configurations, in seeing 'spacing' as a process and performative rather than as an object to be fixed and reified.

These perspectives relate also to one of the particular resonances which Lefebvre's work has had within organization studies: the emphasis that Lefebvre puts on human embodiment. As he powerfully expresses it: 'the whole of (social) space proceeds from the body' (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]: 405). Ian Lennie uses this to look at management from an embodied and lived perspective in his book *Beyond Management* (1999). Dale (2005) and Dale and Latham (2015) combine Lefebvre with studies of material culture and particularly Merleau Ponty's (1965 [1945]) theorization of 'embodiment' in which the 'body' and the 'mind' are not dichotomized but entwined. Wasserman and Frenkel (2015) use Lefebvre's triad to explore the relations between organizational spatiality, gender and class exposing the role of space and its embodied enactment by women of various classes in constructing and reconstructing inequality regimes within organizations. Tyler and Cohen (2010) also explore the interrelationship of embodiment of gender performativity and organizational spaces. In doing this, they bring together Lefebvre's conceptualization of representational space with Butler's work on gender performativity. Further, importantly, 'Lefebvre (1991: 17, 35) argues that the social production of space "implies a process of signification" in which subjects "must either recognize themselves or lose themselves"' (Tyler and Cohen, 2010: 181).

One key observation of the way in which literature on organizational space has developed: that is the tendency to combine Lefebvre's approach with other, more contemporary, literatures. This tendency is both understandable and necessary. It is understandable because other literatures are perhaps more familiar and accessible, having a more long-standing contribution to understanding organizational dynamics. It can also be regarded necessary to actualize Lefebvre's approach and connect his work with contemporary organizational contexts, developments and discussions. There is a risk in this of watering down or distorting Lefebvre's approach, but

there are also rich possibilities for different ideas intersecting and inform-
ing each other. Ford and Harding directly confront the potential dangers of
bringing together different approaches by describing their reading of Lefe-
bvre through a postmodern lens as 'an insouciant perpetration of violence
upon his Marxist perspective' (2004: 817). However, despite this rider, their
detailed use of the spatial triad in an analysis of how different staff under-
stand their relationship with the merger of two health service trust orga-
nizations brings together both the Lefebvrian sense of embodiment in the
production of social space along with a recognition of the political nature
of how the abstract spaces of capital are produced, and the violence inher-
ent in this. They contrast how non-management staff have an embodied
and embedded sense of place with how senior management perceive the
organization, which is conveyed through numerical codes such as budget
figures, numbers of staff, numbers of beds, all held together by management
structures. As in Tyler and Cohen's work they dovetail their case study with
insights from Butler and the power relations of performative spaces which
come to constitute the subject.

In another example, Dobers and Strannegard's (2004) paper on the spa-
tial 'adventures' of a Danish experimental design object, a chair called the
'Cocoon'—designed for possible use in public space to take moments of
relief and shelter from our hectic everyday lives—fuses Lefebvre's approach
with Bruno Latour's actor-network-theory (ANT). This connection makes
sense because in ANT attention is paid to the translation and transforma-
tion of objects as they travel through social space. Furthering this, Peltonen's
(2011) analysis of the architecture of a Finnish university brings Lefebvre
together with the work of Callon, and Callon and Law, to discuss the idea
of buildings as scripts, as producing obligatory passage points and evolv-
ing assemblages. These appropriations reveal that Lefebvre's approach in
several respects pre-figures and parallels other relevant approaches in orga-
nization studies to which it may be fruitfully connected. This approach of
weaving together conceptual insights from Lefebvre with other literatures
is continued in some chapters within this current text, with some novel
combinations.

The range of areas where Lefebvre's writings have been appropriated into
organization studies is diverse and it is impossible to do justice to them
all. Contributions of comparable significance to the ones discussed in this
introduction include for instance Hirst's (2011) analysis of the differential
appropriation of flexible offices spaces; Verduyn's (2015) use of Lefebvre
in developing a process view on entrepreneurship; and Petani and Mengis'
(2016) analysis of the role of 'lost spaces' and 'remembering' in processes
of space planning. These works should all be regarded as indicative of the
rich potential of a Lefebvrian approach for organization studies. We have
discussed a few articles in more detail to draw attention to the disparate
ways in which Lefebvre's concepts have been and can be put to use. In
their influential review of studies of organizational space, Taylor and Spicer

(2007) also recognize and discuss different approaches to space across the literature, categorizing these as studies of space as distance; studies of space as the materialization of power relations; and studies of space as experience. They link these to Lefebvre's triad, which they characterize as practising, planning and imagining. However, they go further than this through an analysis of spatial scale, influenced by Lefebvre's perspective on spatial scale as socially produced (Spicer, 2006). As well as using this to enable the different elements of the triad, or different approaches to space in organization studies, to be articulated in a dialectical way with each other, this also allowed them to explore how the literature in organization studies tends not to range across multiple scales and the interplay between them. This is a state of play which has largely continued through the intervening decade since Taylor and Spicer's analysis, though we hope that some of the chapters in this present book might indicate how engaging with spatial scales might open up productive possibilities (see especially the chapters by Lacerda, Nash, and Zhang).

Another, more general, observation is that Lefebvre's work has been appropriated in a restricted way, with an overwhelming concentration on his model of the spatial triad (particularly Chapter 1 of *The Production of Space*). Although restricted, this 'model' has proved very powerful for first turning space into an object of social analysis and second for analysing the production of the spatial organization as the outcome of dialectical interactions between experience, power and meaning in relation to space. Regarding the use of this model, we would point to the risk of taking this model too literally as a prescriptive objective of static spatial analyses instead of a dynamic heuristic tool. Beyes and Steyaert (2012: 49) explicitly remarked that in the use of the triad, in their view, there is a 'tendency to reify space, to turn spatial becoming into representations of the beings of organizational spaces, to prioritize the spatial products over the processes of their productions'. For a further critique, see also Beyes's chapter in the current volume. In this respect, it is relevant to point out that Lefebvre himself at the end of *The Production of Space* explicitly warned against such an interpretation of his approach, which would 'obscure' his true objective—which is not an analysis of space, but a critique of the established knowledges associated with space—and that he definitely is not aiming to produce 'models, typologies or prototypes of space' (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]: 404–405). Instead, Lefebvre is concerned to see an 'exposition of the *production of space*', meaning that he seeks to focus on the dynamics behind the processes of production. According to a number of commentators (including Shields (1999), Elden (2004), Merrifield (2006) and Goonewardena et al. (2008)), Lefebvre does not always live up to this ideal in his work, perhaps especially in his extensive overview of the 'history of space' in Chapter 4 of *The Production of Space*, in which he alternates between a process view and rather essentialist accounts of the historical succession of spatial situations and systems. However, Lefebvre clearly formulates his analytical ideal

in terms of an *orientation* or a perspective which overcomes the distinction between the process and the product, 'in an organ that perceives, a direction that may be conceived, and a directly lived movement progressing towards the horizon' (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]: 423). One way to counter the risk of reification, in our view, is to read and use the triad more explicitly in relation to Lefebvre's work as a whole, and relate it to his philosophical discussions and notions of time, the body, everyday life, technology, the urban, the global and abstract space. On the other hand, Lefebvre's radically open approach, and his reluctance against, a distinction between the process and its product, can perhaps also be considered as a shortcoming, as argued by Neil Smith in his introduction to *The Urban Revolution* (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970]: xiv). Smith argues that this prevents Lefebvre from seriously considering 'how certain social meanings become fixed, however temporarily, in and as space and place'. In any case, an analysis of which differences in spaces are made and remade maybe against his ideal but is not entirely at odds with Lefebvre's own substantive analyses. And, as suggested by Smith, this ambivalence might perhaps be overcome by defining spatial products against the backdrop of time.

Outline of the Present Work

This volume offers a range of Lefebvrian inspired discussions and spatial analysis of organization processes. With this, the volume seeks to explore, and draw attention to, a new approach in the field of organization studies, a field that is currently dominated by a focus on discursive approaches (Carlile et al., 2013). The Lefebvrian (spatial) perspectives can be regarded both as alternatives and as complements to mainstream organization studies. They are alternatives because they place organizations in a new and different light, and offer new insights and interpretations for the social construction of organizations and for the controversies over the products, services and (unintended) consequences these organizations contribute to the wider society. They are complements because they show that organizations are more diverse and complex than specialist spatial analyses or the disembodied and dematerialized accounts of many organization studies seem to suggest.

   In some respects, the chapters bring to the surface submerged traditions in organization studies, as is the case with detailed workplace studies, organizational history, geography and design. In other respects organizational analyses are extended in new and relevant directions, as is the case with rhythm-analysis, the urban and the role of the state. The varied contributions all draw upon Lefebvre's work in various ways and connect them to various extents with contemporary illustrations and case studies. They express in all cases a spatial orientation. Serious attention is drawn towards rituals, symbols, meanings, values, legitimations, power relations, (informal) work-relations, and the artifacts involved in the (re)production of spatial organizations. The case studies provide rich and detailed descriptions,

they cover a range of organizational sectors, and they stem from a range of countries, including Brazil, Israel, China, Sweden, Spain, Finland, Switzerland and the UK. Although the global and national connectedness of the organizations will be evident, at the same time the case studies stress the unique local embeddedness of organization processes. We do not suggest that the chapters represent a common understanding of Lefebvre or that the editors and the various authors would necessarily agree on each other's uses and interpretations of Lefebvre. We do suggest that there is agreement on the great potential of Lefebvre's work for developing organization studies, and that all contributions share Lefebvre's work as a point of departure for linking his approach to contemporary organizational contexts.

The volume follows a logic of scope, and is organized into parts on theoretical considerations, spaces of organizations, and the organization of spaces, although inevitably there is overlap between the parts. The first part which focuses on theoretical contribution offers discussions on how to broaden the appropriation of Lefebvre's approach, the idea of 'absent spaces' in architectural design, the idea of 'spacing leadership', and a comparison between institutional and Lefebvrian analysis in organization studies. The spaces of organizations part addresses the private and everyday life aspects of organizations, regarding for instance the embodiment of work practices, rhythm-analysis, and the significance of informal spaces and practices at work. The organization of spaces part considers intermediate relations and makes clear that processes of organizing affect and penetrate societies at large, often in many and profound ways. This part includes analyses and considerations of the historical and abstract space relations involved in the spatial construction of the urban and the (nation) state.

Part I (**Theoretical considerations—process, absence, power, institutions**) starts with a chapter by Timon Beyes about politics, embodiment and everyday life as possible themes for extending the significance of Lefebvre's work for organization studies. From the perspective of this volume, Beyes's chapter offers a good start because it shares a key concern of this introduction and this volume, namely that Lefebvre's work can be regarded as of greater relevance for organization studies than the spatial triad alone. Beyes extends our understanding of Lefebvre by situating *The Production of Space* in the broader context of Lefebvre's oeuvre and shifting attention from the triad to three themes on which Lefebvre's insights are considered equally valuable and which have great potential for, and connect with, current interests in organization studies: 'dialectic materialism', 'everyday life', and the 'human body'. These themes reflect 'problems of spatial organization' and are important for further developing, as Beyes stresses, the study of *spaces of organizing*. The themes are in Beyes' terms helpful for formulating and addressing the 'how', 'where' and 'what' questions. Dialectical materialism (the 'how' question) concerns the way Lefebvre conceptualizes the production of space. Lefebvre—different from and against Hegel and Marx—always considers three dimensions which are continuously affecting each other and which,

therefore, produce a dialectic and a change process which is open ended by definition. It follows, argues Beyes, that spatio-organizational analyses should focus on the process of production, the emancipatory moments of change, and the significance of self-organization—*autogestion*, in Lefebvre's terms. With the concept of everyday life (the 'where' question) Lefebvre extended his analyses beyond the economic sites of production such as the workplace to include questions of social reproduction, cultural life and the urban. Lefebvre regards everyday life as a key domain for sensing alienation and developing resistance against the forces of organized capitalism and the state. Beyes considers it important to prioritize the study of the mundane aspects of organizing, and participant-observation, over the structural analysis and spatial set-ups of formal organizations. For this purpose he also considers the body (regarding the 'what' question) and Lefebvre's *rhythmanalysis* as important in organizational research. Beyes particularly argues for a critical and politicized engagement with processes of organization.

In Chapter 3, Fabio Petani and Jeanne Mengis consider the use of Lefebvre's spatial triad for analysing the role of 'absent spaces' in a space planning process. Planning always involves the exclusion of alternative possibilities and the production of a range of plans and variations of which only a part (and often nothing) will be materialized. However, argue Petani and Mengis, we need to better understand how, in the practice of conceiving space, discarded spaces may remain relevant and how presences and absences interact over time. This also involves a consideration of how absence and disposal in the pre-production phase of conceiving is 'lived' and experienced by those involved. Petani and Mengis actually understand absent space as 'an expression of how a once conceived, but then disposed space becomes lived'. Theoretically they project this absent space as a mirror image of the perceived space, and as a dialectical moment, in Lefebvre's triad and the production of space. Petani and Mengis illustrate the dynamic of how absent spaces become significant in the narratives of practitioners through two complementary examples from their research on the building of a public culture centre in a small city in Switzerland. These examples concern the inclusion of a museum which was initially excluded from the plans, and the exclusion of a park which was not considered a significant loss. The strategic disposal of the plan for the museum for reasons of cost-cutting was successfully resisted by planners and other stakeholders who emotionally invested meaning in the museum. However, in the complementary case of the park such emotional investment was virtually lacking and the disposal was consequently not regretted. Following Petani and Mengis, a consideration of absence and disposal may reveal hidden meanings and interests in the planning process.

In Chapter 4, Perttu Salovaara and Arja Ropo introduce the notion of 'spacing leadership' in a discussion of changes in organizational power relations from 'power-over' to 'power-with' orientations in the design of a new work space. Salovaara and Ropo compare and combine Lefebvre's

understanding of power relations with critical leadership studies in which increasing attention is drawn to the role of materiality and space in leadership. In these novel approaches leadership is considered as a collective rather than an individual activity and not only as a relation between people but also between people and the material environment. The human-material leadership relations Salovaara and Ropo consider in terms of 'spacing leadership'. For this they specifically draw on Lefebvre's analysis of the natural rhythms and constraints of rural life in peasant communities, in which leadership is in their view conceived in terms of collective actions across informal networks. This notion of leadership compares to Mary Parker Follet's notion of 'power with' (as distinguished from 'power over'), a democratic horizontal approach to leadership. Salovaara and Ropo illustrate their dynamic Lefebvrian understanding of spacing leadership with an analysis of a spatial renovation project in a Finnish university building. This case study was characterized by the unique feature of a close involvement of the university staff in the design process. Salovaara and Ropo posit, among other things, that the immediate involvement and influence in the change process by personnel led to a greater sense of ownership and belonging in the new work spaces.

In Chapter 5, Drori and Preminger compare and combine Lefebvre's spatial theory with neo-institutional theory, a dominant theoretical framework in contemporary organization studies. They illustrate their approach with an analysis of Jerusalem's Western Wall. What is called 'neo institutional theory' represents a popular and dominant stream in organization studies which, similar to Lefebvre, is characterized by a multi-dimensional approach. But different from Lefebvre, these theories hardly take materiality into account. Institutional theory largely relies on discursive analysis. Drori and Preminger argue for a need to include spatiality in institutional analysis and build on recent initiatives to do so with their reading of Lefebvre's spatial theory. Lefebvre offers in their view 'new paths for conceptual and empirical advances'. They first show that recently space has been incorporated in institutional theory as a 'relational sphere', a 'professional domain' or as a 'legitimation tool'. Difficulties in comparing the two approaches arise because of the differences in ontological backgrounds—Weberian with a bias on legitimation in the case of institutional theory and Marxist with a bias on power in the case of Lefebvre. Neo-institutional theory might in Drori and Preminger's view benefit from Lefebvre's approach by broadening the scope of spatial analysis, by adding a new dimension or 'sphere' to theoretical considerations, by a stronger focus on power and hierarchy, and by furthering the study of global organization. In their empirical illustration of the holy monument of Jerusalem's Western Wall, Drori and Preminger distinguish between three spatial dimensions of the Western Wall, those of logics—of religion, archeology and nationality—and the subsequent sensemaking and enactment of these logics. Drori and Preminger's exercise reveals some of the difficulties but also the possibilities for integrating Lefebvre's approach with mainstream organization studies.

In part II (**Spaces of organization—everyday work life, embodiment, rhythms, boundaries**) the focus shifts from theoretical considerations to Lefebvrian analyses of small-scale organizational practices. This second part starts with Chapter 6 by Sarah Warnes, who takes the reader to an English Cathedral where she studied the everyday life aspects of the work of employees and volunteers from an embodied spatial perspective. Warnes shows how organizational members deal with the tensions generated by the dual objectives of this Cathedral, which serves as a religious site for contemplation but also depends on tourism. The analysis is built up from Lefebvre's notions of rhythms and the 'spatial body', which consists of thoughts, movement and gestures that are able to 'fuse a prescribed space with a different space, a lived space'. Warnes seeks to analyse an 'experiential understanding' of how value clashes are mediated by the body. Concepts of 'dwelling' and 'dressage' are of particular relevance here. As a participant-observer in the Cathedral, Warnes focused on the mundane routines of workers, and how they dealt with the differences, combinations and tensions between sacred and secular activities and spaces. She particularly shows how the body is effective in managing the competing value clashes which characterize the organization's problematic. She explains, for instance, how the experience of church workers is one of dwelling at work: feeling comfortable and inhabiting the space through a personalized workplace territory with meaningful pictures, paintings or a screen-saver, which may trigger feelings of being 'at home' or of a momentarily relief from the pressures of work. Other examples relate to organizational dressage in which workers were 'playing out' conflicting values, such as challenging the prescribed walking routes they take through the Cathedral, or the way some challenged prescribed work routines in the Cathedral's shop, which played a key role in terms of revenue generation. In this analysis Warnes uses Lefebvre's approach as an alternative way to explore issues of organizational belonging, identity and resistance, and to further an understanding of spatial production through bodily movement.

In Chapter 7, Louise Nash explores the relevance of Lefebvre's *Rhythmanalysis* (2004 [1992]) for organization studies in her study of the public space of the financial district of London City. Here Nash seeks to research the broader spatial context of a work setting through the experiences of those employed there, thus bringing meaning, space, and organizational-geographic sector together. Nash refers to Thrift's notion of 'patina' to address the City's distinctive aura, appearance and cultural meaning. Rhythms in Nash's research are not only important objects of research but also a methodological key to unlock the experience of this setting, which requires both an immersion in the rhythms and a detached observation of those rhythms. To understand rhythms, the focus falls on the conjunction of time and space, in particular the 'sense of urgency' Nash felt in the City as well as the loss of confidence from the financial crisis which started in 2007. Nash analyses the City's distinctive patina in three themes: the hectic performance of business

life; the masculine privatized corporate space—both inside and outside; and the rhythms of order and disorder including the (legitimate) release of pressure in excessive behaviour and cycles of financial crises. Nash sees the City thus as linked with the linear rhythms of the workday and the dynamic of a global financial centre, as a localized part of Greater London and as a public space which often operates as a private space.

Chapter 8 by Tuomo Peltonen and Perttu Salovaara focuses on the tension between the conceived space and the everyday enactment of the perceived and the lived space to better understand the political aspects of the social space. Focusing on a case study of the Lunch Beat disco—Scandinavian workers dancing during lunch breaks—Peltonen and Salovaara exemplify a collective, artistic carnival that attempts to transcend the existing capitalist order. As an embodied practice, dancing during the working day demonstrates not only how body and mind are intertwined in organizational everyday life, but also posits a liminal space where workers could escape to during the day. However, as they claim, a 'reading of the Lunch Beat through Lefebvre's politically expanded triadic model, the movement [the Lunch Beat] had potential for a larger emancipatory effect, but this remained unfulfilled', because it remained oriented towards an increase in productivity and was experienced as a means to enhance well-being at work and produce a motivated, happy employee. Escape practices were reframed as work-oriented tools and consequently, instead of challenging capitalist power relations, the movement has reproduced them.

Chapter 9 by Harriet Shortt focuses on Lefebvre's triad as well and analyses food and eating in workplaces as a mundane and routine activity that takes place in specific spaces. Shortt urges us to take into consideration that space has an important role in constructing social interrelations, and she thus uses the term 'foodscape' to highlight that in order to understand eating as a socio-cultural phenomenon, it is crucial to critically examine how spaces of food are consumed, planned, controlled, resisted, embodied and lived. Based on a study conducted in a governmental organization that was relocated into a new building, Shortt demonstrates how different locations for eating were experienced and interpreted differently by the workers. The tensions between the conceived space and the perceived and lived spaces are exposed through four main themes: conversations during food breaks which took place in various locations, usually not in those which were designated for this purpose, thus creating alternative collaborative working environments; workers seeking 'unmanaged' experiences by escaping to private dining areas within and outside the organization, thus avoiding the organizational expectation 'to socialize' with others; smell as an embodied spatio-cultural experience that disrupts the formal, planned spaces of organizations; and lastly healthy foodscapes imposed by the organization subverted by employees through sharing sweets and cakes in liminal spaces. The chapter is divided into dishes—appetizer, starter, amuse bouche, main dish and dessert—which gives the reader a highly embodied experience. In

this respect, the chapter provides a rich Lefebrian analysis which integrates many of Lefebvre's ideas in regard to everyday life, power, domination, resistance, appropriation, politics, embodiment, and socio-cultural production of space.

Part III (**Organization of spaces—Capitalism, urban- and state relations**) is devoted to macro analyses of the production of space and it starts with Chapter 10 by Zhongyuan Zhang on the spatial dynamics of the Chinese city, Hangzhou. Zhang encourages organizational scholars to draw much heavier on Lefebvre's early writings on urban space, looking at the underlying processual dimensions of the city and the dynamic interrelations between the conceived, perceived and lived spaces. Based on Lefebvre's *The Right to the City* and the Marxist concepts of exchange-value and use-value, Zhang analyses the reality of the city both as a product that can be traded and consumed and as an *oeuvre* that people can use in non-economic ways. In this sense, Zhang continues the previous chapter's emphasis on the tension between power and resistance, domination and appropriation. In the chapter, three urban processes/practices are examined: redesigning roads by narrowing bike lanes and abolishing sidewalks thus revoking pedestrians' territorial rights; appropriation of the sidewalk by citizens who (mis)use it for various domestic purposes (such as drying laundry, cooking and eating) and thereby reclaiming their right to space; and square-dancing that often evokes conflicts between residents and dancers that are mediated by local governmental attempts to regulate these activities. In his conclusion, he offers some insights about the implications of his study on the city for organizational studies: putting more emphasis on unintentional subversions of controlled spaces and avoiding an overly romantic view of the resisting power of the lived space, paying more attention to changes in organizational spatial layouts to reveal hidden power rationales and revealing new liminal, in-between spaces within and outside organizations.

Chapter 11 by Inbal Ofer is also based on the concept of the right to the city, but it adds an historical angle to Lefebvre's writing focusing on urbanization processes in Madrid from Franco's dictatorship to the democratic regime. Ofer draws our attention to the state level and their planning regimes by analysing the formation of the city and the changes that occurred in Madrid from a highly segregated and dominated urban space (imposed by the state officials) to the vernacular, informal, resistant spatial practices (carried out by the city inhabitants, the citizens). Ofer shows that even in dictatorial regimes, power is not complete and planned spaces are always disrupted and recreated, but, on the other hand, citizens' participation in democratic regimes is also not exhausted. The chapter is divided into three historical periods: the first refers to Madrid under Franco's regime in the 1950s and 1960s, in which market-driven, hierarchical, and rational planning brought about functional zoning and to highly spatial segregation that reinforced the state's domination; the second relates to the emergence of sporadic, illegal and informal counter-spaces in the late 1960s which offered

the citizens much more independence and flexibility and a way to cope with the alienation of the segregation; and third considers the democratization of Spain which brought about new forms of urban knowledge through the participation of citizens in the planning processes. Even though Ofer outlines a process of urban democratization in which new forms of knowledge could emerge from the participation of citizens in planning processes, she doubts the ability of democratic authorities to allow citizens to gain their full rights to the city and to take an active part in designing and regulating their own living environment.

Chapter 12 by Daniel Lacerda also deals with the state's role in urbanization and in its attempts to regulate citizens' appropriation of space, but theoretically it is much more focused on power and even violence. Focusing on the case of Brazilian favelas in Rio de Janeiro, Lacerda examines the various ways the violence of abstraction is perpetrated by the state's attempts to take control over the social space in the favelas. Based on observation, interviews and visual methodologies, the chapter offers an analysis of the coercive practices of the state and of the police, whose aim was to fight against the drug cartels that dominated the favelas but also provided basic public services that the residents did not get from the official state authorities. By applying the Lefebvrian triad and putting a special emphasis on the abstract space, Lacerda describes the struggle between these two entities as contesting political and economical ideologies and violent spatial practices. By analysing this extreme case study, the chapter raises important questions regarding the 'totality of space' and 'the abstract space of capital accumulation' and suggests some insights on how to implement these ideas in the field of organizational studies.

In this introduction, we have not aimed to provide a complete overview of the significance of Lefebvre for organization studies. Likewise, this is not the aim or pretension of the volume. Our objective was to make clear that Lefebvre's work is only beginning to be appropriated in organization studies and that this volume illustrates different possible ways of using Lefebvre. The chapters of this volume only represent part of the possible routes that have been or could be taken towards developing Lefebvrian organization studies; i.e. to studying 'spatial organization'. We will return to and specify this approach in more detail in the final chapter of this volume on 'future directions'. The authors and studies are brought together in the hope that this selection will inspire and challenge organization scholars and practitioners across the world to further explore and develop the rich potential of Lefebvre's work for organization studies.

References

Aronowitz, S. (2015). Henri Lefebvre: The ignored philosopher and social theorist. In *Against Orthodoxy: Social Theory and Its Discontents* (pp. 73–91). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beyes, T. and Steyaert, C. (2012). Spacing organization: Non-representational theory and performing organizational space. *Organization*, 19, 45–61.

Brenner, N. and Elden, S. (2009). Henri Lefebvre on state, space, territory. *International Political Sociology*, 353–377.

Carlile, P. R., Nicolini, D., Langley, A., et al. (2013). *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. *Organization, 12*, 649–678.

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). *The Spaces of Organisation & the Organisation of Space. Power, Identity & Materiality at Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dale, K. and Latham, Y. (2015). Ethics and entangled embodiment: Bodies—materialities—organization. *Organization*, 22, 166–182.

Dobers, P. and Strannegård, L. (2004). The cocoon—a traveling space. *Organization*, 11, 825–848.

Elden, S. (2004). *Understanding Henri Lefebvre—Theory and the Possible*. London and New York: Continuum.

Ford, J. and Harding, N. (2004). We went looking for an organization but could find only the metaphysics of its presence. *Sociology*, *38*, 815–830.

Goonewardena, K., Kipfer, S., Milgrom, R., et al. (2008). *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. New York: Routledge.

Gottdiener, M. (1985). *The Social Production of Urban Space*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Habermas, J. (1984 [1981]). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Boston Beacon Press.

Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hirst, A. (2011). Settlers, vagrants and mutual indifference: Unintended consequences of hot-desking. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24, 767–788.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. New York: Verso.

Kingma, S. (2004). Gambling and the risk society: The liberalisation and legitimation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. *International Gambling Studies*, *4*, 47–67.

Kingma, S. F. (2008). Dutch casino space or the spatial organization of entertainment. *Culture and Organization*, *14*, 31–48.

Kingma, S. F. (2011). Waterfront rise. Urban casino space and boundary construction in the Netherlands. In P. Raento and D. G. Schwartz (Eds.), *Gambling, Space, and Time. Shifting Boundaries and Cultures* (pp. 83–107). Reno & Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press.

Kipfer, S., Goonewardena, K., Schmid, C., et al. (2008). On the production of Henri Lefebvre. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom, et al. (Eds.), *Space, Difference, Everyday Life. Reading Henri Lefebvre*. London and New York: Routledge.

Knights, D. (1992). Changing spaces: The disruptive impact of a new epistemological location for the study of management. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 514–536.

Lefebvre, H. (1969 [1968]). *The Explosion: Marxism and the French Upheaval* (translated by Alfred Ehrenfeld). New York: Modern Reader.

Lefebvre, H. (1982 [1966]). *The Sociology of Marx* (translated from the French by Norbert Guterman). Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1947]). *Critique of Everyday Life Introduction* (translated by John Moore, With a Preface by Michel Trebitsch). New York: Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1974]). *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2003 [1970]). *The Urban Revolution* (translated by Robert Bononno. Foreword by Neil Smith). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2004 [1992]). *Rhythmanalysis. Space, Time and Everyday Life* (translated by Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore, with an introduction by Stuart Elden). New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Lefebvre, H. (2014 [1947, 1961, 1981]). *Critique of Everyday Life. One Volume Edition. Vol I, II, III* (translated by John Moore and by Gregory Elliott; prefaces by Michel Trebitsch), London: Verso.

Lennie, I. (1999). *Beyond Management*. London: Sage.

Merleau-Ponty, M. P. (1965 [1945]). *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge.

Merrifield, A. (2006). *Henri Lefebvre. A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Miller, B. (2000). *Geography and Social Movements: Comparing Antinuclear Activism in the Boston Area*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Peltonen, T. (2011). Multiple architectures and the production of organizational space in a Finnish university. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *24*, 806–821.

Petani, F. J. and Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history. *Organization*, *23*, 71–89.

Schmid, C. (2008). Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space: Towards a three-dimensional dialectic. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom, et al. (Eds.), *Space, Difference, Everyday Life*. London and New York: Routledge, 27–45.

Shields, R. (1999). *Lefebvre, Love & Struggle. Spatial Dialectics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Shields, R. (2001). Henri Lefebvre: Philosopher of everyday life. In A. Elliott and B. Turner (Eds.), *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*. London: Sage, 226–237.

Soja, E. (1996). *Third Space. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Soja, E. W. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London and New York: Verso.

Spicer, A. (2006). Beyond the convergence–divergence debate: The role of spatial scales in transforming organizational logic. *Organization Studies*, *27*(10), 1467–1483.

Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *9*, 325–346.

Tyler, M., & Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. *Organization Studies*, *31*(2), 175–198.

Verduyn, K. (2015). Entrepreneuring and process: A Lefebvrian perspective. *International Small Business Journal*, *33*, 638–648.

Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2011). The spatial implications of homeworking: A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based work. *Organization*, *19*, 63–79.

Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. *Organization Science*, *22*, 503–521.

Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in-between glass ceilings and glass work: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. *Organization Studies*, *36*, 1485–1505.

Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. *Culture and Organization*, *11*, 209–220.

Yeung, H. W.-C. (1998). The social-spatial constitution of business organizations: A geographical perspective. *Organization*, *5*, 101–128.

Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space. *Ephemera. Theory & Politics in Organization*, *6*, 219–223.

Zhang, Z., Hancock, P. and Spicer, A. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J. G. Ballard. *Organization*, *13*, 549–567.

Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of hierarchical space in a Chinese bureaucracy. *Human Relations*, *47*, 739–762.

References

1 Introduction: Henri Lefebvre and Organization Studies

Castells, M. (1996). The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. Organization, 12, 649-678.

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). The Spaces of Organisation & the Organisation of Space. Power, Identity & Materiality at Work. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Dale, K. and Latham, Y. (2015). Ethics and entangled embodiment: Bodies— materialities—organization. Organization, 22, 166-182. Dobers, P. and Strannegård, L. (2004). The cocoon—a traveling space. Organization, 11, 825-848. Elden, S. (2004). Understanding Henri Lefebvre—Theory and the Possible. London and New York: Continuum. Ford, J. and Harding, N. (2004). We went looking for an organization but could find only the metaphysics of its presence. Sociology, 38, 815-830. Goonewardena, K., Kipfer, S., Milgrom, R., et al. (2008). Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre. New York: Routledge. Gottdiener, M. (1985). The Social Production of Urban Space. Austin: University of Texas Press. Habermas, J. (1984 [1981]). The Theory of Communicative Action. Boston: Boston Beacon Press. Hatch, M. J. (1997). Organization Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Hirst, A. (2011). Settlers, vagrants and mutual indifference: Unintended consequences of hot-desking. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24, 767-788. Jameson, F. (1991). Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. New York: Verso. Kingma, S. (2004). Gambling and the risk society: The liberalisation and legitimation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. International Gambling Studies, 4, 47-67. Kingma, S. F. (2008). Dutch casino space or the spatial organization of entertainment. Culture and Organization, 14, 31-48. Kingma, S. F. (2011). Waterfront rise. Urban casino space and boundary construction in the Netherlands. In P. Raento and D. G. Schwartz (Eds.), Gambling, Space, and Time. Shifting Boundaries and Cultures (pp. 83-107). Reno & Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press. Kipfer, S., Goonewardena, K., Schmid, C., et al. (2008). On the production of Henri Lefebvre. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom, et al. (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life. Reading Henri Lefebvre. London and New York: Routledge. Knights, D.

(1992). Changing spaces: The disruptive impact of a new epistemological location for the study of management. Academy of Management Review, 17, 514–536. Lefebvre, H. (1969 [1968]). The Explosion: Marxism and the French Upheaval (translated by Alfred Ehrenfeld). New York: Modern Reader. Lefebvre, H. (1982 [1966]). The Sociology of Marx (translated from the French by Norbert Guterman). Columbia: Columbia University Press. Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1947]). Critique of Everyday Life Introduction (translated by John Moore, With a Preface by Michel Trebitsch). New York: Verso. Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1974]). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (2003 [1970]). The Urban Revolution (translated by Robert Bononno. Foreword by Neil Smith). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. (2004 [1992]). Rhythmanalysis. Space, Time and Everyday Life (translated by Stuart Elden and Gerald Moore, with an introduction by Stuart Elden). New York: Bloomsbury Academic. Lefebvre, H. (2014 [1947, 1961, 1981]). Critique of Everyday Life. One Volume Edition. Vol I, II, III (translated by John Moore and by Gregory Elliott; prefaces by Michel Trebitsch), London: Verso. Lennie, I. (1999). Beyond Management. London: Sage. Merleau-Ponty, M. P. (1965 [1945]). Phenomenology of Perception. London: Routledge. Merrifield, A. (2006). Henri Lefebvre. A Critical Introduction . New York: Routledge. Miller, B. (2000). Geography and Social Movements: Comparing Antinuclear Activism in the Boston Area. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Peltonen, T. (2011). Multiple architectures and the production of organizational space in a Finnish university. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24, 806–821. Petani, F. J. and Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history. Organization, 23, 71–89. Schmid, C. (2008). Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space: Towards a three-dimensional dialectic. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom, et al. (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life. London and New York: Routledge, 27–45. Shields, R. (1999). Lefebvre, Love & Struggle. Spatial Dialectics. London and New York: Routledge. Shields, R. (2001). Henri Lefebvre: Philosopher of everyday life. In A. Elliott and B. Turner (Eds.), Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory. London: Sage, 226–237. Soja, E. (1996). Third Space. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Soja, E. W. (1989). Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory. London and New York: Verso. Spicer, A. (2006). Beyond the convergence–divergence debate: The role of spatial scales in transforming organizational logic. Organization Studies, 27(10),

1467–1483. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9, 325–346. Tyler, M., & Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. Organization Studies, 31(2), 175–198.

Verduyn, K. (2015). Entrepreneuring and process: A Lefebvrian perspective. International Small Business Journal, 33, 638–648. Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2011). The spatial implications of homeworking: A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based work. Organization, 19, 63–79. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science, 22, 503–521. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in-between glass ceilings and glass work: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36, 1485–1505. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11, 209–220. Yeung, H. W.-C. (1998). The social-spatial constitution of business organizations: A geographical perspective. Organization, 5, 101–128.

Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space. Ephemera. Theory & Politics in Organiza tion, 6, 219–223. Zhang, Z., Hancock, P. and Spicer, A. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J. G. Ballard. Organization, 13, 549–567. Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of hierarchical space in a Chinese bureaucracy. Human Relations, 47, 739–762.

2 Politics, Embodiment, Everyday Life: Lefebvre and Spatial Organization

Grosz, E. (1998). Bodies-cities. In H. J. Nast and S. Pile (Eds.), Places Through the Body (pp. 42–51). London: Routledge. Harvey, D. (2013). Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution. London: Verso. Hassard, J., Holliday, R. and Willmott, H. (2000). The body and organization. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday and H. Willmott (Eds.), Body and Organization (pp. 1–14). London: Sage. Hernes, T. (2004). The Spatial Construction of Organization. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Highmore, B. (2002). Introduction: Questioning everyday life. In B. Highmore (Ed.), The Everyday Life Reader (pp. 1–34). London: Routledge. Holt, R., Hernes, T ., Helin, J. and Hjorth, D. (2014). Process is how process does'. In J. Helin et al. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Process Philosophy and Organization Studies (pp. 1–16). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Kipfer , S., Goonewardena, K., Schmid, C. and Milgrom, R. (2008a). On the production of Henri Lefebvre. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre (pp. 1–23). London: Routledge. Kipfer, S., Schmid, C., Goonewardena, K. and Milgrom, R. (2008b). Globalizing Lefebvre? In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre (pp. 285–305). London: Routledge. Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. (2004). Bringing space back in: Organizing the generative Building. Organization Studies, 25(7), 1095–1114. Lefebvre, H. (1968). Dialectical Materialism (translated by John Sturrock). First published 1940. London: Jonathan Cape. Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space (translated by D. Nicholson-Smith). First published 1974. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (1994). Everyday Life in the Modern World (translated by S. Rabinovitch). First published 1968. London: Transaction. Lefebvre, H. (1996). Right to the city. In E. Kofmann and E. Lebas (Ed. and trans.), Henri Lefebvre: Writings on Cities (pp. 63–181). First published 1967. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (2003a). Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche (from Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche ou le royaume des ombres, first published 1975). In S. Elden, E. Lebas and E. Kofman (Eds.), Heni Lefebvre: Key Writings (pp. 42–49). London: Continuum. Lefebvre, H. (2003b). Triads and Dyads (from La Présence et l'absence, first published 1980). In S. Elden, E. Lebas and E. Kofman (Eds.), Heni Lefebvre: Key Writings (pp. 50–56). London: Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2003c). The Urban Revolution (translated by R. Bononno). First published 1970. Minneapolis: University

of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2004). Rhythmanalysis (translated by S. Elden and G. Moore). First published 1992. London: Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2008a). Critique of Everyday Life, Vol. I (translated by J. Moore). First published 1947. London: Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (2008b). Critique of Everyday Life, Vol. II: Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday (translated by J. Moore). First published 1961. London: Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (2008c). Critique of Everyday Life, Vol. III: From Modernity to Modernism (translated by J. Moore). First published 1981. London: Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (2009a). Reflections on the politics of space (first published in Espaces et sociétés, 1970). In N. Brenner and S. Elden (Eds.), trans. G. Moore, N. Brenner and S. Elden, Henri Lefebvre: State, Space World: Selected Essays (pp. 167–184). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. (2009b). Space: Social product and use value (first published in Critical Sociology: European Perspectives , ed. J. W. Freiberg, 1979). In N. Brenner and S. Elden (Eds.), translated by G. Moore, N. Brenner and S. Elden, Henri Lefebvre: State, Space World: Selected Essays (pp. 185–195). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. (2009c). Space and the state (from De l'État, first published 1978). In N. Brenner and S. Elden (Eds.) translated by G. Moore, N. Brenner and S. Elden, Henri Lefebvre: State, Space World: Selected Essays (pp. 223–253). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2009d). Theoretical problems of Autogestion (first published in 1966). In N. Brenner and S. Elden (Eds.) translated by G. Moore, N. Brenner and S. Elden, Henri Lefebvre: State, Space World: Selected Essays (pp. 138–152). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. and Levich, C. (1987). The everyday and everydayness. Yale French Studies, 73, 7–11. Löw, M. (2008). The constitution of space: The structuration of spaces through the simultaneity of effect and perception. European Journal of Social Theory, 11(1), 24–49. Martin, P. Y. (2002). Sensations, bodies and the 'Spirit of a Place': Aesthetics in residential organizations for the elderly. Human Relations, 55(7), 861–885. Mayer, M. (2010). Social Movements in the (Post-)Neoliberal City. London: Bedford Press. Merrifield, A. (1995). Lefebvre, anti-logos

and Nietzsche: An alternative reading of The Production of
Space. Antipode, 27(3), 294-303. Merrifield, A. (2000).
Henri Lefebvre: A socialist in space. In M. Crang and N.
Thrift (Eds.), Thinking Space (pp. 167-182). London:
Routledge. Merrifield, A. (2006). Henri Lefebvre: A
Critical Introduction. London: Routledge. Poster, M.
(2002). Everyday (virtual) life. New Literary History,
33(4), 743-760. Renaudie, S., Guilbaud, P. and Lefebvre, H.
(2009). International competition for the new Belgrade
urban structure improvement (originally submitted in 1986).
In S. Bittner and H. Weber (Eds.), Autogestion, or Henri
Lefebvre in New Belgrade (pp. 1-32). Berlin: Sternberg
Press. Roberts, J. (1999). Philosophizing the everyday: The
philosophy of praxis and the fate of cultural studies.
Radical Philosophy, 98(November/December), 16-29. Ross, K.
(2008). The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the
Paris Commune. First published 1988. London: Verso.
Schmid, C. (2005). Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri
Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes.
München: Franz Steiner. Simonsen, K. (2005). Bodies,
sensations, space and time: The contribution from Henri
Lefebvre. Geografiska Annaler, 87B(1), 1-14. Smith, N.
(2009). Preface. In S. Bittner and H. Weber (Eds.),
Autogestion, or Henri Lefebvre in New Belgrade (pp.
81-86). Berlin: Sternberg Press. Soja, E. W . (1996).
Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other
Real-andImagined Places. Oxford: Blackwell. Stanek, L.
(2011). Henri Lefebvre on Space. Architecture, Urban
Research, and the Production of Theory. Minneapolis:
University of Minnesota Press. Stewart, L. (1995). Bodies,
visions, and spatial politics: A review essay on Henri
Lefebvre's The Production of Space. Environment and
Planning D: Society and Space, 13(5), 609-618. Taylor, S.
and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: An interpretive
review of research on organizational spaces. International
Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325-346. Tyler, M.
and Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender
performativity and organizational space. Organization
Studies, 31(2), 175-198. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M.
(2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity
regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science,
22(2), 503-521. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015).
Spatial work in between glass ceilings and glass walls:
Gender-class intersectionality and organizational
aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1485-1505.
Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial
practices and spaces of representations: An application of
Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3),
209-220. Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you
first': The everyday production of hierarchical space in a

Chinese bureaucracy. Human Relations, 67(6), 739-762.
Zhang, Z., Spicer, A. and Hancock, P. (2008).
Hyper-organizational space in the work of J.G. Ballard.
Organization, 15(6), 889-910.

3 Rhythms of Historical Disposal: The Role of Absent Spaces in the Organizational Process of Space Planning

Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an Ecology of Mind. New York: Ballantine.

Benjamin, A. (2000). Architectural Philosophy. London: Athlone.

Beyes, T. and Steyaert, C. (2012). Spacing organization: Non-representational theory and performing organizational space. Organization, 19(1), 45-61.

Boje, D. M. (Ed.). (2011). Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook. London: Routledge.

Callon, M. and Law, J. (2004). Introduction: Absence-presence, circulation, and encountering in complex space. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 22(1), 3-11.

Cooper, R. (2006). Making present: Autopoiesis as human production. Organization, 13(1), 59-81.

Cooper, R. (2007). Organs of process: Rethinking human organization. Organization Studies, 28(10), 1547-1573.

Cooper, R. (2014). Process and reality. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjorth and R. Holt (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Process Philosophy & Organization Studies (pp. 585-604). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Crewe, L. (2011). Life itemised: Lists, loss, unexpected significance, and the enduring geographies of discard. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 29(1), 27-46.

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. Organization, 12(5), 649-678.

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). The Spaces of Organisation and the Organisation of Space: Power, Identity and Materiality at Work. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

de Vaujany, F.-X. and Mitev, N. (2013). Materiality and Space: Organizations, Artefacts and Practices. Houndmills

and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

de Vaujany, F.-X. and Vaast, E. (2014). If these walls could talk: The mutual construction of organizational space and legitimacy. Organization Science, 25(3), 713-731.

Decker, S. (2014). Solid intentions: An archival ethnography of corporate architecture and organizational remembering. Organization, 21(4), 514-542.

Edensor, T. (2005). Waste matter—The debris of industrial ruins and the disordering of the material world. Journal of Material Culture, 10(3), 311-332.

Elden, S. (2004a). Rhythmanalysis: An introduction. In Lefebvre, H. (2004/1992), Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life (pp. vii-xv). London: Continuum.

Elden, S. (2004b). Understanding Henri Lefebvre. London: Continuum.

Fleming, P. and Spicer, A. (2004). 'You can checkout anytime, but you can never leave': Spatial boundaries in a high commitment organization. Human Relations, 57(1), 75-94.

Ford, J. and Harding, N. (2004). We went looking for an organization but could find only the metaphysics of its presence. Sociology, 38(4), 815-830.

Ford, J. and Harding, N. (2008). Fear and loathing in Harrogate, or a study of a conference. Organization, 15(2), 233-250.

Gastelaars, M. (2010). What do buildings do? How buildings-in-use affect organizations. In A. Marrewijk and D. Yanow (Eds.), Organizational Spaces. Rematerializing the Workaday World (pp. 77-95). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gieryn, T. F. (2002). What buildings do. Theory and Society, 31(1), 35-74.

Giovannoni, E. and Quattrone, P. (2017). The materiality of absence: Organizing and the case of the incomplete cathedral. Organization Studies. First Published Online June 22, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617708005

Hancock, P . and Spicer, A. (2011). Academic architecture and the constitution of the new model worker. Culture and Organization, 17(2), 91-105.

Hetherington, K. (2004). Secondhandedness: Consumption, disposal, and absent presence. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 22(1), 157-174.

Jones, G., McLean, C. and Quattrone, P. (2004). Spacing and timing. Organization, 11(6), 723-741.

Kallinikos, J. (1995). The architecture of the invisible: Technology is representation. Organization, 2(1), 117-140.

Kingma, S. F. (2008). Dutch casino space or the spatial organization of entertainment. Culture and Organization, 14(1), 31-48.

Lefebvre, H. (1947). Descartes. Paris, France: Éditions Hier et Aujourd'hui.

Lefebvre, H. (1968). Le droit à la ville. Paris, France: Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. (1970). La Fin de l'Histoire. Paris (France): Éditions de Minuit.

Lefebvre, H. (1975). What is the historical past? New Left Review, 90(27-34).

Lefebvre, H. (1980). La présence et l'absence: contribution à la théorie des représentations. Paris, France: Casterman.

Lefebvre, H. (1986). Préface to the New Edition of La Production de l'espace (3rd ed.). Paris, France: Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2003). Key writings. In S. Elden, E. Lebas and E. Kofman (Eds.), Key Writings. London: Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2004/1992). Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life. London: Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2014a). Critique of Everyday Life. London: Verso.

Lefebvre, H. (2014b). Toward an Architecture of Enjoyment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2014/1947). Critique of Everyday Life.

London: Verso.

Lorimer, H. (2005). Cultural geography: The busyness of being 'more-thanrepresentational'. Progress in Human Geography, 29(1), 83-94.

Meyer, M. (2012). Placing and tracing absence: A material culture of the immaterial. Journal of Material Culture, 17(1), 103-110.

Mitev, N. and De Vaujany, F. X. (2013). Conclusion: Back to long durée, materialism and management practices? In F. X. De Vaujany and N. Mitev (Eds.), Materiality and Space: Organizations, Artefacts and Practices. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nicolini, D. (2013). Practice Theory, Work, and Organization: An Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orlikowski, W. and Scott, S. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. The Academy of Management Annals, 2, 433-474.

Petani, F. J. and Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history. Organization, 23(1), 71-89.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1990). Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. Organization Science, 1(3), 267-292.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1997). What is a processual analysis? Scandinavian Journal of Management, 13(4), 337-348.

Schatzki, T. R. (2006). On organizations as they happen. Organization Studies, 27(12), 1863-1873.

Schmid, C. (2008). Towards a three-dimensional dialectic. Lefebvre's theory of the production of space. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre (pp. 27-45). New Y ork: Routledge.

Sebald, W. G. (2001). Austerlitz. London: Penguin.

Shanor, R. R. (1988). The City that Never Was: Two Hundred Years of Fantastic and Fascinating Plans that Might Have Changed the Face of New York City. New York: Viking.

Stanek, L. (2011). Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Taylor, F. T. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper.

Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325-346.

Thrift, N. (2008). Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect. London: Routledge.

Tyler, M. and Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. Organization Studies, 31(2), 175-198.

Van de Ven, A. H. (1992). Suggestions for studying strategy process: A research note. Strategic Management Journal, 13(169-188).

Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2012). The spatial implications of homeworking: A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based work. Organization, 19(1), 63-79.

Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science, 22(2), 503-521.

Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209-220.

Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space? Ephemera, 6(2), 219-223.

Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of hierarchical space in a Chinese bureaucracy. Human Relations, 67(6), 739-762.

Zhang, Z., Spicer, A. and Hancock, P. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J. G. Ballard. Organization, 15(6), 889-910.

Hamel, G. (2007). The Future of Management (With Bill Breen). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. Hansen, H., Ropo, A. and Sauer, E. (2007). Aesthetic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 18, 544–560. Harding, N., Lee, H., Ford, J. and Learmonth, M. (2011). Leadership and charisma: A desire that cannot speak its name? Human Relations, 64(7), 927–949. Hatch, M. J. and Cunliffe, A. (2006). Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Post-Modern Perspectives. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Hawkins, B. (2015). Ship-shape: Materializing leadership in the British Royal Navy. Human Relations, 68(6), 951–971. Hegel, G. W. F. (1986). Phänomenologie des Geistes. Werke 3. Frankfurt, a.M.: Suhrkamp. Humphries, C. and Smith, A. C. T. (2014). Talking objects: Towards a postsocial research framework for exploring object narratives. Organization, 21(4), 477–494. Jones, M. (2013). Untangling sociomateriality. In P. R. Carlile, D. Nicolini, A. Langley and H. Tsoukas (Eds.), How Matter Matters. Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies (pp. 197–226). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Kelly, S. (2008). Leadership: A categorical mistake? Human Relations, 61(6), 763–782. Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. R. (2004). Bringing space back in: Organizing the generative building. Organization Studies, 25(7), 1095–1114. Kuronen, T. and Huhtinen, A.-M. (2016). Organizing conflict: The rhizome of Jihad. Journal of Management Inquiry. DOI: 10.1177/1056492616665172. Ladkin, D. (2008). Leading beautifully: How mastery, congruence and purpose create the aesthetic of embodied leadership practice. Leadership Quarterly, 19, 31–41. Laloux, F. (2014). Reinventing Organizations. Brussels: Nelson Parker. Lefebvre, H. (1963). La vallée de Campan, études de sociologie rurale. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Lefebvre, H. (1971). Everyday Life in the Modern World. London: The Penguin Press. Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (2000). Pyrénées. Pau: Cairn. Lefebvre, H. (2003). The country and the city. In S. Elden, E. Lebas and E. Kofman (Eds.), Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings. London: Continuum. Lefebvre, H. (2004). Rhythmanalysis. Space, Time and Everyday Life. London: Continuum. Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (2000). The Aesthetics of Organization. London: Sage. Liverpool, P. R. (1990). Employee participation in decision-making: An analysis of the perceptions of members and non-members of quality circles. Journal of Business and Psychology, 4(4), 411–422. Margetts, H., John, P., Hale, S. and Reissfelder, S. (2013). Leadership without leaders? Starters and followers in online collective action.

Political Studies, 63(2), 278-299. Merrifield, A. (2006).
Henri Lefebvre. A Critical Introduction . New York:
Routledge. Oborn, E., Barrett, M. and Dawson, S. (2013).
Distributed leadership in policy formulation: A
sociomaterial perspective. Organization Studies, 34(2),
253-276. Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices:
Exploring technology at work. Organization Studies, 28,
1435-1448. Orlikowski, W. and Scott, S. (2008).
Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of
technology, work and organization. The Academy of
Management Annals, 2(1), 433-474. Orr, J. (1995). Talking
About Machines. An Ethnography of a Modern Job. Ithaca:
Cornell University Press. Pallasmaa, J. (2014). Space,
place, and atmosphere: Peripheral perception in existential
experience. In C. Borch (Ed.), Architectural Atmospheres:
On the Experience and Politics of Architecture (pp.
18-41). Basel, Switzerland: Birkhäuser. PMBOK (2013). A
Guide to Project Management Body of Knowledge. Newtown
Square, PA: Project Management Institute. Puranam, P.,
Alexy, O. and Reitzig, M. (2014). What's 'new' about new
forms of organizing? Academy of Management Review, 39(2),
162-180. Raelin, J. (2005). We the leaders: In order to
form a leaderful organization. Journal of Leadership and
Organizational Studies, 12(2), 18-29. Robertson, B. J.
(2015). Holacracy. The New Management System for a Rapidly
Changing World. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.
Ropo, A. and Höykinpuro, R. (2017). Narrating
organizational spaces. Journal of Organizational Change
Management, 30(3), 357-366. Ropo, A. and Parviainen, J.
(2001). Leadership and bodily knowledge in expert
organizations: Epistemological rethinking. Scandinavian
Journal of Management, 17(1), 1-18. Ropo, A., Parviainen,
J. and Koivunen, N. (2002). Aesthetics in leadership. From
absent bodies to social bodily presence. In J. Meindl and
K. Parry (Eds.), Grounding Leadership Theory and Research:
Issues and Perspectives (pp. 21-38). Greenwich CT:
Information Age Publishing. Ropo, A. and Salovaara, P.
(2018). Spacing leadership as an embodied and performative
process. Leadership. Published online: April 16. Ropo, A.,
Salovaara, P., Sauer, E. and De Paoli, D. (Eds.) (2015).
Leadership in Spaces and Places. Cheltenhamand
Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. Ropo, A., Sauer, E. and
Salovaara, P. (2013). Embodiment of leadership through
material place. Leadership, 9(3), 378-395. Ryle, G. (1946).
Knowing how and knowing that. Proceedings of the
Aristotelian Society, New Series, 46, 1-16. Salovaara, P.
(2014). Video: Leadership in spaces and places.
Organizational Aesthetics, 3(1): 79-79. Retrieved from
http://digitalcommons.wpi.edu/oa/vol3/iss1/8/

Salovaara, P. and Bathurst, R. (2016). Power-with leadership practices: An unfinished business. Leadership. doi:org/10.1177/1742715016652932

Scotto, C. (2014). The principles of campus conception: A spatial and organiza tional genealogy. What knowledge can we use from a historical study in order to analyse the design processes of a new campus? In Francois-Xavier de Vaujany, N. Mitev, P. Laniryi and E. Vaast (Eds.), Materiality and Time. Historical Perspectives on Organizations, Artefacts and Practices. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. Sergi, V. (2016). Who's leading the way? Investigating the contributions of materiality to the study of leadership-as-practice. In J. Raelin (Ed.), Leadership-asPractice: Theory and Applications (pp. 110–131). London: Routledge. Shotter , J. (2006). Understanding process from within: An argument for 'withness'thinking. Organization Studies, 27, 585–604. Simonsen, K. (2005). Bodies, sensations, space and time: The contribution from Henri Lefebvre. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, 87(1), 1–14. Simpson, B. (2015). Where's the agency in leadership-as-practice? In J. Raelin (Ed.), Leadership-as-Practice. Theory and Application (pp. 159–177). New York: Routledge. Stingl, V. and Geraldi, J. (2017). Errors, lies and misunderstandings: Systematic review on behavioural decision making in projects. International Journal of Project Management, 35(2), 121–135. Strati, A. (1999). Organization and Aesthetics. London: Sage. Strati, A. (2007). Sensible knowledge and practice-based learning. Management Learning, 38(1), 61–77. Sutherland, N. (2015). Leadership without leaders: Understanding anarchist organising through the lens of critical leadership studies. In B. Carroll, J. Ford and S. Taylor (Eds.), Leadership: Contemporary Critical Perspectives (pp. 212–232). London: Sage. Sutherland, N., Land, C. and Böhm, S. (2014). Anti-leader(ship) in social movement organizations: The case of autonomous grassroots groups. Organization, 21, 759–781. Sveiby, K.-E. (2011). Collective leadership with power symmetry: Lessons from Aboriginal prehistory. Leadership, 7(4), 385–414. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325–346. Van Marrewijk, A. and Yanow, D. (Eds.) (2010). Organizational Spaces. Rematerializing the Workaday World. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science, 22(2), 503–521. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in between glass ceilings and glass walls:

Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1485-1505. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209-220. Wood, M. (2005). The fallacy of misplaced leadership. Journal of Management Studies, 42(6), 1101-1121. Yanow, D. (2010). Giving voice to space: Academic practices and the material world. In A. van Marrewijk and D. Yanow (Eds.), Organizational Spaces. Rematerializing the Workaday World (pp. 139-158). Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar .

Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space? ephemera, 6(2), 219-223.

Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of hierarchical space in a Chinese bureaucracy. Human Relations, 67(6), 739-762.

5 Between Institutional Theory and Lefebvre: Sensemaking, Logics and Enactment of, and in, Space

Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. The Journal of Marketing, 56(2), 51-71.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. Journal of women in culture and society, 28(3), 801-831.

Boxenbaum, E., Jones, C., Meyer, R. E. and Svejenova, S. (2015). The material and visual turn in organization theory: Objectifying and (re)acting to novel ideas. Organization Studies, 36, 133-138.

Carlile, P. R., Nicolini, D., Langley, A. and Tsoukas, H. (Eds.) (2013). How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Clegg, S. and Kornberger, M. (Eds.) (2006). Space, Organization and Management Theory. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press. Cohen-Hattab, K. (2010). Struggles at holy sites and their outcomes: The evolution of the Western Wall plaza in Jerusalem. Journal of Heritage Tourism, 5(2), 125-139. Crang, M. (1999). Globalization as conceived, lived and perceived spaces. Theory, Culture & Society , 16(1) 167-177. Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. Organization, 12(5), 649-678. Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2003). An-aesthetics and architecture. In A. Carr and P. Hancock (Eds.), Art and Aesthetics at Work (pp. 155-173). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). The Spaces of Organization and the Organization of Space. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147-160. Drori, G. S., Delmestri, G. and Oberg, A. (2016). The iconography of universities as institutional narratives. Higher Education, 71(1), 163-180. Drori, G. S. and Krücken, G. (2009). World society: A theory and research in con text. In G. Krücken and G. S. Drori (Eds.), World Society: The Writings of John W. Meyer (pp. 1-32). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Drori, G. S., Meyer, J. W. and Hwang, H. (2009). Global organization: Rationalization and actorhood as dominant scripts. Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Institutions and Ideology, 27, 17-43. Fligstein, N. and McAdam, D. (2011). Toward a general

theory of strategic action fields. Sociological theory, 29(1), 1-26. Freidland, R. (2009). Institution, practice, and ontology: Toward a religious sociology. Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Institutions and Ideology, 27, 45-83.

Greenwood, R. and Meyer, R. E. (2008). Influencing ideas: A celebration of DiMaggio and Powell (1983). Journal of Management Inquiry, 17(4), 258-264.

Greenwood, R. Oliver, O., Lawrence, T. and Meyer, R. E. (Eds.) (2017). Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R. and Sahlin-Andersson, K. (Eds.) (2008). The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism. Los Angeles: Sage.

Hancock, P. and Spicer, A. (2011). Academic architecture and the constitution of the new model worker. Culture and Organization , 17 (2), 91-105.

Höllerer, M. A., Jancsary, D., Meyer, R. E. and Vettori, O. (2013). Imageries of corporate social responsibility: Visual recontextualization and field-level meaning. Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Institutional Logics in Action, 39(b), 139-174.

Höllerer, M. A., Walgenbach, P. and Drori, G. S. (2017). Consequences of globalization for organizations and institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. Lawrence and R. E. Meyer (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Jones, C., Boxenbaum, E. and Anthony, C. (2013). The immateriality of material practices in institutional logics. Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Institutional Logics in Action, 39(A), 51-75.

Jones, C., Maoret, M., Massa, F. G. and Svejenova, S. (2012). Rebels with a cause: Formation, contestation, and expansion of the de novo category 'modern architecture,' 1870-1975. Organization Science, 23(6), 1523-1545.

Jones, C. and Massa, F. G. (2013). From novel practice to consecrated exemplar: Unity temple as a case of institutional evangelizing, Organization Studies 34(8), 1099-1136.

Jones, C., Meyer, R. E., Jancsary, D. and Höllerer, M. A. (2017). The material and visual basis of institutions. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, T. Lawrence and R. E. Meyer (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications. Kellogg, K. C. (2009). Operating room. Relational spaces and microinstitutional change in surgery. American Journal of Sociology, 115(3), 657-711. Kennedy, M. T. and Fiss, P. C. (2013). An ontological turn in categories research: From standards of legitimacy to evidence of actuality. Journal of Management Studies, 50(6), 1138-1154. Kingma, S. F. (2008). Dutch casino space or the spatial organization of entertainment. Culture and Organization, 14(1), 31-48. Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. (2004). Bringing space back in. Organization Studies, 25(7), 1095-1114. Lawrence, T. B., Leca, B. and Zilber, T. B. (2013). Institutional work: Current research, new directions and overlooked issues. Organization Studies , 34(8), 1023-1033.

Lawrence, T . B. and Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence and W. R. Nord (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Studies (2nd ed., pp. 215-282). London: Sage. Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R. and Leca, B. (2009). Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Leonardi, P. M., Nardi, B. A. and Kalinikos, J. Eds. (2012). Materiality and Organizing: Social Interaction in a Technological World. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. Academy of Management Journal, 50(2), 289-307. Löw, M. (2016). The Sociology of Space: Materiality, Social Structures, and Action. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maitlis, S. and Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. The Academy of Management Annals, 8(1), 57-125. Meyer, J. W. (2010). World society, institutional theories, and the actor. Annual Review of Sociology, 36, 1-20. Meyer, J. W. and Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The 'actors' of modern society: The cultural construction of social agency. Sociological Theory, 18(1), 100-120. Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363. Meyer, R. E., Höllerer, M. A., Jancsary, D. and Van Leeuwen, T. (2013). The visual

dimension in organizing, organization, and organization research: Core ideas, current developments, and promising avenues. The Academy of Management Annals, 7(1), 489-555. Navis, C. and Glynn, M. A. (2010). How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynamics of legitimacy, identity, and entrepreneurship in satellite radio, 1990-2005. Administrative Science Quarterly , 55 (3), 439-471. Orlikowski, W. J. and Scott, S. V. (2008). Sociomateriality: Challenging the separation of technology, work and organization. Academy of Management Annals, 2(1), 433-474. Pache, A. C. and Santos, F. (2013). Inside the hybrid organization: Selective coupling as a response to competing institutional logics. Academy of Management Journal, 56(4), 972-1001. Petani, F. J. and Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history. Organization, 23(1), 71-89. Peltonen, T. (2011). Multiple architectures and the production of organizational space in a Finnish university. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24(6), 806-821. Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Pitman, Marshfield, MA. Powell, W. W. and Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin and R. Suddaby (Eds.), The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism (pp. 276-298). Los Angeles: Sage. Pratt, M. G. and Rafaeli, A. (1997). Organizational dress as a symbol of multilay ered social identities. Academy of Management Journal , 40 (4), 862-898. Preminger, B. and Drori, G. S. (2016). How institutions get materialized in space: 'Spatialized logics' along Jerusalem's Western Wall. In J. Gehman, M. Lounsbury and R. Greenwood (Eds.), Research in the Sociology of Organizations: How Institutions Matter?, 48(A), 101-136. Rabinowitz, S. (2009). The Western Wall: Laws and Customs. Jerusalem: The Western Wall Heritage Foundation. Rao, H., Monin, P. and Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Tocque Ville: Nouvelle cuisine as an identity movement in French gastronomy. American Journal of Sociology, 108(4), 795-843. Reay, T. and Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. Organization Studies, 30(6), 629-652. Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32(4), 493-511. Scott, W. R. (2008). Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. Theory and Society , 37 (5), 427-442. Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests and Identities (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage. Scott, W. R. and Meyer, J. W. (1994). Institutional Environments and Organizations: Structural Complexity and Individualism. California: Sage. Strang, D. and Meyer, J. W. (1993). Institutional conditions for

diffusion. Theory and Society, 22(4), 487-511. Strang, D. and Soule, S. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. Annual Review of Sociology, 41, 265-290. Suddaby, R. (2010). Challenges for institutional theory. Journal of Management Inquiry, 19(1), 14-20. Suddaby, R. (2015). Can institutional theory be critical? Journal of Management Inquiry, 24(1), 93-95. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325-346. Thornton, P. H. and Ocasio, W. (1999). Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958-1990. American Journal of Sociology, 105(3), 801-843. Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W. and Lounsbury, M. (2012). The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Tyler, M. and Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. Organization Studies, 31(2), 175-198. de Vaujany, F. X. and Mitev, N. (2013). Introduction: Space in organizations and sociomateriality. In N. Mitev and F. X. de Vaujany (Eds.), Materiality and Space: Organizations, Artefacts and Practices (pp. 1-21). London: Palgrave Macmillan. de Vaujany, F. X. and Mitev, N. (2015). The post-Macy paradox, information management and organising: Good intentions and a road to hell? Culture and Organization, 21(5), 1-29. de Vaujany, F. X. and Vaast, E. (2014). If these walls could talk: The mutual construction of organizational space and legitimacy. Organization Science, 25(3), 713-731. de Vaujany, F. X. and Vaast, E. (2016). Matters of visuality in legitimation practices: Dual iconographies in a meeting room. Organization, 23(5), 763-790. Wasserman, V. (2011). To be (alike) or not to be (at all): Aesthetic isomorphism in organizational spaces. International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion, 4(1), 22-41. Wasserman, V. (2012). Open spaces, closed boundaries: Transparent workspaces as clerical female ghettos. International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion, 5(1), 6-25. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science, 22(2), 503-521. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in between glass ceilings and glass walls: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1485-1505. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209-220. Weber, K. and Glynn, A.N (2006). Making sense

with institutions: Context, thought and action in Karl
Weick's theory, Organization Studies, 27(1), 1639-1660.
Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M. and Obstfeld, D. (2005).
Organizing and the process of sensemaking. Organization
Science, 16(4), 409-421. Willmott, H. (2015). Why
institutional theory cannot be critical. Journal of
Management Inquiry, 24(1), 105-111. Zhang, Z. and Spicer,
A. (2013). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of
hierarchical space in a Chinese bureaucracy. Human
Relations, 67(6), 739-762. Zilber, T. B. (2007). Stories
and the discursive dynamics of institutional
entrepreneurship: The case of Israeli high-tech after the
bubble. Organization Studies, 28 (7), 1035-1054. Zucker, L.
G. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural
persistence. American Journal of Sociology 42(5), 726-743

6 Managing Tensions in an English Cathedral—An Embodied Spatial Perspective

Engel, M. (2011). British Institutions: The Church of England. FT Magazine.

Flores-Pereira, M., Davel, E. and Cavedon, N. (2008). Drinking beer and understanding organizational culture embodiment. Human Relations, 61(7), 1007-1026.

Francis, L., Mansfield, S., E., W. and Village, A. (2010). Applying psychological type theory to Cathedral visitors: A case study of two Cathedrals in England and W ales. Visitor Studies, 13(2), 175-186. Gadamer, H. (1975/2004). Truth and Method, Vol. 2. London: Continuum. Garsten, C. (1999). Betwixt and between: Temporary employees as liminal subjects in flexible organizations. Organization Studies, 20(4), 601-617. The Church of England (2018) Our Vacancies. Retrieved May 9, 2018, from https://

Maddison, J. (2000). Ely Cathedral Design and Meaning. Suffolk: Ely Cathedral Publications. McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. Qualitative Research, 5(4), 455-473. Obrador Pons, P. (2003). Being-on-holiday tourist dwelling, bodies and place. Tourist Studies, 3(1), 47-66. Peltonen, T. (2011). Multiple architectures and the production of organizational space in a Finnish university. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24(6), 806-821. Petani, F. and Mengis, J. (2016). In search of lost space: The process of space planning through remembering and history. Organization, 23(1), 71-89. Pullen, A. and Rhodes, C. (2015). Ethics, embodiment and organizations. Organization, 22(2), 159-165. Radley, A. and Taylor, D. (2003). Images of recovery: A photo-elicitation study on the hospital ward. Qualitative Health Research, 13(1), 77-99. Riach, K. and Wilson, F. (2014). Bodyspace at the pub: Sexual orientations and organizational space. Organization, 21, 329-345. Saldaña, J. (2009). The Coding Manuel for Qualitative Researchers. London: Sage. Shackley, M. (2001). Managing Sacred Sites. London Thomson. Shackley, M. (2002). Space sanctity and service the English Cathedral. International Journal of Tourism Research, 4, 345-352. Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places' at work. Human Relations, 68(4), 633-658. Simonsen, K. (2005). Bodies, sensations, space and time: The contribution from Henri Lefebvre. Human Geography, 87(1), 1-14. Smith, J., Flowers, P. and Larkin, M. (2009). Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis, Theory, Method and Research. London: Sage.

Sturdy, A., Schwarz, M. and Spicer, A. (2006). Guess who's coming to dinner? Structures and used of liminality in strategic management consultancy. Human Relations, 59, 929.

Symon, G. and Cassell, C. (2012). Qualitative Organizational Research Core Methods and Current Challenges. London: Sage. Theos. (2012). Social capital the present and future of English Cathedrals. Retrieved January 10, 2013, from https://www.theosthinktank.co.uk/research/2012/10/12/

W asserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2010). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science (1-19).

Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in between glass ceilings and glass walls: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 35(11), 1485-1505.

Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209-220.

Zhang, Z., Spicer, A. and Hancock, P. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J. G. Ballard. Organization, 15, 889.

7 City Rhythms: Walking and Sensing Place Through Rhythmanalysis

Brenner, N. (2000). The urban question: Reflections on Henri Lefebvre, urban theory and the politics of scale. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 24(2), 361-378.

Brenner, N. and Elden, S. (2009). Henri Lefebvre on state, space, territory. International Political Sociology , 3 (4), 353-377.

Brenner, N. and Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a new epistemology of the urban? City, 19(2-3), 151-182. CityofLondon.gov.uk (2017). Statistics About the City. Retrieved July 12, 2017, from

French, S., Leyshon, A. and Thrift, N. (2009). A very geographical crisis: The making and breaking of the 2007-2008 financial crisis. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society , 2(2), 287-302. Halford, S. (2004). Towards a sociology of organizational space. Sociological Research Online, 9(1). Retrieved from www.socresonline.org.uk/9/1/halford.html Hall, T., Lashua, B. and Coffey, A. (2008). Sound and the everyday in qualitative research. Qualitative inquiry, 14(6), 1019-1040. Ho, K. (2009). Liquidated: An Ethnography of Wall Street. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. King, A. D. (1990). Global Cities: Post-Imperialism and the Internationalization of London . Abingdon: Taylor & Francis. Kornberger , M. and Clegg, S. (2003). The architecture of complexity. Culture and Organization , 9 (2), 75-91. Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. R. (2004). Bringing space back in: Organizing the generative building. Organization Studies, 25(7), 1095-1114. Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. Ethnography, 4(3), 455-485.

Lefebvre, H. (1971). Everyday Life in the Modern World (translated by Sacha Rabinovitch). London: Blooomsbury. Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space (translated by Donald NicholsonSmith). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. Lefebvre, H. (2003). The Urban Revolution. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. (2004). Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life. London: A&C Black. Lyon, D. (2016). Doing audio-visual montage to explore time and space: The everyday rhythms of Billingsgate Fish Market. Sociological Research Online, 21(3), 12. Matos Wunderlich, F. I. L. I. P. A. (2008). Walking and rhythmicity: Sensing urban space. Journal of

Urban Design, 13(1), 125-139. McCann, E. J. (1999). Race,
protest, and public space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the
US city. Antipode, 31(2), 163-184. McDowell, L. (1997).
Capital Culture: Money, Sex and Power at Work. Oxford:
Blackwell. Merrifield, A. (2006). Henri Lefebvre: A
Critical Introduction. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
Merrifield, A. (2011). The right to the city and beyond:
Notes on a Lefebvrian reconceptualization. City, 15(3-4),
473-481. Meyer, K. (2008). Rhythms, streets, cities. In K.
Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (Eds.),
Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre
(pp. 147-160). London: Routledge.

Paquette, D. and McCartney , A. (2012). Soundwalking and
the bodily exploration of places. Canadian Journal of
Communication, 37(1), 135. Pink, S. (2007). Walking with
video. Visual Studies, 22(3), 240-252. Porter, R. (1998).
London: A Social History. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press. Pressman, E. (Producer) and Stone, O. (Director).
(1987). Wall Street (Motion Picture). United States: 20th
Century Fox. Prigge, W. (2008). Reading the urban
revolution: Space and representation. In K. Goonewardena,
S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom and C. Schmid (Eds.), Space,
Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre (pp.
46-61). London: Routledge. Raulet-Croset, N. and Borzeix,
A. (2014). Researching spatial practices through
commentated walks: "on the move" and "walking with."
Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 3(1), 27-42.
Reinhart, C.M. and Rogoff, K.S., (2008). Is the 2007 US
sub-prime financial crisis so different? An international
historical comparison. American Economic Review, 98(2),
339-344.

Roberts, R. and Kynaston, D. (2002). City State: A
Contemporary History of the City of London and How Money T
riumphed. London: Profile. Scorsese, M. (Producer and
Director). (2013). The Wolf of Wall Street (Motion
Picture). Hollywood, California: Paramount Pictures. Sikka,
P. (2009). Financial crisis and the silence of the
auditors. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34 (6),
868-873.

Simpson, P. (2008). Chronic everyday life: Rhythmanalysing
street performance. Social & Cultural Geography, 9(7),
807-829. Simpson, P. (2012). Apprehending everyday rhythms:
Rhythmanalysis, time-lapse photography, and the
space-times of street performance. Cultural Geographies,
19(4), 423-445. Soja, E. W. (1998). Thirdspace: Journeys to
Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places. Capital &
Class, 22(1), 137-139.

Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews , 9(4), 325-346. Thibaud, J. P. (2013). Commented city walks. Wi: Journal of Mobile Culture, 7(1), 1-32.

Thrift, N. (1996). Spatial Formations, Vol. 42. London: Sage. Thrift, N. (2005). But malice aforethought: Cities and the natural history of hatred. T ransactions of the institute of British Geographers, 30 (2), 133-150. Tyler, M. (2011). Tainted love: From dirty work to abject labour in Soho's sex shops. Human Relations, 64(11), 1477-1500. Tyler, M. and Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. Organization Studies , 31 (2), 175-198. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in between glass ceilings and glass walls: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1485-1505. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organiza tion, 11 (3), 209-220. Zukin, S. (1991). Landscapes of Power. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

8 Lunch Beat, Lefebvre and the Politics of Organizational Space

Beyes, T. and Steyaert, C. (2011). Spacing organization: Non-representational theory and performing organizational space. Organization, 19(1), 45-61.

Biehl-Missal, B. (2016). Filling the 'empty space': Site-specific dance in a techno club. Culture and Organization, DOI: 10.1080/14759551.2016.1206547

Braverman, H. (1974). Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Deregulation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Carr, A. N. and Zanetti, L. A. (2000). The emergence of a Surrealist movement and its vital estrangement-effect in organization studies. Human Relations, 53(7), 891-921. Cederström, C. and Spicer, A. (2015). The Wellness Syndrome. Cambridge: Polity Press. Clegg, S. and Kornberger, M. (Eds.) (2006). Space, Organizations and Management Theory. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press. Cohen, S. and Taylor, L. (1992). Escape Attempts. The Theory and Practice of Resistance to Everyday Life. London and New York: Routledge. Connellan, K. (2013). The psychic life of white: Power and space. Organization Studies, 34(10), 1529-1549. Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality. Organization, 12(5), 649-678. Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). Spaces of Organization and the Organization of Space. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. De Certeau, M. (1984). The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press. DW English. (2012). Lunch Beat—Midday dancing in Stockholm. Retrieved November 11, 2017, from www .youtube.com/watch?v=mjR0FyFAQu0 Echols, A. (2010). Hot Stuff: Disco and the Remaking of American Culture. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company. Elden, S. (2001). Politics, philosophy, geography: Henri Lefebvre in recent AngloAmerican scholarship. Antipode, 33(5), 809-825. Elden, S. (2004a). Understanding Henri Lefebvre. London and New York: Continuum. Elden, S. (2004b). Between Marx and Heidegger: Politics, philosophy and Lefebvre's The Production of Space. Antipode, 36(1), 86-105. Fazer Group. (n.d.). Fazer's Know-How in Food Services Was Inherited From Women Who Served as Caterers During the War. Retrieved from www.fazer group.com/about-us/history—heritage/fazer-and-lotta-svard/ Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (translated by A. Sheridan). New York: Random House. Gabriel, Y. (1995). The unmanaged organization:

Stories, fantasies and subjectivity. Organization Studies, 16(3), 477-501. Grindon, G. (2013). Revolutionary romanticism: Henri Lefebvre's revolution-asfestival. Third Text, 27(2), 208-220. Held, D. (1980). Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas (Vol. 261). Berkeley: University of California Press. Hernes, T. (2004). The Spatial Construction of Organization. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Karlsson, P. (2010). Lunch Beat Stockholm #1 [Video]. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from www.youtube.com/watch?v=WlLRGy_1Y5k&feature=youtu.be& list=PLVWEwN391vOeyghk1ny4S20fBZNWakdFq%29 Kingma, S. (2008). Dutch casino space or the spatial organization of entertainment. Culture and Organization, 14, 31-48. Lefebvre, H. (1957, reprinted 2000). Pyrénées. Pau: Cairn. Lefebvre, H. (1963). La vallée de Campan, études de sociologie rurale. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Lefebvre, H. (1975). Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Ou, le Royaume des Ombres. Paris: Casterman. Lefebvre, H. (1979). Space: social product and use value. In: Freiberg, J. W. (Ed.). Critical sociology: European perspectives (pp. 285-295). Irvington, NY: Halsted Press. Lefebvre, H. (1980). Marxism exploded. Review (Fernand Braudel Center), 4(1), 19-32. Lefebvre, H. (1991a). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (1991b). Critique of Everyday Life. London and New York: Verso. Lukács, G. (1971). History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics (Vol. 215). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Lizardo, O. (2007). Fight Club, or the cultural contradictions of late capitalism. Journal for Cultural Research, 11(3), 221-243. Lunch Beat. (2011). If It's Your First Time at Lunch Beat, You Have to Dance. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from www.lunchbeat.org Manzoor, S. (2012, May 31). Lunch Beat entices office workers to mid-day 60-minute boogie. The Guardian. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from www.theguardian.com/

Marikar, S. (2013, May 8). It's lunchtime: Let's dance. New York Times. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/ Marx, K. (1887). Capital. A critique of political economy. Moscow: Progress Publishers. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from www.marxists.org/archive/marx/ works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-I.pdf McLeod, K. (2006). "A Fifth of Beethoven": Disco, classical music, and the politics of inclusion. American Music, 24(3), 347-363. Merrifield, A. (2000). Henri Lefebvre: A socialist in space. In M. Crang and N. Thrif (Eds.), Thinking Space (pp. 167-182). London and New York: Routledge. Morgan, G. (2006). Images of organization (updated edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage. Morgan, G., Frost, P. J. and Pondy, L. R. (1983). Organizational symbolism. Organizational Symbolism,

3, 35. Olson, P. (2012, May 16). Meet the woman behind Europe's new lunchtime dance craze. Forbes. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from www.forbes.com/ Pajunen, J. (2017). Lunch disco- the new best practice from the Finnish Tax Administration. Retrieved November 7, 2017, from https://twitter.com/JenniPajunen/ status/903266378492239874 Pallasmaa, J. (2014). Space, place and atmosphere. Emotion and peripheral perception in architectural experience. Lebenswelt – experience and philosophy in architecture, 4, 230-245. https://doi.org.10.13130/2240-9599/4202 Pavis, P . (2003). Analyzing Performance, Theater, Dance, and Film. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Peltonen, T. (2012). Exploring organizational architecture and space: A case for heterodox research. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 20(1), 68–81. Ropo, A. & Sauer, E. (2008). Corporeal Leaders. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Eds.), New Approaches in Management and Organization (pp. 469-478). London: Sage.

Ross, K. and Lefebvre, H. (1997). Lefebvre on the situationists: An interview . October, 79, 69–83. Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'temporary dwelling places' at work. Human Relations, 68(4), 633–658. Steven, P. (1980). Saturday Night Fever just dancing. Jump Cut, 23, 13-16. Ta, L. M. (2006). Hurt so good: Fight Club, masculine violence, and the crisis of capitalism. The Journal of American Culture, 29(3), 265–277. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9, 325–346. Vicky, L. (2014). Situating the factory canteen in discourses of health and industrial work in Britain (1914-1939). Le Mouvement Social, 2(247), 65. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209–220. Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space? ephemera, 6(2), 219-223.

9 Cake and the Open Plan Office: A Foodscape of Work Through a Lefebvrian Lens

Flowers, R. and Swan, E. (Eds.) (2013). Food Pedagogies. London: Ashgate Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1991). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. London: Penguin.

Freidberg, S. (2010). Perspective and power in the ethical foodscape. Environment and Planning A, 42, 1868-1874.

Gallagher, J. (2016, June 24). Office cake culture is 'danger to health'. BBC News. Retrieved December 19, 2016, from www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-36608269 Glanz, K., Sallis, J., Saelens, B. and Frank, L. (2005). Healthy nutrition environments: Concepts and measures. American Journal of Health Promotion, 19, 330-333. Goodman, M., Maye, D. and Holloway, L. (2010). Ethical foodscapes? Premises, promises and possibilities. Environment and Planning A, 42, 1782-1796. Harper, D. (2002). Talking about pictures: A case for photo elicitation. Visual Studies, 17(1), 13-26. Hatch, M. J. (1990). The symbolics of office design: An empirical exploration. In P. Gagliardi (Ed.), The Symbolics of Organizational Artefacts (pp. 129-146). Berlin: de Gruyter. Hultén, B., Broweus, N. and van Dijk, M. (2009). Sensory Marketing. London: Palgrave Macmillan. Johnston, J., Rodney, A. and Szabo, M. (2012). Place, ethics and everyday eating: A tale of two neighbourhoods. Sociology, 46(6), 1091-1108. Kiffin, K. M., Wansink, B., Devine, C. M. and Sobal, J. (2015). Eating together at the firehouse: How workplace commensality relates to the performance of firefighters. Human Performance, 28(4), 281-306. Klein, N. (2002). Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Frontlines of the Globalization Debate. London: Harper Perrrenial. Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Social Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Lindsay, J. (2017, June 28). Stop Food Shaming in the Office. Metro. Retrieved August 7, 2017, from http://metro.co.uk/2017/06/28/stop-food-shaming-in-the-office-6740630/ Mikkelsen, B. (2011). Images of foodscapes: Introduction to foodscape studies and tier application in the study of healthy eating out-of-home environments. Royal Society for Public Health, 131(5), 209-216. Nath, J. (2011). Gendered fare? A qualitative investigation of alternative food and masculinities. Journal of Sociology, 47(3), 261-278. Parker, M. (2008). Eating with the Mafia: Belonging and violence. Human Relations, 61(7), 989-1006. Pink, S. (2007). Doing Visual Ethnography. London: Sage.

Plester, B. (2015). Ingesting the organization: The embodiment of organizational food rituals. Culture and Organization, 21(3), 251-268. Poulsen, S. and Jørgensen, M. (2011). Social shaping of food intervention initiatives at worksite: Canteen takeaway schemes at two Danish hospitals. Royal Society for Public Health, 131(5), 225-230. Ray, J. and Smith, A. (2012). Using photographs to research organizations: Evidence, considerations and application in a field study. Organizational Research Methods, 15(2), 288-315. Riach, K. and Warren, S. (2015). Smell organization: Bodies and corporeal porosity in office work. Human Relations, 68(5), 789-809. Ritzer, G. (1993). The McDonaldization of Society. London: Sage. Rosen, M. (1985). Breakfast at Spiro's: Dramaturgy and dominance. Journal of Management, 11, 31-48. Rosen, M. (1988). You asked for it: Christmas at the bosses' expense. Journal of Management Studies, 25, 463-480. Roy, D. (1959). Banana time: Job satisfaction and informal interaction. Human Organization, 18(4), 158-168. Royal Society for Public Health. (2016). Health in a Hurry: The Impact of Rush Hour Commuting on Our Health and Well-Being. London: Royal Society for Public Health. Saldaña, J. (2012). The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. London: Sage. Shaw, D. (2016, March 6). Office Etiquette: Five rules for eating at your desk. Retrieved December 19, 2016, from www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-35717493 Shields, R. (1999). Lefebvre, Love and Struggles: Spatial Dialectics. London: Routledge. Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places' at work. Human Relations, 68(4), 633-658. Shortt, H. and Warren, S. (2012). Fringe benefits: Valuing the visual in narratives of hairdressers' identities at work. Visual Studies, 27(1), 18-24. Sobal, J. and Wonsink, B. (2007). Kitchenscapes, tablescapes, platescapes, and foodscapes: Influences of microscale built environments on food intake. Environment and Behaviour, 39(1), 124-142. Strangleman, T. (2010). Food, drink and the cultures of work: Consumption in the life and death of an English factory. Food, Culture and Society, 13(2), 260-280. Stroebaek, P. S. (2013). Let's have a cup of coffee! Coffee and coping communities at work. Symbolic Interaction, 36(4), 381-397. Sturdy, A., Schwarz, M. and Spicer, A. (2006). Guess who's coming to dinner? Structures and uses of liminality in strategic management consultancy. Human Relations, 59, 1-32. Swinburn, B. Egger, G. and Raza, F. (1999). Dissecting obesogenic environments: The development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity. Preventive Medicine, 29, 563-570. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: A narrative review of research on

organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325-346. Thanem, T. (2009). 'There's no limit to how much you can consume': The new public health and the struggle to manage healthy bodies. Culture and Organization, 15(1), 59-74. Throsby, K. (2012). Dreaming of Jelly Babies: English Channel Swimming and the Challenges and Comforts of Food. BSA Food Study Group Conference, Food and Society, British Library. Turner, V. (1982). From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications. Underhill, P. (2000). Why We Buy: The Science of Shopping. New York: Touchstone. Underhill, P. (2004). The Call of the Mall: How We Shop. London: Profile Books Ltd. Valentine, G. (2002). In-corporations: Food, bodies and organizations. Body and Society, 8(2), 1-20. Van Leeuwen, T. and Jewitt, C. (Eds.). (2001). Handbook of Visual Analysis. London: Sage. Visser, M. (1991). The Rituals of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities, and Meaning of Table Manners. London: Penguin. Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2012). The spatial implications of homeworking: A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based working. Organization , 19(1), 63-79. Warren, S. (2002). Show me how it feels to work here: Using photography to research organizational aesthetics. ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organizations, 2(3), 224-245. Warren, S. (2005). Photography and voice in critical qualitative management research. Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 18(6), 861-882. Warren, S. and Riach, K. (2017). Olfactory control, aroma power and organizational smellscapes. In V. Henshaw, G. Warnaby, K. McClean and C. Perkins (Eds.), Designing With Smell: Practices, Techniques and Challenges. London: Routledge, forthcoming/ in print. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2015). Spatial work in between glass ceiling and glass walls: Gender-class intersectionality and organizational aesthetics. Organization Studies, 36(11), 1485-1505. Wasserman, V., Rafaeli, A. and Kluger, A. (2000). Aesthetic symbols as emotional cues. In S. Fineman (Ed.), Emotion in Organisations. London: Sage. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209-220. Williams, J. (1997). 'We never eat like this at home': Food on holiday. In P. Caplan (Ed.), Food, Health and Identity. London: Routledge.

10 Exploring the Spatial Dynamics of the City: A Case Study in China

Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (1996). Writings on Cities. Malden: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (2004). Rhythmanalysis. London: Continuum.

Lefebvre, H. (2008). Critique of Everyday Life, Vol. I, II, III. London: Verso.

Prior, L. (1995). The architecture of the hospital: A study of spatial organization and medical knowledge. The British Journal of Sociology, 39(1), 86–113. Shields, R. (1999). Lefebvre, Love and Struggle: Spatial Dialectics. London: Routledge. Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places' at work. Human Relations, 68(4), 633–658. Soja, E. (2000). Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions. Oxford: Blackwell. Spicer, A. (2006). Beyond the convergent-divergence debate: The role of spatial scales in transforming organizational logic. Organization Studies, 27(10), 1467–1483. Strati, A. (1996). Organizations viewed through the lens of aesthetics. Organization, 3(2), 209–218. Taylor, S. and Spicer, A. (2007). Time for space: An interpretive review of research on organizational spaces. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(4), 325–346. Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2012). The spatial implications of homeworking: A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based work. Organization, 19(1), 63–79. Wasserman, V. and Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational aesthetics: Caught between identity regulation and culture jamming. Organization Science, 22(2), 503–521. Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representations: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(3), 209–220. Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The everyday production of hierarchical space. Human Relations, 67(6), 739–762. Zhang, Z., Spicer, A. and Hancock, P. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J.G. Ballard. Organization, 15(6), 889–910.

11 Producing the Space of Democracy: Spatial Practices and Representations of Urban Space in Spain's Transition to Democracy

Bilbao Larrondo, L. (2006). La Vivienda en Bilbao: Los años sesenta. Años de cambio. Ondare. Cuadernos de Artes Plásticas y Monumentales, 25, 81-86.

Box Varela, Z. (2008). La fundación de un régimen. La construcción simbólica del franquismo (Tesis doctoral). Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Brillembourg, C. (2006). José Castillo: Urbanism of the informal. Bomb Magazine, 94(winter), 28-35. Retrieved from http://www.bombsite.com/issues/94/ articles/2798 Google Scholar Capel Sáez, H. (1962). Las Migraciones Interiores Definitivas en España. Estudios Geográficos, XXIV, 600-602. Castells, M. & Portes, A. (1989). World underneath: The origins, dynamics and the effects of the informal economy. In A. Portes, M. Castells, L. Benton (Eds.), The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries (pp. 11-37). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. Castells, M. (2009). Productores de ciudad: el movimiento ciudadano de Madrid in Pérez. In V. Quintana and P. Sánchez León (Eds.), Memoria Ciudadana y movimiento vecinal. Madrid 1968-2008 (pp. 21-32). Madrid: Catarata. COPLACO (1977). Informe sobre participación pública en el planeamiento metropolitan. Madrid: Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Urbanismo. de Souza Briggs, X. (2005). Social capital and segregation in the United States. In Varady D. P. (Ed.), Desegregating the City: Ghettos, Enclaves and Inequality (pp. 79-101). New York: State University of New York. Elden, S. (2004). Understanding Henri Lefebvre. Theory and the Possible. London: Continuum. Grafmayer, Y. (1994). Regards sociologiques sure la segregation. In La Ségrégation dans la ville (pp. 85-117). Paris: L'Harmattan. Higueras, Arnal, A. (1967). La Emigración Interior en España. Madrid: Ediciones Mundo del Trabajo. Hoskyns, T. (2014). The Empty Place. Democracy and Public Space. London: Routledge. Le Corbusier (1973). The Athens Charter (translated by A. Eardely). New York: Grossman Publishers. Lehman-Frisch, S. (2011). Segregation, spatial (in)justice, and the city. Berkeley Planning Journal, 24(1), 70-90. Lefebvre, H. (1976). The Survival of Capitalism: Reproduction of the Relations of Production (translated by F. Bryant). New York: St. Martin's Press. Lefebvre, H. (1976-78). De l'État. Paris: UGE. Lefebvre, H. (1991a). The Production of Space (translated by D. Nicholson-Smith). Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (1996). Writings on Cities (translated and introduced by E. Kofman

and E. Lebas). Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (2003a). Key
Writings (edited by S. Elden, E. Lebas and E. Kofman).
London: Continuum. Lefebvre, H. (2003b). The Urban
Revolution (translated by R. Bonnano). Minneapolis, MN:
University of Minnesota Press. Leloup, X. (1999). "Distance
et différence entre nationalité: La ségrégation
résidentielle des populations étrangères dans un contexte
urbain." Recherches Soci ologiques, 1. Mayer, M. (2012).
The "right to the city" in urban social movements. In N.
Brenner, P. Marcuse, and M. Mayer (Eds.), Cities for
People Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right
to the City (pp. 63-85). London: Routledge. Meseta de
Orcasitas (1982). Boletín Informativo, no. 1 (abril).
Ofer, I. (2017). Claiming the City and Contesting the State
Squatting, Community Formation and Democratisation in
Spain (1955-1986). London: Routledge. Park, R. E. (1926).
The urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and Moral Order.
In R. H. Turner (Ed.), Robert E Park on Social Control and
Collective Behavior. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago
Press. Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right
to the city and urban politics of the inhabitants.
GeoJournal, 58, 99-108. Purcell, M. (2003). Citizenship and
the right to the global city: Reimagining the capitalist
world order. International Journal of Urban and Regional
Research, 27(3), 564-590. Raymond, H. (1974). Habitat,
modèles cultureless et architecture. In H. Raymond, J. M.
Stébé and A. Mathieu Fritz (Eds.), Architecture
urbanistique et société (pp. 213-229). Paris:
L'Harmattan. Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality toward an
epistemology of planning. Journal of the American Planning
Association, 71(2), 147-158. Sambricio, C. (2004). Madrid,
vivienda y urbanismo: 1900-1960. Madrid: AKAL. Sennet, R.
(2006). The Open City, LSE Cities. Retrieved from
https://lsecities.net/
media/objects/articles/the-open-city/en-gb/ Shields, R.
(1999) Lefebvre, Love and Struggle. London: Routledge.
Siguán, M. (1959). Del campo al suburbio. Un estudio sobre
la inmigración interior en España, Madrid: C. S. I. C.
Stanek, L. (2011). Henri Lefebvre on Space. Architecture,
Urban Research, and the Production of Theory, Minneapolis,
MN: University of Minnesota Press. Terán, F. (1982).
Planeamiento urbano en la españa contemporanea (1900-1980).
Madrid: Alianza Universidad Textos.

Cooke, B. (2006). The cold war origin of action research as managerialist cooptation. Human Relations, 59(5), 665-693. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10. 1177/0018726706066176

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in organizational control. Organization, 12(5), 649-678. Retrieved from https://doi. org/10.1177/1350508405055940

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2008). The Spaces of Organisation and the Organisation of Space: Power, Identity and Materiality at Work. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dar, S. (2007). Negotiating autonomy: Organising identities in NGOs. Journal of Health Management, 9(2), 161-188. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/ 097206340700900202

Dar, S. and Cooke, B. (2008). The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization. London: Zed Books.

Davis, M. (2007). Planet of Slums. New York: Verso.

Elden, S. (2004). Understanding Henri Lefebvre—Theory and the Possible. London and New York: Continuum.

Fleming, P. and Spicer, A. (2008). Beyond power and resistance: New approaches to organizational politics. Management Communication Quarterly, 21(3), 301-309. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907309928

Fleury, S. (2012). Militarização do social como estratégia de integração: o caso da UPP do Santa Marta. Sociologias, 14(30), 194-222. Retrieved from https://doi. org/10.1590/S1517-45222012000200007

Hancock, P. and Spicer, A. (2011). Academic architecture and the constitution of the new model worker. Culture and Organization, 17(2), 91-105. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2011.544885

Hirst, A. and Humphreys, M. (2013). Putting power in its place: The centrality of edgelands. Organization Studies, 34(10), 1505-1527. Retrieved from https://doi. org/10.1177/0170840613495330

Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. R. (2003). Reflections on space, structure and their impact on organisations. European Spatial Research and Policy, 10(2).

Kornberger, M. and Clegg, S. R. (2004). Bringing space back in: Organizing the generative building. Organization Studies, 25(7), 1095-1114. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840604046312

Lacerda, D. S. (2015). Rio de Janeiro and the divided state: Analysing the political discourse on favelas. Discourse & Society, 26(1), 74-94. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926514541346 Lacerda, D. S. (2016). The production of spatial hegemony as statecraft: An attempted passive revolution in the favelas of Rio. Third World Quarterly, 37(6), 1-19. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.1109437 Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Machado, L. A. (2010). Afinal, qual é a das UPPS? Observatório Das Metrópoles, 1-7. Maréchal, G., Linstead, S. and Munro, I. (2013). The territorial organization: History, divergence and possibilities. Culture and Organization, 19(3), 185-208. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2013.812703 Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative Researching (2nd ed.). London: Sage. Mir, R., Mir, A. and Srinivas, N. (2004). Managerial knowledge as property: The role of universities. Organization Management Journal, 1(October 2012), 37-41. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1057/omj.2004.23 Munro, I. and Jordan, S. (2013). "Living Space" at the Edinburgh festival fringe: Spatial tactics and the politics of smooth space. Human Relations, 66(11), 1497- 1520. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713480411 Srinivas, N. (2008). Managerialism and NGO Advocacy: Handloom weavers in India. In S. Dar and B. Cooke (Eds.), The New Development Management (pp. 74-90). London: Zed Books. T aylor, F. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management (Vol. 7). New York: Harper. Tyler, M. and Cohen, L. (2010). Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational space. Organization Studies, 31(2), 175-198. Retrieved from https:// doi.org/10.1177/0170840609357381 Wapshott, R. and Mallett, O. (2012). The spatial implications of homeworking : A Lefebvrian approach to the rewards and challenges of home-based work. Organization, 19(1), 63-79. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508411405376 Watkins, C. (2005). Representations of space, spatial practices and spaces of representation: An application of Lefebvre's spatial triad. Culture and Organization, 11(February 2015), 209-220. Retrieved from

https://doi.org/10.1080/14759550 500203318 Willis, G. D. and Prado, M. M. (2014). Process and pattern in institutional reforms: A case study of the police pacifying units (UPPs) in Brazil. World Development, 64, 232-242. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.06.006 Wilson, J. (2014). The violence of abstract space: Contested regional developments in Southern Mexico. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 38(2), 516-538. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12023 Zhang, Z. (2006). What is lived space? Ephemera, 6(2), 219-223. Zhang, Z., Spicer, A. and Hancock, P. (2008). Hyper-organizational space in the work of J. G. Ballard. Organization, 15(6), 889-910. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508408095819

13 Future Directions: Henri Lefebvre and Spatial Organization

Castells, M. (1996). The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Castells, M. (2001). The Internet Galaxy. Reflexions on the Internet, Business and Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Courpasson, D. (2017). The politics of everyday. Organization Studies, 38, 843-859.

Elden, S. (2004). Understanding Henri Lefebvre—Theory and the Possible. London and New York: Continuum.

Elden, S., Lebas, E. and Kofman, E. (2003). Henri Lefebvre. Key Writings. London: Bloomsbury.

Kingma, S. F. (2016). The constitution of 'third workspaces' in between the home and the corporate office. New Technology, Work and Employment, 31, 176-193.

Kipfer, S., Schmid, C., Goonewardena, K., et al. (2008). Globalizing Lefebvre? In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom, et al. (Eds.), Space, Difference, Everyday Life. Reading Henri Lefebvre. New York: Routledge. Lefebvre, H. (1969 [1968]). The Explosion: Marxism and the French Upheaval (translated by Alfred Ehrenfeld). New York: Modern Reader. Lefebvre, H. (1991 [1974]). The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell. Lefebvre, H. (2003 [1970]). The Urban Revolution (translated by R. Bononno. Foreword by N. Smith). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. Lefebvre, H. (2003 [1981]). The end of modernity? In S. Elden, E. Lebas, and E. Kofman (Eds.), Henri Lefebvre. Key Writings (pp. 105-107). London: Bloomsbury . Lefebvre, H. (2014 [1947, 1961, 1981]). Critique of Everyday Life. One Volume Edition. Vol I, II, III (translated by J. Moore and by G. Elliott; prefaces by M. Trebitsch). London: Verso. McDowell, L. (1997). Capital Culture: Money, Sex and Power at Work. Oxford: Blackwell. Merrifield, A. (2006). Henri Lefebvre. A Critical Introduction . New York: Routledge. Meyer, J. W. and Bromley, P. (2013). The worldwide expansion of 'Organization'. Sociological Theory, 31, 366-389. Shields, R. (1999). Lefebvre, Love & Struggle. Spatial Dialectics. London and New York: Routledge. Shortt, H. (2015). Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places' at work. Human Relations, 68, 633-658. Simonsen, K. (2005). Bodies, sensations, space and time: The contribution from Henri

Lefebvre. Geografiska Annaler, 87B(1), 1-14. Thrift, N.
(2005). Knowing Capitalism. London: Sage. Yeung, HW-C.
(1998). The social-spatial constitution of business
organizations: A geographical perspective. Organization,
5, 101-128.

Zhang, Z. and Spicer, A. (2014). 'Leader, you first': The
everyday production of hierarchical space in a Chinese
bureaucracy. Human Relations, 47, 739-762.