Designing and managing the space for creativity. Artistic interventions for strategic development of an organization in resisting environment

Marja Soila-Wadman

Gothenburg University, School of Business, Economics and Law and School of Design and Crafts (HDK)

e-mail: marja.soila-wadman@handels.gu.se

Oriana Haselwanter

Gothenburg University, School of Design and Crafts (HDK)

Keywords: Creativity, Artistic interventions, Aesthetics, Design management, Design thinking, Strategy, Organizational development

Creative interventions as a strategic tool in organizations have gained an increased interest with the hope to handle the complex, chaotic and interactional environments in the global competition. In this study we explore an organization which has involved an artist to facilitate a creative change in its working routines. The study is based on qualitative methods inspired by ethnography. Aesthetic perspective on organizations, design thinking and artistic intervention literature form the main theoretical frame. In the first phase of the two-year-long intervention project we have noticed a lot of problems depending on the differing business logics and the artistic logics, the artistic and designerly methods in practice have shown a lot of similarities.

1. INTRODUCTION

In our society new ways of finding strategic advantages in different kinds of business have largely focused on creativity (DeFillippi & al. 2007). Maybe the popularity of the concept creativity in contemporary discussion tells about a wish to find solutions to any kind of problems, but it is also evaluated critically, as a buzz word worth questioning (Ericsson 2001; Rehn 2009; Styhre & Sundgren 2005). Surely, a number of firms reach out to people working with creativity, like professional artists and designers. Companies ask for creative and innovative solutions by exploiting "the creatives" skills and exotic mindsets in order to generate economic profit and stimulate idea generation amongst employees, or at least attract

public attention and hence raise the value of the company. Norman (2010) claims that applying design thinking in companies is a powerful public relations term.

Design management has been one of the fields which has been associated with ideas of strategic management of the creative resources in companies (Borja de Mozota 2008; Kim and Chung 2007; Liedtka 2010, 2011). As Walton (2006) states, instead of asking if design makes a difference, the question nowadays is how design makes a difference. However, there are scholars who have criticized design management discourse in the sense that the view on creativity is too instrumental and is focused on the cognitive aspects in knowledge creation. Consequently, there exist opinions that aesthetics, art and cultural aspects, too, would be included in design management and design thinking (Digerfelt-Månsson 2009; Jahnke 2013; Johansson & Woodilla 2010; Verganti 2006; Venkatesh & al. 2012). Verganti (2006) emphasizes that design discourse is created in a network consisting of users, companies, products, designers, design schools, artists, cultural and communication actors which facilitates different kind of interactions allowing imagination to flourish. Parallel thoughts, concerning art being created in a network of several actors, have been presented by Guillet de Monthoux (2004). How inspiration from art and the cultural world, as well as aesthetics, can facilitate efforts to increase creativity in different kinds of organizations and companies has been of growing interest during the last decades (Austin & Devin 2003; Gagliardi 1996; Guillet de Monthoux 2004; Ladkin & Taylor 2010; Linstead & Höpfl 2000; Strati 1999; artist in residence, www. resartis.org, 20110620).

One of the organizations which has responded to the challenge of developing new, creative working methods is the Swedish trade union "GREEN" which is working in somewhat resisting environment in the society. According to Institute for Advanced Labour Studies, University of Amsterdam (Visser 2010), the membership numbers have fallen from a peak level of 86% in 1995 to 71 % at 2010. The same tendency can be identified in Sweden, too. In order to encounter the declining membership numbers a core group in "GREEN" consisting of eight persons, "Group8", situated at "Holmen" in the city G, has been assembled. As a tool, with focus on the internal strategic development of Group8's working routines, a company "LITTL" with artistic interventions in organizations as its business idea has been involved. Besides *increasing creativity* in Group8 the goal for the cooperation between LITTL and Group8 is, eventually, to *find out new, innovative working methods*. As a

part of improving the image of the union Group8 wants *to learn* about creativity and innovations in order to communicate the lessons in further contacts with old and potential new members.

Although there exists increased interest on design management, design thinking and artistic interventions in organizations with the aim of developing the business, it is tricky to analyse which are the consequences. Why this marriage between business and design world would work, if it works, Liedtka (2010) asks, stating that there is an asymmetry in the thinking systems between the creative and the business world. Business thinking expects rationality and clean economic logic with quantifiable measurements, and executives value stability and control. In contrast, design thinking assumes always more or less messy real life human experiences, and reality is socially constructed (ibid). It is problematic to measure and evaluate the impact of creative initiatives and the outcomes don't necessarily will be what is expected (Biehl-Missal and Berthoin Antal, 2011; Barry & Meisiek, 2010). There are also differences in design thinking and art belonging to two different traditions, and there has been little cross-disciplinary research, state Johansson and Woodilla (2012).

Consequently, in this study we explore what differences and similarities of artistic interventions and design thinking can be found in a business development process (on the example of the GREEN Group8 Holmen project)? What can be learned from such approaches and what is needed to support these efforts?

By focusing on artistic innovations and design thinking as conceptual and practical tools in strategic development of an organization our *purpose* is to raise appreciation for the creative approaches in business and organizational world. We also want to present some insights in the artistic intervention process in order to summarize experiences from the ArtRes project during the Spring 2013 as a base for the further intervention process. - In the long run the overall purpose of this two years long study is to create theoretical, empirical and methodological understanding for strategic development in organizations with help of the artistic and design methods in order to increase creativity and innovations.

However, the study is about the intervention process during the first months of the project, and our aim might be described like going to the location in order to conduct an ethnographic study, be open to what is happening and thereby setting the stage for the further research, both empirical and theoretical. Consequently, the results, analysis and discussion should be

viewed as the first reflections on the case of impacting artistic or designerly skills on business development.

2. THEORETICAL INSPIRATION

In this part we are presenting first the concepts of creativity and innovation. Second, perspectives and opinions on strategy, design management and design thinking are reviewed. After that follows a part on arts management and artistic interventions.

Creativity and innovations

Styhre and Sundgren (2005) present four different streams of research on **creativity**, e.g. creative processes, creative people, creative products and creative environments, stating that, at the inception of the field, it concentrated on the individual perspective; however, later on, interest focused on the contexts where creativity occurs. In organizational literature, creativity is often conceptualised as finding out something new, as new useful ideas, products, processes, procedures, and services (Amabile & al. 2004). In both public and private organizations, great efforts are made to find these new ways of managing the global problematic, states Koivunen and Rehn (2009). They continue by saying that, although creativity was previously greatly connected with the fields of art and culture, nowadays the basic premise of theoretical reasoning must be that creativity exists in all areas and every single person must be acknowledged as a source of creativity.

How creativity can be manifested interesting ideas can be found in process thinking (Hernes & Maitling, 2012). Chia & King (1998) argues that new situations, events and outcomes, incorporate the events into their past, providing opportunities for something new to emerge, but that also brings restrictions. According to process thinking, creativity and becoming are immanent in all living systems. Instead of viewing organizations as thing like social entities, they would be seen as processes of world-making. Mary Parker Follet is one of those raising the question of creativity as a collective action needed in a dynamic society (1919, 1924 www.folletfoundation.org/writings, 2011-05-31). She writes about social communities as creative processes and uses a relational, interactive perspective, arguing that if something new is to emerge, it will happen when different kinds of encounters and conflicts occur within a community.

Often, the creativity concept is followed by discussions about **innovations**. Koivunen & Rehn (2009) notes the gap in the understanding of the relationship between the two terms,

being partly overlapping, but also distinctive in the sense that creativity would be defined as the *generation of new ideas*, and innovation is understood as the *implementation* of the creative ideas. According to Wennes (2009), economic results are central to the innovation perspective. Johansson and Woodilla (2009) states that innovation is a technological discourse aiming to be knowledgeable about bringing inventions to the market, which do not only need to be product specific – they can also be social (Mulgan, 2007). Styhre (2013) wants to expand the economic discussion concerning innovations to include also playfulness and squandering.

Strategy, design management, strategic management of the creative resources, design and design thinking

Surely, in traditional management thinking on **strategy** in organizations it has been viewed as a tool, largely understood as planning by top manager team, which leads the organization through changes and secures its future success. However, a static view on strategy has been questioned by process thinking (Mintzberg, 1994; Chia & MacKay, 2007)). Mintzberg (1994) states that the future is not given, strategic analysis can't be separated from implementing of it, and formal procedures don't necessarily to contribute to innovation. That means that planned inputs, but also acute everyday arrangements must be done, and we must rely on luck, too. During the recent years an approach called Strategy as practice has gained attention. Johnson & al. (2011) views the strategy as an important social practice. Wittington (2001) argues that *we must study what the people who do strategizing actually do.*

T**he strategic management of the creative resources** has been an important discussion in **the design management field** (Borja de Mozota, 2008; Cooper & al., 2011; Kim and Chung 2007; Liedtka 2010, 2011). According to Cooper & Press (1995) adding value by corporate planning process with help of design can be an individual activity or a management function. The disciplinary boundaries for design can range from engineering to fine art. Accordingly, design management would be viewed as management of design in companies, emphasizing its role in strategic and innovation work (Cooper & al. 2011). There are a lot of definitions and interpretations for the word design and the word can be understood in different ways. Design is making sense (of things) (Krippendorff, 1989), as well as creation and re-creation of meaning (Verganti, 2006). Simon (1996) talks about a framework of problem formulation followed by finding a solution, and Schön (1983) writes about reflection in action –both during and after the designing process. Consequently, as soon as design management moves

into more conceptual spheres of design and expands its scope to not only product development, production, distribution, sales or delivery, *design thinking* becomes relevant as a concept. According to DMI (2013) design thinking describes the use of design for management, therefore it can certainly be argued that design management can include the use of design thinking – or using design processes to solve general business problems. *Design management can be understood as the organizational strategy of design whereas design thinking is the used methodology, and design tools might be the concrete methods used in a design thinking process.*

Concerning the concept **design thinking** the term is generally referred to as applying a designer's sensibility and methods to problem solving (Lockwood 2010). At companies using design as a business strategy, design and designers have moved beyond roles as stylists to catalyze innovation as a core competency (Sato 2009). Hence, when talking about design thinking, it is crucial to make a clear differentiation between *design as practice* (traditional notion of design resulting in a product or service) and *design as method* (design thinking). Design thinking can be seen as the abstracted form of practice-based design. However, Tonkinswise (2011) is critical against design thinking meaning that it is *"design minus aesthetics"*. Kimbell (2009) talks about design thinking reducing design to an immaterial, intellectual problem solving technique, design without the material practice. Brown (2008) states that design thinking helps in the transformation of design from form and style to that of function and structure.

One of the ground rules of design thinking is to apply **a design process** to a more strategic process. This means that iterative, non-linear practices – which are one of the fundamentals of a design process – are utilized for business, product or service development. Therefore, design thinking – with its process focus – is more related to the verb, the process of designing (Liedtka & Mintzberg 2006).

One of the basic ingredients of design process is *the re-definition of the initial problem* or *brief*– being a part of the professional skill of a designer (Norman 2010). The next step of is *the user of the intended product or service in the center* approach (Rylander 2009). Norman & Verganti (2012) says that human- or user-centered design is a philosophy, not a precise set of methods. In the *ideation phase* the design thinkers play with the gathered insights. This often happens in multi-disciplinary teams, which might be the best way to unearth creative possibilities in innovation (Eriksson-Zetterquist& al. 2011). In the next phase to use the

developed ideas, design thinkers make and test without a clear goal by *prototyping* new solutions that arise from their four strengths of empathy, intuition, imagination and idealism. Neumaier (2009) says, that instead of "solving" problems, designers "work through" them. *Failure* is also a significant feature of design thinking (Brown 2009).

Summing up. Design thinking occurs at the merger of business and design and strives to understand the character of designers' sense making (Johansson & Woodilla (2009), its practices aim to improve innovation capability (Jahnke, 2009). It is is argued to be more suitable to solve the vast and complex economic, social and ecological problems of today than traditional "scientific" approaches (Liedtka, 2010; Rylander, 2009). Aesthetics, art and cultural aspects, too, would be included in design thinking (Digerfelt-Månsson 2009; Johansson & Woodilla 2010; Verganti 2006; Venkatesh & al. 2012).

Arts management and Artistic interventions

During the last twenty years interest has been shown in arts management; that is, how ideas in business administration can influence practical organizing procedures in art and culture creating organizations in order to achieve better management (Evrard & Colbert 2000; Fitzgibbon & Kelly 1999; Stenström 2000; Taylor 2012), on the one hand. On the other hand, interest has also been growing concerning how art and the cultural world, as well as issues concerning aesthetics, can create an understanding of organizing and management/leadership in different kinds of organizations and companies (Austin & Devin 2003; Björkegren 1996; Gagliardi 1996; Guillet de Monthoux 2004; Koivunen & Rehn 2009; Linstead & Höpfl 2000; Ladkin & Taylor 2010; artist in residence, www. resartis.org, 20110620; Soila-Wadman & Köping 2009; Strati 1999). Biehl-Missal & Berthoin Antal (2012) claims that companies often are longing for co-operations with art-world thanks to their "otherness". Artists are also said to be more capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries and doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason, which maybe explains why initial communication between managers and artists is prone to be difficult. Grzelec and Prata (2013) writes that the general idea behind artistic interventions is that when the two contrasting logics (the logic of the artist and the logic of the organisation) clash, energy is released in the form of new ideas and deeper understanding for what the organization is doing on an existential or meta-level.

The interventions can range from the use of theatrical presentation workshops to develop employees' confidence, poetry workshops to improve reading and writing skills, sculpture

sessions to stimulate imagination, storytelling activities to encourage knowledge sharing and to improve communication, photography sessions to encourage teambuilding, filmmaking to visualize a group's development, and more. (Biehl-Missal & Berthoin Antal 2011).

Artistic methods can act as the "flavour of the month" or the "creative afternoon", adding something new and engaging to managerial development activities with little idea of what that something is (Biehl-Missal & Berthoin Antal 2011). Even rather low-expectancy projects can have a high impact in the long-run if they manage to keep everyone engaged. Yet the benefits are hard to predict and therefore sometimes difficult to appreciate from a management perspective. For such projects to be "successful" the participants need to be open and develop a high level of *trust* in the performing artist. Because first and foremost, artistic interventions – by the very nature of art – require freedom and trust (Biehl-Missal & Berthoin Antal 2011). Berthoin Antal (2012) declares that, art and artists stimulate us to see, hear and experience more of what is going on within us and around us. This is also when soft skills or tacit knowledge surface (Polanyi 1966). They are hard to evaluate and be taken into serious consideration in a world dominated by quantitative measurable results. Soft skills deal with emotions, feelings and intuition. For artists, these attributes are essential in their way of working, determining their decision-making processes.

Darsö (2004: 135-146) presents a model on how arts may influence the participants in an artistic intervention project to reflect on their everyday view of world and thereby develop a deeper understanding of themselves and how they relate to the circumstances surrounding them. Hopefully this deeper understanding will lead to action. The different phases are named as *downloading, seeing, sensing and presensing, crystallizing, prototyping and embodying*. Taylor & Ladkin (2009) identifies four different parts of artistic interventions regarding soft skills, they exist on their own or in combinations: (1) Skills transfer. Arts-based methods can facilitate the development of artistic skills in a group. (2) Projective technique. The output of artistic endeavours allows participants to reveal inner thoughts and feelings that may not be accessible through more conventional developmental modes. (3) Illustration of essence. Arts-based methods can enable participants to apprehend the "essence" of a concept or tacit knowledge in a specific situation in a particular way, revealing depths and connections. (4) Making. The very making of art can foster a deeper experience of personal presence and connection.

Berthoin Antal and Strauß (2013) have examined 205 publications on arts and business and social impacts of the arts interventions in different kind of organizations. The majority of the cases report impacts of artistic interventions in *activation* (positive experience, emotion, stimulation, energy), *seeing more and differently* (reflection, widen perspectives, awareness of present conditions), *personal development* (discovery of self, personal growth, skills, tools) and *collaborative ways of working* (working together quality, communication quality, communication quantity). Only the fewest saw strategic and operational (profitability / turnover, marketing / PR, strategy, product development, product / service quality, efficiency / productivity, HR development / recruitment) impacts.

3. METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

The text draws on relational constructionism (Gergen 1994; Dachler, Hosking & Gergen 1995), reflective ethnography (Kostera 2007; Law 2004) and narrative knowledge creation (Czarniawska 1998). Process ontology, sense-making and narrative thinking as already noticed in the previous chapter, are the inspirators when looking at creativity, viewed as an on-going process whereby we human beings structure and stabilize the moving social reality (Hernes & Maitlis, 2012; Chia & King 1998). We also want to emphasize the role of aesthetics in knowledge creation, meaning that knowledge creation is not only a chronological, linear, rational process, but also one that is based on our senses, emotions and imagination (Linstead & Höpfl 2000; Strati 1999; Taylor & Hansen 2005; Welsch 1997). Aesthetic reflexivity would be described as knowledge creation "through appropriation and transformation of the sensory and emotional characteristics of our experiences" (Sutherland 2012:1-19).

The empirical investigation part of this report focuses on a collaborative project between two quite different organizations – "GREEN" (a Swedish trade union) and "LITTL" (a creative agency working with artistic interventions). We have been able to monitor the early phases of LITTL's artistic intervention (called the ArtRes project), and conducted interviews with all participants in the project as well as with a lot of related stakeholders. Techniques have included participant observation of meetings and encounters, semi-structured interviews of the Goup8 members, the intervening artists and officials at Green, as well as a focus group conversation after the meeting of designing the action plan for Group8. The interviews are recorded and transcribed. The interventions are in part documented by video and photo, which have been studied as well as other written documents.

4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The main goal and reason for the existence of this ArtRes project is set by GREEN'S board. The aim is to *"attract 8.000 new members within two years. In this context the development of new stadiums and functions of Group8 should be supported by the main organization GREEN. It is hoped that the fruits of this innovation work can be used within GREEN on a national level later on."* (Liinason, 2012).

Touch points for the intervention process

To represent the creative approaches in this project three touch points are selected, the kick-on workshop, the designer workshop and the action plan formulation.

Kick-on: In February 2013 LITTLs artist, who is steering the ArtRes process, started her first "getting-to-know" workshop with Group8. The team was asked to cut out six images from provided newspapers and magazines to represent their **personalities** and glue them on to a plastic cube. In the reflection phase, the participants were supposed to talk about their cubes. The team mostly chose images representing hobbies and interests rather than personalities. Would this task have had different outcomes if the team would have known each other better and been more confident to share personal things? A statement of a participant was: " *I liked that the artist presented her work. This touched me somehow and is certainly something I will remember."* This evidences a first clue for the important emotional aspect of artistic interventions. In the afternoon, everybody went to a nearby photo studio. The two teams were asked to come up with ideas of how to physically **visualise** "strength" and "togetherness" via the medium of photography for the other team respectively. The photoshooting – since very physical in its nature – led to a lot of engagement and cooperation amongst the participants. They seemed to have fun, and learned that ideas can also emerge *along the way* and *do not necessarily need to be determined at the beginning of a process only*.

Designer workshop: The designer workshop was organized by the designer because the team was stuck in the fuzzy phase of a creative process, and constantly asked for clarification, validation and documentation. The assignments were, first, an icebreaking game with sound and ball, second, everyone would tell a story of their lives, and third, brainstorming session to generate different tools and tasks how to visualize their learning process. They also got homework to write down the tools and tasks, and deliver them next week in closed envelopes. The assignments were meant to be clear but open enough to trigger a free flow of ideas. But

this proved to be a difficult part. As soon as it was explained that ideas could be quite random and playful, the team started to loosen up a bit and have fun.

The presentation of the homework results the following week brought fun stories and first good revelations. Although not everybody was able to show something, the learning from this task was beneficial for whole the group. *The participants started to realise that the outcome was actually not as important as the creative process itself.*

Action plan: The first workshop of the action plan formulation immediately raised the question what an action plan was, how it could be understood and what it should lead to. It proved to be a bit tricky to make a clear distinction between the ArtRes action plan and another action plan the project group received from the head office of GREEN in Stockholm, laying out the business related focal points for the company for the next quarter. Later, again a control question from the Group8 project leader about the meaning of the brainstorm came up; whether the ideas should be linked to concrete and practical applicable proposals of how to meet potential GREEN members (the core goal of this project) or focus around things that seem fun to do? This evidences an ongoing confusion about the ArtRes project compared to GREEN's business strategy. A statement underlines this notion: *"I do not understand the structure. I certainly have not rooted ArtRes properly. I need structure and an overall project plan."*

Analysis

The importance of increased creativity in the organization GREEN is well noticed and accepted in the organizational rhetoric in several hierarchical levels. However, in formal positions at GREEN there are also people who have a skeptical attitude towards the ArtRes project and Group8 feels they must continuously justify the ArtRes project. Also in the practical intervention processes once a week at Group8 some resistance has been noticed.

A few key topics or challenges became apparent during the ArtRes process:

Team: Since Group8 was a new team, people were rarely acquainted with each other, occupied with their practical work issues and felt the need to prove themselves. This made it hard for the artist to create trust in her work which is an important issue (Biehl Missal & Berthoin Antal 2011) - Trust is needed in order to be able to reveal one's inner thoughts and feelings in workshops where a lot of work is accordingly done with *'projective techniques'* (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009).

Structure vs. openness: During our study, it became clear that engaging in an open creative process seemed challenging for the participants since they were new to this type of working and doing. Several of the researchers we have referred to talk about an open attitude in the beginning of a creative process. Norman (2010) writes about the *the re-definition of the initial problem* or *brief*. Darsö (2004) talks about '*downloading'*, meaning moving from one's ordinary view on world to *'seeing'* in the sense of being observational to one's surroundings and oneself, which probably is on the way, but cannot really be seen yet in the Group8. Everyone has been used to well-organized and structured working routines. From the very beginning, the participants – among others the project leader – have asked for rules, set goals, to-do lists, tasks and frameworks from the artists. This has been hard to provide due to the nature of an artistic intervention, which rests upon *co-creational approaches*, as also Mary Parker Follet (1919, 1924) emphasizes as a basic aspect for creativity to emerge, rather than set frames and guidelines. Even after four months of working with the artist, the participants still wanted these types of instructions. Interestingly, an instruction could also be that there were no instructions. This apparently already made it easier for the project team, since they had something they can hold on to. *"I need to mentally prioritise the customer visits – then comes creativity,"* said one team member.

Expectations: Group8 had different expectations of what an artistic intervention is, compared with the involved artist. Taylor & Ladkin (2009) name the phase in the beginning of an intervention process for '*skills transfer'* which describes the need for the acceptance that the artist's skills are useful for the organization. Contrasting interpretations of goals and deliverables have appeared all the time. Is the set goal according to traditional business logics to reach 8.000 new GREEN members really the goal that should be achieved through ArtRes? These and other discrepancies often dealt with mismatching notions about definition and understanding of the ArtRes process, time issues, questions about documentation, working effectively, credibility, measuring and visualizing creativity and the pressure of performing and justifying the financial investment for this project. Furthermore, artists are usually not keen on goals and outcomes. They live for the process and can hardly make promises of what the result of their work is going to be. Therefore, having clear, corporate, measurable goals might be counter-productive for their processes. A phrase points out this struggle*: "We would achieve things much faster when they would trust me (the artist) and don't think about numbers and goals all the time."* **Acknowledgement**: *'Crystallization'* is one of Darsö's (2004) terms for the phase in

intervention after 'seeing'. The term is used to tell about a deeper understanding of the process, and which would lead to changed actions, named as *'prototyping'* and *'embodying'* (prototyping - in a slightly different meaning as it is used in design theory, but these words can be viewed having some parallel meaning referring to something which becomes materialized, or embodied as a changed behavior). -Positive affirmations have appeared to be important. Everyone at the Group8 seemed to need to feel that they achieved something, that they were *efficient* in one or another way at the end of the day. This helped them to feel good about their work and stay motivated.

Summing up, one might learn from our observations, that artists and designer can use rather similar tools and techniques when it comes to practice-based methods. Compared with Berthoin Antal & Strauss (2013) study about the artistic interventions, our case seems to focus on the same kind of issues, like positive experiences, emotion, stimulation, energy, widening perspectives, personal and collaborative ways of working. However, there is a difference in this case in the sense that strategic development, product / service quality, efficiency and HR development impacts have been raised as important questions at Group8. The question is nevertheless if the organizational development is a task for the artist, or is it the task for Group8 to come to work with these organizational issues, but with a widened and renewed perspective during the intervention process, and after.

5. FINAL WORDS

One of our purposes has been to raise appreciation for creative approaches through increased understanding for the use of artistic interventions and design thinking as strategic tools in organizational development process. We also have looked at the differences and similarities, on the one hand, in theoretical constructions concerning design management/design thinking and artistic interventions, and, on the other hand, working methods in the intervention practices.

Surely, design management and design thinking has been accused of lacking the aesthetic, material and embodied perspective in design, favouring the cognitive perspective (Kimbell 2009; Tonkinwise 2011). However, there are several texts which also emphasize the role of aesthetics (Borja de Mozota, 2008; Svengren, 1995; Verganti, 2006) and art (Digerfelt – Månsson, 2009; Thornquist, 2005) and this trend already exists. The argument why we plead for the aesthetics would be reinforced with what Welsch (1997) writes. According to him

there is no cognition without aesthetics because our thinking is depending on the knowledge we get through our senses.

What concerns *the artistic methods and design techniques* in the different workshops during the ArtRes project they look quite similar. In theoretical works concerning both design thinking and artistic intervention can be found the ideas of opening up for seeing the world differently (Darsö, 2004; Liedtka, 2010). But we also can see differences between art and design when looking at their application in such a process. Artistic interventions – from their very nature – are practice-based methods that might have long-term personal, cultural or organizational impacts. Whereas design thinking is an abstracted form of design-as-practice. Therefore, one can rather speak of design-as-practice in the context of our designer workshop. Design practice in that sense is different to design thinking as mentioned by several researchers (see the theoretical part). Design thinking describes how a designer's mindset can be used *strategically*, and therefore we wonder whether design thinking can really be used in a workshop alone.

However, what has made a strong impression on us is the clash between traditional business thinking and the creative approaches, which for instance Liedtka (2010), Grzelec & Prata (2013) and Barry & Meisiek (2010) notice. Although there is an acceptance in Group8 of the opportunity to change one's working methods, and willingness to do it, persons in a responsible managerial positions have at the same time expectations from higher hierarchical levels to deliver results in traditional, quantifiable forms.

Further research will focus on the continuing theoretical elaboration of the topics that have been raised in this text, on the one hand strategy and design management, on the other hand the organizational creativity and innovation development. In order to respond to the demands of more empirical research concerning the everyday practices and working routines (Sutherland 2012), in the further intervention process we will continue the field study in Group8, and focus on the situated learning processes of the group members concerning creativity, which, although some gravel on the road, is described as follows:

"We want that ArtRes is undemanding and leads to openness, creativity and joy. In order to subsequently implement new ideas and approaches in daily work. We want to create positive energy together and have time to try new things and dare to fail."

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amabile, T. M., E. A. Schatzel, G. B. Moneta and S. J. Kramer. 2004. Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15 (1):5-32.

Artist in Residence. www.resartis.org, 20110620.

Austin, R. and L. Devin. 2003. *Artful making – What Managers Need to Know About How Artists Work*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Press.

Barry, D. and S. Meisiek . 2010. Seeing more and seeing differently. Sensemaking, Mindfulness and the Workarts. *Organization Studies* 31:1–26.

Bathurst, R. and N. Monin. 2010. Shaping Leadership for Today: Mary Parker Follett's Aesthetic. *Leadership,* 6:115-131.

Becker, H. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berthoin Antal, A. (2009) *Research Framework for Evaluating the Effects of Artistic Interventions in Organizations*. Social Science Research Center Berlin.

Berthoin Antal, A. (2011a) *Artistic Interventions in small Organizations: Why do the stakeholders engage and what do they value from the experience?* Social Science Research Center Berlin.

Berthoin Antal, A. (2011b*) When Arts enter Organizational Spaces: Implications for Organizational Learning*. Social Science Research Center Berlin.

Berthoin Antal, A**.** (2012) *Art-based Research for Engaging Not-Knowing in Organizations*. Social Science Research Center Berlin, Intellect Books UK / University of Chicago Press.

Berthoin Antal, A. (2013) Seeking Values: Artistic Interventions in Organizations as potential Cultural Sources of Values-added. D. Baecker & B. P. Priddat (eds.)*. Ökonomie der Werte / Economics of Values*. Marburg: Metropolis Verlag.

Berthoin Antal, A. and A. Strauß**.** (2013) Artistic Interventions in Organisations: Finding Evidence of Values-added. *Creative Clash Report. Berlin: WZB.*

Biehl-Missal, B. and A. Berthoin Antal. 2011. The Impact of Arts-based Initiatives on People and Organizations: Research Findings, Challenges for Evaluation and Research, and Caveats. *KEA – European Affairs, in Partnership with British Council, (*ed.) Giełda Papierów Wartościowych Warsaw Stock Exchange, Warsaw, Poland.

Borja de Mozota, B. 2008. A Theoretical Model for Design in Management Science. Design Managemet Journal, pp 30 -37.

Brown, T. 2008. Design Thinking. *Harvad Business Review*.

Brown, T. 2009. *Change By Design: How Design Thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation*. Harper Business, New York.

Chia, R. and I. R. King. 1998. The Organizational Structuring of Novelty. *Organization*, 5: 461-478.

Chia, R. and B. MacKay. 2007. Post-processual challenges for the emerging strategy-as-practice perspective: Discovering strategy in the logic of practice. *Human Relations,* 60: 217-242.

Cooper, R. and M. Press. 1995. *The Design Agenda. A Guide to Successful Design Management.* Chischester: Wiley.

Cooper, R., S. Junginger and T. Lockwood. 2011. *Handbook of Design Management.* Oxford, Berg.

Czarniawska, B. 1998. *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*. London: Sage.

DeFillippi, R., G. Grabher & C. Jones. 2007. Introduction to paradoxes of creativity: managerial and organizational challenges in the cultural economy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 28: 511-521.

DMI (2013) www.dmi.org/dmi/html/aboutdmi/design_management.htm, 25.04.2013

Ericsson, D. 2001. Creative leaders – or prisoners of the past? In Sjöstrand, S.-E., J. Sandberg & M. Tyrstrup (eds.) *Invisible Management*. London: Thomson Learning.

Eriksson-Zetterquist, U., T. Müllern, A. Styhre. 2011 *Organization Theory: A Practice Based Approach.* Oxford University Press.

Evrard, Y. & F. Colbert. 2000. Arts Management – A New Discipline Entering the New Millennium. *International Journal of Arts Management,* 2: 4-13.

Fitzgibbon, M. and A. Kelly. 1999. *From Maestro to Manager. Critical Issues in Arts & Culture Management.* Dublin: Oak Tree Press.

Follet, M. P. 1919. *Community is a process.* www.folletfoundation.org/writings 2011-05-31

Follet, M. P. 1924. *Creative experience*. www. folletfoundations.org/writings 2011-05-31

Gagliardi, P. 1996, 2006. Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence & W. Nord (eds.) *Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*. London: Sage.

Gergen, K.J. 1994. *Realities and Relationships: Soundings in Social Construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grzelec, A. and T. Prata. 2013. Artists in Organisations – Mapping of European Producers of Artistic Interventions in Organisations. *Creative Clash.*

Guillet de Monthoux, P. 2004. *The art firm: aesthetic management and metaphysical marketing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Guillet de Monthoux, P., C. Gustafsson and S.-E. Sjöstrand, (eds.) 2007. *Aesthetic leadership. Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haselwanter, O. 2013. *Towards curated business development, using art and design*. Master thesis at Business & Design, School of Design and Crafts/ School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg.

Hernes, T. and S. Maitlis (eds.) 2012. *Process, Sensemaking and organizing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holloway, M. 2009. How Tangible is your Strategy? How Design Thinking can turn your strategy into reality. *Journal of Business Strategy, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.*

Hosking, D.M., H.P. Dachler & K.J. Gergen. Eds. 1995. *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Jahnke, M. 2009. Design Thinking as enablers of Innovation in engineering Organisations. *8th European Academy Of Design Conference, Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland.*

Jahnke, M. 2013. Meaning in the Making. *Business & Design Lab, HDK - Högskolan för Design och Konsthantverk, University of Gothenburg.*

Johansson, U. and J. Woodilla. 2009. Towards an Epistemological merger of Design Thinking, Strategy and Innovation. *8th European Academy Of Design Conference, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland.*

Johansson, U. and J. Woodilla. 2012. Looking at Design Thinking Interventions as Artistic Interventions. *International Design Management Research Conference*, Boston.

Johansson, U., J. Woodilla, M. Çetinkaya. 2013. Design Thinking: Past, Present and Possible Futures. *Creativity & Innovation Management,* 22: 121 146.

Johnson, G. (ed.), K. Scholes and R. Whittington. 2011. *Exploring strategy: text and cases.* Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Kimbell, L. 2009. Design Practices in Design Thinking. *Paper presented at the EURAM 2009, Liverpool, UK.*

Koivunen, N. and A. Rehn. 2009. *Creativity and the Contemporary Economy*. Malmö: Liber.

Krippendorff, K. 1989. On the Essential Contexts of Artifacts or on the Proposition that "Design Is Making Sense (Of Things)". *Design Issues,* no. 5: 9 -39.

Kostera, M. 2005. The Narrative Collage as Research Method. *Storytelling, Self, Society*,

2: 5-27.

Kostera, M. 2007. *Organizational Ethnography*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kvale, S. and S. Brinkmann, 2009. *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing. Los Angeles: Sage.*

Ladkin, D. and Taylor, S. 2010. Leadership as art: Variations on a theme. Leadership 6: 235-241.

Lawson, B. 2006/1980. *How Designers Think – The Design Process Demystified*. Oxford, Architectural Press.

Liedtka, J. 2010. Business strategy and Design: Can this Marriage Be Saved? *Design Management Review* 26:6-11.

Liedtka, J. 2011. Learning to use design thinking tools for successful innovation. *Strategy and Leadership* 39: 13 -19.

Liedtka, J. and H. Mintzberg. 2006. Time for Design. *Design Management Review* 17: 10-20.

Liinason, J. 2012. UNIONEN Lindholmen Innovation 2013-2014. *Project description by TILLT.*

Lockwood, T. 2010. Design Thinking: Integrating Innovation, Customer Experience, and Brand Value. *Allworth Press.*

Linstead, S. & H. Höpfl (eds.) 2000. *The Aesthetics of Organization.* London: Sage.

Mulgan G. 2007. *Social Innovation. What it is, why it matters and how it can be accelerated.* The Basingstoke Press, The Young Foundation.

Neumaier, M. 2009. The Designful Company. *Berkeley, CA: New Riders.*

Polanyi, M. 1966. The Tacit Dimension. *Library of Congress, Doubleday & Company Inc., Garden City, New York.*

Norman, D. 2010. Design Thinking: A Useful Myth. www.core77.com/blog/columns/design_thinking_a_useful_myth_16790.asp. 28.02.2013, 20.02.2013

Rylander, A. 2009. Design Thinking as Pragmatist Inquiry. *European Group for Organization Studies (EGOS) Colloquium.*

Schön, D. 1983. The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action. *Aldershot, Surrey: Ashgate Press.*

Simon, H. 1996 The Sciences of the Artificial. *Cambridge, MIT Press.*

Shalley, C. E. and L.L.Gilson. 2004. What Leaders need to know: A Review of Social and Contextual Factors that can Foster or Hinder Creativity. *Leadership Quarterly,*15: 33-53.

Sjöstrand, S.-E., Sandberg, J. & Tyrstrup, M. (Eds.) *Invisible Management.* London: Thomson Learning.

Soila-Wadman, M. & A.-S. Köping. 2009. Aesthetic Relations in Place of the Lone Hero in Arts Leadership: Examples from Film Making and Orchestral Performance. *International Journal of Arts Management,* 12: 31-43.

Sutherland, I. 2012. Art-based methods in leadership development: Affording aesthetic workspaces, reflexivity and memories with momentum. *Management Learning*, 0(0) 1-19.

Stenström, E. 2000. *Konstiga företag.* Stockholm: EFI.

Strati, A. 1999. *Organization and Aesthetics.* London: Sage.

Styhre, A. 2013. *A Social Theory of Innovation.* Malmö: Liber.

Styhre, A. and M. Sundgren. 2005. *Managing Creativity in Organizations.* Houndsmills:

Taylor, S.S. 2012. *Leadership craft, Leadership Art.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Taylor, S. and D. Ladkin. 2009. Understanding Arts-Based Methods in Managerial Development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education.*8: 55 -69.

Tonkinswise, C. 2011. A Taste for Practices: Unrepressing Style in Design Thinking. *Design Studies.*

Verganti, R. 2006. Innovating Through Design. *Harvard Business Review.*

Verganti, R. 2009. Design-Driven Innovation – Changing the Rules of Competition by Radically Innovating what Things mean. *Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.*

Visser, J. 2010. Database on Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention And Social Pacts 1960-2010. *Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies AIAS, University of Amsterdam.*

Welsch, W. 1997. *Undoing Aesthetics.* London: Sage.

Wennes, G. 2009. Art, Creativity and the new. In *Creativity and the Contemporary Economy*. Eds. Koivunen, N. & A. Rehn. Malmö: Liber.

Whittington, R. 2001. *What is strategy - and does it matter*. London: Routledge.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Marja Soila-Wadman, PhD

works as a researcher and senior lecturer at School of Business, Economics and Law at the University of Gothenburg. Her research interests are management in art and culture creating organizations, organizational development, creativity and aesthetics in organizations. She is the director for Business and Design Lab that is cooperation between School of Business and School of Design and Crafts (HDK). She has also been working twelve years as a dentist where the aesthetics plays an important role.

Oriana Haselwanter, MA

is an educated visual communicator and took her BA (Hons) degree at the Glasgow School of Art. She has been working as a graphic designer for 4 years at Swarovski in Austria. During her Master's degree in Business & Design education at School of Design and Crafts (HDK) at Gothenburg University, she was able to expand her interests and skills in the fields of project management, business development, strategic design, and design management. For her master thesis "Toward curated business development, using art and design" she has been researching how bigger companies in Sweden work with design thinking respectively artistic interventions.