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Abstract

A gap in Organization and Management Theory exists regarding how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely makes a difference to the daily functioning of organization. A ‘Communication as Constitutive of Organization’ (CCO; e.g. Cooren et al., 2011) view of text (e.g. Taylor et al., 1996) is identified as holding unrealized potential to address this omission. A nine-month ethnography of a UK cosmetics company, followed by an abductive analysis (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011) of fieldwork material focusing on ventriloquism (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetics (e.g. Hancock, 2005) and practice theory (e.g. Schatzki, 2006), provides original insight into how authority routinely acts. The thesis’s main contribution to knowledge is the crafting of ‘dominant text’ which is defined as; a series of orchestrated texts which simultaneously exercise authority by routinizing the daily workings of organization. To elaborate, actors are instructed and taught to make sure a ventriloqual text routinely directs clients’ attention toward a particular course of action. At the same time, interventions are made to ensure aesthetic and practice texts routinely remind actors to represent a collective identity and disciplines how they act. While CCO studies show how texts periodically exercise authority (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), a dominant text enhances knowledge about how authority routinely organizes activities which constitute and characterize organization. Theoretical insights are also generated that extend the CCO project of developing a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization.
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Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter presents a gap in knowledge within Organization and Management Theory (OMT) regarding how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts. As the first section outlines, addressing this omission will further OMT’s understanding of how authority routinely makes a difference to the daily workings of organization. Next, ‘Communication as Constitutive of Organization’ (CCO; e.g. Cooren et al., 2011) is introduced as an instructive paradigm for filling this theoretical void. Specifically, a CCO understanding of text (e.g. Taylor et al., 1996) is identified as a useful, but underutilized, concept for advancing our comprehension of authority’s routinization. After the research question is presented, the third section considers the personal motivation for studying authority. In particular, a pilot study is pinpointed as the catalyst for further empirical and theoretical investigation of this topic. Section four provides an overview of the ethnographic methodology deployed and how, using mystery construction (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011), findings were derived from an abductive analysis focusing on fieldwork material and ventriloquism (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetics (e.g. Hancock, 2005), and practice (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) theory. The section then introduces the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge: the concept of a ‘dominant text’. Crafting this concept is claimed to advance an understanding of how authority routinely makes a difference to the daily workings of organization. The section closes by outlining how several other insights generated throughout this doctoral study also extend the CCO project of developing a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization. The penultimate section identifies the historical, economic and social importance of the cosmetics industry where fieldwork was conducted. However, the section reflects on how, despite the industry’s significance, this doctoral research provides sorely needed insight into its day-to-day workings. The chapter closes with an overview of the six chapters which follow this one.
1.2 Theoretical gap

Authority has long been recognized as integral to organizing and organization. However, there is a lack of understanding within OMT about how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely makes a difference to day-to-day interactions. Prominent relational theories (Barnard, 1938; Carpenter and Krause, 2014; Follett, 1942) conceptualize authority’s negotiation as taking place within, and being constrained by, pre-existing structures of positional or personal authority. Similarly, relationally orientated studies limit an understanding of authority’s relational routinization by viewing it as a possession (un)altered by, rather than something routinely negotiated through, discourse(s) (e.g. Dick and Collings, 2014; Laine and Vaara, 2007; Mantere and Vaara, 2008) or practice(s) (e.g. Bechky, 2003; Huising, 2015; Nelsen and Barley, 1997). By anchoring authority to a person, these studies pre-determine where and when authority acts. A central argument of this research is that decoupling the concept’s long-standing and restrictive association with human agency facilitates an investigation of how authority, as a concept worthy of investigation in its own right, routinely acts in unforeseen ways. Offering an alternative understanding of authority is considered to revive one of OMT’s oldest concepts (Sikula, 1975) and to provide original insight into the daily functioning of organization.

1.3 Theoretical framework and research question

Weber’s (1922/1978) concept of ‘routinized charisma’ along with CCO theory (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Schoneborn et al., 2014), form the theoretical underpinnings of this research. In particular, a Montreal School (cf. Schoneborn et al., 2014) view of CCO is used to argue that conceptualizing authority as, in the CCO sense of the term, a ‘text’ (Cooren, 2004; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000) provides an instructive way of addressing this theoretical gap. Previous CCO studies of authoritative texts (Kuhn, 2008) have only explored how this concept periodically organizes actors’ activities within meetings (e.g. Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011). This has left a lack of knowledge about how texts routinely exercise authority over the day-to-day activities which constitute and characterize organization. The following question is therefore tackled in this thesis: how is authority constituted and routinized as a text? The next section reflects on the personal motivation for pursuing this question.
1.4 Motivation for the research

The motivation for studying authority stems from a pilot study into how moments of leadership are produced in conversations. While attending management meetings in a cosmetics organization, it was observed that something (i.e. a saying), as opposed to someone, exercised authority by directing attendees’ attention towards the subsequent month’s sales target and the strategies needed to achieve it. Furthermore, in follow-up interviews attendees reflected on how the saying had authoritative effects beyond these meetings by reminding their colleagues of the month’s sales priority and the actions they needed to perform to accomplish it. These findings triggered a newfound curiosity about the nature of authority and, more specifically, intrigue about how authority, as something worked out in actors’ relations, routinely acts across space and time. Further consultation of OMT offered little by way of understanding for this, and this gap in theory provided the basis for further empirical and theoretical investigation through doctoral study. After introducing the motivation for researching authority, the next section introduces the methodological approach taken, how this approach led to the crafting of findings, and the thesis’s claimed contribution to knowledge.

1.5 Contribution to knowledge

Exploring the communicative constitution and routinization of authority as a text required a methodological approach that allowed access to actors’ day-to-day workings. To this end, a nine-month ethnographic investigation of makeup artists’ work in a UK cosmetics company was carried out between late September 2015 and early May 2016. An abductive analysis (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011) of the ethnographic material gathered during this investigation (i.e. field notes, meeting transcripts, documents, social media posts and interviews with 65 actors), alongside theory from within and outside of OMT, was conducted. The findings from this analysis develop the theories of ventriloquism (i.e. ‘our capacity to make other beings say or do things while we speak, write, or, more generally, conduct ourselves’; Cooren, 2012: 1), aesthetics (i.e. ‘the dimension of experience which serves an integrating function between our senses, emotions and intellect’; Ladkin, 2006: 168), and practice (i.e. ‘routine bodily activities made possible by the active contribution of an array of material resources’; Nicolini, 2012: 4). In doing so, a significant contribution to knowledge regarding how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts is provided. This is through crafting the concept of a ‘dominant text’, which is defined as:
A series of orchestrated texts which simultaneously exercise authority by routinizing the daily workings of organization.

Specifically, a dominant text is made up of ventriloqual, aesthetic and practice texts which respectively make a difference to daily organizational life by routinizing actors’ advice to clients, their collective identity, and their way of working. While numerous studies show how a single text periodically makes a difference to organizing (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2014; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), the notion of a dominant text develops CCO theory by:

- Describing how a series of choreographed and co-existing texts routinely exercise authority over activities which constitute and characterize organization.

In doing so the thesis makes a wider contribution to OMT by showing how authority, as an understudied phenomenon in its own right, routinely organizes actors’ day-to-day work. While arriving at the main contribution, several other insights are generated which facilitate the CCO project of developing a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization. Specifically, knowledge is advanced about how: communication simultaneously organizes and creates disorder (e.g. Vásquez et al., 2016); how relations between the symbolic and material dimensions of communication constitute organization (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009); and how organizations endure (e.g. Brummans et al., 2014). The next section provides background to the industry and the organizational context in which the fieldwork was carried out. It considers the economic and cultural importance of this industry to society and, somewhat surprisingly, identifies a lack of research into the industry’s day-to-day workings.

1.6 Fieldwork background: The cosmetics industry

Fieldwork took place within the United Kingdom (UK) sales and education department of a global cosmetics organization headquartered in the United States (US). Anonymized as either “Ella May” or “Ella” throughout this study, the organization offers a range of makeup and skincare products for demonstration on, and for sale to, the general public by professional makeup artists. The host organization is owned by a group referred to using the pseudonym “Cosmetico” which has a
portfolio of circa 30 prestigious organizations selling cosmetic products in skincare, makeup, fragrance, and/or haircare (Cosmetico, 2015).

In addition, the types of cosmetic products Ella May sells have a long historical importance. The use of makeup and skincare can be traced back thousands of years to Egyptian, Greek, and Roman eras when they were largely used for ceremonial purposes related to religion, war, and mating rituals (Gamberini et al., 2008; Kumar, 2005; Kumar et al., 2006; Pérez-Arantegeui et al., 2009). For example: the ancient Egyptians used mesdemet, a type of lead, as black eyeliner to emphasize their eyes and for magic-religious purposes (Gamberini et al., 2008); soothing cream was invented in ancient Greece (Kumar, 2005); and cosmetic creams were developed by the Romans using cattle and sheep fats (Pérez-Arantegeui et al., 2009).

In the nineteenth century, the use of cosmetics became more widespread as expensive natural ingredients were increasingly replaced with chemicals, which made them more accessible and affordable to a wider audience (Kumar, 2005). Following the two world wars, the twentieth century saw the emergence of a cosmetics industry with products believed to be ‘one way of revitalizing the human spirit’ at that time (Chun, 2016: 529). Within the present century, the industry’s expansion is claimed to make significant contributions to both global gross domestic product and to the ‘colourful social lives of humans globally’ (Kumar, 2005: 1263). Fieldwork could therefore be considered to have taken place within an industry steeped in history, which remains culturally relevant, and has become increasingly important economically.

Around the time of fieldwork, the makeup and skincare categories sold by Ella May and the wider industry of which it forms a part were in economic growth. The global cosmetics market, for example, grew 3.6% year-on-year to reach €181bn in 2014 (Ernst & Young, 2015). Within this market, makeup was the fastest growing cosmetic category year-on-year in 2014 at 5% (Ernst & Young, 2015). In the same year, the European cosmetics market saw year-on-year growth reach €72.5bn with the industry employing 1.7m people (Cosmetics Europe, 2014). Colour cosmetics, an umbrella category which includes makeup, was one of the market’s fastest growing categories in 2014 at 1.2% (Cosmetics Toiletry & Perfumery Association, 2015a).

Similarly, in the UK, colour cosmetics saw the largest year-on-year growth of any category in the industry at 7%, with the overall UK cosmetics market worth £9.1bn in 2015 (Cosmetics Toiletry & Perfumery Association, 2015b). Year-on-year increases within UK colour cosmetics, reported for face (9%), lips (5%), and eye (4%) products, also contributed to this category’s growth in 2014 with
sales valued at £1.7bn (Euromonitor International, 2015a). Similarly, the UK skincare category also experienced growth in 2014 with a 2% annual increase returning sales of £2.2bn (Euromonitor International, 2015b). Sales trends like these indicate that the industry where the fieldwork was carried out was generally in growth at that time and demand for products similar to those offered by Ella May were a key driver for this.

Furthermore, online users’ interest in cosmetics generally, and makeup specifically, was also growing. For example, two-thirds of the 15 billion “beauty” views on YouTube in 2013 were focussed on makeup (Ernst & Young, 2015). In addition, there were 700 million new views on beauty in the same year which represents a 133% increase from 2010 (Ernst & Young, 2015). Mirroring the aforementioned sales trends, these figures indicate that the cosmetic industry and one of Ella’s key commodities was of daily relevance to a large digital audience around the time of fieldwork.

Although this study seeks to offer theoretical insights rather than empirical generalizations, the figures above nevertheless suggest that the fieldwork was conducted in an industry considered important from economic, socio-economic and from many consumers’ perspectives. Despite its sizeable economic contribution, however, organization and management research into the cosmetics industry is notably rare. Studies have predominantly focused on cosmetic organizations’ marketing activity (e.g. Antioco et al., 2012; Chae et al., 2017; Hall et al., 2013), have provided historical reviews of the industry (Kravets and Sandikci, 2013; Moura, 2015), or have offered commentaries on organizations working within it (Hong and Doz, 2013; Jones, 2012; Umemura and Slater, 2017). Only a handful of studies have carried out research within a cosmetics organization (Chan et al., 2014; Dambrin and Lambert, 2017; Nemoto, 2013; Tanure and Duarte, 2005) and to the best of my knowledge no studies have observed workers’ and managers’ day-to-day activities. Considering the economic and societal contributions made by this industry, research that focuses on how organizations within the industry function is therefore an absent presence. In addition to its claimed theoretical contribution, this research therefore deepens understanding of the daily workings of an important, but understudied, industry. The next section outlines the thesis and introduces the six chapters which follow this one.
1.7 Thesis outline

This thesis comprises seven chapters: this introduction, a literature review, an introduction to the host organization where the fieldwork was carried out, a description and justification of the methodological and analytical approaches taken, a presentation of the findings, a discussion, and a conclusion which reflects on the claimed main theoretical contribution.

The second chapter reviews definitions of authority and differentiates it from the neighbouring concept of power (e.g. Dahl, 1957; Lukes, 1978; Pitkin, 1972). Several models of authority are critiqued and researchers within OMT are identified as typically omitting a distinguishing feature of authority: its relational negotiation over time. Theoretical lenses which hold potential to address this gap are then pinpointed and, after reviewing their strengths and deficiencies, the main theoretical framework of this thesis is introduced: CCO (e.g. Cooren et al., 2011). In particular, the unrealized potential of a CCO understanding of text (e.g. Taylor et al., 1996) is argued to enhance knowledge of how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts over space and time.

The following chapter presents the organizational setting where the fieldwork was carried out. This sets the scene for the research by placing the host organization within a wider organizational context. The structure, products and services of the department where the research took place are introduced and the processual nature of access to its activities are described.

The methodology chapter discusses how fieldwork was carried out and how empirical materials were analyzed. It reflects on how my meta-theoretical assumptions directed the choice to carry out ethnography (cf. Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). After justifying the use of this methodology, attention turns to the choice and use of the research methods which fall under it. Consideration is then given to how reflexivity was practiced throughout and after fieldwork. The penultimate section describes how fieldwork materials and theory were analyzed using the six stages of Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007, 2011) mystery construction technique. The chapter closes with a discussion of procedural and situational ethics.

Next, the findings from the fieldwork are presented. Following the analytical methodology presented in the previous chapter, a range of empirical and theoretical materials are used to do this. In particular, excerpts of naturalized talk, interview transcripts, field notes, extracts of documents, and social-media posts are analyzed alongside ventriloquism (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetics (e.g. Hancock, 2005) and practice (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) theory. In line with my meta-
theoretical assumptions, these materials are presented alongside theoretical interpretations and personal reflections, intuitions, and hunches. Like many organizational ethnographies, a ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973: 5) of actors’ daily working lives is presented.

Following this, chapter six discusses the findings and places them within the theoretical framework introduced in the literature review. The concept of a dominant text is crafted and is claimed to further knowledge about how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely organizes actors’ day-to-day actions and interactions. This concept is argued to provide CCO researchers with a way to comprehend how authority routinely makes a difference to activities which constitute and characterize organization. In addition, while developing the notion of a dominant text, several other insights are generated which facilitate a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization.

The final chapter reflects on the main contribution of the thesis in greater depth alongside its other theoretical insights. It also considers how the findings provide a richer appreciation of the day-to-day workings of an important but under-researched industry. The limitations of the thesis are considered and the lessons learned while producing it are reflected on. Finally, the methodological and reflexive practice of ‘doing gender’ (e.g. West and Zimmerman, 1987: 125) in cross-gender research is discussed and several possible directions for future research into the forms and functions of a dominant text are identified.

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter began by introducing a deficiency within OMT regarding how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts. An argument was then advanced about why addressing this theoretical gap enriches our understanding of the daily workings of organization. CCO (e.g. Cooren et al., 2011) theory was presented as an instructive framework for filling this theoretical void and, in particular, a CCO understanding of text (e.g. Taylor et al., 1996) was identified as holding unrealized potential to provide a fuller comprehension of how authority is routinized over space and time.

After presenting the research question, the findings of a pilot study were pinpointed as a catalyst for studying authority’s routinization. Next, the ethnographic approach to fieldwork was outlined and a description of how empirical material and theory were analysed using mystery construction
(Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011) was given. Following an overview of the findings, the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge was stated: the crafting of a dominant text. Specifically, claims were made about how this concept advances an understanding of how authority routinely makes a difference to activities which constitute and characterize organization. In addition, several other insights which aid the development of a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization were introduced. The penultimate section gave background to the cosmetics industry where fieldwork was carried out and identified how, despite the industry’s importance, this doctoral study offers rare and much needed insight into its daily workings. Finally, the chapter closed by providing a synopsis of the six chapters which follow this.

The next chapter begins by reviewing definitions and models of authority within OMT. After identifying a theoretical gap in this literature with regards to the routinization of authority, the thesis’s theoretical framework is introduced and justified. The chapter closes by identifying the unfulfilled potential of a construct within this framework to address this void in understanding and, by doing so, enhance our understanding of the daily workings of organization.
Chapter two: Literature Review

2.1 Chapter Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of authority within organization and management studies literature and identifies value in resurrecting Weber’s (1922/1978) notion of charismatic authority. Specifically, within the extant literature a lack of understanding is found regarding how, as a relational phenomenon, authority becomes routinized in day-to-day interactions; an issue Weber identified as paramount to the workings of organization and something which is argued throughout this thesis as having importance to daily organizational life. To address this theoretical gap, a Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO; e.g. Cooren et al., 2011) understanding of text (e.g. Taylor et al., 1996) is pinpointed as holding unrealized potential to further knowledge about how authority becomes relationally routinized.

This chapter is comprised of ten substantive sections. The first section begins with an introduction to the multifarious ways authority, as an important yet elusive construct, has commonly been defined within organization and management studies. It then considers how such confusion stems in part from authority’s conflation with a conceptual bedfellow within these fields: power (Dahl, 1957; Lukes, 1978; Pitkin, 1972). In particular, it finds parallels between principal views of authority (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014) and power, and identifies how studies interested in the former have “black-boxed” authority and consequently have omitted a distinguishing feature of this phenomenon; the relational negotiation of legitimacy. To this end, the section closes by introducing relational perspectives on authority (e.g. Barnard, 1938; Scott, 1964; Simon, 1957) and considers the potential of adopting a relational perspective to further an understanding of authority as a rich and multifaceted construct and, as a welcome by-product, differentiate it from power.

The next section considers four relational authority theories that are prominent within organization and management studies: Weberian (Weber, 1922/1978); acceptance (Barnard, 1938); situational (Follett, 1942); and transactional (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014). It identifies how, by commencing their explorations of relational authority with preconceived ideas of people in authority, the latter three theories have curbed an understanding of relational authority’s nuances. In turn, it identifies how, by conceptualizing charisma in the context of bureaucracy as a base from which
authority can be claimed and conferred, a Weberian perspective on authority holds potential to further knowledge of relational authority.

Section three probes Weberian (1922/1978) understandings of authority in greater depth. Specifically, it recognizes how organization and management scholars have regularly misappropriated Weber’s three “pure” types of authority (legal-rational, traditional, and charismatic) by neglecting whether claims to authority made on these grounds are relationally constituted. It identifies how studies are particularly culpable of omitting relationality from explorations of charismatic authority and how Weber’s view of charisma as an ephemeral and routinized phenomenon holds unrealized potential to stimulate an exploration of how authority is relationally (re)constituted over time.

To this end, the fourth section hones in on charismatic authority as a construct of interest. It considers both its “pure” and routinized variants and identifies how the latter was particularly important for Weberian (1922/1978) writings on bureaucracy and remains relevant to understanding organizations’ daily workings. After identifying the unrealized potential of an aesthetic (Ladkin, 2006) approach to exploring the routinization of charismatic authority, this section identifies a tendency among extant management and organization scholars to (retrospectively) focus on charisma’s routinization following a leader’s departure. It finds such a focus has led to a paucity of knowledge about how charisma is routinized on a day-to-day basis: an issue Weber identified as crucial to explorations of this phenomenon and something this thesis sees as a catalyst to explore how authority becomes claimed and conferred on a routine basis. To this end, the section identifies value in problematizing (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007; Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011; Sandberg and Alvesson, 2011) authority’s relational routinization by viewing this phenomenon through theoretical lenses more sympathetic to exploring authority’s ongoing negotiation.

The fifth section considers how studies adopting a discourse perspective have explored relational authority. It identifies a tendency for studies to either adopt a big ‘D’ discourse or a small ‘d’ discourse approach (cf. Alvesson and Kårreman, 2000, 2011; Kårreman, 2014) to this phenomenon with scholars in the former camp favouring a unilateral (rather than relational) view of discourse authoritatively bearing down on interactions and emboldening or weakening individuals’ extant sources of authority. In turn, this section finds that small ‘d’ discourse studies equate authority with, and reduce it to, talk which similarly tends to reinforce speakers’ existing bases of
authority. Although both small ‘d’ and big ‘D’ discourse approaches contain relational tenets, their predilection for studying how existing sources of authority are maintained or changed within interactions limits the extent to which relational understandings of authority may be advanced.

Section six introduces another theoretical perspective attuned to a relational exploration of authority: practice (e.g. Nicolini, 2012; Schatzki, 1996, 2005). Similarly to discourse perspectives, this section finds practice study authors tend to commence investigations of authority from an a priori view of an individual and/or office possessing authority before exploring how, through practice, such bases are negotiated. However, despite this tendency, this section identifies how a teleological hierarchy view of practice (Schatzki, 2002, 2005, 2012) holds unfulfilled promise for exploring how authority becomes relationally routinized over time.

After critiquing discourse and practice approaches to authority, the seventh section introduces a perspective which emanates from the former and draws on the latter: CCO (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Schoneborn et al., 2014). This section identifies how the ontological and epistemological positons of authors who align with, or borrow from, this perspective differentiates it from those reviewed previously in this chapter. Specifically, it assesses how CCO studies’ view of human and non-human actors’ conjoint communicative constitution of organization holds potential for exploring authority’s relational routinization. In particular, it identifies how studies within a specific CCO school, and its view of a ‘plenum’ (Ashcraft et al., 2009: 20) of agencies communicatively constituting organization, offers a promising progression of discourse and practice views which, as identified in section six, both foreground individuals and human agency in studies of authority.

The eighth section introduces the main theoretical framework of the thesis and considers how, from a Montreal School perspective (cf. Schoneborn et al., 2014), texts (e.g. Cooren, 2004; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000) offer a potentially useful construct to explore authority’s relational routinization. The section begins by introducing a Montreal School definition of texts, which differentiates them from discourse (cf. Baralou and Tsoukas, 2015) and everyday understandings of the term. It then introduces how, as a text, authority becomes communicatively constituted and identifies parallels between authoritative texts’ potential routinization and Weber’s writings on how charisma becomes routinized. After identifying symmetries between the routinization of charismatic authority and authoritative texts, the section assesses the value in drawing on the former’s analytical tenets to advance an understanding of
how the latter becomes routinized. To this end, the section then splits into three subsections. The first of these reviews how, through a coorientation cycle of talk and text (Cooren et al., 2011; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008; Kuhn and Ashcraft, 2003; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor, 2000, 2006; Taylor and Robichaud, 2004; Taylor et al., 1996; Wright, 2016), studies have explored how authoritative texts periodically organize actors’ actions within meetings (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2014; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011). It identifies how these studies’ foci furthers an understanding of how texts exercise authority at a particular point in time but limits an understanding of how authoritative texts become routinized over space and time. To this end, the subsection considers this construct’s potential to investigate how, as a text, authority becomes relationally routinized. The next two subsections consider how issues of propriety (e.g. Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Taylor, 2011; Wood, 1992) and intertextuality (e.g. Allen, 2000; Kuhn, 2008, 2012) hold potential to affect authoritative texts’ routinization.

Section nine introduces three other Montreal School perspectives on the communicative constitution of authority and discusses their potential for furthering a relational understanding of how authority becomes routinized. Split into three sub-sections, it discusses how presentification (Benoit Barné and Cooren, 2009; Cooren, 2009; Cooren et al., 2008; Koschmann and Burk, 2016; Koschmann and McDonald, 2015), thirdness (Brummans et al., 2013; Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014) and ventriloquism (Caronia and Cooren, 2014; Cooren, 2010a, 2010b, 2012, 2015; Cooren and Sandler, 2014; Cooren et al., 2013; Wilhoit and Kesselburgh, 2017) have typically been used in restricted ways by scholars interested in authority. Specifically, the section finds a tendency among studies following the former two approaches to foreground extant sources of authority when investigating its communicative constitution. In turn, the review identifies how ventriloqual studies tend to prioritize investigations of bi-directional (i.e. figure-ventriloquist) relationships. By doing so these studies omit explorations of whether these relationships are attributed with legitimacy by third parties and, consequently, whether and how they become routinized. These issues are considered as grounding investigations of the communicative constitution of authority to the “here and now” of interactions and limit explorations of authority’s routinization. However, the section also identifies the conceptual potential these constructs hold for resurrecting explorations of authority as a relational phenomenon.
The last section summarizes the chapter. It recaps why, compared to the other perspectives discussed in this review, adopting a CCO lens to explore authority’s relational routinization is considered beneficial. Specifically, it closes by reiterating how, in the Montreal School sense of the term, conceptualizing authority as a text holds particular promise.

2.2 Situating authority

This section introduces how authority has been conceptualized within organization and management studies. It then discusses how scholars in these fields and within political science have often conflated it with an allied concept, that of power. Finally, the section identifies the value in drawing sharper conceptual boundaries between these two constructs by exploring authority from a relational perspective.

Authority has long been recognized as an important, but contested, construct within organization and management studies. In 1957, Simon wrote ‘there is no consensus today in the management literature as to how the term ‘authority’ should be used’ (p. xxxiv). Shortly afterwards, Mandeville similarly stated that within the management literature the term had become ‘more and more confused with the passing of the years’ (1960: 107). Later, Sikula commented that ‘Authority is one of the oldest yet most misunderstood administrative concepts […] and is] still to acquire a common definitional base’ (1975: 1). Likewise, in more contemporary writings, Brummans et al. (2013: 349) state ‘while the term “authority” is bandied about frequently in organizational life, it remains an elusive concept’.

Such prolonged confusion stems partly from the proximity of authority to other contested concepts. Writing within political studies, Arendt (1970) acknowledged the affinity of authority to other significant concepts in her field but also claimed that to treat them as satisfactory substitutes was flawed: “power”, “strength”, “force”, “authority”, and, finally, “violence”… are held to be synonyms because they have the same function [… however…] To use them as synonyms […] result[s] in a kind of blindness to the realities they correspond to’ (p. 43). Specifically, within organization and management studies, authority has regularly been conceptualized as related to power but one major argument of this thesis is that, despite their similarities, authority is not reducible to power and ought to be granted more conceptual significance.
Power has often been conceived as the ‘capacity’ (Pfiffner and Sherwood, 1960: 77) or ‘ability’ (Gazzell, 1970: 73; Sikula, 1975: 23; Thompson, 1956: 290) of one party to influence and/or secure dominance over others. For example, in an oft-cited definition, Dahl wrote: ‘A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do’ (1957: 202-203, emphasis added). Similarly, Weber (1922/1978) referred to power as domination ‘by virtue of a position of monopoly’ (p. 943). For Weber, (1922/1978), power occurs when a party exploits a ‘monopolistic position […] that is […] dictate(s) the terms of exchange’ (p. 214, emphasis added) to another and where there is ‘the possibility of imposing one’s own will upon the behaviour of other persons’ (p. 942, emphasis added). Echoing Weber’s (1922/1978) view, Lukes (1978) regarded power as ‘an “agency” notion […] it is held and exercised by agents’ (p. 635). This possession or utilization of power takes place within an ‘asymmetric relation’ (Lukes, 1978: 638) where one agent either can or does exert control over the actions of others who have a dependency on him/her. Relatedly, Pitkin (1972: 276) understood power as one party enacting ‘power over’ another, irrespective of the former’s intention or the latter’s wishes. Until exercised, power is conceptualized as a latent phenomenon: as ‘power to’ (Pitkin, 1972: 277) or ‘in potentia’ power (Latour, 1984: 264). These perspectives therefore characterize power as involving one party’s potential or actual exploitation or monopolization of another.

By contrast, authority is often characterized as occurring when one party has legitimacy or a ‘right’ to make requests of others and to direct their behaviour. Views of legitimacy and authority are regularly ‘confined to static equilibrium concepts’ (Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 11) across a range of studies. For example, authority is unquestionably thought to ‘derive’ from (Fayol, 1949: 21), ‘inhere’ in (Merton, 1940: 195), be ‘institutionalized in’ (Parsons, 1939: 461), and be ‘arrogated by’ (Bennis, 1959: 289) a position of office. Relatedly, authority is conceptualized as vested in individuals’ resources (e.g. ‘experience’, Fayol, 1949: 21; ‘human relations skills’, Peabody, 1962: 466; and ‘interpersonal skills’, Scott et al., 1967: 102). From ‘principal authority’ (Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 11) viewpoints such as these, authority can be identified as a hermetically sealed phenomenon, akin to a physical law which has repeated and universal effects on organizing and organization. For example, across areas as diverse as marketing (e.g. Mishra and Prasad, 2004), information technology (e.g. Nidumolu and Subramani, 2003), operations management (e.g. Bates et al., 1995) and human resource management (e.g. Useem and Gottlieb, 1990), studies have focused on how authority is allocated and delegated downwards, from persons in positions of authority, through organizational chains of command. Using Baker et al’s (1999: 56) terminology,
these studies have been interested in how those in ‘formal authority’ own authority and decide how much of it to loan out to those lower down the hierarchical chain of command. From the optimal allocation of decisions regarding pricing authority (e.g. Joseph, 2001), to IT governance (e.g. Sambamurthy and Zmud, 1999), to new product development (e.g. Chao et al., 2009), these studies’ findings resonate with House’s view that organizations ‘with a clear and single flow of authority from top to bottom, should be more satisfying to members and should result in more effective economic performance and goal achievement than organizations set up without assurance of such an authority flow’ (1970: 53-54). Echoing the monopolistic view of power previously discussed, from a ‘principal’ perspective, authority is therefore regarded as a “black box” which unilaterally and unquestionably organizes others. Studies adopting a principal authority perspective are therefore culpable of neglecting the nuanced and intricate ways authority can be exercised.

Relational views, by contrast, regard authority as requiring a reciprocal negotiation of legitimacy between parties: ‘authority […] rests upon the acceptance or consent of individuals’ (Barnard, 1938: 163). A party has to willingly accede to another’s requests. As Simon (1957) writes: ‘Authority that is viewed as legitimate is not felt as coercion or manipulation, either by the man [sic] who exercises it or by the man [sic] who accepts it’ (p.106, emphasis added). ‘A certain minimum of voluntary submission’ (Scott, 1964: 497, emphasis added) from one party to another is therefore a prerequisite for the exercise of authority. For relational views, a negotiation of influence between parties rather than the one party’s unilateral exercise of influence over another is “sine qua non”.

Compared to power (a ‘diametrically contrasting(s) type of domination’, p. 943), Weber (1922/1978) regarded authority or, alternatively put, ‘genuine dominance’ as requiring one party to provide ‘a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an interest (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience […] In addition there is normally a further element, the belief in legitimacy’ (1922/1978: 212 -213, emphasis in original). Unlike ‘principal’ views of authority, the claim-confer processes which characterize relational views of this phenomenon hold considerable scope to empirically explore the myriad of ways authority becomes negotiated and renegotiated over time as followers (re)affirm or revoke their beliefs about an individual’s authority. In addition, a welcome by-product of pursuing a relational perspective is the drawing of sharper conceptual boundaries between power and authority, while acknowledging that no separation can be absolute.
After differentiating power from authority and then highlighting the conceptual promise of a relational view of the latter, the next section introduces and critiques four prominent models of relational authority within organization and management studies. As the following section details, one of these models offers particularly fertile ground for furthering knowledge of authority as a relational phenomenon.

2.3 Relational authority in more depth

From a relational perspective, authority is considered a ‘probabilistic achievement’ enacted in daily practice (Huising, 2015: 264). Indeed, contrary to the principal authority views previously discussed, for relational authority studies, ‘whether authority is official, institutional, or stable is an empirical matter i.e. – an achievement rather than a given […] a never failing authority would be a physical law, not a sociotechnical endeavour’ (Bourgoin and Bencherki, 2015: 37). This section discusses four prominent models of authority which share this ‘achievement’ tenet: Weberian (1922/1978); acceptance (Barnard, 1938); situational (Follett, 1942); and transactional (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014).

Firstly, a Weberian (1922/1978) model of authority has had significant crossover to management and organization studies (cf. Lounsbury and Carberry, 2005). Weber saw authority as involving a relational exchange between parties in which: ‘every […] system attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its legitimacy’ (1922/1978: 213). Actors could base their claims to legitimacy on “pure” authoritative grounds (which Weber intended to be interpreted idealistically and for conceptual clarity as opposed to being used as an exhaustive everyday rubric). Three pure grounds were offered: rational (‘resting on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority)’); traditional (‘resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them (traditional authority)’); and charismatic (‘resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him (charismatic authority)’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 215). Crucial to Weber’s model was individuals' belief in, and voluntary acceptance of, representatives' claims. Authority was therefore regarded as something granted by followers to others, rather than being the possession of someone in a position of authority.
The second acceptance model of authority is an instructive anchoring reference for considering relational perspectives on authority. In this theory, communication is considered as having the ‘character of authority’ (Barnard, 1938: 173) when the receiver presumes it to have emanated from a sender who has competence. The acceptance of a communication’s authoritative character is ‘induced’ (Barnard, 1938: 172), in part, by whether it is perceived as originating from senders who hold positions of authority or positions of leadership (i.e. superior ability, such as knowledge or understanding, regardless of organizational position) and has passed through ‘the lines of authority’ (Barnard, 1938: 175) within an organization. This model signals a departure from the principal views of authority introduced in the preceding section because, unlike these views, the extent to which a communication is authoritative does not solely reside in “persons of authority” (although they undoubtedly have some influence on the perception of its character), but rather lies with the persons to whom the communication is addressed. Barnard’s (1938) theory therefore strikes a middle ground between a view of authority as a possession and something which is open to relational negotiation. Although Barnard’s (1938) model has a clear relational tenet, the claim-confer nature of authority takes place within, and is either facilitated or constrained by, a pre-existing structure of authority. Introducing a line of authority into an acceptance view therefore limits explorations of authority as a (wholly) relational phenomenon.

A situational model of authority is grounded in the work of Follett (1942). Essentially, Follett conceptualized authority as an emergent construct, as something ‘always fresh, always being distilled anew’ (1942: 133). Specifically, authority is viewed as emanating from, rather than preceding, co-ordination between parties: ‘you [can] have no authority as a mere left-over. You cannot take the authority which you won yesterday and apply it to today’ (Follett, 1942: 33). A party may arrive at an interaction with an area of expertise which provides them with a potential for authority within it, however their authority ‘continually shift(s) and morph(s) to match the situation as it evolves’ (Bathurst and Monin, 2010: 120). Although Follett’s view has experienced less export to organization and management studies than the Weberian model, it nevertheless provides a basis for conceptualizing the manifold ways authority may situationally manifest. However, like Barnard’s (1938) acceptance model of authority, a situational perspective is open to critique on the grounds that it is too deferential to a pre-given authority of office. For example, while asserting that ‘most decisions could and should arise organically through a process of shared authority facilitated by genuine participation by all employees in concert with the efforts of managers’, Follett also stated there remains ‘a need in some circumstances for there to be a final authority for a particular
decision’: a final authority she equated with individuals in positions of management (Berman and Van Buren III, 2015: 46).

Finally, ‘rooted in seminal treatises on organizations’ is a transactional model of authority (Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 8). For transactional theorists, authority ‘rests on the premise of bargaining and mutual exchange that reflects a partnership – albeit sometimes a contested one – between principal and agent […] even if the principal employs a formal mechanism at their disposal to control bureaucratic behavior, this can be offset by agency action’ (Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 8 and 18, emphasis added). Rather than a “fait accompli”, authority is therefore bartered for between two or more parties. For example, in Simon’s (1951) formulaic conception, a transactional relationship between parties is a clear requisite: ‘B (a boss) exercises authority over W (a worker) if W permits B to select x (a work task). That is, W accepts authority when his behavior is determined by B’s decision’ (p.294, emphasis added). This two-step relational acceptance-action process is a necessary and sufficient condition for authority’s enactment: without it authority cannot be exercised ‘whatever may be the ‘paper’ theory of organization’ (Simon, 1957: 125). Similarly, Presthus extended the number of parties involved within authority transactions when writing that, rather than being a static immutable quality possessed by a few individuals, authority ‘is (a) subtle interrelationship whose consequences are defined by everyone concerned’ (1960: 87, emphasis added). Adopting a transactional view of authority therefore provides scholars with abundant scope to explore the “push-and-pull” negotiation possibilities through which authority repeatedly evolves over time. However, although this model assumes ‘both the principal and agent jointly shape the terms of whatever authority is to be delegated by the principal to the agent’ (Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 10, emphasis added), studies based on this model have handicapped understandings of relational authority from their outset. Specifically, by narrowing their foci to typically assume that, upon entry to negotiations, the principal’s transactional “currency” is predicated around an existing static base of authority: the authority of office (e.g. ‘boss’, Simon, 1951: 294; or ‘supervisor’, Carpenter and Krause, 2014: 9).

This section has identified how acceptance (Barnard, 1938), situational (Follett, 1942) and transactional (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014) models are inclined to implicitly focus on how negotiations of relational authority proceed from an existing authority of office base. By contrast, Weber’s (1922/1978) insistence on charismatic authority involving reciprocal claim and confer processes that are not wed to a pre-given source of authority provides a useful platform from which
relational studies of authority can advance. However, despite the conceptual promise in Weber’s work, organization and management studies have often overlooked this crucial relational element. To this end, the next section considers in greater depth the core tenets of Weber’s model, how these have regularly been misunderstood within organization and management studies, and the opportunities both of these present for studying authority from a relational perspective.

2.4 Weberian understandings of authority

Of the three “pure” types of authority introduced previously, Weber considered claims made on legal-rational grounds as ‘capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of exercising authority over human beings’ (1922/1978: 223). Consequently, ‘Weber spent more time tracking the historical shift from traditional to rational-legal authority systems as a way to understand the origins of modern modes of economic and social action’ (Lounsbury and Carberry, 2005: 504). In turn, the study of legal-rational authority has been of particular interest for organization and management scholars, who have considered it a hallmark of modern organization (cf. Casey, 2004; Fleming and Spicer, 2014; Lounsbury and Carberry, 2005).

Indeed, among the bulk of organization and management studies interested in authority, there has been a tendency to either ‘implicitly or explicitly assume rational-legalism as the principal foundation for most organizations’ (Nelson, 1993: 653). For example, in addition to the plethora of studies previously identified in this review which unilaterally and unquestionably attribute authority to positions of office, numerous studies conceptualize authority as a noun: as something vested in an inanimate legal body (e.g. a ‘local’ (i.e. public sector) authority (e.g. Collins et al., 2013: 211); a ‘tax’ authority (e.g. Magro and Nutter, 2012: 291); or a ‘monetary’ authority (e.g. Dai and Singleton, 2002: 415). Like ‘office’ studies, such research unquestionably assumes that authority resides in a vacuum which remains largely untouched by human influence. In doing so, both ‘office’ and ‘noun’ views miss out on the rich and nuanced interrelations Weber understood as key to constitutions of authority.

Although having less export to organization and management fields than the legal-rational type, authors have often conflated claims of authority made on traditional grounds with organization culture (Nelson, 1993). Like legal-rational authority, this has led to Weber’s construct often being
investigated ‘in relative isolation from societal context’ (Nelson, 1993: 654). By stripping authority of relationality, a pre-requisite for a Weberian understanding, this construct is again left sanitized.

Weber wrote that charismatic authority can only be exercised when a leader’s ‘revelation, his [sic] heroism or his exemplary qualities … fall within the scope of the individual’s belief in his charisma’ (1922/1978: 216, emphasis added). For Weber, the rarity with which charismatic attributions were possible was evident: ‘The term “charisma” will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he [sic] is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities’ (1922/1978: 241, emphasis added). Assignations of charisma are therefore considered to be a precious and precarious commodity bestowed upon the exceptional few (e.g. ‘a war leader […] prophet, artist, philosopher, ethical or scientific innovator’; Weber, 1922/1978: 1121) rather than the many.

Compared with his views on both legal-rational and traditional authority, Weber singularly emphasized the importance of relationality to this “pure” type of authority: ‘pure charisma does not recognize any legitimacy other than one which flows from personal strength proven time and again […] He gains and retains it solely by proving his powers in practice’ (1922/1978: 1114, emphasis added). For Weber, leaders need to continuously “prove” their charismatic authority. Charismatic authority therefore depends on follower attributions and acceptance: if these are not forthcoming or are withdrawn then charismatic authority disappears. Though crucial to understanding claims to legitimacy across all three “pure” types, relationality is, or should be, of paramount concern to studies using Weber’s conception of charismatic authority. However, despite this, Weber’s understanding of charisma has tended to be co-opted by a certain strand of positivism within leadership studies which has predominantly focused on ‘the attributes, techniques, and strategies of charismatic leadership and its aftermath’ (Nelson, 1993: 654). Under charismatic leadership theory and transformational leadership model umbrellas, scholars including: Bass (Bass 1985; Bass and Avolio 1990); Conger (Conger and Kanungo, 1987; Conger and Kanungo, 1994; Conger and Kanungo, 1998); House (House, 1977; Klein and House, 1995) and Shamir (1991) have appropriated Weber’s conception and proposed charisma to be ‘a particular yet very effective style of leadership’ (Petit, 2012: 513). By doing so, such scholars have ‘favour(ed) a psychological reading of charisma and focus(ed) on the characteristics of the individual leader and his [sic] relationship with his followers’ (Petit, 2012: 513). In addition, the relatively few leadership studies that claim to take a relational approach to charisma presuppose it to be the possession of a leader
and use psychological self/other ratings to test this proposition (Beyer, 1999). Though charismatic and transformational leadership models have furthered knowledge about leadership styles, their omission of Weber’s core relational (claim-confer) component means their contribution to understanding the constitution of authority is limited.

A notable exception to this trend is the work of Ladkin (2006) who, drawing on Weber (1922/1978), conceptualized charisma as a relational phenomenon. Specifically, in contrast to the prevailing orthodoxy within leadership studies identified above, Ladkin reconsiders charisma as an experience of the aesthetic (defined as ‘the dimension of experience which serves an integrating function between our senses, emotions and intellect’ (2006: 168). For Ladkin, aesthetic experience has a clear relational tenet:

‘Our aesthetic sensibility alerts us to the qualities of those people, things, and environments we encounter. Both the perceiver and the object of perception have roles to play in that encounter. Those objects, people, or even ideas which pique our aesthetic sense exhibit certain qualities, but perhaps just as importantly, the perceiver must be open and attentive to appreciating those qualities. In this way the experience of the aesthetic could be said to be ‘co-created’ in that it arises between the perceiver and the object of perception’.

(2006: 168)

In particular, followers will recognize their own strengths and capabilities and become empowered if they experience charismatic leaders as having a ‘sublime’ aesthetic quality (Ladkin, 2006: 165). Though writing for a leadership audience, Ladkin’s aesthetic reconceptualization of charisma provides a potentially useful step to better understanding the value of relational studies of charismatic authority. However, an aesthetic approach to relational authority is usually lacking within organization and management studies. For example, aesthetic perspectives of this phenomenon have tended to focus on how iconographic portraits symbolize the charismatic authority (e.g. the corpus of a saint; Sørenson, 2010 and Emperor Maximilian; Acevedo, 2011) or formal authority (e.g. Queen Victoria; Griffey and Jackson, 2010) of historic figures. These studies’ retrospective focus therefore precludes an investigation of the relational co-creation of authority over time.
Relatedly, other aesthetic perspectives within organization and management studies have concentrated on how managers use aesthetic appearances (e.g. ‘makeup’; Warhurst and Nickson, 2007: 113; and ‘workplace layout, colours, zoning, and shapes’; cf. Wasserman and Frenkel, 2011: 503) to symbolize and uphold a presumed existing base of positional authority. These authors’ investigations of authority take a possession view of authority as their starting point and explore how it is aesthetically reinforced. Like the principal views of authority previously reviewed, these studies therefore cloud an appreciation of the claim-confer processes integral to a relational view of authority. In light of Ladkin’s (2006) aesthetic reconceptualization of charismatic leadership and extant organization and management studies’ prioritization of the symbolic over the relational in aesthetic studies of authority, aesthetics therefore provides a potentially useful theoretical lens through which to explore relational authority.

In addition, two constructs used by aesthetic scholars to explore how organizations exert control or influence over their employees and/or consumers hold potential to further understandings of relational authority. Firstly, numerous studies have drawn on Gagliardi’s (1990, 1996, 2006) concept of landscaping (i.e. when artefacts are moulded and presented ‘in such a way as to generate a specifically aestheticized regime of meaning or pathos’; Hancock, 2005: 38) to explore how managers exert control. For example, studies have explored how managers use aesthetic means to exercise control over workers’ bodies (Hancock and Tyler, 2000; Witz et al., 2003) and to influence consumer perceptions of an organization’s ‘profile’ (Berg and Kreiner, 1990: 41), ‘front’ (Witkin, 1990: 327) or ‘style of service’ (Witz et al., 2003: 34). Similarly, Carter and Jackson use a related an-aesthetic construct (i.e. ‘a process of masking and denial of the experienced reality of organization’; 2000: 180) to theorize how an organization (The Commonwealth War Graves Commission) tries to mask the horrors of war to cemetery visitors. At present, both concepts are used to explore how senior actors unilaterally exercise control over subordinates or situations. However, these studies give no consideration to how recipients of landscaping or an-aestheticizing acts regard them as legitimate. Broadening the scope of these two constructs to include actors’ reactions holds the potential to explore how actors and artefacts participate in the claim-confer processes of legitimacy that characterize a relational view of authority.

After introducing Weber’s (1922/1978) three “pure”/ideal types in greater detail, this section identified numerous organization and management studies that have deviated from or misappropriated a Weberian understanding of relational authority. Specifically, it demonstrates how
studies are culpable of divorcing relationality from each authority type and how this omission is particularly problematic when investigating charismatic claims and attributions of authority. With this oversight in mind, the following section probes a Weberian understanding of routinized charisma and considers how the concept may offer a useful platform from which to further relational understandings of authority.

2.5 Routinized charisma

In its “pure” form, Weber considered charismatic authority to be ‘extra-ordinary’ (1922/1978: 244) as the following examples highlight: ‘He must work miracles, if he wants to be a prophet. He must perform heroic deeds, if he wants to be a warlord. Most of all, his divine mission must prove itself by bringing wellbeing to his faithful followers’ (1922/1978: 1114). Because of this he regarded it as ‘sharply opposed’ (1922/1978: 244) to rational and traditional authority variants which he saw as ‘everyday forms of domination’ (1922/1978: 244). Indeed, Weber wrote: ‘in its pure form charismatic authority has a character specifically foreign to everyday routine structures’ (1922/1978: 246). However, Weber also appreciated that for authority claims based on charisma to have export to and relevance within bureaucratic systems, its idealistic “pure” characteristics required some form of transformation or routinization within available structures. As charisma is not to be regarded as an autonomous concept, it requires the support of organizations and their systems in order to coalesce and be maintained:

‘If this is not to remain a purely transitory phenomenon, but to take on the character of a permanent relationship, a “community” of disciples or followers or a party organization or any sort of political or hierocratic organization, it is necessary for the character of charismatic authority to become radically changed. Indeed, in its pure form charismatic authority may be said to exist only in statu nascendi’.

(Weber, 1922/1978: 246, emphasis in original)

In its “pure” derivative form, charismatic authority was therefore a transitory phenomenon. Indeed, only in the short term, after their initial gift of an attribution of charisma, could this variant fulfil the needs of followers. Once a community’s initial attributions of faith in, and enthusiasm, for the charismatic qualities of their appointed leader had subsided, ‘The great majority of disciples and

Weber (1922/1978) therefore identified how the purity of charismatic authority and its routinization were mutually exclusive. The ideal type required a degree of routinization to meet the demands of daily bureaucratic life: however “too much” alteration threatened to quell its defining appeal for followers. Within bureaucracies, although workers or “staff” held idealistic views of charisma, they had ‘stronger material interests [to] participate in normal family relationships or at least to enjoy a secure social position’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 246). The ideals of “pure” charisma alone could not provide a long-term living for workers and so the demand would always eventually be that charisma became put to work to useful ends: routinized in a way that was beneficial to followers.

Unsurprisingly, this tension between “pure” charisma’s ideals and the material needs and demands of followers and bureaucracy became ‘conspicuously evident’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 248) following a charismatic leader’s departure or, in their followers’ views, a dispersion of his/her charisma. Concomitant with the material calling of staff, the ‘problem of succession’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 248) meant that charismatic authority ‘cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 246). For example, after the claiming and conferring of “pure” charisma during the early stages of prophetic and political movements, ‘as soon as control over large masses of people exists, it [charisma] gives way to the forces of everyday routine’ (Weber, 1922/1978: 252). In short, wherever claims to authority based on charisma are made within bureaucratic environments in which leaders are susceptible to being replaced, and within which workers have material needs, charisma’s transformation from a “pure” type to a routinized version is an ongoing concern and process.

However, although parallels between Weber’s bureaucracies and organizations appear intuitively clear, compared to its “pure” variant studies into charismatic authority’s routinization have received scarce attention within organization and management studies (Beyer and Browning, 1999; Petit, 2012; Trice and Beyer, 1986). Of the relatively few studies interested in charisma’s routinization, the majority of studies have either presumed it to be inevitably routinized within traditional or bureaucratic structures (Blau, 1963; Conger, 1993; Dow, 1969; Shils, 1965) or have honed in on
one particular aspect; the succession of a charismatic leader (Beyer and Browning, 1999; James and Field, 1992; Petit, 2012; Robinson, 1988; Salaman, 1977; Trice and Beyer, 1986).

With regards to the former, Dow (1969) for example speculates how charisma gradually loses its lustre as it becomes subsumed within bureaucratic systems. For Dow, charisma deteriorates from a pure variant during its inception to being ‘largely charismatic during an indeterminate period of institutional control’ (1969: 311) and then ultimately ‘non-charismatic’ (1969: 311) as a leader’s transcendent image/ideal recedes in the face of success or failure. Likewise, Conger (1993) provides a commentary on how an organizational failure inevitably leads to the cessation of charismatic authority’s routinization and, paradoxically, how organizational success culminates in the same outcome. For example, following an organizational success, Conger writes:

‘There exists a desire to institutionalize the new order … to turn it into a permanent everyday possession … with institutionalization, authority by charisma is replaced by rules and traditions, and the charismatic life cycle ends… The very forms of bureaucracy and tradition that it rises up against ultimately consume it’.

(1993: 280)

For these authors, the routinization and then demise of charismatic authority within bureaucratic systems is inevitable. This fatalistic outlook has therefore limited an ‘understanding of the charismatic phenomena and its organizational consequences’ (Calás, 1993: 321) and left considerable scope for authority studies of a relational hue to explore the myriad of ways in which authority is claimed and conferred on a day-to-day basis.

In addition, most studies attending to the routinization of charismatic authority have attended to the consequences of, rather than the relational processes involved within, charisma’s routinization by beginning their exploration of this phenomenon at a leader’s point of ‘severance’ (i.e. once a charismatic figure has departed; Petit, 2012: 514). This tendency has resulted in a predominance of retrospective accounts of charismatic authority’s routinization. Specifically, studies tend to attribute charisma to a former leader and then, often several years later, use organizational outcomes to approximate whether routinization occurred and the extent to which it was rationalized and/or traditionalized. For example, using historical accounts, Beyer and Browning (1999) presumed a deceased computer chip manufacturer CEO had charisma and then, based on the durability of organizational changes, enumerated five characteristics of charismatic routinization.
after his tenure ended. Similarly, other studies provide historical biographies of how a departed leader’s charisma either: became routinized through bureaucratization (Robinson, 1988); was relatively unsuccessful because of bureaucratization (Salaman, 1977) or traditionalization (Petit, 2012); transformed in character as a consequence of both rationalization and traditionalization (James and Field, 1992); or a leader’s charisma survived efforts to routinize it (Nelson, 1993).

Employing a different methodology but achieving a similar finding, Masden and Snow (1983) used a cross-sectional survey of Argentinian citizens as a basis from which to determine the extent to which a former vice-president of the country’s charisma had become routinized. Due to their retrospective focus on the routinization of a charismatic leader’s succession, a common limitation of these studies is their enumeration of routinization’s effects rather than an exploration of the claim and attribution processes within routinization. For example, after providing an enumerative definition of charisma, Trice and Beyer (1986) fell into the same retrospective trap by stipulating five components which must all be present in order for routinization to occur: ‘any instance that is missing one or more of these components we consider to be a failure of routinization’ (p. 137).

Though of some interest to the study in hand, by solely enumerating and not exploring the interrelations between the five components, Weber’s relational understanding of charisma’s routinization is left untapped. An exception to this trend can be found in Hatch and Schultz’s (2013) study. Though they did not study charismatic authority directly, these authors were embedded within the Carlsberg organization and observed and questioned the ‘moment-by-moment’ (p. 159) routinization of a brand product’s charisma. Although they acknowledge their intellectual debt to Weber, Hatch and Schultz (2013) circumvent a key tenet of his writings on charismatic routinization when they assume, rather than interrogate how, said product had charisma and then explore how managers and workers endowed it with such.

To precis, thus far this review has identified a scarcity of studies that attend to the in-situ relational routinization of charisma. This leads to a deficiency in understanding what, in Weber’s view, is a critical component for understandings of charismatic authority: its relationality and ongoing routinization. Extant studies are therefore culpable of illustrating and retrospectively understanding, rather than extending or challenging, Weber’s view that through rationalization and/or traditionalization charismatic authority becomes routinized in and through everyday organizing activity.
Though Weber originally conceptualized charismatic authority's routinization as, somewhat pessimistically and deterministically, occurring through one or a combination of rationalization and traditionalization, more recent work suggests that 'permanent institutions based on charisma can indeed survive largely free of bureaucratic or traditional encumbrance' (Nelson, 1993: 658). To this end, this study sees value in using Weber’s view of charisma as a catalyst to further an understanding of relational authority as a routinized phenomenon. Specifically, this study takes heed of Lounsbury and Carberry’s recommendation that, 'to remain honest to Weber's legacy, organizational theorists need to examine the ways in which new forms of domination and authority are emerging in the postindustrial age’ (2005: 516, emphasis added).

The remainder of this review therefore proceeds by reviewing and borrowing from other theoretical paradigms to 'problematize' (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007; Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011; Sandberg and Alvesson, 2011) and revive understandings of what, to wit, is an important yet underdeveloped construct: relational authority’s routinization. Though undoubtedly important for better understanding the appeal of charismatic leaders, studies which pursue, for example, a psychological (e.g. Kahn and Kram, 1994; Konovsky, 2000; Lind et al., 1993; Milgram, 1965, 1974; Tyler and De Cremer, 2005; Tyler and Lind, 1992) or psychoanalytic (e.g. Gabriel, 1997, 2011; Hirschhorn, 1990; Og lensky, 1995) approach are therefore deemed to be of little relevance to this study, as its focus is on the ongoing production of authority. To this end, the next section considers how adopting a discourse perspective on authority holds potential to stretch understanding of how, from a relational perspective, authority becomes routinized.

2.6 Discourse approaches to authority

Often defined as a lens that ‘highlights the ways in which language constructs organizational reality, rather than simply reflects it’ (Hardy et al., 2005: 60), organizational discourse offers a promising alternative to relational studies' tendency to assume that authority predates interactions. From a 'fine grain' use of language [...] to a macro-emphasis on the 'big picture' of perspectives and ideologies' (Phillips and Oswick, 2012: 454), this approach provides considerable scope to study authority’s relational routinization. In line with this wide ranging distinction, discursive studies of authority can be cruelly divided into two camps: big ‘D' discourse and small d discourse (cf. Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, 2011; Kärreman, 2014).
Big ‘D’ ideological discourses can be characterized by an interest in how values, ethics, and knowledge exercise authority and enable or constrain an individual’s agency during their relations with others (Bourgoin and Bencherki, 2015). These discourses operate on a taken-for-granted level and become so deeply entrenched that their authority seems natural. For example, studies have explored how managerial discourses of masculinity (Kerfoot and Knights, 1998), morality (i.e. ‘winning the hearts and minds of the workforce’; Barley and Kunda, 1992: 364), and feminism (Willmott, 1993) exercise authority over those exposed to them. Discourses such as these are reported to, for example, regulate workers’ thoughts and emotions (Barley and Kunda, 1992), to align workers with a specific corporate culture (Willmott, 1993) and to restrict women’s ‘fuller participation’ in organizations (Kerfoot and Knights, 1998: 7). Relatedly, several strategy studies have explored how senior managers draw on strategy discourses to reinforce their positional authority and, vis-à-vis, undermine non-managerial staffs’ ability to speak or act as strategists (Dick and Collings, 2014; Laine and Vaara, 2007; Mantere and Vaara, 2008). For example, Dick and Collings (2014) report how a Vice President drew on business model discourses to further establish his authority. Similarly, Laine and Vaara (2007) describe how the launch of a ‘new strategy discourse’ (p. 40) by corporate management ‘legitimated its authority position […], but at the same time undermined the agency and subjectivity of others’ (p. 44). Likewise, Mantere and Vaara (2008: 347) found a ‘mystification’ discourse was in circulation which portrayed strategy as a grandiose and secretive activity that is the preserve of top management only. This discourse had a material authoritative effect on strategizing in which ‘top managers” (p. 348) subject positions were strengthened and non-managers’ participation in discussions were restricted. Similarly, within an advertising agency, Hackley (2000) reports that although ‘explicit, overt, bureaucratic, sanction-backed corporate authority’ (p. 239) was absent, a ‘strategic imperative’ discourse exercises authority by circumscribing non-instrumental viewpoints and workers’ freedom to contribute to discussions (p. 243). Although these studies illustrate how discourses have authoritative effects in relations between individuals, they take a deterministic “top down” view of how discourses bear down on, as opposed to being negotiated within, interactions. Ontologically, they tend to conceive of authority as an entity which exists (for a select managerial few) prior to relations and, via extant authoritative discourses, becomes emboldened within them. This a priori assignation of authority coupled with an assumption of the unilateral, authoritative effects of discourse limits this perspective’s scope to extend a relational understanding of how authority, as a wholly relational phenomenon, becomes routinely claimed and conferred over time. In addition, this discourse
perspective arguably blurs, rather than sharpens, the conceptual boundaries between authority and the monopolistic ‘power over’ view (Pitkin, 1972: 276) introduced earlier in this chapter.

By contrast, studies adopting a small ‘d’ discourse perspective are interested in how ‘people create and construct the social world through linguistic interaction’ (Kärreman, 2014: 203) and consider authority as a situated conversational achievement. Several of these studies investigate the rhetorical skills and discursive strategies individuals deploy in the “here and now” of interactions to (de)legitimize their own and others’ positional authority. For example, Samra-Fredericks (2005) found that individuals used personal pronouns to position themselves and others as authoritative strategic figures. Similarly, in a study of an aerospace firm, Kwon et al. (2014) report how board members deploy a range of discursive strategies to maintain, shorten or distance authority relations within meetings. Via the use of jokes, politeness and colloquial language, for example, an ‘equalizing’ (p.284) strategy downplayed speakers’ positional authority. Conversely, within the ‘legitimizing’ (p.284) strategy, actors legitimated their positional authority by using quantitative arguments and expert technical language. Relatedly, several studies explore how individuals attempt to make a difference to situations by making discursive appeals or references to authority in written texts (Vaara et al., 2006; Vaara and Tienari, 2008) or talk (Erkama and Vaara, 2010). Across these studies, individuals deploy authority-based arguments (authorization strategies) to legitimize unpopular courses of corporate action, such as restructures and shutdowns. These strategies portray decisions as being made by the ‘highest authorities’ (Erkama and Vaara, 2010: 828) or as being at the behest of ‘market’ authority (Vaara et al., 2006: 799; Vaara and Tienari, 2008: 989). These conversational explorations go some way in furthering our understanding of authority as a situated and negotiable phenomenon. However, they also tend to equate authority (solely) with talk and as a consequence provide a relational but reductionist viewpoint. In contrast to these studies, Porter et al. (2017) use a discursive approach to explore how authority is relationally negotiated in an environment where the locus of authority is ambiguous (i.e. debates on climate change). The authors examined how actors make discursive ‘authoritative moves’ (Porter et al., 2017: 1) to engender and respond to dialectical tensions within debates and to try to position their fellow debaters around topics. Although their perspective contains a clear relational element, by primarily relying on interviews Porter et al. (2017) retrospectively show actors’ authoritative moves but do not trace over time the (charismatic or otherwise) attributions of legitimacy that are integral to exploring how, from a relational perspective, authority becomes routinized.

Other small ‘d’ discourse studies conceptualize managers as theatrical actors who put on “shows”
of authority by employing management jargon during attempts at impression management (Cluley, 2013; Watson, 2004). Using material from ethnographic research of managerial work, Watson (2004), for example, regularly observed managers using ‘managerial pseudo-jargon’ (p.67) for these ends. This form of jargon, which is neither specific to a specialized cadre of experts nor meaningless noise making, was used by managers to impress upon themselves and others their authority in times of uncertainty. Similarly, Cluley (2013) states that the circulation of managerial ‘buzzwords’ (p.38) in organizations serves similar functions. These words, which have no precise meaning and function, defend their users from criticism and provide managers with an appearance of authority in situations where they are ‘painfully aware that they lack genuine authority’ (Cluley, 2013: 38). Cluley does not embellish what he means by ‘genuine authority’, yet the reference to ‘buzzwords’, coupled with Watson’s ‘pseudo-jargon’, highlights a discursive and performative view of authority as a theatrical pretense. Similar to the small ‘d’ studies previously discussed, both Cluley’s and Watson’s studies have a relational aspect to them in terms of a watching “audience”, who are positioned as being able to decide whether a manager’s performance is charismatic and/or legitimate. However, as BourgoIn and Bencherki (2015) succinctly remark, ‘most people generally have no problem performing authority – but then there isn’t much to be observed’ (p. 20). These studies therefore do little to advance our understanding of authority’s ontology.

Although studies within both discourse camps have relational elements to them, they also have drawbacks as far as this research topic is concerned. Specifically, big ‘D’ discourse studies' deterministic view of authoritative discourses “bearing down” on interactions coupled with small ‘d’ studies’ reductionist equation of language with authority leaves the processes through which authority may be relationally routinized untapped. After considering whether discourse perspectives hold potential to further understanding of this phenomenon, the next section explores whether studies within a related (practice-based) theoretical paradigm can contribute to this endeavor.

### 2.7 Practice approaches to authority

Practices are commonly understood as organized activities undertaken with material arrangements in a given setting (Schatzki, 2005) and are considered key to the ‘production, reproduction and transformation of social and organizational matters’ (Nicolini, 2012: 14). However, despite the broad scope of study afforded by a practice paradigm, which explores nexuses of peoples’ sayings
and doings (Schatzki, 1996), ‘social science has paid little attention to the actual practices through which authority is instantiated’ (Stevanovic and Peräkylä, 2012: 297).

Among the relatively few practice studies that have researched authority, this section identifies a common trend to focus on how individuals’ authority is negotiated through practices. For example, Nelsen and Barley (1997) demonstrate how pairs of paid emergency medical technicians use concisely orchestrated working practices to demonstrate their expert authority to patients and volunteer colleagues. Similarly, Bechky (2003) explores how occupational groups use manufacturing practices to maintain their own, and challenge others’, authority. For example, engineers use drawings to ‘maintain their authority over the design and manufacturing process’ (p. 736, emphasis added). However, in turn, their authority was challenged by ‘technicians’ physical control of the machines’ (p. 740). In addition, Barratt and Oborn (2010) found a project manager used timelines and Gantt charts as boundary objects (i.e. ‘mediating artefacts that have interpretive flexibility’; p. 1210) to assert ‘his managerial authority’ (p. 1211). Relatedly, while Sapsed and Salter (2004) consider authority to be ‘implicit’ (p. 1530) within certain boundary objects (e.g. ‘A Gantt chart suggests how much work will be done by which time, by whom’, p. 1530), the authors report how objects such as these are discarded and their authority becomes dissipated in the ‘absence of clear authority’ (p. 1530). Therefore, while these studies acknowledge that objects (e.g. drawings, Gantt charts) play a role in relational contests over authority, they conceptualize authority as a pre-given and human-centred entity that influences whether and how objects have an authoritative effect. Likewise, Huising (2015) demonstrates how, ‘despite having formal authority’ (p. 263, emphasis added), laboratory professionals had to engage in ‘scut work […] menial work with contaminated materials’ (p. 263) to elicit clients’ voluntary compliance and enact relational authority. Similarly, Tello-Rozas et al. (2015) draw on epistemologies of possession and practice (cf. Cook and Brown, 1999; Marshall and Rollinson, 2004) to explore how members of a social movement organization use formal authority (which they equate with power) to ‘encourage’ (p. 1082) and to ‘create spaces for’ (p. 1090) the emergence of informal authority through micro-practices.

Like the discourse views explored and critiqued above, these practice views provide a potentially useful theoretical paradigm from which to advance a relational understanding of how authority becomes routinized over time. However, they proceed with a presumption that a pre-existing source of authority provides the foundation for, and is contested within, practices. To elaborate,
despite claiming relational authority to be a ‘probabilistic achievement’ (p.264: 2015), Huising presupposes, rather than empirically explores, how formal authority is a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the exercise of relational authority. Relatedly, although they further understanding of how authority emerges in relations between social movement organizations, Tello-Rozas et al. (2015) essentially conceptualize micro-practices as conduits through which a pre-existing type of (formal) authority unilaterally, as opposed to relationally, constitutes another (informal) type.

From another practice perspective, Schatzki’s (2002, 2005, 2012) theory of teleological hierarchy similarly presumes that sources of authority pre-determine how a practice unfolds. For Schatzki, a practice ‘always exhibits a set of ends that participants should or may pursue, a range of projects that they should or may carry out for the sake of these ends, and a selection of tasks that they should or may perform for the sake of those projects’ (2002: 80). However, within this theory authoritative systems/personnel are conceptualized as determining in advance what the ends of a practice will be and which combinations of projects and tasks actors will use to accomplish them. For example, writing about a community of Shakers, Schatzki reports hierarchical authority is ‘built into the teleo-affective structure of the (community’s) herbal medicine practices’ (2002: 82). Similarly, while referring to the day-trading practices of the NASDAQ, Schatzki reports how ‘authorities create “new” practices through the massive overhaul or replacement of existent ones’ (2002: 245). Schatzki therefore takes a possession and noun-based view of authority and conceptualizes it as unilaterally bearing down on a practice rather than a phenomenon which is relationally claimed and contested through a practice. However, while Schatzki recommends that to identify and acquire knowledge of practice as it happens ‘requires considerable “participant observation”’ (2005: 476, emphasis added) and ‘the investigator has no choice but to do ethnography’ (2012: 11, emphasis added), his inferences about the role of authority (and other phenomena) within a teleological hierarchy are drawn largely from third party descriptions (e.g. ‘journals and diaries’; Schatzki, 2002: 86). In so doing, the potential for teleological hierarchy theory to further an understanding of how relational authority becomes routinized is left untapped.

Epistemic practice views (Dick, 2013; Glenn and LeBaron, 2011; Heritage and Raymond, 2005) consider authority to be negotiated and displayed through a combination of multimodal behaviors, such as ‘talk, gesture, gaze, and touch’ (Glenn and LeBaron, 2011: 3). Authority is therefore “worked out” within situations and is something actors can assert and defer to. Glenn and
LeBaron’s (2011) study of employment interviews provides an empirical illustration of how a range of behaviors are used in epistemic authority negotiation. For example, from a preexisting position of authority, interviewers use a combination of hand gestures, gaze and talk to articulate to the applicant that they have knowledge of a file’s contents and therefore epistemic authority. Interviewers conversely deferred epistemic authority to the applicant when, through behaviors (such as shuffling papers, leaning, and talking), they indicated to the applicant that clarification on their application was required. From an epistemic viewpoint, authority is therefore conceptualized as a situationally specific and temporal micro-practice which can momentarily reinforce (certain) individuals’ authority. Specifically, through doings and sayings, individuals embolden their legitimate right within a situation by asserting or deferring to authority. Like the small ‘d’ discourse studies previously critiqued, by conceptualizing epistemic authority as an ephemeral phenomenon, these studies arguably offer a somewhat reductionist view of relational authority. To elaborate, although authority is approached as open to negotiation, this is conceptualized as a momentary accomplishment rather than a phenomenon that becomes routinized over time.

As discussed at the outset of this section, practice-based studies offer manifold possibilities to explore how authority is relationally negotiated and conferred over time. However, by predominantly anchoring their studies in an epistemology of possession, practice-based authority scholars tend to conceptualize authority somewhat deterministically, as a phenomenon transformed by, rather than constituted within, practice. Like the discourse studies previously discussed, by presuming (some) individuals enter interactions with an existing base of authority, practice-based authors are arguably blinkered to, and neglectful of, the processes through which authority may be relationally routinized.

Having evaluated the potential of discourse and practice approaches to advance an understanding of authority’s relational routinization, the next section introduces a perspective which emanates from the former and draws on the latter: Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO; cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Schoneborn et al., 2014). It begins by detailing how the ontological position of authors who follow a CCO perspective, coupled with their ecumenical view of communication, differentiates their studies from those previously discussed in this review. It then proceeds to explore the potential of constructs within a specific CCO ‘school’ to resurrect Weber’s (1922/1978) view of routinized charisma and, by doing so, further a relational understanding of authority as a routinized phenomenon.
2.8 Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO)

During the last two decades, both linguistic (cf. Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000) and discursive (Grant and Hardy, 2004) ‘turns’ have questioned a functionalist view of organization: specifically, ‘the way it positions communication as something that happens in organizations rather than something that is intrinsic to the organization and organizing’ (Mills and Cooren, 2016: 267). Problematizing a transmission model of communication (in which communication is presumed to be a conduit for pre-existing realities, cf. Axley, 1984), these ‘turns’ stimulated an alternative conceptualization whereby language and discourse constitute organizational reality (Mumby, 2011). From these linguistic and discursive turns, a perspective emerged which questions the ontological basis of organization and, epistemologically, the role of human and non-human actors in its constitution; CCO. This section introduces CCO as the main theoretical framework of this thesis.

As the moniker suggests, proponents of a CCO perspective are unified by an ontological premise that organizations are invoked in and maintained through communicative practices (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Schoneborn et al., 2014). Alongside the bold and ‘amorphous’ ontological claims of CCO authors (Brummans et al., 2014: 187), CCO studies’ broad view of communication differentiates this perspective from the others reviewed in previous sections. Specifically, as Cooren et al. (2011) write:

‘If the CCO perspective is to be taken seriously, it means that one should not only pay attention to language and discourse, but also to the interactional events that constitute the building blocks of organizational reality […] any turn of talk, discourse, artifact, metaphor, architectural element, body, text or narrative should at least be considered in its performative […] or transactional […] dimension […] If organizations are indeed communicatively constituted, it means that one should examine what happens in and through communication to constitute, (re-)produce, or alter organizational forms and practices’.

(p.1151, emphasis in original)

After previously identifying discourse and practice authors’ tendency to commence studies of relational authority with a priori views of which individuals enter or have authority within interactions, a CCO perspective is regarded as affording considerable latitude to explore how
human and non-human actors conjointly participate in relational authority’s routinization. Paralleling its importance to studies within more “mainstream” organization and management studies, authority is considered particularly crucial to communicative constitutions of organization. As Putnam and Nicotera write: ‘the mere presence of communication […] is not sufficient to produce an organization without attention to coordinated action, coorientation, or the constitution of authority’ (2010: 160). Relatedly, from a CCO viewpoint, authority is regarded as a phenomenon constituted within interactions rather than something which resides outside them: ‘issues of power, authority or precedence … should not force us to look outside communication, but, on the contrary, invite analysts to identify all the figures participating in the co-construction and co-constitution of an (organizational) situation’ (Cooren et al., 2011: 1153). Indeed, the communicative constitution of authority is of particular interest to studies that identify with, or share the theoretical tenets of, what has become known as ‘The Montreal School’ of CCO (e.g. Brummans, 2006; Cooren, 2000, 2004, 2010; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor, 1999, 2000; Taylor et al.,1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000, 2011).

In comparison to the other two ‘explicit’ (Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011) CCO ‘schools’ (Four Flows, e.g. McPhee and Zaug, 2001 and Social Systems, e.g. Luhmann, 1995), studies which follow or borrow from the ‘Montreal School’ are characterized by a common interest in the multifarious ways a ‘plenum’ (Ashcraft et al., 2009: 20) of human and non-human actors and agencies communicatively constitute organization. Drawing on an eclectic mix of ‘actor-network theory, Greimas’s narrative theory, conversation analysis, and speech act theory’ (Kuhn, 2012: 551), advocates and adopters of this ‘school’ share a common view in which: ‘it makes no sense to grant some agencies greater strength without examining their actual interaction; it is not tenable to prioritize symbolic or material forces in the abstract. Communication is the site of their interpenetration, the process through which agencies collide to co-create realities’ (Ashcraft et al., 2009: 35).

After previously identifying discourse and practice studies’ tendency to conceptually root their relational exploration of authority in individuals, and the rich potential offered by some aesthetic and practice-based approaches, Montreal School authors’ ontological and epistemological positions are intuitively appealing. Specifically, such studies’ conceptualization of human and non-human actors’ interpenetration and their agencies (communicatively) colliding is regarded as providing fertile ground from which to explore how, from a relational perspective, authority becomes
routinized over time. To this end, the next section introduces how, from a Montreal School perspective, authority is conceptualized as communicatively constituted both within ‘explicit’ CCO studies and CCO studies that are more ‘embedded’ within management and organization studies (Ashcraft et al., 2009: 9). Specifically, it reviews a construct which holds potential to empirically explore the routinization of relational authority: text (e.g. Arnaud and Fauré, 2016; Cooren, 2004; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000).

### 2.9 Authoritative texts’ communicative constitution

This section begins by defining a term frequently used in everyday parlance and discourse studies from a Montreal School perspective: text (Cooren, 2004; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000). It then considers how texts’ meanings inform, and are reciprocally informed by, conversations: a cyclical process which Montreal Scholars term the talk-text dialectic (Cooren et al., 2011; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008; Kuhn and Ashcraft, 2003; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor, 2000, 2006; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Robichaud, 2004; Taylor and Van Every, 2000). Next, a review of how explicit and embedded CCO studies use a coorientation view of communication (i.e. where ‘two or more individuals align actions in relation to a common object through an ongoing dialectic of conversations and texts’ (Koschmann et al., 2012: 335) to study the communicative constitution of authority is provided. Following this, parallels between Weber’s (1922/1978) conception of charismatic authority’s routinization and authoritative texts are pinpointed. Finally, after identifying the potential that texts hold for exploring how authority becomes relationally routinized, the section identifies two issues which, following their authoritative constitution within coorientation talk-text cycles, hold potential to affect the routinization of authoritative texts.

In the Montreal School sense of the term, texts refer to:

> ‘Elements mobilized in organizational communication that have a permanence beyond the here and now and that individuals draw on in more ephemeral conversations. As well as material artefacts such as written documents, cultural beliefs, taken-for-granted rules and routines that remain in memory may form part of such a ‘text’.”

(Fenton and Langley, 2011: 1184, emphasis added)
Unlike organizational discourse studies’ focus on what members do when ‘producing or using texts in organizational contexts’ (Cooren, 2004: 373), CCO scholars are interested in the agency of texts and explicitly focus on their ‘active contribution… to organizational processes; that is, on the ways that texts… perform something’ (Cooren, 2004: 374, emphasis in original). In contrast to the discourse and practice studies previously reviewed, a CCO conceptualization of text holds particular promise to explore how authority becomes relationally routinized because it decentres human agency. In addition, the conceptualization of texts having ‘a permanence beyond the here and now’ (Fenton and Langley, 2011: 1184) offers considerable scope to explore this phenomenon. To this end, a CCO-specific understanding of the term text will be used and reviewed throughout the remainder of this chapter.

Texts have garnered significant interest among those interested in the communicative constitution of authority. Specifically, authoritative texts are widely considered as key to the communicative constitution of organization among scholars who identify with or borrow from the Montreal School of theorizing (e.g. Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000, 2014). For texts to become authoritative they must “make a difference” from “a distance” by, for example, controlling, coordinating or normalizing activities (Kuhn, 2008; Taylor and Van Every, 2014), by monitoring, rationalizing, or engendering organizing (Taylor and Robichaud, 2004), and by directing members’ attention to appropriate practice, disciplining their practice and showing how their activities are connected in relative unity (e.g. through the use of narrative and names which offer a collective a representation of who “we” are and where “we” are going’; Koschmann et al., 2012: 343).

One way texts are conceptualized as making a “difference” from a “distance” is through a coorientation system of talk and text (Cooren et al., 2011; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008; Kuhn and Ashcraft, 2003; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor, 2000, 2006; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Robichaud, 2004; Wright, 2016). Specifically, texts are constituted as authoritative when, through a series of dialectical talk-text cycles, they become distanced from the scene and the author(s) of their initial production (Taylor et al., 1996) and have a controlling, disciplining and directing influence on conversations and organizing practices elsewhere (e.g. Kuhn, 2008). For (authoritative) texts to become distanciated (i.e. distanced from) they must exist separately and, more or less, objectively from whence they were first constituted. However, as discussed below, authoritative texts’ ability to do this is problematic.
To date there is a lack of understanding with regards to texts’ ability, once constituted as authoritative, to retain their authoritativeness as they become distanced and “travel” from the scene and context of their production. As this review identifies: iterability (Derrida, 1988); the potential for a ‘mis’ (Cooren, 2009: 46, emphasis in original); and immutable-mobile (Latour, 1987) are instructive theoretical constructs to conceptualize the issues authoritative texts may encounter if they are to become routinized within talk-text cycles.

Drawing on the work of Derrida, Cooren (2004, 2009) writes that for oral and written communication to become an oral, written or iconic text (Cooren, 2004) it needs to be able to break from the context of its production and still be recognizable and understood in the absence of its producer and receiver (Cooren, 2009). For communication to do this it requires iterable qualities (i.e. to have a repetitious quality), although there is an inherent tension in the ability of texts to do this as exact repetition of texts across space and time is impossible (Cooren, 2009). Due to the ‘impurity inherent in the iterable character’ of texts, any text, during repetition, has a potential for ‘misunderstanding, miscommunication, miscalculation, misperception, and so forth’ (Cooren, 2009: 46, emphasis in original). A challenge for researchers is therefore ‘to account for the reproduction of sameness while acknowledging the alteration implicit in any reproduction’ (Cooren, 2009: 52). In another reading of Derrida, Brummans (2007) similarly states that ‘textualizations scratch meaning into infinite horizons… making it impossible to capture things in their original presence’ (p. 725). Texts, therefore, can never be routinized wholly in their original form because they always have something either added to/detracted from them as they travel. To date, the extent to which texts are able to retain, gain, or lose authoritativeness while they become routinized has received scant scholarly attention.

Immutable-mobile (Latour, 1987) is an instructive construct, drawn on by Montreal School scholars, for exploring how much distortion or manipulation texts can withstand if they are to be constituted as authoritative and routinely make a difference to organizing. An immutable-mobile is a thing or entity that moves around yet holds its shape in some relational or functional manner (Law and Singleton, 2005). Put differently, an immutable-mobile is ‘an entity that can travel from one point to the other without suffering from distortion, loss, or corruption’ (Cooren et al., 2007: 157). Though Latour (1987) predominantly conceived of immutable-mobiles as material objects (Cooren and Taylor, 1997), more contemporary studies have appropriated this construct and adapted it to explore the immutability of language (e.g. Cooren and Taylor, 1997; Cooren et al., 2007).
An instructive empirical illustration of the immutability of an authoritative text is provided by Cooren et al. (2007). These authors explore how Médecins Sans Frontière’s (MSF) mission statement, as a text that aimed at authoritativeness and immutability, travelled without significant transformation. Their findings show that little transformation occurred because MSF’s representatives, through their discourses, reinforced and buttressed it across three meetings in the Democratic Republic of Congo. For example, three declarations from the mission statement were regularly recited by the MSF’s head of mission and, through other representatives’ explanations and arguments, became almost ‘mantra’ like (Cooren et al., 2007: 158). Cooren et al. (2007) seem to hold open the possibility that all texts, to some extent, are mutable. Yet, immutable-mobile is a useful construct through which to explore the pliable nature of texts and how, as they become routinized, texts remain relatively intact yet also become more or less transformed.

As Cooren et al. (2007) state, to be immutable or to retain immutability, texts need to be appropriated or translated by interlocutors without experiencing ‘too great a transformation’ (p.158). Unanswered questions arise, however, regarding how great “too great” is. If a text’s physical and relational shape changes too much then a betrayal has occurred and their translator becomes a ‘traitor’ (Cooren et al., 2007: 158). Immutable-mobile is therefore an instructive construct through which to consider how texts, once communicatively constituted as authoritative, can become routinized and still be perceived as authoritative. However, to wit, authoritative texts’ ability to do this has attracted relatively little consideration in the extant literature.

These trials and tribulations associated with authoritative texts' routinization share clear parallels with Weber’s (1922/1978) view of the necessary and inevitable routinization of “pure” charisma. To recap Weber’s conceptualization, for “pure” charisma to be authoritative in the long term it needed to break from the scene where it was claimed-attributed or, in CCO terms, it required distanciating (Taylor et al., 1996). Specifically, “pure” charisma was regarded as requiring some form of routinization through the day-to-day workings of bureaucracies. As this review previously discussed, Weber also identified an inherent tension in the routinization of “pure” charisma. In particular, although “pure” charisma required some form of daily routinization it concomitantly also needed to retain some of its initial spark of appeal to still be attributed by people as authoritative. Using CCO terminology, for “pure” charisma to be mobilized it needed, to some extent, to possess iterable (Derrida, 1988) qualities and retain some form of immutability (Latour, 1987) as it became routinized. This symmetry between Weber’s view of charismatic authority and CCO conceptions of
Authoritative texts is regarded in this thesis as holding potential for exploring how, as a text, authority becomes relationally routinized through a coorientation system of talk-text cycles. After identifying this similarity, the following subsection reviews how coorientation studies have explored the communicative constitution of authoritative texts. From these studies, two issues which hold potential to affect authoritative texts’ routinization are identified: propriety (e.g. Kuhn, 2012) and intertextuality (e.g. Allen, 2000).

### 2.9.1 A coorientation view of authority

This subsection discusses in greater detail how several explicit or embedded CCO studies have used the concept of text to explore the constitution of authority and assesses the utility of this construct for advancing a relational understanding of authority’s routinization. Specifically, it discusses how studies have used a coorientation view of communication to conceptualize (e.g. Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008) and to analyze how authoritative texts are formed within, and have organizing effects beyond, local interactions (e.g. Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011). However, while Kuhn asks ‘how is it that particular texts persist and reliably influence practice across time and space?’ (2008: 1238), studies have yet to empirically answer this question. One reason for this is coorientation studies’ exclusive focus to date on how authoritative texts are constituted within, and make a difference to, meetings as the only empirical setting.

Drawing on fine-grained analyses of meeting talk, documents, and actor interviews, studies demonstrate how authoritative texts periodically organize actors rather than explore how texts routinely exercise authority over actors’ day-to-day workings. For example, by analyzing five stages of a strategy document planning cycle, Spee and Jarzabkowski (2011) found a strategy text disciplines and shapes actors’ meeting talk. Similarly, Fauré et al’s (2010) study of accountancy meetings shows how attendees’ talk gives meaning to, and is recursively reinforced by, budgetary documents. In doing so, this study shows how through a talk-text cycle an organizational hierarchy is intermittently reaffirmed. Likewise, Jordan et al. (2013) demonstrate how a document (i.e. a risk map) set the agenda for engineers’ talk in meetings and Koschmann (2012) reveals how, through actors’ meeting talk, a dashboard functions as a text which engenders a sense of collective identity. In addition, Güney and Creswell (2010) show how technology-as-text (i.e. an operating system)
(re)settles actors’ precedence relationships in meetings and Holm and Fairhurst (2017) report how a discursive text serves a ‘bookending’ (p. 3) function by opening and closing down leadership meetings. In short, by focusing on talk-text cycles in meetings, coorientation studies demonstrate how authoritative texts make a difference to organizing at a point in time rather than across space and time. In relation to charismatic authority, although Weber (1922/1978) did not use the specific term, it seems probable that, to become routinized, charisma would have to traverse meetings and other arenas of day-to-day bureaucratic life. Returning to the present day, by studying authoritative texts’ trajectories, novel insights are possible that shed light on how, as a text, authority becomes relationally routinized over time. To this end, the following two sub-sections identify and critique two constructs: propriety (e.g. Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Taylor, 2011; Wood, 1992), and intertextuality (e.g. Allen, 2000; Kuhn, 2008, 2012), which hold potential to affect authoritative texts’ routinization.

2.9.2 Propriety

As previously identified, distanciation is a crucial aspect in the constitution of an authoritative text. Drawing on Wood (1992), Taylor (2011) states that for texts to be authoritative and credibly represent the organization, as opposed to their creator/author, they need to be distanciated and stripped of the ‘authors’ prejudices, biases and partialities’ (p.1283).

Several coorientation studies analyzing authoritative texts’ trajectories within dialectical talk-text cycles have conceptualized how, following distanciation, their re-authorship by certain actors has a bearing on their ability to become routinized. Koschmann et al. (2012: 342), for example, posit that certain actors’ communicative practices can serve ‘gatekeeping’ functions that protect texts’ meaning. Similarly, Kuhn’s communicative theory of the firm states: ‘Texts may lend themselves to dominant ‘readings’ because of the prominence of some components of the network’ (2008: 1235). For Kuhn, actors are a key component of this network and authoritative texts’ appropriation by ‘particular actors in particular circumstances’ has a bearing on whether they become regarded as ‘true’ (2008: 1237). Similarly, Taylor et al’s (1996) illustration points towards the influence ‘certain persons in certain circumstances’ (p.35) may potentially have on the meaning of texts within dialectical talk-text cycles.
Likewise, for Kuhn (2012: 555), ‘shielding’ an authoritative text from intertextual influences within the social surround (e.g. from stakeholders, competitors, institutional settings, textual resources) is a power-based achievement that requires ‘substantial work’. Kuhn states that shielding is usually associated with the ascendancy of an organizational figure (typically an individual) who, granted the authority by ‘the array of organizational elements’ (2012: 555), comes to ‘author’ the organization’s authoritative text. Although an ‘array of organizational elements’ provides the authors of future coorientation studies with little direction with regards to which actors can shield a text and how they do so, Kuhn acknowledges that unpacking the ‘power-laden’ (2012: 555) processes by which actors are afforded the authority to shield organizational texts within dialectical talk-text cycles is an important scholarly task.

Similarly, in their study of risk map inscriptions (i.e. tools for setting levels of, and for monitoring and evaluating risk), Jordan et al. (2013) raised the issue of ‘powerful actors [who] aim to keep control over the map and prevent others from extending the project’s scope’ (p.170). Their analysis, in conjunction with the above conceptual illustrations of Kuhn (2008, 2012), Koschmann et al. (2012) and Taylor et al. (1996), point to the potential influence of propriety on texts’ authoritative routinization. Unanswered questions therefore abound regarding whether traces of ‘particular’ or ‘certain’ actors’ co-authorship of texts dissipate and whether their (dis)association from texts have a bearing on their authoritiveness. Drawing on Koschmann et al. (2012) and Kuhn (2012), questions arise regarding whether texts require some form of “guardianship” to protect their meaning. Returning to a point broached at the outset of this section, compared to previously reviewed non-CCO constructs, the decentring of human agency within authoritative text studies offers plentiful opportunities to explore how actors of human and non-human hues shield or weaken texts’ authoritativeness within a coorientation system of talk-text cycles.

2.9.3 Intertextual relations

As Kuhn (2008) reminds us, texts are rarely unitary or monolithic entities: the perception of texts’ authoritativeness is, in part, influenced by its relations with other texts. Any exploration of authoritative texts’ routinization must therefore take into consideration intertextuality, defined as: ‘the recognition that texts are formed upon, within, in opposition to – and exist as conglomerations of – a myriad of social and organizational texts’ (Kuhn, 2012: 554). As identified below, the extent to
which the “fibres” of authoritative texts’ interweave with and relate to other texts is an interesting observation from a coorientation analysis of authority and worthy of consideration for prospective investigations into the routinization of authoritative texts.

Koschmann et al. (2012) conceptually raise the potential of inter-textual relations influencing texts’ trajectory and authoritativeness. Using a cross-sector partnership’s collective agency text to illustrate their point, they posit that its receptivity and resistance to saturation by other texts, increases its potential for collective agency and to create value. Similarly, Jordan et al’s (2013) analysis of the authoritative effects of a risk map text points to the fibrous nature of texts. On the map, risk inscriptions/objects were flexibly placed and moved around, with the top ten inscriptions giving the map its authoritative effect by assigning workers’ responsibilities. How these inscriptions/objects interacted to alter the map’s shape and meanings are however interesting questions left open by this study. Likewise, in Güney and Creswell’s analysis, technology-as-text (an IT operating platform) formed the basis of a new form of governance that became orally represented as a ‘little e’ (2012: 163) text. Again, questions arise regarding the bounded nature of these texts’ relationships and whether changes in the form of one text affected the form and the meaning of the other.

Similarly, Koschmann’s (2012) study of an inter-organizational collaboration agency found the ‘dashboard’ text encountered ‘competing sub-texts’ (p. 82) and ‘various intertextual efforts vied to shape [its] official interpretation’ (p. 81). Applying Allen’s (2000) classification of intertextual influences to Koschmann’s (2012) findings, paratextual influences (i.e. ‘those elements which lie on the threshold of the text and which help to direct and control the reception of a text by its readers’: Allen, 2000: 103) could be considered as either having or attempting to have a bearing on the dashboard text’s form and meaning. The issue of sub-texts does raise interesting questions beyond Koschmann’s (2012) focus with regards to what differentiates a sub-text from a text? Can sub-texts be authoritative? And, do sub-texts influence authoritative texts’ meaning if they become routinized?

Koschmann’s (2012) study also throws up the potential influence of metatextuality, which is ‘when a text takes up a relation of “commentary” to another text’ (Allen, 2000: 102) within dialectical talk-text cycles. The dashboard text, for example, was ‘extended [by actors’ talk to…] “moving the needle” on key issues and making sure the “tank was full” and that “we aren’t stuck on cruise control” (Koschmann, 2012: 78). Sharing literal and figurative threads around automobiles and performance
respectively, ‘needle’, ‘tank’ and ‘cruise control’ could be considered to be metatexts (variants of the dashboard text) which informed, and potentially reinforced, its authoritativeness. Again questions arise regarding whether and to what extent texts can be extended and still retain a recognizable form as their initial co-authors originally intended.

Reviewing extant studies of authoritative texts within a system of coorientation, two issues are identified as having the potential to affect texts’ authoritativeness as they become routinized: propriety and intertextuality. The effects issues such as these can potentially have on texts, either singularly or interdependently, highlights the precariousness of texts’ authoritativeness over time.

To précis, this section has identified parallels between Weber’s (1922/1978) routinization of charismatic authority and a CCO understanding of an authoritative text. It then considered the utility of exploring how authority can become routinized as a text through a system of cooriented talk-text cycles. In particular, texts’ agentic qualities were regarded as offering a promising alternative to extant aesthetic, discourse and practice studies identified in this review which have a tendency to flavour the study of relational authority by foregrounding either: individuals, human agency, or the authority of office. In addition, texts are conceptualized as providing a means for exploring how authority moves from the “here and now” to the “there and then” of interactions.

However, as this section has demonstrated, coorientation studies’ focus on how an authoritative text is constituted within and organizes actors’ actions in meetings has resulted in a lack of understanding about how authoritative texts become routinized over time. Specifically, issues of propriety and intertextuality are identified as potentially affecting texts’ authoritative constitution and routinization. Such issues would require attention in any prospective study of how authority is communicatively constituted and routinized as a text. The next section introduces three other Montreal School constructs which hold potential to further an understanding of this phenomenon. The following section identifies how, although the application of these constructs is limited, they hold analytical promise for exploring the routinization of authority from a relational perspective.

2.10 Montreal School approaches to authority

This section introduces and critiques three conceptualizations of authority from authors who identify with, or borrow constructs from, the Montreal School of CCO. Comprised of three sub-sections it
discusses how explicit and embedded studies have considered authority to be communicatively constituted through: presentification (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Cooren, 2009; Cooren et al., 2008; Koschmann and Burk, 2016; Koschmann and McDonald, 2015), thirdness (Brummans et al., 2013; Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014), and ventriloquism (e.g. Caronia and Cooren, 2014; Cooren, 2010, 2012, 2015; Cooren and Sandler, 2014; Cooren et al., 2013). Each subsection begins by introducing the construct before evaluating its utility for furthering a relational understanding of authority’s constitution and routinization.

2.10.1 Presentification

Presentification studies are interested in how sources of authority are made present or, put differently, presentified in interactions (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Cooren, 2009; Cooren et al., 2008; Koschmann and Burk, 2016; Koschmann and McDonald, 2015). Studies’ interest lies in exploring how, for example, contracts, statuses, principles, directives, and labels are communicatively brought forth by human and non-human agents (e.g. signs) within interactions or how sources surround and ‘haunt’ (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009: 11) interactions (e.g. in a contract which defines organizational statuses) and are contested within them (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Cooren, 2009). Through sources’ lingering and ‘spectral’ presence, authority is therefore conceived as being able to ‘sustain’ (p.5) and ‘endure’ (p.6) prior to and after interactions (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009).

Compared to the discourse and practice views of authority discussed previously in this review, presentification opens up numerous possibilities for conceptualizing how a band of human and non-human actors participate in the claim-confer processes that are crucial for the relational routinization of authority. However, by pre-judging sources’ authoritativeness (e.g. statuses, directives, etc.) prior to their presentification, these authors blur the lines between the constitu-tion of authority as a verb and authority as a constitu-ed phenomenon as a noun. Consequently, presentification authors have a tendency to “feature spot” authoritative sources (e.g. a directive, a contract, a director etc) which they pre-emptively deem to be lurking around interactions and then periodically “surfacing” within them. A notable exception to this trend is Koschmann and McDonald’s (2015) study of how, within a non-profit organization, an authoritative text of inclusion was presentified within team meeting rituals. Rather than presume that an authoritative source is
present within the organization, these authors claim this inclusion text (materialized through, for example, meeting wall posters) directed attendees’ attention toward the organization’s purpose. However, how this text was presentified within meeting rituals is less clear. By their own admission, Koschmann and McDonald (2015) rely on attendees’ ‘retrospective personal accounts’ (p.250) to ‘presuppose’ (p.251) rather than ‘demonstrate’ (p.251) how this text is made present. Nevertheless, these authors’ conceptualization of a source’s constitution as an authoritative text being presentified (rather than the presentification of a predefined authoritative source) holds potential to further an understanding of how, as a presentified text, authority becomes constituted and routinized.

2.10.2 Thirdness

From a thirdness perspective, authority is constituted when a third party is linguistically or mimetically introduced into an interaction and two or more parties mutually orient to it (Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014). Specifically, if these parties mutually interpret their actions as being authorized by a ‘third’ (e.g. ‘company policy’ or ‘management says’; Taylor and Van Every, 2014: 9) then authority is considered to be ‘enshrined’ in, but ‘not possessed by’, that third (Taylor and Van Every, 2014: 198). Parties’ shared interpretation of, and mutual orientation to, a third is not, however, always forthcoming. On such occasions, parties participate in ‘frame games’ (Taylor and Van Every, 2011: 38) where they endeavour to have their interpretation of the third accepted by others and oriented to as the norm.

Thirdness provides a useful conceptualization of how a third actor becomes authoritative by governing people’s actions. In addition, the multifarious frame games around the third holds potential for exploring how a third, or individuals’ interpretation of it, becomes authoritative and routinized over time. However, despite the clear relational tenets of this construct, individuals’ ability to participate in these games is, in Taylor and Van Every’s (2011, 2014) view, either enabled or constrained by a pre-existing authority of office. For example, referring to their retrospective accounts of individuals’ voicing of a third during frame games within law enforcement and public broadcast organizations, they write: ‘where this becomes complicated […] is in determining who [i.e. which party] is to act as the human voice […] the rationale of positions privileges management’ (2014: 14) and ‘the head of the organisation sits at the summit of an […] administration. As such, he
or she is the ultimate third’ (2014: 203). In short, although a third’s authority and actors’ interpretations of it may (theoretically) become routinized over time, Taylor and Van Every (2011, 2014) have stymied the potential of this construct to explore authority’s relational routinization because, ultimately, individuals with positions of authority are conceived as having a predisposition to author, interpret and veto thirds’ authoritativeness.

Brummans et al. (2013) have also applied authority as thirdness in a limited way. These authors report how, within a Buddhist humanitarian organization, leaders invoke their spiritual master as a ‘third’ in daily workings by, for example, adopting her intonation and copying her body movements. In turn, such faithful interpretations of this third lead to the establishment of leaders’ personal authority, alongside the third’s, in their workings. As Brummans et al. (2013) report: ‘Differences in authority between members are established, in turn, based on whether members are regarded as skilful, knowledgeable, and rightful interpreters of the organization’s revered figures’ (p. 351). While their conceptualization of thirds contains a clear relational element, for Brummans et al. (2013) authority is constituted and then routinized within a recursive loop which emanates from, and then inheres in, existing bases of authority. Taking this approach to explore the routinization of authority is therefore restrictive because, essentially, ‘thirds’ are conceptually anchored to existing and static bases of, for example, Weber’s (1922/1978) legal-rational and traditional authority. Like the previous subsection, shedding preconceived ideas of authority as something possessed prior to interactions offers a promising avenue to advance understanding of how, as a wholly relational construct, authority becomes routinized. Specifically, authority as thirdness holds scope for a relational exploration of how actors routinely interpret a ‘third’ as having authority and/or how actors’ framings of a third become routinized as authoritative.

2.10.3 Ventriloquism

Scholars taking a ventriloquism view of communication use the metaphor of a ventriloquist and their dummy to explore how humans and non-humans speak through and to each other (Caronia and Cooren, 2014; Cooren, 2010, 2012, 2015; Cooren and Sandler, 2014; Cooren et al., 2013; Wilhoit and Kisselburgh, 2017). From this perspective, a variety of human and non-human forms and figures of agency are theorized to always be in play in any interaction or dialogue (Cooren, 2010, 2012, 2015). As this subsection shows, a variety of explicit and embedded CCO studies
have drawn on this theory to conceptualize and explore how authority is shared between forms and figures in an upstream-downstream chain of agency.

Specifically, upstream sources of authority (e.g. principles, values, policy, etc.) can animate, and be animated by, downstream interlocutors. As Cooren writes: ‘the effects of ventriloquism therefore are bidirectional and mark an oscillation/vacillation’ (2012: 6). Within these ventriloqual processes, non-human figures are considered fully-fledged participants in the constitution of organizational realities and organization as opposed to being at the behest of human figures. Because of this orientation, a ventriloqual approach offers a promising alternative to the previously discussed discourse and practice-based views of authority (which foreground the agency of humans over non-human forms) because it conceptualizes ‘how human ventriloquists and their figures are “entangled” or mutually constitutive’ (Cooren et al., 2013: 264). For example, a simple and common instance of this phenomenon can be witnessed when one person says to another ‘I am sorry, but according to our policy, I cannot provide you with this type of information’ (Cooren, 2010: 137). In this exchange ‘policy’, and most likely the organization it “speaks” on behalf of, are being ventriloquized as authoritative figures by the speaker. Simultaneously, the organization and the policy are conceptualized as making the speaker “speak” as an authority figure, by giving him or her reason to reject the request (Cooren, 2010). Therefore, for Cooren (2015) ‘ventriloquism thus goes in both directions’ (p. 476) with, in the example above, the policy and speaker concurrently acting as both figure and ventriloquist.

For ventriloqual studies, the agency of mobilized sources (authoritative or otherwise) is conceptualized as an ‘open question’ (Cooren, 2012: 8), one that is answered on the ‘terra firma’ of communication (Cooren, 2012: 9). Ventriloquism therefore offers a promising theoretical lens through which to study the routinization of authority because it is seemingly unfettered by authors’ a priori assignation of positional and/or professional authority. As Cooren writes: ‘it is because a person can be perceived as voicing other forms of agency that he/she can be considered more powerful, authoritative and influential’ (2012: 13, emphasis added). However, despite this attributional tenet, this review identifies that the majority of studies applying a ventriloqual lens to authority have focused on bi-directional ventriloquist-dummy performances and have neglected third-party “audience” reactions to these. For example, in their study of how members of crisis management teams’ framed their interpretations of crises as authoritative, Bergeron and Cooren (2012) focused on the ‘presence and absence of figures, as well as the role and the importance
each figure played in the *individuals’* framing of the situation’ (p. 125, emphasis added). Likewise, Cooren et al. (2013) explore how individuals become overly attached or ‘cling’ (p. 258) to ventriloqual figures they deem authoritative and, by continuing to ventriloquize these, how organizational tensions ensue.

A dyadic (i.e. ventriloquist-dummy) focus is similarly evident within management and organization studies which borrow constructs from, but do not explicitly label themselves as, CCO. For example, during appraisal interviews Sorsa et al. (2014) explore speakers’ attempts to authoritatively ventriloquize the ‘voice of strategy’ (p. 60). However, they concentrate on how ‘speakers displayed *their attitudes* toward them’ (i.e. figures), with ventriloquism found to be ‘a resource for displaying a variety of attitudes’ (p. 71, emphasis added). Likewise, Jahn (2016) studies how firefighters authoritatively made a difference within situations by ventriloquizing safety rules. However, the study’s retrospective interview-based methodology precluded any attempt to explore the reception of this conjoint firefighter-rule ventriloqual performance by others *within* such situations. In short, both explicit and more embedded CCO studies’ arguably myopic focus on ventriloquist-dummy dyads precludes investigations of how authority could become relationally routinized over time because they omit a necessary condition for investigations of this phenomenon: its legitimization by other interactants.

An interesting, albeit rare, exception to this trend is Caronia and Cooren’s (2014) observation of work carried out in a hospital’s Intensive Care Unit. These authors provide an in-situ account of how a third party (a doctor) legitimizes a ventriloqual performance which took place between a nurse and (in the upstream–downstream chain of agency) hospital protocol and hygiene norms. Specifically, by accepting the nurse’s offer of a box of latex gloves and putting a pair on, the doctor accepted that these various human and non-human figures of agency momentarily had authority over him during a patient consultation. Caronia and Cooren’s (2014) study provides an interesting example of how, within a ventriloquist (i.e. nurse)– figure (i.e. protocol and norms)– audience (i.e. doctor) triad, authority is communicatively constituted in the moment. However, whether and how such an authoritative constitution could become routinized over time is left open by Caronia and Cooren (2014) and, for the reasons identified above, by other ventriloquism studies too.

To summarize, this section has discussed three CCO constructs which further understanding of in-situ communicative constitutions of authority. However, by conceiving (pre-existing) authoritative sources to be lurking and then surfacing within interactions (i.e. presentification) and as
constraining/enabling individuals' ability to author and/or interpret thirdness, two of these constructs tend to ground communicative constitutions of authority in the “here and now” of interactions. In turn, ventriloqual studies’ tendency to (predominantly) focus on bi-directional ventriloquist-figure “performances” was identified as precluding explorations of third-party attributions of legitimacy and, by extension, if and how such performances become routinized over time. However, while numerous studies were identified as applying these three constructs in limited ways, this section identified the analytical promise each holds for furthering an understanding of authority's communicative constitution and routinization. The next section summarizes the chapter.

2.11 Chapter summary

This chapter began by identifying two prominent views of authority within organization and management studies: principal authority (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014) and relational authority (e.g. Barnard, 1938; Scott, 1964; Simon, 1957). After highlighting some conflation between the former of these views and power, the chapter proceeded by exploring how the latter had been studied within organization and management fields. Specifically, it introduced four established models of relational authority and, from these, identified a Weberian (1922/1978) view of authority as holding considerable scope for conceptualizing and exploring the multifarious ways authority may be relationally negotiated.

Further interrogation of Weber’s (1922/1978) writings on authority led to the routinization of charismatic authority being identified as an important but, to wit, under-developed construct in organization and management studies. While reviewing studies interested in the routinization of charismatic authority, a tendency on authors’ parts to ascribe charismatic authority to leaders and to focus on the succession of charismatic authority (i.e. once a leader has departed an organization) was found. As the section identified, this leaves a paucity of understanding with regards to charismatic authority’s routinization and provides a conceptual platform from which studies interested in the relational routinization of authority may proceed. However, an aesthetic approach to authority (Ladkin, 2006) was identified as holding (unrealized) potential to further an appreciation of this phenomenon.

Following this gap in extant Weberian (1922/1978) readings, the review widened its scope to consider how discourse and practice-based perspectives, regarded as conceptually sympathetic to
furthering knowledge about the routinization of authority from a relational perspective, could contribute to filling this gap. A review of both discourse (big ‘D’ and little ‘d’) (cf. Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000, 2011; Kärreman, 2014) and practice (cf. Nicolini, 2012; Schatzki, 1996, 2005) studies of authority identified a tendency among authors to commence their studies with a predetermined view of who (i.e. person and/or position) has authority and how it is then negotiated through discourse(s) or practice(s). However, a particular construct within practice studies, teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002, 2005, 2012) was identified as offering a myriad of ways to explore how attributions of authority become routinized over time. The relational tenets of discourse and practice perspectives led, in turn, to the identification of a perspective which emanates from discourse studies and amalgamates practice perspectives: CCO (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Schoneborn et al., 2014).

The ontological and epistemological views of studies that characterize the CCO perspective were considered as offering considerable latitude from which to explore the relational routinization of authority. Specifically, studies aligning with or borrowing from the Montreal School (cf. Brummans, 2006; Cooren, 2000, 2004, 2010; Robichaud et al., 2004; Taylor, 2000; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000, 2011) of CCO and their ecumenical view of which actors and agencies make a difference within interactions was identified as offering a means to decentre human agency and the authority of office found in previous sections of this review. The chapter honed in on a CCO construct which offers potential for exploring how authority is relationally routinized between interactions: texts (e.g. Cooren, 2004; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000). Taking a speculative stance the section identified two issues which hold potential to affect texts’ authoritativeness if they were to become routinized over time: propriety (e.g. Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Taylor, 2011; Wood, 1992) and intertextuality (e.g. Allen, 2000; Kuhn, 2008, 2012). Following this, the chapter identified three other Montreal School constructs (presentification; Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; thirdness; Brummans et al., 2013; Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014; ventriloquism; Cooren, 2010, 2012, 2015) which have been used in restricted ways to explore the constitution of authority but, nevertheless, hold unfulfilled potential to explore the routinization of authority from a relational perspective.

After reviewing theories of authority within organization and management studies, a clearer exposition and a greater appreciation of the ways texts’ authority changes during routinization is
considered as resurrecting Weber’s (1922/1978) conception of routinized charisma. Specifically, a more nuanced appreciation of this phenomenon is anticipated to further understanding of the differential impact (an) authoritative text(s) can have, at different times and at various places, on working practices.

The next chapter details the organizational context in which the research question was explored. It begins by outlining the industry the organization forms a part of, the group to which the organization belongs, and the organization’s key product offerings and services. It closes by considering the process taken for gaining access to the organization.
3.1 Chapter Introduction

This chapter provides background to the organizational context in which the fieldwork was carried out. It begins by outlining the key products and services of the organizational group (anonymized as Cosmetico) which owns the host organization (referred to using the pseudonyms Ella May or Ella). Following this, the global offerings of Ella May are introduced. This leads into a more in-depth discussion of Ella May’s UK activities and specifically the structure of, and the roles and responsibilities within, the sales and education department where the fieldwork took place. In the penultimate section, attention turns to how and why the host organization and this department were chosen for fieldwork. The chapter concludes by detailing the processual nature of access to the department’s activities.

3.2 Cosmetico

Cosmetico is one of the cosmetic industry’s leading luxury companies (Cosmetico, 2013, 2014, 2015; Ernst & Young, 2015). Since its inception in the 1940s, it has acquired over 30 companies into its portfolio and employs circa 45,000 full-time employees. Cosmetico’s companies are active in over 150 countries and its products are predominantly distributed through limited and select distribution channels including premium department stores, luxury boutiques, and prestige spas and salons (Cosmetico, 2013, 2014, 2015). Each company sells products in one or a combination of the following categories: makeup (which includes products such as lipsticks, foundations, and mascaras); skincare (e.g. moisturizers, cleansers, and toners); fragrance (e.g. colognes, eau de parfums, and candles); and haircare (e.g. shampoos, conditioners, and styling creams).

Around the time of fieldwork Cosmetico was in growth. For example, the group’s year-on-year net sales had grown from around $9bn in 2011 to roughly $11bn in 2015 (Cosmetico, 2015). In addition, according to its 2015 annual shareholder report, over 90% of the group’s operating income and over 80% of its net sales came from skincare and makeup which are, as the next section discusses in greater depth, the cosmetic categories Ella specializes in.
3.3 Ella May (globally)

Founded in the 1990s, Ella May employs over 3,500 professional makeup artists across 65 countries on cosmetic counters and within its own proprietary stores. It offers a wide range of makeup and skincare products, which when correctly chosen and properly applied, it claims, ‘empowers a woman to confidently create a beauty style that’s uniquely hers’ (Ella May, 2015). To enable this, Ella offers a range of one-to-one makeup and skincare ‘lessons’ which were the predominant type of artist-client interaction witnessed throughout fieldwork. A ‘lesson’ is a pre-booked episode of interaction where artists investigate clients’ skincare and/or makeup requirements and show them, by applying products onto their skin, how these can be addressed. At the close of the lesson makeup artists attempt to sell clients all or some of the products used. In addition to lessons, customers can browse and buy Ella’s makeup range in retail stores. Ella May claims to offer ‘effortless, universally flattering makeup for all skin tones’ (Ella May, 2015). Its portfolio, for example, includes: concealers, bronzers, foundations, blushers, lipsticks, mascaras, eyeshadows, and eyeliners. Similarly, Ella May offers a variety of skincare products for demonstration and sale. These include, for example: moisturizers, makeup removers, soaps, cleansers, toners, tonics, rinses, eye creams, serums, face creams, eye creams, hand creams, and lip balms. The majority of these products are made with different formulas and ingredients which, Ella May claim, offer a ‘sensorial experience, instantly visible results and long-term benefits’ (Ella May, 2015) and cater for all skin types (i.e. dry, oily, and combination), certain skin conditions (e.g. sensitive skin, dehydrated skin, acned skin, and rosacea), and skin problems (e.g. blemishes, hyperpigmentation and sunburn). Following consideration of Ella May’s core international provision of lessons and products, the next section details how these are offered in the UK. Specifically, the following section discusses the organizational structure and the key responsibilities of the UK sales and education department where fieldwork was carried out.

3.4 Ella May (in the UK)

Within the UK, Ella’s lessons and products are available in around 80 retail spaces across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Ella May is also available in two stores in the Republic of
Ireland. The vast majority of retail spaces are large, premium department retail stores which house departments such as womenswear, menswear, electrical, home and garden, and beauty. In these stores Ella May's goods and services are available, alongside their competitors', on cosmetic counters.

Alternatively, Ella May is also available in proprietary retail stores either owned or rented by Cosmetico. These stores represent around one-tenth of Ella May's total retail space in the UK and solely offer and sell their own products and services. In addition, Ella May is also available at some UK airports and designer outlet retail parks. However, these retail spaces fall under Cosmetico’s auspices rather than the sales and education department of Ella May and they did not therefore form a part of the fieldwork.

The UK sales and education department is overseen by the UK Vice-President (VP) who also has overall responsibility for marketing, communications, public relations, digital, and social-media departments. As figure 1 shows, the National Sales Manager (NSM) reports to the VP. The NSM directs UK sales strategy by, for example, setting fiscal and quarterly sales and lesson booking targets, planning and forecasting new product and lesson launches, and liaising with other UK departments to support sales activity. Two area managers’ report into the NSM: one in the North and one in the South of the UK. Both managers have responsibility for implementing and monitoring sales and lesson activity in their area and both areas are comprised of four geographical regions. The North includes: Scotland and Northern England, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, Manchester, and the East Midlands. The South includes: Southern England, the South East of England, Greater London, and the West End of London. Each region has a sales manager and an education manager who have responsibility for approximately 10 stores. The former has responsibility for activities such as: setting and monitoring weekly and monthly sales and lesson targets, liaising with department store managers about Ella May activity, and attending to human resource issues such as recruitment, promotions, and disciplinary hearings. Education managers are responsible for training Ella May makeup artists within stores and counters around activities such as: makeup application techniques, developing product knowledge, and teaching Ella’s ethos and philosophy.
Figure 1: Ella May’s UK sales and education organogram
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One business manager from each cosmetic counter and one studio manager from each Ella May store report into their regional sales and education managers. In addition to having the same responsibilities as makeup artists (discussed below), business and studio managers oversee counter and store day-to-day operations and have responsibilities such as: organizing staff rotas, ordering product stock, and reporting sales and lesson booking figures on a daily and weekly basis. Their efforts are supported by an assistant studio manager in Ella stores or an assistant business manager on cosmetic counters. In addition, each counter and store has a resident educator/coach who, in the absence of the regional education manager, provides advice on product features and application techniques to makeup artists on a daily basis.

Each counter and store employs between approximately 3 to 30 makeup artists in a variety of full-time and part-time positions. The number of artists per counter/store depends, in large part, on its geographical location with, for example, large cosmetic counters in London’s West End employing more artists than smaller counters in Greater London. The main responsibility of an artist is to sell Ella’s products to customers in accordance with its espoused philosophy of teaching them how to enhance, rather than transform, their appearance. Management expect artists to do this primarily through scheduling lesson appointments with customers. Artists’ attempts to secure appointments typically involves asking browsing customers and those buying products at the till-point if they would like to schedule a lesson and by rebooking existing customers at the end of lessons.

The duration of lessons varies from between 5 minutes to 1 hour. During this time artists, who are typically standing up, apply products onto customers who are seated in consultation chairs. Lessons commence with a consultation in which makeup artists investigate, through looking, touching and asking, whether customers have any skincare concerns (e.g. dry or flaky skin) and how they would like their skin and makeup to look and to feel. Following this, artists are supposed to remove any makeup a customer may be wearing using cotton pads before Ella’s products can be applied. Depending on the product used and customers’ needs, makeup artists either apply products: directly onto customers (e.g. lipstick, mascara, and eyeliner); with the aid of brushes (e.g. eyeshadow, bronzer, and blusher); or by using their hands (e.g. moisturizer, eye cream, face cream). Throughout the lesson artists are supposed to write down which products are being used and in what order on a customized Ella May piece of paper. At the end of the lesson artists are expected to use this document to recommend products for the customer to purchase. If the customer wishes to make a purchase, the artist takes new unopened products to the till before cleaning the tester products and the brushes used in the lesson. Artists are required to ask all
purchasing customers for their personal details (e.g. name, postal and email addresses, and telephone number) so they can be added to Ella May’s customer relationship management database.

In addition to their lesson responsibilities, all artists are required to greet and, where necessary, offer advice to and answer queries from browsing customers. For example, an artist may: help a customer choose a lipstick which suits their complexion, describe the waterproof properties of mascaras, or explain a face cream’s mineral and vitamin ingredients. As with lessons, such advice is supposed to be in accordance with and to promote Ella’s philosophy around enhancing rather than transforming customers’ appearance. For these reasons, artists are required to attend biannual training events where education managers introduce Ella’s Spring/Summer and Autumn/Winter product collections. Within these events Ella’s ethos is reiterated and artists receive training on new products’ properties, ingredients and application techniques. Similarly, artists are required to attend regular on-counter and instore training sessions to refresh this knowledge.

When they are not with customers, artists are expected to replenish product stocks on counters and in stores. Often this involves moving products from stock rooms to counter/store drawers and ensuring the stands which house the products are fully equipped. In addition, artists are tasked with maintaining counter’s/store’s appearance and levels of hygiene by cleaning surfaces and stock. For example, artists are regularly required to shave the tips off tester lipsticks which visitors have tried on. This sees to it that the same product is not used on different people and also so that when lipsticks are lined up in a row on stands their ends are of a uniform height.

In addition to the management roles outlined in figure 1, artists can also potentially be promoted into artistry positions with more responsibility. For artists who meet sales and lesson booking targets and demonstrate proficiency in makeup application, there are opportunities for promotion to ‘advanced’, ‘featured’, or ‘pro-artistry’ roles. Alongside their day-to-day instore/on-counter responsibilities, around 50 advanced artists have opportunities to represent Ella May and work at events such as London fashion week, public relations (PR) events and photography shoots for magazines. Five featured artists also have the opportunity to attend these events. These artists work in either the North or the South areas and their day-to-day responsibilities involve visiting counters and stores to have one-to-one or group makeup lessons with customers. Finally, like featured artists, two pro-artists hold lesson events on makeup counters and work at fashion, PR, and photography events. In addition, these artists work at similar international events and attend
global Ella May training events which they then replicate and deliver to education managers and artists in the UK. Following consideration of the organizational structure of Ella May’s UK sales and education department, and the key roles and responsibilities within it, the next section considers how and why fieldwork was carried out there.

3.5 Choosing the host organization

My initial introduction to Ella May came via a recommendation from a relative who was a former employee. My preconceptions of the organization was that the nature of makeup artistry was a visual, verbal, gestural and sociable practice which involves artists “performing” on customers and in front of colleagues and the general public on a regular basis. Having only previously purchased fragrances from cosmetics organizations, this perception was influenced somewhat by a previous research project I had carried out with a sister organization of Ella May in 2014. This pilot study involved observing communication within beauty counter managers’ meetings and in stores, followed by semi-structured interviews about these observations with managers shortly afterwards. This experience partly steered my choice to approach the case organization though undeniably, because of my family contact, an element of serendipity was also at play. In short, based on my prior conceptions and experiences I believed the case organization would be theoretically interesting to study, access seemed achievable and doing so would allow me to address a gap in our knowledge of this under-researched industry.

Running counter to Buchanan et al’s (1988) advice that it is neither necessary nor desirable for a student researcher ‘to go in at the top’ (p. 56), my initial contact with the host organization came via emails and a meeting with the VP during May 2015. As Calveley and Wray (2002) remind us, securing meetings about access with decision makers in organizations can be difficult, so I was fortunate to have this meeting facilitated by my family member and to a lesser extent by my pilot study experience which appeared to give the VP some confidence in my credentials and trustworthiness.

The VP seemed interested in, and open to, the general idea of the study. Presented in non-academic jargon, this was around how: messages are communicated within and become more or less authoritative as they travel around organizations; how I planned to research this (mainly through observations and research interviews); and how long I would be doing it for (from
approximately Autumn 2015 to Spring/Summer 2016). The choice around a specific department for me to research was jointly steered toward the artistry sales teams in the locality where I lived (which is also coincidentally the organization’s highest grossing UK sales region): London. The VP relayed how the organization was in a period of growth and it would be refreshing to get an “outside-in” perspective on how messages are communicated into and around the stores and the counters the organization owned and rented within department stores. I had the impression this ‘strategic exchange’ (Watson, 1994: 37) could therefore be mutually beneficial for both parties. As is often the case when academic researchers “pitch” their idea to senior organizational figures, however, I did not sense there to be an expectation for a formal “output”, nor pressure for any feedback to align with certain management views (Bell and Bryman, 2007; Buchanan and Bryman, 2007). I believe obtaining this gatekeeper’s “buy-in” expedited the access process which is discussed next.

3.6 Accessing the host organization

My experience of obtaining access is that it is an ongoing process to be monitored and managed as opposed to a “one off” achievement. Following the VP’s initial “in-principle” agreement I was mindful that physical access to the organizational ‘site’ does not equate to ‘interpersonal access’ (Miller, 2004: 221). Ongoing negotiation with several gatekeepers from multiple levels within the organization was therefore required throughout the research.

Initially, the access process was hierarchical and “top-down” in nature. After the VP meeting I met with the National Sales Manager (NSM) in September 2015 to discuss the idea, the preliminary research plan and, if agreeable, the logistics required to implement it. The NSM felt it would be beneficial for me to observe the ‘Quarter Two National Sales Meeting’ in September 2015 to get an overview of the organization and to present myself, the research, and the ethical assurances to the Sales and Education managerial pairings who were responsible for the United Kingdom’s eight geographical regions. Within and shortly after this meeting, I made preliminary enquiries with the Sales and Education pairings who had responsibility for three of the UK regions, which comprised London, about having full-time research access.

Although criticism could potentially be levelled at what may be deemed a “broad brush” attempt at access to the three regions, I made the decision based on three factors informed by my experience
of the organization (at that point) and the sensibilities I had developed during the pilot study. Firstly, visitors could only access stores when accompanied by a regional manager. Secondly, the sales manager of each regional pairing was often otherwise engaged in human resources issues (e.g. disciplinary meetings, appraisals) which, as discussed later in the ethics section, I did not seek access to. Thirdly, I had a sense that in one of the three regions it would be more difficult for me to gain and maintain access. For example, within this region access to some stores was purported to be far stricter to visitors on exclusivity and security grounds. In essence, therefore, access to the organization’s stores in London seemed largely contingent on two education managers.

Following my initial approach to the managerial pairings of each of the three regions, I was invited to observe and document ‘Regional Sales’ meetings in two regions. These meetings were delivered by the managerial pairings to their region’s studio and store managers, and gave me an opportunity to follow the same approach I adopted at the National Sales Meeting: to introduce myself and the research to another level of management. Studio and store managers’ familiarity with the research facilitated my access to counters and stores and, following the same process outlined above, I would often attend breakfast meetings or “flash briefs” and use this opportunity to introduce the research to makeup artists.

Following this relatively orderly and sequential approach, access to the three regions became largely contingent on negotiating access to stores and counters on a weekly basis. As familiarity grew between myself, education managers and teams within two of the regions, I started being invited to training events and meetings where the managers were either presenting or being presented to and I began to be added to each region’s email distribution lists. I took these managers’ actions to be an indication that they found my initial presence in their day-to-day working lives unobtrusive and that they were comfortable with me being privy to a large part of their teams’ activities and correspondence.

Through the NSM gatekeeper, I was granted access to, and listened to, the national weekly conference call which all regional sales and education managers dialled into and reported their region’s plans for the week ahead. This call took place every Monday during managers’ working-from-home administration days. On these days I therefore had no access to stores or makeup counters. Following these calls I also, more often than not, received a weekly email from the National Coordinator which summarized the call’s main action points for attendees. In addition, on days where I was unable to visit studios or stores (such as Mondays) I was offered the opportunity,
again through the NSM, to hot-desk in Ella May’s head-office in London. On these occasions I would sit alongside office-based sales and education employees and their colleagues from marketing, social media, public relations and digital departments. These calls and head-office visits were beneficial because they enabled me to place my day-to-day experiences within the London regions into a wider context. For example, when working with these teams I had some appreciation of their comparative sales pressures and a more informed understanding of how other departments’ activities relieved or added to these.

3.7 Chapter summary

This chapter has placed the sales and education department where fieldwork was conducted into a wider group and organizational context. It has outlined the department’s structure and, alongside my previous experience carrying out research in a cosmetics company, discussed why the largely social, visual and verbal nature of its activities made it a potentially theoretically interesting fieldwork setting. It has also detailed however how this choice was, in large part, due to good fortune. Finally, it has discussed how access to three regions within the department involved ongoing negotiations throughout fieldwork with various organizational gatekeepers. Following this discussion of access to the field, the next chapter discusses what I did in the field and why.
4.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter presents, explains and justifies the methodological approach taken during nine months of fieldwork. Comprising seven sections, it begins by outlining the key research activities undertaken in the field. Next, the meta-theoretical assumptions underpinning the study are introduced and accompanied by a discussion of how these influenced the chosen ethnographic approach. Following this, attention turns to how adopting an ethnographic approach affected choices around research methods. This section is broken down into three subsections which detail the primary method used (participant observation), the use of field notes throughout field work, and the use of semi-structured interviews as a supplementary method. The next section considers the practice of reflexivity throughout fieldwork and, so far as possible, how my assumptions and values mediated co-constructions of knowledge. The penultimate section introduces the analytical approach taken. Comprised of two subsections, the abductive logic (Peirce, 1978) which informed this approach is considered first and a discussion of its deployment using mystery construction (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011) follows. Finally, the chapter concludes by discussing ethics and how several procedural and situational issues were encountered and addressed prior to and during fieldwork.

4.2 Fieldwork

Fieldwork took place over a nine-month period from late September 2015 to early May 2016. Over this period I spent approximately 640 hours working with, observing, and conversing with makeup artistry teams and managers across London. Of this time, over half was spent in stores observing and as a participant observer of makeup counters, and the remaining half was roughly split between meetings and training events.

Field notes were produced throughout and were accompanied by audio recordings of approximately 85 hours of meetings and 65 hours of training events. I considered these events to be useful because they allowed me to build up a contextual understanding of makeup artists’
actions in stores and on counters. For example, by attending three quarterly National Sales meetings I was able to observe the Vice-President and the National Sales Manager (NSM) set expectations around future sales and lesson booking figures. In turn, through attendance at two of the three London regions’ quarter 2, 3, and 4 sales meetings, I could witness these requirements being cascaded to Business Managers and to Studio Managers and have some appreciation of how these managers planned to achieve them. For example, I often observed attendees discussing artist incentives (e.g. increasing sales commission) and customer initiatives (e.g. providing luxury samples with purchases). Relatedly, attending numerous breakfast meetings and “flash briefs” in stores and on counters gave me opportunities to witness artists’ reactions to, and questions about, management expectations with issues such as: staff shortages, low product stocks, and competitors’ price promotions regularly being raised as mitigating factors.

Additionally, attending various training events enabled me, to some extent, to contextualize artists’ interactions with customers. For example, I was able to observe artists being trained in the application of new products (such as face masks) and come to an appreciation of why and in what circumstances these were appropriate for use on different skin types. Within these events I could also regularly witness trainers encouraging artists to converse with customers in specific ways and use, for example, key phrases and certain stories to promote Ella’s philosophy and ethos. In addition, I was able to attend training events where pro and featured artists taught advanced artists how to apply products during catwalk events, public relations events, and fashion shows. Being privy to these training events was beneficial because they enabled me to observe the requirements placed on the artists (such as application techniques, product usage, and sharing of Ella’s philosophy) when they were with different types of (non-paying) client.

The possibility of filming and photographing meetings and training events was explored with the NSM. However, like artists, I was not permitted to do so because many of the promotional and product visuals were awaiting launch to the general public and therefore the NSM was wary of any inadvertent early releases. Nevertheless, being freely allowed to make notes and to use audio-recording assisted me in recollecting and reconstructing the events later in my writing.

On Mondays, following the weekly National Sales conference call, I would dial into one of the London region’s conference calls (it was not possible for me to dial into all three regions’ calls because they happened simultaneously). Like the National Sales conference call, counter managers would share their previous week’s performance and their counter’s plans for the week
ahead. Similar to the meetings I attended, these calls were useful because they provided a summary of the performance of stores I had visited the previous week and a synopsis of stores’ weekend activity. In addition, these calls also allowed access to information about stores’ planned activity for the week which I was able to use to schedule future visits.

Most of the fieldwork took place on either proprietary makeup counters or in the large retail department stores described in Chapter 3. In these environments I typically observed, assisted, and asked questions of makeup artists as they applied products onto customers and attempted to close product sales. Being privy to and a part of these interactions was considered important because through them I could experience first-hand whether and how Ella May’s products, services, and philosophy were communicated.

During all of the above activities I would, wherever possible, collect documents. In meetings these would often be PowerPoint handouts and in training events they would typically be brochures cataloguing the new season’s products and their launch dates. Throughout fieldwork I also received the monthly sales brand bulletin, a spiral bound booklet, which was sent out to all UK makeup artists within Ella May. In addition, I was given log-on access to an internal private Facebook group where artists across the UK uploaded photographs of, and made comments about, their own and others’ artistry skills. Artists also regularly posted pictures of store events (e.g. group makeup lessons) and teams’ decorations of stores and counters on special occasions (e.g. Valentine’s Day). Poster uploads were informative because they provided examples of makeup and store visuals which, in artists’ opinion, exemplified Ella’s philosophy and they were comfortable with their peers and management seeing and critiquing. Ella May’s social media accounts which are available to the general public, such as Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube, were also followed or checked. This was to appreciate how other departments (e.g. digital, social media, marketing) portray Ella May’s philosophy to existing and potential customers on an ongoing basis through, for example, posts of: the brand’s makeup; women either wearing or having the brand’s makeup applied; the founder; motivational slogans; and aspirational images of food, drink and locations.

During and following some of the above activities I would also attend social gatherings with managers and makeup artistry teams. For example, I attended two national Christmas meals, went for post-work drinks with regional managers following training events and, on one memorable occasion, went to a Brazilian themed nightclub with artists and managers following the launch of a Spring/Summer makeup collection. Being privy to occasions such as these was beneficial because
they allowed me to observe how artists and managers communicated with one another and about Ella May away from customers and helped me integrate into teams.

Like Michailova et al. (2014) report, I experienced entering and leaving fieldwork to be a gradual and drawn-out process rather than a discrete act. For example, during the earlier weeks and months of fieldwork I experienced a sense of rapport and trust building with managers and artists and began to anticipate when events would happen or where peaks and troughs in trade were likely to facilitate or hamper access. For example, during one week in November 2015 there was a “Black Friday” event, in which retailers discount prices, and my access to stores and counters was therefore restricted. Following the busy Christmas period, I spent more time working with and observing artists due to the quieter retail environment and, in part, because of my increased familiarity with them and managers.

The process of withdrawing began in March 2016 and in retrospect chimed with Michailova et al’s point that ‘exiting is an outcome of a constant interplay between unforeseen and planned contingencies in the field and negotiations with research participants’ (2014: 144). For example, around this time, one of the London regions was experiencing difficulties hitting year-on-year sales targets and consequently my contact with the education manager dissipated. In addition, around this time one of the education managers was also applying for a promotion and therefore our contact, though still regular, became less frequent. Another issue related to managers taking annual leave. Following the unavailability of holiday entitlement during Christmas and the retail sales period, managers would often take leave during this period and were therefore uncontactable. In sum, although my access to and time in the field unsurprisingly varied on a weekly basis, my general access to sales and education teams was analogous to a bell curve with an incremental increase in exposure to the three regions between September and December mirrored by a gradual decline from March to May and a peak experienced in the intervening months. This section has described the key activities I undertook and their duration during fieldwork. Following this, the next section details my meta-theoretical assumptions and how these affected my methodological choice.
4.3 Meta-theoretical assumptions

Decisions about the appropriateness of research methods should be informed by the researcher's metatheoretical assumptions rather than just being an abstract choice (cf. Cunliffe, 2011; Littlejohn, 1999; Morgan and Smircich, 1980). Specifically, as Cunliffe (2011) notes, ‘researchers need to figure out their assumptions about the nature of social reality […] (ontology) and the nature and purpose of knowledge (epistemology) before deciding which research methods might be appropriate’ (p. 649) to investigate them. Surfacing these assumptions is important because they allow researchers to situate, differentiate, and legitimate their work within, and be open to critique from, broader scholarly fields (Cunliffe, 2011).

Within this doctoral study my ontological assumption, or ‘world view’ (Morgan and Smircich, 1980: 493), is that communication is constitutive of social reality (cf. Craig, 1999). This offers an alternative to constative assumptions which conceive of reality as existing prior to, and as being transmitted within, communication (cf. Axley, 1984). Within this constitutive world view, communication is constitutive of organization rather than something which happens within pre-structured organizational containers (cf. Smith, 1993 in Cooren and Taylor, 1997). Many holders of this view can be found within what has become known as the Communication as Constitutive of Organization (CCO) theoretical paradigm (e.g. Ashcraft et al., 2009; Cooren et al., 2011; Taylor and Van Every, 1993, 2000, 2011, 2014; Taylor et al., 1996). Scholars within this paradigm tend to base their assumptions about the nature of organizing and organization around an ecumenical view of communication, in which ‘any turn of talk, discourse, artifact, metaphor, architectural element, body, text or narrative should at least be considered in its performative […] or transactional […] dimension’ (Cooren et al., 2011: 3). More specifically, like the view taken in this doctoral study, CCO scholars’ ontological position can be characterized by a general assumption that organizing and organization are (often) precarious accomplishments realized, experienced, and identified in talk and text communicational processes (Cooren et al., 2011). Following their constitution within communicative processes, CCO researchers generally and this doctoral study particularly, hold open the possibility that organizational phenomena such as power and authority shape and are shaped by further complex communicative processes (Putnam and Nicotera, 2010).

As Morgan and Smircich (1980) inform us, a researcher’s ontological assumption implies ‘different grounds for knowledge about the social world’ (p.493). My epistemological position within this study is that knowledge of the communicative constitution of social reality, which includes organization
and organizing, is an intersubjective construction (cf. Cunliffe, 2011; Gill, 2011; Vásquez et al., 2012) between human actors, non-human actors and the researcher. This necessitated a methodological approach that involved me “making sense” of human and non-human actors’ interactions, human actors’ “making sense” of their interactions, and me “making sense” of their “sense-making”. This need for me to make interpretations with and of actors’ interactions directed attention to what has become a broad descriptor within social science: ethnography (cf. Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). The various understandings of ethnography and its use as a methodology in this doctoral study are discussed in the next section.

4.4 Methodology

Various usages of the term ethnography circulate within management and organization studies. Whether referred to, for example, as method (e.g. Rosen, 1991), epistemology (Cunliffe, 2011), or a ‘way of writing about and analysing social life’ (Watson, 2011: 202), a distinguishing tenet of ethnography is the involvement of a researcher in some significant participant observation in ‘naturally occurring settings’ (Cunliffe, 2010: 229). Drawing on anthropological roots some view ethnography as an endeavour that involves ‘living with and living like those who are studied’ (Van Maanen, 1988: 2) in an attempt ‘to grasp the native’s point of view’ (Bate, 1997: 1151). In light of these viewpoints, I attempted to follow, so far as possible, the first of these anthropological dictums and to try to “make sense” of actors’ actions with them on an ongoing basis. My ambition therefore was to co-construct meaning with, as opposed to getting inside the heads of and capturing it from, the people I was working alongside, observing, and asking questions of.

Though an ethnographer can potentially use any research method alongside prolonged participant observation (Watson, 2011, 2012), a common view is that the use of methods alone do not constitute an ethnographic approach (Cunliffe, 2010; Puddephat et al., 2009; Van Maanen, 2010; Watson, 1994, 2011, 2012; Watson and Watson, 2012). Instead, ethnography as methodology utilizes research methods as a way of “seeing’ the components of social structure and the processes through which they interact’ (Rosen, 1991: 13). Overarching social theoretical ideas concerning, for example, action, meaning and culture therefore overlay and inform researchers’ choice and use of research methods within an ethnographic approach (Bate, 1997; Rosen, 1991; Van Maanen, 1988, 2010, 2011; Watson, 1994, 2011, 2012; Watson and Watson, 2012).
For example, a typical ontological assumption of a naturalistic ethnographer is that naturally occurring phenomena exist and can be “captured” and described through intensive and prolonged methods of participant observation. For naturalistic ethnographers, these descriptions are independent of their presence (which they would consider as introducing “bias” into descriptions) (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). However, whether such a detached and neutral stance is possible has been questioned. Indeed, suspicions have been raised regarding whether any researcher can be free of paradigmatic presuppositions and practical and political commitments during fieldwork (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Specifically, accusations are levelled that such studies regress into a form of naïve realism (cf. Hammersley, 1992; Humphreys and Watson, 2009; Watson, 2011) where researchers (misguidedly) claim to tell ‘of it like it is’ (Brewer, 2000: 41).

Similarly, in addition to scepticism of naturalistic ethnographers’ claims of value-neutrality, critics query the notion that their accounts of fieldwork can ever be completely transparent and contend they are always constructions drawn from rhetorical strategies (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

An alternative and arguably more common understanding of ethnography as methodology can be found within interpretative or reflexive ethnographic studies (e.g. Agar, 2010; Carroll and Nicholson, 2014; Hirst and Humphreys, 2013; Nicholson and Carroll, 2013; Watson, 1994; Watson and Watson, 2012). Ethnographers like these are, broadly speaking, interested in immersing themselves in members’ lives and communities, primarily using methods of participation observation and/or in-depth relatively unstructured interviews (Hammersley, 2005; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007), because they want to gain an appreciation of how and why members construct their worlds as they do. Unlike naturalistic ethnographies, these ethnographers see fieldwork as an interpretive act rather than an observational or descriptive one (Agar, 1986; Van Maanen, 1988) as succinctly surmised by Watson: ‘I was no neutral fly-on-the-wall in ZTC Ryland and I was not ‘collecting’ attitudes and other data like a naturalist netting butterflies’ (1994: 7).

Drawing on a sociological grounding, Watson (1994) entered fieldwork with a foreshadowed issue (that managers were lay theorists) before acknowledging how this assumption, coupled with his dual researcher/consultant fieldworker role, shaped interpretations.

From an interpretative/reflexive viewpoint, ethnography therefore involves ‘the peculiar practice of representing the social reality of others through the analysis of one’s own experience in the world of these others’ (Van Maanen, 1988: ix, emphasis added). An interpretative ethnographer’s account in and of the field is necessarily therefore always a retelling rather than a telling and a translation rather than a transcription (Bate, 1997). Adopting this perspective, phenomena neither
await “capture” nor do they “emerge” within the interactions ethnographers either observe or are a part of. Rather, phenomena are filtered through each ethnographer’s assumptions, intuitions, and senses and are crafted through their rhetorical accounts. This approach holds the potential, therefore, for the production of original and/or novel interpretations of organizational phenomena. However, one implication of adopting an interpretative approach is a tendency for ethnographers’ reflexive accounts to, more often than not, leave the reader with an interesting personal, but nevertheless overly introspective, fieldwork account (Marcus, 1998).

Similar to interpretative ethnographic views of phenomena, my epistemological assumption is that knowledge of the communicative constitution of authority involves constructions of actors’ actions and constructions. I also assume, in common with interpretative views, that the meaning of these constructions is ‘disclosed’ (Golden-Biddle and Locke, 1993: 596) and ‘born’ (Kunda, 2013: 18) in the reading process rather than something I produce through writing. Put differently, although I claim meaning through my writing, ultimately it is assigned by others. Knowledge of phenomena from this perspective is therefore always a second or third order construction between actors, researchers/writers, and readers (Rosen, 1991; Van Maanen, 1988, 2011).

In order for constructions to be made and acknowledged, an ethnographic methodology was considered necessary for three main reasons. The first relates to my ontological assumption that ‘who or what is acting always is an open question’ (Cooren et al., 2011: 4). Because of this, an approach was required whereby in-situ, rather than a priori, interpretations could be made regarding which actors exercise agency and how they ‘make a difference’ (Cooren, 2015: 475). A second reason concerns ethnographers’ previously described preference for using methods of participant observation. The use of these methods was considered important because although I assume that human and non-human actors can make each other “speak” (in an agentic sense) and this is open to interpretation on the “terra firma” of interactions (e.g. Cooren, 2006, 2012; Cooren et al., 2007; Cooren et al., 2008; Schoeneborn et al., 2014), I cannot, of course, converse with the latter. The use of participant observation was therefore considered important because I needed to craft interpretations with human actors about how non-human actors, referred to as texts within CCO (e.g. Kuhn, 2008, 2012; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 1996; Taylor and Van Every, 2000, 2014), exercise agency. A third reason, again related to my worldview, was my assumption that the communicative constitution of authority is communicatively (re)negotiated by actors on a continual basis. Rather than attending to how phenomena are constitut-ed (i.e. as a noun) as rhetoricians and semioticians often do (Cooren, 2012), my interest
lies in the constitution of authority in an interactional or transactional register of communication (Cooren, 2012; Taylor and Van Every, 2011). This entailed a methodological approach whereby co-constructions between actors and I could be crafted on a repeated and regular basis. Put differently an extended and immersive stay within, as opposed to a ‘jet plane’ (Bate, 1997: 1150) visit to, the case organization was deemed necessary. After discussing how my meta-theoretical assumptions informed my methodological choice, the next section discusses the use of research methods during ethnographic fieldwork.

4.5 Research Methods

Methodology concerns guiding assumptions regarding how research should be conducted, whereas “methods” typically refer to the techniques researchers employ for practising their craft (Bryman, 2008: 160). While a range of eclectic methods can be used within an ethnographic methodology (Watson, 2011, 2012), management and organization ethnographers’ methods of choice can commonly be characterized by the ‘tools’ of observation (including varying degrees of participation), conversing (including various forms of interviewing) and the close reading of documentary sources (Ybema et al., 2009: 6). How such methods or tools are used is however less clearly delineated. Indeed, in contrast to qualitative researchers who have ‘an insatiable appetite for “how to” methods books’, ethnographers have been described as favouring a more pragmatic, ‘suck it and see’ approach (Bate, 1997: 1152).

While appreciative of the contextually dependent and often ad-hoc nature of ethnographic fieldwork, I took some comfort from Rosen’s (1991) view that even a short research stay in an unfamiliar setting can be advantageous for a would-be ethnographer about to embark on an extended study. Specifically, I found self-reflections from the aforementioned pilot study (see chapter three) concerning my use of observations and field-notes useful. For example, within the pilot study I had a tendency to treat audio recordings as more “trustworthy” than my observations and intuitions because they could be “checked”. Prior to one of the pilot study’s meetings (which I audio recorded), I noticed some attendees were playing a game in which they took in it turns to guess each other’s tie manufacturer and price. This “game” may, for example, have been interpreted as one in which the tie exercised agency in the sense that it positioned its wearer and others in terms of status and was also open to being (re)positioned as prestigious (or otherwise) by
other people. Maybe because the tie was mute (in an auditory sense) I had a preference for favouring “verifiable” communication. This reflection, like several others, was important for me to reflect upon throughout this ethnographic study because it cautioned me not to hide behind neutrally verifiable research tools. Ultimately, it is through my experiences, intuitions, sensibilities, and interpretations that co-constructions are made and methods such as participant observation and interviews assist me in doing so. In short, echoing Clarke et al’s (2009) experience, fieldwork was therefore a ‘creative endeavour’ (p.329). Following this caveat, the next section discusses which methods were used, how they were used, and why.

4.5.1 Participant Observation

Throughout fieldwork my experiences of participant observation largely covered the broad spectrum of research practices identified by Watson (2011): ‘Participant observation […] is a research practice in which the investigator joins the group, community, or organization being studied, as either a full or partial member, and both participates in and observes activities, asks questions, takes part in conversations, and reads relevant documents’ (p. 206). Various combinations of participation, observation and conversation were used within this study under the participant observation umbrella (Gans, 1999) because experiencing the immediacy of actors’ day-to-day settings was considered necessary for me to make interpretations of their actions and orientations (Lofland et al., 2006). Similar to other ethnographic studies where participant observation is the ‘sine qua non’ (Watson, 2012: 16), this method was the primary one used within this study.

Unlike Watson’s (2011) binary either/or distinction between full and partial membership of a group, community, or organization, my self-perceived membership regularly fluctuated within and between the makeup counter, training and meeting settings. Rather, I found Adler and Adler’s (1987) role type continuum a useful heuristic to aid description of my membership. Using their categorizations, I would generally label my membership as shifting from a ‘peripheral’ member to an ‘active’ member over the course of my nine-month stay and also between, and on occasions within, settings. These stances are of course ‘ideal typical’ (Adler and Adler, 1987: 36) and, initially at least, I found participant observation to be a complex construction and I was riddled with self-doubt about whether I was doing it “correctly”. A summary of my typical reflections and main reflections
during fieldwork are presented in table 1 below, followed by some examples which chart my shifting observational role from a peripheral to an active member of sales and education teams.
Table 1: An overview of fieldwork activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total hours</th>
<th>Hours spent in each setting</th>
<th>Typical activities</th>
<th>Main reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Meetings (8)</td>
<td>Notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Introduced to the company values, philosophy and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed an understanding of the department’s structure (see figure 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovered how each region’s sales results and targets compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Store visits (25)</td>
<td>Shadowing managers; tidying stockrooms; notetaking.</td>
<td>Became familiar with artists’ personal makeup style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings (35)</td>
<td>Tidying workspaces; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Learned about the products and appointments available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Store visits (80)</td>
<td>Greeting customers; dusting workspaces; tidying stock; notetaking.</td>
<td>Introduced to the company’s brand guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings (29)</td>
<td>Timing artistry demonstrations; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Became aware of managers’ planned store and counter activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obtained insight into how each store’s and counter’s sales results compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Store visits (32)</td>
<td>Cleaning workspaces; passing artists stock; monitoring customers; timing appointments; notetaking.</td>
<td>Increased familiarity with the makeup styles artists produce on customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Became further acquainted with artists’ appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Store Visits</td>
<td>Training Events</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training events (22)</td>
<td>Tidying and cleaning workspaces; timing artistry demonstrations; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Attained context about how artists should structure and conduct appointments. Gained a richer account of how artists should work within brand guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings (19)</td>
<td>Timing artistry roleplays; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Kept abreast of each store’s and counter’s performance and future plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016 105 Training events (80)</td>
<td>Customer roleplaying; finding stock; arranging workspaces; restocking refreshments; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Developed fuller appreciations about how artists should interact with customers. Broadened understandings about how artists should adhere to brand guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings (25)</td>
<td>Judging artistry demonstrations; tidying workspaces; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Stayed informed about each store’s and counter’s results and planned activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 109 Store visits (89)</td>
<td>Tidying workspaces; cleaning artists’ utensils; sorting stock; alerting artists to unattended customers; notetaking.</td>
<td>Augmented understandings about how artists interact with customers. Heightened an awareness of how workspaces are presented. Extended appreciations of the makeup styles artists produce on themselves and customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training events (11)</td>
<td>Tidying workspaces; timing artistry demonstrations; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Acquired context about how artists should interact with customers outside of appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings (9)</td>
<td>Tidying workspaces; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
<td>Accrued further background about stores’ and counters’ performance and future plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 83 Store visits (40)</td>
<td>Cleaning and passing artists’ utensils; finding stock; monitoring customers; notetaking.</td>
<td>Generated insights about how artists publicise their work. Broadened an appreciation of customer demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training events (27)</td>
<td>Tidying stock; customer roleplaying; preparing and arranging workspaces;</td>
<td>Furthered understandings of how artists should interact with customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Replenishing refreshments; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings (16) Tidying workspaces; notetaking; audio recording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Store visits Documenting appointments; cleansing and passing artists utensils; cleaning workspaces; referring customers to artists; refilling stock; notetaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings (9) Audio recording; tidying workspaces; notetaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Store visits Stock taking, charting appointments; equipping artists with utensils; cleaning workspaces; referring customers; notetaking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1.1 Peripheral membership

My initial experiences with artistry teams were predominantly observational. After our introductions by a regional manager I would typically sit in on breakfast meetings either on makeup counters or in stores in an observational capacity, where I would listen and take notes. Following these meetings, I would usually stay in the store or on the counter and either a manager or an artist who was free would do a “floor walk” with me pointing out the various makeup collections, in-store technology, and talking me through the various makeup lessons and techniques the organization offered whilst artists were applying makeup. Following these induction days and familiarization with the teams I started to participate in teams’ activities. Instead of solely observing breakfast meetings I would play a role in them. For example, I would often adopt the persona of a customer who was either new to, or returning to, a counter and artists would question me about my hypothetical requirements and review one another’s questions. Similarly, I would often act as timekeeper, and occasional judge, for artistry challenges in which artists had to perform a certain look on or up sell a product to one another. These meetings were useful because I experienced the requirements managers place on artists and how the latter should interact with customers. These meetings were also beneficial in a more functional sense because, during discussions about daily duties, I could volunteer for jobs which would enable me to have some first-hand experiences of how artists interacted with other actors, such as customers and products, in their day-to-day roles. I would often act as a “host”, for example, a job which involved welcoming customers as they came into the store and thanking them as they left. I also dusted and polished shop floor counters and would, where required, dismantle the caddies which housed lipsticks, foundation sticks, mascaras etc. and give these a “deep clean” using a cleaning solution and cotton buds. I considered this job to be particularly useful because, in addition to facilitating a close proximity to artist-customer interactions, it meant I could familiarize myself with the repertoire of products on offer. In addition, as artists became more familiar with my presence they would often ask me to keep an eye on the time and to subtly let them know if they were running over their allocated time with customers. Thus, I gradually developed an impression that my presence, though ‘peripheral’ (Adler and Adler, 1987: 36), was starting to assist artists in small ways and often when I overheard security guards or customers asking artists who I was, I was identified as “with them”.

4.5.1.2 Active membership

Over time and with increased familiarity with artists, I sensed that, through participating more in teams’ social events and their ‘functional’ or ‘core’ work activities, I assimilated into more of an ‘active membership’ role within groups and to some extent became part of the group, not just with them (Adler and Adler, 1987: 36). With regards to functional activities, I would, on a daily basis, assist artists as they applied makeup on customers. One common task, for example, involved the cleaning of artists’ brushes during and between makeup lessons. This practice of wetting a tissue with brush cleaner fluid before wiping a brush across it until all pigment of colour had transferred was deemed an important job for both artists and my research purposes. For artists it maintained hygiene standards (something managers assessed them on during “mystery shops”) and prevented cross-contamination of makeup colours during application. It also enabled me to stand in artists’ shadows and observe how they applied makeup and conversed with customers and colleagues. A similar task involved me writing down on a customized piece of paper which products were being applied on the customer and where. This practice was similarly functional in the sense it freed up artists’ time and hands and was, again, a task assessed by managers. Similar to brush cleaning, this task allowed me some insight into artist-customer relations and to experience how human and non-human actors (e.g. brush, tissue, and cleaning solution) acted together.

Other ‘functional’ jobs involved less physical proximity to artists and customers. When most makeup brushes were sufficiently clean and artists were charting their own lessons, I would often walk around the counter and look out for any customers who appeared to require service. This task was again functionally useful because often artists would have their heads down (something they were regularly told not to do by managers) and their eyes focused on the customer sitting in the chair in front of them. An interesting observation, shared by artists in my conversations with them, was that within several of the older stores (which were modelled on a kitchen layout) there was a breakfast bar stanchion which supported makeup mirrors either side of it but also impeded artists and counter visitors’ views of one another.

Often during the ‘traffic (i.e. customer) watching’ task, and to a lesser extent during makeup lessons, I would chat with artists about their day. A common recurring topic of conversation was whether it had been, or looked like being, a “good” one in terms of hitting lesson appointment targets. Unsurprisingly, these conversations varied in length depending on who I was speaking with and in what circumstance but over time I came to understand peak and fallow periods of trade
across teams. Generally speaking, for example, teams within central London which were closer to the financial and media districts would be busier during lunch times with female “City” workers coming in for appointments and their male colleagues searching for gifts. In another store, not far from one of the Royal Family’s residences, busier periods could be roughly approximated depending on tour party arrival times. I therefore came to have some understanding of the more suitable times during which to have what Lofland et al. (2006: 87) refer to as ‘informal interviews’: conversations which take place within the participation and/or observation setting and which are directed to some extent by the researcher. Often these interviews took place while artists and I were dusting or cleaning, which gave me opportunities to explore my observations and intuitions with them. For example, we may discuss their interpretation of why they had chosen a specific product or “closed a sale” a certain way in a lesson I had observed and/or participated in earlier.

Where needed, I would also put away, tidy, and check stock levels within shops and on counters. This involved me either bending down to, or, where seats were not taken by customers, sit at cabinets and rifle through drawers in order to find a particular product (e.g. mascara, foundation) in a specific colour shade. I experienced this to be one of the least interesting jobs an artist undertakes and from my conversations and informal interviews this was often how artists described it to me too. This job required more concentration than some of the others largely because all makeup products were boxed in the same colour, making it hard for the artists and I to find customers’ specific colour shades quickly. I often felt I was “missing out” on something more interesting whilst doing this job, such as artists’ interactions with colleagues and customers. However, as Barley (1990) points out from his considerable experience, when an ethnographic researcher faces boredom, it is not only ‘a sure sign that repetition is taking place, but the events that occasion boredom may represent useful setting-specific indicators’ (p. 232). Repetitive experiences of these tasks, and reflections with artists about them, led me to co-construct this as an example in which products’ packaging (by virtue of their camouflaging into a homogenous mass in a drawer), made a difference to artist–customer interactions because they sometimes denied the artist a sale and the customer a product. Rather than actively seek out ‘drama’ (Kunda, 2013: 14), ‘focal events’ (Brewer, 2000: 111) or focus on the ‘exceptional’ in my ethnographic writing, I considered my (seemingly shared) perception of the mundanity and repetitiveness of these tasks as constituting ‘subjects’ rules for organizational life and these were important for me to gain a ‘sufficient’ understanding of ‘how and why they construct their social world as it is’ (Rosen, 1991: 5).
My experiences of shop floor and makeup counter “life” chimes with Li’s (2008) point that participant observers should adopt ‘plasticity’ (p. 100) when adopting field membership roles. On some occasions, for example, counters became too congested with customers for me to physically occupy space on them. In these instances I would leave the counter and, within proprietary Ella May retail units, often sit in the staff room or tidy a stock room. More often than not, the walls of these rooms were adorned with motivational messages intended for artists and photographs of their work with, for example, “before and after” pictures of customers’ makeup a common feature. During these solitary occasions I would often make notes on, and reflect upon, earlier observations. In department stores, where I required the retailer’s permission to enter staff rooms and stock rooms, I would often walk around the department floor taking in and observing how the organization’s competitors presented themselves, their products, and how their makeup artists seemed to be interacting with customers and applying makeup on them. Although, again like with the drawer sorting task, I felt a sense of “missing out” during these occasions, I did, as Gellner and Hirsch advise ethnographers to do, make ‘a commitment to methodological holism’ and consider that ‘anything in the research context can be relevant and could potentially be taken into account’ (2001: 1).

Through performing tasks such as brush cleaning, face charting, traffic watching, and drawer sorting I was co-participating, in one sense, as an active member of the team in a ‘joint endeavour’ in addition to my research purposes (Adler and Adler, 1987: 51). In an attempt to work in the anthropological spirit of ‘living with and like’ (Van Maanen, 1988: 2) artistry teams I would, alongside my functional tasks, regularly join them on breaks throughout the working day and where invited join teams’ social events. In particular, regular lunches with managers in department stores or high street restaurants would often give me an opportunity to initiate or continue ‘informal interviews’ (Lofland et al., 2006) as we would sit for an hour conversing over lunch. Similarly, after-work occasions such as Christmas meals, birthday drinks and end of training celebratory outings were regular and valuable opportunities for my immersion into a part of artists’ lives I did not usually experience and for me to have some understanding of how they constructed their day-to-day activities in different settings. Following a discussion of participant observation, the next section considers the use of field notes throughout fieldwork.
4.5.2 Field notes

Field notes were produced throughout the fieldwork in an effort to record my lived day-to-day experiences within sales and education teams. As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) remind us, trying to note down everything is a futile and impossible task because ‘social scenes are truly inexhaustible’ (p.144). As well as being aide memoirs to what was said in the field, I used notes in an attempt to invoke the sensation of being there, the atmosphere, and the nuances of moments (Jarzabkowski et al., 2014). Adopting an intersubjective stance towards epistemology and using abductive logic (explained below), my assumptions and expectations inevitably influenced which observations were deemed ‘worthy of annotation’ (Wolfinger, 2002: 85) and the ‘processes of sensemaking and interpretation’ during note-taking (Emerson et al., 2001: 353). Like Hirst and Humphreys (2013), I used field notes to ‘concretize’ my fleeting experiences into a form I could subsequently ‘contemplate, assess and manipulate’ (p.1512). Field notes were therefore treated as symbolizing, rather than capturing, experiences and I used them to aid my reflections and ‘working out of understandings’ (Van Maanen, 1988: 118).

Like many ethnographic fieldworkers, my notetaking approach regularly iterated between, and combined, techniques of retelling events chronologically and/or by starting with an event or incident considered to be a ‘high point’ (Emerson et al., 1995: 48). The latter approach, also referred to as ‘the salience hierarchy’, refers to a technique where the ethnographer begins notetaking by ‘describing whatever observations struck them as the most noteworthy, the most interesting, or the most telling’ (Wolfinger, 2002: 89) and uses this as a catalyst to consider ‘in some topical fashion other significant events, incidents, or exchanges’ (Emerson et al., 1995: 48). Similarly to many other ethnographic note takers, my experience was that this choice was regularly circumstantial rather than deliberate and depended in large part on whether notes could be made contemporaneously (Wolfinger, 2002).

Whilst working or observing on makeup counters or in department stores in-situ note taking often seemed either incongruous with the activities going on around me or it was not permitted. In the opening weeks of fieldwork I would attempt to chronologically detail my observations and reflections within these settings at the end of a working day on crowded “rush hour” tube carriages and/or trains. Out of necessity, this often involved typing notes into my mobile phone and expanding on these when I arrived home. However, I found this timeline technique somewhat unwieldy as interesting reflections came to me more freely than sequentially. Through trial-and-
error I gradually began to adopt an approach more akin to the ‘high point’ (Emerson et al., 1995: 48) or ‘salience hierarchy’ (Wolfinger, 2002: 89) technique and used bathroom breaks throughout the day to note phrases or terms relating to things I found interesting in an attempt to trigger fuller descriptions, reflections and associations later that evening during my commute and at home.

Like many ethnographic studies, the longer I was in the field (and I iterated back and forth between fieldwork and academic literature), my interpretation of what was or was not salient shifted (Wolfinger, 2002). Van Maanen writes that, during the process of note taking: ‘events and conversations of the past are forever being reinterpreted in light of new understandings and continuing dialogue with the studied’ (1988: 118). This point chimed with my experience where, for example, phrases heard on makeup counters that seemed innocuous and worthy of a passing comment in earlier descriptions were, through their repetitious use and apparent agentic effects, deemed worthy of fuller inclusion and reflection in later notes. Descriptions were also considered alongside, and influenced by, previous field notes, with notes often detailing whether, for example, the arrangement, decoration, and adornment of counters were interesting because of their typicality or their peculiarity. On other occasions I would start note taking by describing or paraphrasing conversations I had with managers or artists or let my sense of the general mood or ambience of the counter begin my notations and act as a stimulus for other reflections.

In contrast to makeup counters and shop floors, note taking seemed a common and accepted practice within meetings and training events/exercises. Like the artists and managers who regularly sat in front of or beside me, I often, albeit for different reasons, noted down interesting observations, thoughts, and feelings freely and concurrently within small notebooks. Like many ethnographic note takers who simultaneously use recordings, I found my notes would typically focus more on attendees’ non-verbal communication, such as how they caught each other’s eye at particular moments, than trying to note down snippets of conversation or sequences of talk verbatim (Jarzabkowski et al., 2014). I would regularly use time markers to cross-reference notes with recordings and listened back to tapes while writing or reflecting on notes either later that evening or at the earliest opportunity. However, drawing on my previously mentioned pilot study experiences, I was mindful of not placing too great an emphasis on audio-recordings, which can ‘distort one’s sense of ‘the field’’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 148). Following meetings and training events I typically would read these chronological accounts and use asterisks to mark down what I found particularly interesting or thought-provoking and worthy of fuller reflection. Adopting this approach, I found note taking after meetings and events would often come to resemble the
process of freely making reflections and associations I used while making notations about my experiences on makeup counters and in stores. Following a discussion of how and why field notes were used, the next section considers the use of interviews as a supplementary method.

4.5.3 Interviews

Four months into fieldwork, and running concurrently alongside participant observation, I began the first of sixty-five one-to-one semi-structured interviews (Corbin and Morse, 2003) with makeup artists and managers whom I had worked alongside and observed. Thirty-seven artists and twenty-eight managers of various levels within the organization were interviewed once and all interviews were audio-recorded. Set within an ethnographic approach, I considered these to be continuations of the ongoing conversations I was having with artists and managers in the field. I therefore took a view that interviews were an element of participant observation (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995) rather than as a separate activity or a ‘complex social event’ (Alvesson, 2003: 14).

In keeping with my intersubjective epistemological assumptions and in line with participations and observations, I considered accounts within interviews to be jointly produced constructions rather than reflections on what is really present ‘out there’ (Van Enk, 2009: 1268) or as ‘a setting that provides authentic and direct contact with interviewees’ realities’ (Roulston et al., 2003: 645).

Interviews were therefore considered as providing extended opportunities for artists and I to “make sense” of working at the organization and were influenced by the constructions I had made with and about them and other actors whilst working, observing, and conversing. The rationale behind and advantage of scheduling interviews away from makeup counters and shop floors (for example in staff rooms, department store cafés, etc.) was they were generally uninterrupted and lasted for longer periods than were permissible whilst working. Interviews ranged from 10 minutes (when an artist had to inadvertently return to counter) to 1 hour and 30 minutes. In January 2016, I began to approach artists and managers within two of the three London regions about the possibility of having ‘research chats’. Following approval from these regions’ managers I typically used breakfast meetings or events where artists collectively met, such as training, to introduce the idea of having extended, voluntary, and confidential one-to-one interviews. I then individually followed up with artists and managers who expressed an interest in talking with me. A breakdown of the artists and managers interviewed is provided below in table 2.
Table 2: A summary of interview activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Approximate age</th>
<th>Position in company</th>
<th>Approximate tenure at company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cara</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Assistant Studio Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Paige</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chantelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lizzy</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bryony</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rosie</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fleur</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jade</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Millie</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>National Education Manager</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fran</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gabby</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Counter Manager</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rhiannon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nathalie</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Regional Sales Manager</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Layla</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Regional Sales Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Kristen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Studio Manager</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Counter Manager</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jess</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mila</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Frankie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Counter Manager</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Ceri</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Featured Artist</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Regional Education Manager</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Featured Artist</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dani</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Keely</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artistry coach</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly to the exchanges artists and I had on shop floors, makeup counters, and during breaks at meetings and during training events, interviews generally commenced with, and were interspersed throughout with, “small talk” about life at the organization and in general. Following initial small talk I would reiterate the confidential nature of the interview and ask respondents if they were comfortable with me making notes and using an audio-tape, to which all respondents agreed. All interviews started with a general open-ended ‘grand tour’ (Spradley, 1979: 87) question: “tell me about your first contact with the organization”. This question was an attempt on my part to set the tone of the interview in terms of artists talking more than me and for them to largely direct the flow and topics of conversation. Like many ethnographic interviewers, I made mental notes of issues I wished to explore prior to and during interviews rather than prepare set questions in advance (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Issues varied depending on the flow of conversations within interviews and from the ongoing constructions produced whilst I was working, observing, and conversing with artists outside of them. Within several of the earlier interviews, for example, I had previously observed artists telling customers stories about the case organization’s founder and so I would ask respondents how they came to know of these stories and their thoughts on repeating them. Whereas, within later interviews, after I had attended training events in which guidelines over setting up breakfast meetings were discussed, I would typically ask respondents if they had experienced or foresaw any issues in implementing guidelines on counter or in-store. Thus, although interviews were largely loosely structured and to some extent directed by artists and managers they were also, like all research interviews (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007), somewhat pre-structured because of my academic agenda.

In addition, I would often restate respondents’ words such as “philosophy” back to them and ask for elaboration regarding when they had encountered or used them. Asking for usage as opposed to meaning was an attempt to explore how respondents tacitly constructed their worlds in everyday language rather than to make these constructions explicit with “why” questions (Spradley, 1979). I would also often couch restatements and probe questions within the terminology artists used when conversing with me and colleagues outside the interview setting. For example, I would often preface a restatement with a commonly experienced phrase “to your point” in an attempt to re-establish familiarity from the shop floor into the interview setting.

Within several earlier interviews I frequently made in-situ notes about respondents’ non-verbal communication (Fontana and Frey, 2000), such as occasions when they leant forward in their seat and showed apparent enthusiasm. However, I ceased this practice shortly after starting the early
interviews as I sensed it made respondents feel too self-conscious. Although respondents were made aware of, and consented to, me taking notes in meetings and training sessions I got a sense that within a one-to-one situation they felt as if they, and their responses, were being “judged”. From there-on-in artists’ non-verbal communication which struck me as interesting was noted down as soon as possible after the interview.

Following Corbin and Morse’s (2003) advice to novice ethnographic interviewers, I tried to limit my interjections, to leave pauses, and tried not to fill silences in order to try and create an environment where the respondent felt they were free to do the majority of talking and did not feel rushed to do so. I felt this research skill improved somewhat over time and I estimate that my contributions became closer to the 90/10 ratio of listening to talking which Roulston et al. (2003) advise ethnographic interviewers to strive for.

Interviews generally came to a close with me thanking respondents for their time and contributions and asking if they had any questions. Generally, no questions were forthcoming, however on a few occasions respondents asked “was that [the interview] ok for you?” and “did you get want you wanted?” I interpreted these questions as suggestive of these artists’ subjective experience of the interview as more akin to a formal event than my interpretation of it as a continuation and extension of our previous “chats”. Relatedly, on one occasion following two successive interviews, I entered a staff room where the respondents were discussing their “answers”. Similarly, I interpreted this experience as an example where artists constructed the interview situation as qualitatively different from our chats on the shop floor: one in which their contributions were open for critique. By contrast, other artists commented they were either looking forward to or had enjoyed their “Dave chat”. One potential interpretation of these remarks could be that these artists shared similar views of interviews as mine: as more akin to an ongoing conversation.

Each recording was listened to on either the night of the interview or, following Gioia and Thomas’s (1996) advice, within 24 hours. This was partly so I could use the recording to recollect and to add to existing notes made on, for example, attendees’ body language or my emotions at that point in time. In a more functional sense, listening back to the tapes allowed me to check for any inaudible parts of the interview. On one occasion, for example, a workman’s intermittent drilling into an adjoining stockroom wall meant parts of the exchange were masked. Following instances such as these, listening back to tapes within this timeframe enabled me to, so far as possible, recall and note down an approximation of what was said. As the forthcoming analysis section details, once
the audio-recordings had been professionally transcribed, these notations were added to the interview transcripts. Following a discussion of the use of interviews within fieldwork, the next section considers how acts of reflexivity were an ongoing consideration throughout the research process.

4.6 Reflexivity

Like all interpretative ethnographers, my interpretations of actors’ actions and their own sensemaking of their actions were mediated several times over by my meta-theoretical and cultural assumptions, experiences, and the various communities with which I identify and am identified with (Cunliffe, 2003, 2010). More specifically, issues such as my CCO-influenced worldview, initial naivety with makeup products and retail environments, and my “and/or” presence as: a researcher; a relative of a former employee; and an engaged-to-be-married man had some bearing on either the interpretations actors and I produced in the field, my written accounts of the field, or both. I was therefore interpreting and writing, as all researchers unavoidably are, from a particular ‘room with a view’ (Cunliffe, 2010: 86) and the accounts produced were influenced as much by my own traditions as the “natives” (Cunliffe, 2010; Van Maanen, 1988). With this recognition comes responsibility for ethnographers to, as far as possible, qualify their perceptions, biases and motives (Van Maanen, 1998) so readers have an appreciation of the context of authors’ claims (Watson, 2011) before situating them within, and assigning meaning to them from, their own interpretative viewpoints.

Engaging in ongoing acts of reflexivity where I questioned and considered how my assumptions, thoughts, feelings and experiences mediate constructions of meaning were considered particularly prudent throughout fieldwork. In light of my epistemological stance, which assumes I am inextricably implicated in inter-subjectively constructing knowledge, I sought out regular opportunities with actors to discuss my presence in the field and, where deemed necessary, to subsequently act on this feedback. For example, in the early stages of fieldwork during one of our monthly one-to-one meetings the National Sales Manager informed me, with a sense of frivolity, how makeup artists in one of the stores referred to me as the “diary inspector”. In retrospect, artists’ attribution was possibly due to my first store visit where, wearing a long black rain coat and with my hands behind my back, I was introduced to the team by the Education Manager while they were checking the store's lesson booking diary. Aware of this label and wary of being perceived by
artists as a visitor who was there to audit their work, I sought to ingratiate myself with them by offering to do jobs neither a head office visitor or a managerial visitor would typically do: such as cleaning the counter and tidying the stock room.

An important issue to consider was my area of academic study and in particular Golden-Biddle and Locke’s caution that ‘because ethnographers in organizational/management studies often study cultures similar to their own they have to be aware of and qualify their personal biases’ (1993: 605). Having never bought nor worn makeup my situation was, in some respects, different to the norm Golden-Biddle and Locke describe because I entered fieldwork with limited knowledge of cosmetic products and the various ways they can be applied. Similarly, prior to fieldwork, I had some awareness but little experience of the environments and settings in which cosmetics are demonstrated and sold. I had never visited a store solely dedicated to the demonstration and selling of makeup and had only passed through makeup counters to get elsewhere within department stores. I therefore felt, and perceived that others (i.e. artists, managers, and customers) sensed, an air of naivety accompanying my initial presence. For example, during makeup lessons artists would regularly act as a chaperone and demonstrate the range of products, their order of application and their application techniques to me and, occasionally, on me (see figure 23). On reflection I probably cultivated this sense of naivety in order to have close proximity to artists’ work and in an attempt to be perceived as non-judgemental in my observations. During the earlier stages of fieldwork I undoubtedly cast myself somewhat in line with some artists’ espoused perception that men visiting a makeup counter were somewhat clueless and in need of special assistance.

Like most research enterprises, my fieldwork involved clusters of negotiated relationships (Hoskins and Sholtz, 2005). I considered my relationships with artists and managers to be partly influenced by my (and in some cases their) relationship with the family member who facilitated my access to the organization. I sensed there was a feeling of goodwill towards my relation which seemed, by association, to extend to me. Managers, for example, would often enquire about my relation and their child, ask to see photographs, and ask me to pass on their regards. Mindful of this connection I perhaps made extra efforts to be professional and courteous at all times during fieldwork in an effort to not only reflect well on myself as a researcher and a person but also on my relation. Throughout fieldwork, I was cognisant, however, of my research role and sought to hold back ‘some social and intellectual distance’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 90). I tried, therefore, to
follow a maxim of being friendly but not friends in an effort to produce analytical rather than autobiographical accounts.

Relatedly, as fieldwork progressed and familiarity grew between myself, artists and managers, I was mindful of Michailova et al.’s (2014) advice regarding researchers’ need to simultaneously maintain a dual psychological state of connection to the phenomenon under investigation and distance from it. A key element in this achievement is striking a ‘balance between developing friendship with participants and maintaining the distance that will allow professional judgement’ (Michailova et al., 2014: 148). Endeavours to do so were unsurprisingly easier in some circumstances than others. For example, in one store in particular I was often addressed and referred to by artists as “Davina”. Often when I arrived in the morning either the manager or an artist would greet me with this name and hand me a feather duster to clean the store’s signage. In addition, if customers enquired who I was, artists would regularly refer to me as “one of the girls”. Although I considered this to be a compliment because artists were seemingly comfortable with my presence, I was cognisant of retaining my sense of self as a researcher. I therefore sought to distance myself intellectually from this persona by speaking with my partner and university peers about research issues as well as meeting regularly with my supervisors. These conversations were considered beneficial because they helped me view day-to-day fieldwork experiences from a wider theoretical lens and reminded me that they were for an academic purpose.

Co-constructing identities is an important part of the research process and demographic factors often play a key role (Cassell, 2005). In addition to being a man and a relative of a former employee, I sensed a further salient demographic factor (at the time of fieldwork) was my forthcoming wedding. Bridal makeup is one of the organization’s offerings to customers and many artists were either engaged to be, or already were, married. Weddings were therefore a regular topic for discussion on makeup counters and artists would often draw me into conversations with customers, who were brides-to-be, to talk about wedding preparations and how and with whom my fiancée was having her bridal makeup done. In addition to facilitating my participation in conversations, I got a sense that my engagement assisted in constructing an identity whereby I was perceived as having no romantic interest in artists, managers, or customers. Although this is obviously my attribution, I do believe that whilst working and observing in an almost exclusively female environment, often with artists of a similar age, this factor made artists and I generally more comfortable in one another’s presence. How acts of reflexivity such as these were analytically interpreted alongside empirical and theoretical material is discussed next.
4.7 Analysis

Given the large volumes of empirical material produced, a system of storage and retrieval was required. This involved the nightly “typing up” of notes produced that day and, where applicable, the date ordered indexing of audio recordings and any materials collected. In line with Hammersley and Atkinson’s position, “official” documents (such as training brochures) were considered, like other empirical material, as ‘social products’ (2007: 130) rather than “facts”. Due to the voluminous amount of audio recordings often made during meetings and trainings events, I would typically use time stamped notations within field notes to listen to specific sections of recordings and, where I deemed necessary, transcribe these. On the other hand, all of the interviews were transcribed using a professional transcription service. I considered this to be a prudent course of action because interviews were conducted contemporaneously alongside participant observation and by having interviews transcribed I could interpret them concurrently with the field notes I was making at that time. Once I had received these back from the transcriber I would listen to the recordings again and, where necessary, use my experiences in the field to amend “mistakes” (e.g. where the transcriber had misheard an acronym) and fill-in omissions. In effect, transcripts were therefore a co-constructed product involving the interviewee, the transcriber, and myself as both an interviewer and a proof-reader.

Aside from the conference calls I dialled into and typed up notes from, I typically used Mondays to reread notes and documents and listen to audio recordings made the previous week. While writing I would often puzzle over earlier interpretations and consider them in light of other empirical materials and, in line with my abductive position (discussed below), theoretical material which I’d encountered during my first year of doctoral study and was reading at that point in time.

4.7.1 Abduction

Abductive reasoning (Peirce, 1978) was employed throughout the research process in an attempt to open up a continuous and iterative dialogue between empirical material, academic theories and concepts, and preunderstandings such as those previously recollected (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011; Cunliffe and Coupland, 2012; Van Maanen et al., 2007). This reasoning entails an iterative process whereby a researcher is open to surprises within empirical observations which cannot be accounted for using their previously encountered theory (Alvesson and Kärreman,
Following this, the researcher elicits different theory to try to account for the surprise or mystery and, if it is still left unresolved, attempts to generate new theoretical ideas to provide insights or, put differently, ‘an inference to the best explanation’ (Martela, 2015: 549). Unlike peers who either adopt a deductive logic and seek to (dis)prove theory with data or colleagues who follow an inductive path and consider insight as emerging from data, abductive scholars seek to develop theoretical insights by holding empirical material, theory, and their preconceptions together in tension in order to ‘challenge, rethink and illustrate theory’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1265).

Following my first year of doctoral study (predominantly spent reviewing conceptualizations of authority in organization and management literatures and preparing and delivering a conference paper on authority from a CCO perspective), an abductive approach was deemed appropriate because I entered fieldwork with ‘intellectual luggage’ (Cunliffe, 2010: 86). Due to my epistemological position, such ‘preconceptions’ (Van Maanen, 1988: 83) were considered as playing a salient role in interpreting and analyzing empirical material. My view, therefore, was that knowledge of the communicative constitution of authority emanates neither from the deductive testing of theory nor inductively from data, but rather from a continual back and forth iterative interplay between academic concepts, intuitions and empirical material whilst trying not to become too tethered to either (Cunliffe and Coupland, 2011; Van Maanen et al., 2007). In addition, abductive scholars’ predilection to ‘engender and entertain hunches, explanatory propositions, ideas, and theoretical elements’ (Locke et al., 2008: 907) makes this reasoning particularly predisposed to scholars who take a reflexive and interpretative ethnographic approach like the one claimed in this doctoral study (Agar, 2010; Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011; Locke, 2011).

Despite being used in most promising research projects (Dubois and Gadde, 2002; Locke, 2011; Van Maanen et al., 2007), researchers’ admittance over the use of abductive logic is largely concealed because of journals’ frequently found ‘inimical’ reporting practices (Locke, 2011: 639) and editors’ preference for publishing research with linear data collection and data analysis stages (Sinkovics and Alfodi, 2012). Accounts offering examples of how abductive logic was empirically applied in the analysis of empirical material were therefore somewhat scarce. However, of the notable exceptions (see Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011; Dubois and Gadde, 2002; Sinkovics and Alfodi, 2012), Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007, 2011) mystery construction methodology was considered as providing a particularly instructive exemplar. An overview of this analytical approach is introduced below followed by a discussion of how its elements were applied.
4.7.2 Mystery construction

Mystery construction comprises six elements a researcher may either sequentially follow or selectively draw upon to facilitate a continual iterative orientation between empirical and theoretical worlds and their preconceptions, expectations, and imagination (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011). More specifically, following a Peircian (1978) understanding of abduction, it provides a framework which focuses on ‘inconsistencies and breakdowns within empirical observations and how these, rather than (pure) theoretical speculation, may help us develop theory’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1266). As with all abductive approaches, within mystery construction it is imperative that researchers maintain an open attitude and continually and reflexively broaden their ‘interpretative repertoire’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1273). Regular refreshes of this repertoire, which includes ‘theories, basic assumptions, commitments, metaphors, vocabularies, and knowledge’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1273) are necessary so that (as far as possible) empirical breakdowns encountered during and after fieldwork are not attributable to a researcher’s ignorance and/or naivety or narrow-mindedness (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007). Relatedly, it is important that researchers maintain an ontological openness throughout this process and allow their worldview to be challenged and to evolve in order for empirical research to be interpreted from a multitude of perspectives (Martela, 2015).

Mystery construction was considered to provide a particularly instructive analytical framework in this doctoral study because the six elements set within a “decision tree” process (see Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1271), provided pathways through which a ‘permissive’ (Paavola, 2004: 268; Locke et al., 2008: 909), non-linear, and ‘messy’ (Sinkovics and Alfodi, 2012: 817) abductive logic could be applied. Relatedly, the charting of these paths offers some transparency around the use of this logic and arguably counters accusations of ‘anecdotalism’ or ‘exampling’ often levelled against such approaches (Sinkovics and Alfodi, 2012: 836). In addition, organization studies scholars’ utilization of some or all of its elements provided useful commentaries on its application (e.g. Arnould and Kayla, 2015; Costas and Kärreman, 2016; Hydle, 2015). The six elements and their use within this doctoral study and these studies are discussed below.

4.7.2.1 Element one: Familiarizing oneself with the setting
Mystery construction commences with researchers familiarizing themselves in a setting and, in fairly open ways, making enquiries about what is going on there. At this preliminary stage, a study should have some theoretical direction: however, researchers’ investigatory foci should be broad enough so that they are open to unexpected observations within empirical material (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007, 2011). In keeping with this advice, fieldwork commenced with a conceptual CCO framework from which a ‘loose bundle of concepts […] acted as [a] “first cut” or guide to getting started’ (Hirst and Humphreys, 2015: 1538) and a broad preliminary research question was formulated: ‘how is authority relationally routinized?’ Similar to Barley’s (1990) experience of ethnography, I viewed analysis as commencing in the observational phase of fieldwork and to be an ongoing process which continued throughout fieldwork as opposed to a discrete stage which commenced once I had begun withdrawing from the field (Van Maanen et al., 2007). Like Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), I considered analysis to be informally embodied in my ‘ideas and hunches’ and as formally taking ‘shape in analytic notes and memoranda’ (p. 158).

Following Barley’s (1990) lead, in the first three months of fieldwork I regularly wrote “analytic memos” that recorded the results of my tentative analyses’ (p. 234). Writing these prompted ‘the sort of internal dialogue, or thinking aloud, that is the essence of reflexive ethnography’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 151) and helped me puzzle over behaviours and issues from empirical material which struck me as interesting due to their oddity, familiarity, or regularity. For example, an early memo detailed my surprise at the reverence with which the founder was frequently referred to by managers and artists. Despite residing over 3,000 miles away, these parties spoke as though they personally knew the founder (e.g. ‘Ella likes cheeks to look the colour after they’re pinched’), how she made decisions which impacted their daily working or how she had a bearing on their decision making processes (e.g. ‘keeping Ella Ella is so important moving forward’). Lines from and my reflections on, for example, meeting transcripts, field notes and documents were added to this memo to illustrate my fledgling interpretations.

Another analytic memo detailed senior and middle managers’ constant couching of suboptimal sales results in positive terminology. For example, most managers’ reference to their area, region or store being ‘x% to target’ (i.e. as failing to achieve target) and framing any performance problem (e.g. staff shortages) as an ‘instant changeable’ was a recurring feature of the weekly national and regional sales meeting conference calls. This struck me as peculiar because, through these phrases, managers were perpetuating a façade that sales figures were acceptable among their peers who, more often than not, were faced with, and were contributing to, the same issue.
Writing such memos helped give some early direction to the study. However, at this stage I was mindful of becoming overly wed to an idea and, heeding Kunda’s (2013) advice to ethnographers in the early stages of analysis, I undertook some ‘free style writing’ (p. 18) in an effort to aid creativity. In conjunction with ongoing observations and field notes, memos like these helped me to tentatively conclude I had encountered what Alvesson and Kärreman (2007, 2011) refer to as a ‘breakdown’ in theory. This breakdown and how it was reached is discussed below.

4.7.2.2 Element two: Encountering/constructing breakdowns in understanding

Progressing to the second mystery construction element, researchers’ assess whether they have encountered a ‘breakdown’ or ‘surprise’ within their empirical material that ‘can’t easily be accounted for by available theory’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1270). Like Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2011) surprise at an advertising agency’s extreme division of labour and Costas and Kärreman’s (2016) puzzlement when knowledge theories left their observations of boredom unexplained, the founder’s communicative omnipresence was, to the best of my knowledge, left unaccounted for by CCO theory and other theories within my interpretative repertoire. Initially, presentification (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Cooren, 2009; Cooren et al., 2008) had some explanatory value for these observations. However, cross referencing studies that had drawn on this CCO construct with empirical material led to a judgement that presentification was too much of a broad descriptor to account for my more nuanced interpretations. On the other hand, iterating back and forth between empirical and theoretical material led to a ‘(re)solution’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1272) of an early breakdown. To elaborate, managers’ repeated use of positive language resonates with Dambrin and Lambert’s study of cosmetic managers whereby ‘a commercial failure can always be explained by exogenous factors, and that makes it more acceptable’ (2017: 40) and draws parallels with impression management theory (cf. Cluley, 2013; Fincham, 1999; Watson, 2004). However, the omnipresence surprise still remained unaccounted for.

4.7.2.3 Element three: Moving from breakdown to mystery

The analysis process proceeded to mystery construction’s third element, which involves a researcher deciding whether the ‘breakdown’ encountered between theoretical and empirical
material is solely of local relevance or if it offers a wider and ‘novel’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1271) contribution to their scholarly field. Ongoing reviews of CCO theory indicated a lack of understanding with regards to how authority becomes routinized and, considering the theoretical importance of authority to communicative constitutions of organization (cf. Cooren et al., 2011; Putnam and Nicotera, 2010; Taylor, 2011), the founder’s communicative omnipresence was therefore deemed to be of local and theoretical interest. This breakdown had therefore developed into a theoretical ‘mystery’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1271) and required further systematic work to try and (re)solve it.

4.7.2.4 Element four: Engaging in more systematic work

During the fourth element, a researcher engages in systematic empirical, theoretical and analytic work to develop new understandings of the ‘mystery’ under consideration. With regards to the latter of these activities, I drew on other scholars who had followed Alvesson and Kärreman’s mystery construction approach (Arnould and Cayla, 2015; Costas and Kärreman, 2016; Hydle, 2015) and began to systematically code empirical material. While coding data often carries connotations of ‘a minimization of researcher subjectivity for the benefit of reliable procedure’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1269), I followed Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007) understanding of the term and coded in an effort to reread and reframe my interpretations. Coding began with the printing off (field notes, interview transcripts, meeting transcripts, emails) and/or rereading of empirical material (social media posts and documents). Materials which corresponded to either the founder’s communicative omnipresence or were otherwise deemed as interesting were highlighted and were accompanied with brief annotations.

With the accumulation of a large corpus of coded empirical material I decided to use the qualitative analysis software package NVivo. While acknowledging cautionary tales of researchers’ becoming ‘bogged down’ (Gilbert, 2002: 15) in coding, NVivo was used to assist, rather than perform, the coding process. In addition, this software allowed for empirical material to be stored, retrieved, and coded from one central repository. Either all or parts of empirical material deemed as noteworthy (e.g. certain page(s) of a training workbook), were uploaded to this software. After writing analytic memos, coding with pen and paper, and ongoing reviews of theory, coding within NVivo commenced with three ‘plotlines’ (Cunliffe and Coupland, 2011: 65) in mind. While open to contestation and change, these preliminary plots centred on how the founder’s communicative
omnipresence routinely exercised authority over how artists and managers spoke on-counter, presented workspaces, and applied makeup on themselves and customers. Themes (or ‘nodes’ in NVivo terminology) which corresponded to these plots were created and a fourth (miscellaneous) theme was generated so that empirical material which struck me as interesting but, at that point in time, did not “fit” into one of the three themes was not disregarded. Material (or, using NVivo terms, ‘sources’) were then reviewed and either all, part of, or none of each one were highlighted and coded into one or more of these four themes.

In keeping with the abductive logic of mystery construction, the coding process iterated between empirical and theoretical material. For example, frequently coding managers’ and artists’ use of phrases like ‘Ella says’ in training environments and on makeup counters led me to tentatively conclude that the founder was making artists’ talk and was being made to talk by artists. After reviewing presentification theory, this empirical material provided a closer approximation to another CCO theory from my interpretative repertoire labelled ventriloquism (Caronia and Cooren, 2014; Cooren, 2012, 2013; Cooren et al., 2013; Cooren and Sandler, 2014). Reviews of ventriloqual studies shed some light on this material but could not account for artists’ routine use of these phrases. Hence this part of the mystery was left unresolved. Consequently, the “sayings” theme was relabelled “ventriloquism” and subthemes which corresponded to the nuanced interpretations left unaccounted for by this theory were created and empirical material was coded into these. In addition, following the fifth element of mystery construction, the contemporaneous coding of material into the other three themes (“presenting”, “doing” and “miscellaneous”) led me to theory outside of CCO in an effort to (re)solve this omnipresence mystery.

4.7.2.5 Element five: Solving or reformulating the mystery

Moving to the fifth element of mystery construction, a researcher attempts to solve or reformulate the mystery by developing a novel idea that provides an explanation for it. Applying the same iterative logic as before, this may involve introducing ‘new concepts, a new theoretical framework, or a new metaphor’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1272). For example, following their initial surprise at the importance ethnographer interviewees attached to the use of video within a commercial ethnography, Arnould and Cayla (2016) found organizational theory on narrative left this breakdown unaccounted for. Thereafter, consultation of social theory directed them to a new concept (artefacts) which, in conjunction with further reviews of interview material, led them to an
anthropological theory of fetish which offered a useful heuristic framework to resolve their breakdown.

Relatedly, while coding and reviewing theory, one tentative conclusion was that the founder’s omnipresence was constituted through, and exercised authority over, managers’ and artists’ presentation and photography of workspaces. However, to the best of my knowledge, theories and constructs within CCO offered limited explanatory value to account for this interpretation. Following Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007, 2011) advice I therefore sought to further develop my interpretive repertoire by seeking out new theories, vocabularies and constructs outside of CCO in an attempt to “make sense” of this interpretation. Hence, my interpretation of the founder’s ethereal omnipresence led me toward aesthetic theory (e.g. Hancock, 2005; Strati, 1996) and in particular a construct labelled ‘landscaping’ (Gagliardi, 1996). In keeping with the fifth mystery construction element, this shift in paradigm also prompted the ‘formulation of new research tasks’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1272). Interviews were introduced into the study, alongside observations and informal interviews, in an attempt to explore artists’ and managers’ constructions around their presentation of workspaces. Relatedly, this paradigmatic change also led me to seek access to the company’s private UK Facebook group in order to see how artists’ photographed and described workspaces to their colleagues.

The large amount of material coded into the “routines” theme (previously labelled as “doings”) indicated that routinization was a construct which cut across the empirical material coded up to that point in time. Subsequently, material where artists routinely uttered ‘Ella says’ and furnished workspaces with ‘Ella approved’ artefacts were taken out of the “routines” theme and recoded into the “ventriloquism” and “aesthetic” themes, respectively. Rather than removing researchers’ subjectivity from the analytic process, coding and recoding material into, and relabelling, themes therefore helped me to question and reframe evolving interpretations.

Relatedly, relieving the “routines” theme of a large volume of material gave a sharper focus to this theme’s remaining empirical material. Specifically, material coded in routines and miscellaneous themes directed my attention toward practice theory and specifically the works of Schatzki (e.g. 1996, 2002, 2006, 2012). Reviews of Schatzki’s work led to the identification of constructs which closely approximated to the ordered makeup techniques artists were observed applying, and spoke about applying, on-counter. The “routines” theme was subsequently relabelled as “practices” and subthemes relating to Schatzki’s constructs were created within it. Through this “back and forth”
process between empirical and theoretical worlds a total of three themes (each comprising three subthemes) were finally settled upon.

Following this iterative and abductive logic, I believe, helped me avoid falling into what has been referred to as a ‘coding trap’ (Gilbert, 2002: 218) or ‘coding fetishism’ (Seror, 2013: 235). This arises when a researcher’s increasing familiarity with computer-assisted qualitative data analysis Software (like NVivo) leads to a fixation with the mechanics of coding at the expense of necessary interpretative work. By contrast, coding empirical material in tandem with reviews of theory, I felt, prevented me becoming overly preoccupied with NVivo’s functionality and, so far as possible, retained my subjectivity as a researcher.

4.7.2.6 Element six: Developing the (re)solution of the mystery

Mystery construction culminates with a researcher’s attempt to broaden the relevance of the mystery (re)solution by positioning their contribution (e.g. a new theoretical concept or metaphor) alongside other theories in their chosen academic field. Mysteries and (re)solutions can therefore be framed in a plethora of theoretical ways (Mantere and Ketokivi, 2013). This tenet has unsurprisingly attracted both proponents and critics with, for example, Oswick et al. (2011) falling into the former camp. These authors advocate mystery construction’s use on the grounds that a continual iteration between empirical material and concepts from both inside and outside Organization and Management Theory (OMT) facilitates more novel and radical theoretical contributions to OMT and, contrariwise, for concepts from within OMT to have a wider export to other academic fields. For example, Arnould and Cayla (2016) chose to place their fetishization process concept within two literatures, sensemaking and market research, which had previously left this process unaccounted for. Similarly, following the elements outlined above, Hydle (2015) iterated between interviews, observations, and distributed work practices literature to pitch a novel framework on the spatial and temporal dimensions of strategizing within strategy theory. After an abductive analysis of empirical and theoretical material using the five elements above, this doctoral study crafts an original conceptualization of how authority routinely acts and positions this concept within CCO theory. By marrying ventriloquism with constructs from aesthetic theory and practice theory, this concept is also claimed to offer a novel perspective to, and to be open to critique from, researchers who are interested in authority within OMT and from further afield.
With regards to mystery construction’s shortcomings, McKinley (2008) claims that the inventiveness of this approach compromises the replicability of findings that emanate from it. However, by adopting an interpretative and reflexive approach, this doctoral study follows Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2008) justification for following this process and seeks to make a theoretical contribution which stimulates ‘new lines of inquiry’ (p. 543) as opposed to one that can be replicated. Following consideration of the analytical logic and techniques used, this chapter concludes with a discussion of the various ethical issues encountered throughout the research process.

4.8 Ethics

Like most researchers undertaking an ethnographic approach, I found fieldwork to be ‘replete with the unexpected’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 20). In addition to considering and completing ‘procedural ethics’ (such as those involving ethics boards prior to fieldwork) I, like most ethnographers, therefore had numerous ‘ethics in practice’ issues to assess and address whilst in the field (Johnson, 2014: 24).

During the early stages of fieldwork, and less often thereafter, I issued information sheets and consent forms to artists and managers with whom I would be working and/or observing (see Appendix A). During initial encounters (often in breakfast meetings for example) I would introduce myself and (re)introduce the research by paraphrasing the sheet’s salient points, checking for consent, and welcoming any questions artists or managers may have about the research. These key points concerned: informed consent; the voluntary nature of participation and participants’ right to withdraw; anonymity; and confidentiality. As discussed below, these points required ongoing reflexive consideration throughout the research process. I therefore adopted a position akin to ‘ethical situationism’ whereby ‘what is appropriate and inappropriate depends upon the context to a large extent’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 221).

Informed consent requires that participants should be informed that research is taking place and be advised of its purpose and of the implications of participation (Homan, 1992). The complexity of this issue is arguably heightened within ethnographic approaches due to researchers’ extended stays in the field. Indeed, over time ‘hosts’ may come to overlook the researcher’s purpose and their view of the researcher’s identity qua researcher may fade into the background. Information may
therefore be disclosed which the host does not recognise as relevant to the researcher, but which the researcher does. These issues therefore raise questions regarding the extent to which hosts’ prior consent justifies the use of such disclosures as data (Murphy and Dingwall, 2007). Somewhat fortuitously, a relatively high turnover of artists assisted me in this regard. For example, artists would often leave the organization and need replacing, would transfer between stores, and would work a variety of full-time and/or part-time shift patterns. There were therefore several opportune moments when new starters and returners were being welcomed and briefed within, for example, breakfast meetings for me to introduce the research and to reiterate to existing artists and managers who I was and what my research interests were.

My research interests, as with other ethnographers, were somewhat iterative and fluid and often I could not share with artists and managers interests which only crystalized after some time in the field (Homan, 1992). Indeed, as Atkinson (2009) reminds us, if the outcomes of an ethnographic piece of research were entirely predictable, there would be virtually no point in conducting the research at all. Throughout the research process I regularly reiterated to groups in meetings and more informally during one-to-one chats that my focus was on communication rather than people, that I was not there to “judge” them, and I was working with not for the organization. During such occasions I sought to avoid using jargon and (out of necessity) endeavoured to give a ‘truthful, but vague and imprecise’ synopsis of my current interests (Taylor and Bodgan, 1984). In addition, I used one-to-one monthly meetings with the National Sales Manager (who was the main gatekeeper in the research), scheduled to discuss access for the forthcoming month, to “benchmark” how my interests were perceived by others.

Like other researchers using an ethnographic approach I was, at times, ‘thrust into the presence of actors from inside and outside the organization from whom consent has not been obtained’ (McDonald and Simpson, 2014: 15). Mindful of this issue I sought, so-far-as-possible, to check with store and counter managers if they knew of any potential company visitors and if feasible to schedule an introduction. In actuality visitor arrivals were typically, to the best of my knowledge, impromptu. On such occasions I heeded Hammersley and Atkinson’s (2007) advice that ethical considerations ‘must be done on the basis of a realistic view of human relations, not an idealized one’ (p. 225). I therefore typically attempted to introduce the research to, and seek consent from, visitors at the earliest opportunity and carried business cards to give to visitors in case any later questions or concerns arose.
As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) remind us, participants’ right to withdraw is a basic right within social research. Due to the complexities involved with working with and/or observing groups of people in ethnographic research, questions arise regarding whether the withdrawal of one participant from a collective vetoes the participation of others (Atkinson, 2009). Following artists’ and managers’ initial consent I informed them that they should inform me or, if more convenient, a manager if they did not wish for me to be present during some or all of their activities or to document them using notes and/or audio recordings. Put differently, following their consent, artists and managers were informed they should “opt-out” of the research or parts thereof. This approach was deemed sensible on the grounds of ‘proportionate reason’ (Johnson, 2014: 29), because I considered perpetually obtaining informed consent on an interaction-by-interaction basis would likely result in undue frustration and stress for artists and managers and therefore had the potential to be unethical.

During my initial meetings with the National Sales Manager issues of confidentiality and anonymity were discussed. However, other than signing a mandatory confidentiality agreement which all outside parties who have contact with the organization have to sign, no specific requirements were placed on me. In addition to safeguarding the identity and the privacy of the organization, participants’, colleagues’, competitors’, and the organization’s products and services were anonymized. This was through the use of pseudonyms and by substituting or omitting any distinctive features of the organization or participants. In doing so, I adopted a situationist ethics approach to these issues (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

Throughout fieldwork ethical decisions were regularly made in-situ and based on intuition. Indeed, as Hammersley and Atkinson remind us, in ethnographic research issues such as these ‘are, in fact, very similar to those that are relevant to other human activities […] what and how much to disclose of what one knows, believes, feels etc., can be an issue for anyone at any time’ (2007: 228). For example, I excluded myself from discussions relating to human resources issues, such as disciplinary hearings, promotions and salary discussions, on the grounds that if roles were reversed I would not want a researcher to be privy to such issues. Similarly, mindful of commercially sensitive information, during the early stages of fieldwork I offered to “step out” of meetings where the agenda item related to finance issues. However, the National Sales Manager held a view that I was welcome to be party to these as they provided valuable context to events on shop floors and sales counters.
Relatedly, prior to the start of meetings I double-checked attendees were comfortable with me documenting proceedings using notes and audio-recordings. In one particular meeting in the early stages of fieldwork, following agreement from all parties for me to do so, a manager asked me “you’re not recording this are you?” after a comment about a colleague which could be considered contentious. Although I sensed her comment was an attempt to introduce levity to the room, I aired on the side of caution and switched the tape recorder off. Later at lunch the manager told me she was uncomfortable with the topics of conversation during that part of the meeting which was why she made the request. This was a valuable lesson for me because although from there-on-in I still checked prior to meetings whether recording was allowed, I also relied on an intuitive sensitivity as to whether I or others were uncomfortable with me doing so.

Finally, following a similar approach by Johnson (2014), McDonald and Simpson (2014) and Vásquez et al. (2012), artists and managers were offered the option, if so requested, for me to provide them and/or the organization with an “outside-in” perspective on their organizing practices. These parties were informed that talking to an organization and management researcher about their daily work may help them to reflect on their professional development and learning. I viewed the offer of such an “incentive” as being both fair and necessary considering the length of time I spent in the organization and with them. However, I emphasized to managers and artists that this feedback was from a research rather than a consultative perspective.

4.9 Chapter Summary

Following the previous chapter’s discussion of how access to the field was achieved, this chapter has discussed the methodological approach taken within it. More specifically it chronicled how, following my communicational worldview and intersubjective epistemological assumptions, my role as an interpretive and reflexive researcher in this study was key. Following this recognition, attention turned to why ethnography was considered an appropriate methodological choice. The primary method used in this study, participant observation, was then introduced and illustrative examples of the broad spectrum of participatory and observatory practices undertaken during time spent in makeup stores, meetings, and training events was provided. The role of field notes in crafting interpretations of these experiences was then considered before attention turned to how interviews, as extensions of ongoing conversations I was having with makeup artists, were used. Following this, reflexive concerns and practices were discussed with particular consideration given
to how my (initial) naivety with makeup products and stores, connection to a former Ella May employee, and my engaged-to-be-married circumstance at the time of fieldwork potentially mediated sense-making both with and about actors. Next, the merits of an abductive analytical approach and its ability to engender and utilize such personal and academic (pre)conceptions were discussed. Following a consideration of the appropriateness of employing abductive logic in this study, attention then turned to mystery construction (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007): an analytical methodology which provides guiding pathways to apply this logic. Finally, the chapter closed with a discussion of how procedural ethics were attended to prior to fieldwork and how, like most other ethnographic studies, situational ethical issues were addressed within it. Following this discussion of the interpretation of empirical materials during and following fieldwork, the next chapter introduces the key findings which emanated from these.
5.1 Chapter Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present how the founder of Ella May is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence within daily organizing. It shows how multifarious constitutions of Ella May (the person) become routinized and exercise authority over activities which re-enact and reproduce Ella May (the organization). Comprising three sections, it details how ventriloqual (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetic (e.g. Hancock, 2005), and practice-based (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) constitutions of the founder make an authoritative difference to the makeup practices, looks, and ethos which constitute and characterize Ella May as a beauty organization.

The chapter begins by detailing how artists ventriloquized Ella as an authority on makeup by uttering specific sayings to customers. The first ‘policing’ subsection extends extant conceptions of ventriloquism (Bergeron and Cooren, 2012; Caronia and Cooren, 2014; Cooren et al., 2013; Jahn, 2016; Sorsa et al., 2014) by demonstrating how senior managers both premeditate and monitor artists’ ventriloqual acts. The next ‘rehearsing’ subsection adds a new scholastic dimension to this construct by showing how, through recalling deontic texts (Cooren and Taylor, 2007; Taylor, 2006) and rote-reading stories from the founder, artists were trained in how to ventriloquize Ella. Finally, the ‘reciting’ subsection advances existing bi-directional (i.e. puppeteer-puppet) understandings of ventriloqual authority by demonstrating how, as third-party “audience” members, customers differentially attribute ventriloqual acts (and the puppets and puppeteer within them) as authoritative.

The aesthetics section details how the founder’s constitution as an aesthetic ‘style guru’ (Carter and Jackson, 2000: 182) is perpetuated by, and exercises authority over, managers’ and artists’ stylization of internal and publicly accessible spaces. The first ‘synonymizing’ subsection reaches beyond extant studies of aesthetic taste (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000; Hancock, 2005; Wasserman and Frenkel, 2011; Witz et al., 2003) by charting how, through the provision and presentation of select artefacts, senior managers attempt to depict Ella as a style guru internally and direct junior managers and artists to do likewise. Following this, the ‘surveilling’ subsection adds a new dimension to an aesthetic understanding of authority by demonstrating how the founder is presentified (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Brumanns et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) as
an ethereal purveyor of artists’ attempts to replicate and perpetuate her aesthetic taste. The final ‘propagandizing’ subsection further extends aesthetic views of authority by highlighting how the founder’s aesthetic exercises authority over managers’ and artists’ public and internal actions. Specifically, it demonstrates how managers and artists perpetuate the founder’s aesthetic taste by landscaping (e.g. Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) internal and publicly accessible physical and social-media spaces with stylistically “approved” artefacts. In addition, it offers a communicational perspective to an-aesthetic (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) takes on authority by showing how artists and managers engage in subterfuge to promulgate a physically absent aesthetic of Ella to the public and their peers on social-media.

The final practice section utilizes Schatzki’s (2012) view of teleological hierarchy or, as Schatzki otherwise refers to it, teleological chains (2002) or teleological orderings (2006). It demonstrates how, through artists’ makeup image, demonstration of products and sequential order of makeup application, a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice is constituted which exercises authority over artists’ private and on-counter makeup actions. The first ‘emblematizing’ subsection draws on Schatzki’s (2002, 2006, 2012) view that a hierarchy of actions, activities and tasks culminate in a goal and shows how a goal (i.e. for artists to have a homogenous makeup image) exercises authoritative agency by emblematizing to managers whether actors follow the founder’s preferred hierarchy on themselves. The next ‘proprietal authority’ subsection uses Schatzki’s (2002, 2006, 2012) understanding of how action-activity-task hierarchies operate and highlights how a specific makeup task’s tie to a second goal (i.e. a ‘natural’ makeup image) exercises authoritative agency. Specifically, it demonstrates how, despite customer demand, the founder’s favoured ‘natural’ look circumscribes artists’ on-counter actions by delineating how they use a particular product. Finally, the ‘teleo-authorizing’ subsection demonstrates how, through artists’ actions, activities, and tasks, a normative Ella makeup practice is constituted. It shows how an Ella goal (i.e. to incrementally build and not compromise the founder’s favoured makeup look on clients) exercises authority by restricting artists’ autonomy to decide their order of makeup tasks during lessons.

Taken together, these three sections highlight the multi-faceted nature of the founder’s communicatively constituted omnipresence. In particular, they demonstrate how ventriloqual, aesthetic, and practice-based constitutions of Ella May (the person) become routinized and make an authoritative difference to activities which reproduce the organization that bears her name. These sections, the subsections, and a synopsis of how the founder is communicatively constituted
as an authoritative omnipresence are presented below in figure 2, which also outlines the structure of the chapter.
Figure 2: Findings chapter overview

**Summary**

1. Senior managers premeditate and monitor artists' ventriloquism of Ella.
2. Through deontic texts and role readings of the founder's stories, artists are trained how to ventriloquize Ella.
3. Artists' ventriloquism of Ella makes an authoritative difference to (some) customer lessons.
4. Through the stylization of select artefacts, senior managers depict Ella as an aesthetic style guru.

**First order indicative data**

1. "It's also talking about Ella, there's quite a few points on that, I shouldn't be telling you this what's on the marking scheme. But there's quite a few points like 'did they share Ella's philosophy on skincare? Did they talk about how Ella believes foundation should look?"
2. "Please choose 3-4 artists with different skintones to come to the front to colour match to a powder. Ask them to apply to half of their face, the results are very visual and it really shows the soft focus effect of the product. Talk to the fact that Ella says this is almost a powder version of her tinted moisturiser.'
3. Louise said Ella believes skin should look like skin and makeup should enhance what you've got... She asked if the lady would like to go half heavy and half natural and see which she'd prefer. The lady said she'd go with what she recommends.
4. "Look I hate doing this because it's like, I love how creative you are, I love the things you do on counter but we obviously represent Ella and her philosophies and her ethos and these are the things that she wants, if she wouldn't eat or drink it – we don't want to see it."

**Second order theme**

1. Policing
2. Rehearsing
3. Ventriloquial authority
4. Reciting
5. Synonymizing

**Theoretical construct**

The founder is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence.
Depicted as ethereally omnipresent, Ella pursues artists’ attempts to replicate her taste.

“You’ve seen the food she eats, like the kind of message that she wants to send out about her so I think just keep it super, like super on brand at all times and, yeah, I mean if you’re happy for Ella to see it, post away but like Chantelle said, if you’re not sure just check, just check”

Artists and managers perpetuate Ella’s aesthetic taste by landscaping and an-aestheticizing physical and social media spaces.

“So we can only use healthy kind of snack things. So we have fruit or dark chocolate only. We would never put, like, cakes or anything like that. I know sometimes people have done in the past, but...Which, they’re like, Okay, fine. But don’t put it on any social media, because that is not the Ella Way.”

Artists’ make-up image is emblematic of whether they have followed Ella’s hierarchy of make-up actions, activities, and tasks.

“Oscar said to me and the store manager how one of the artists (the former Miss Finland) wasn’t wearing her make-up the Ella way (i.e. there was too much of it and she wasn’t wearing it right around the eyes). The two of them discussed who should tell her and Oscar took her by the hand, sat her down and touched up her make-up.”

Artists’ use of a particular product is inextricably tied to a specific make-up task in order to achieve a specific Ella look.

“What you say is, you never say to someone “I can’t sell this to you because we don’t do at Ella”, sell it! And usually they’re makeup artists, and they’re quite savvy with it. What you can do, is say is; “We don’t actually train it at Ella so I can’t demo it on you today”.”

The goal behind Ella’s step-wise make-up application circumscribes artists’ autonomy to decide the order of their make-up tasks in lessons.

“That’s why the facechart is set out like that because she (Ella) believes that you should start your make-up with what you can do quickly, and if you need to leave the house you still look good, so corrector concealer first always.”

Surveilling

Aesthetic authority

Propagandizing

Emblemizing

Proprietorial authority

Teleo-authorizing

The founder is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence

Practice-based authority
5.2 Section one: Ventriloquism

This section details how, through managers’ requirements, monitoring, and training, Ella May is ventriloqually constituted as an authoritative omnipresence which exercises agency over, and makes a difference to, artists’ interactions with customers. The first ‘policing’ subsection details how, through two mechanisms (i.e. quarterly mystery shops and an artistry certification programme), senior managers require and monitor artists’ verbal introductions of the founder as an authority on knowing to customers. Through the use of scripted deontic texts (e.g. Cooren and Taylor, 2007) these managers require artists to presentify (e.g. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009) or, more specifically, ventriloquize (e.g. Cooren, 2012) the founder verbally during on-counter interactions. Specifically, by uttering specific phrases, artists are expected to supplement their own opinion with the founder’s. By detailing how managers’ police ventiloquial acts through covert and adjudicative means, this subsection enriches extant ventiloquial conceptions of authority by demonstrating a previously undiscovered premeditated and contrived element to this phenomenon.

The next ‘rehearsing’ subsection illustrates how, through regularly introducing a deontic ‘Ella says’ text, artists are trained in ventriloquizing the founder as an authority on knowing. Through this text, Ella is presentified in these environments as a form of thirdness (Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014) intended to give meaning to artists’ future actions and to supplement their personal on-counter authority. Extending the ventriloquism metaphor, this subsection also details how, through rehearsing the utterance of such a text, educators sought to strengthen the attachment/strings between the founder (as puppeteer) and artists (as puppets). Relatedly, through rote, mantra-like recitals of the founder’s stories, training attendees invoke Ella and become accustomed to speaking as her in this environment. Considered in tandem, artists’ routine rehearsals of sayings and stories deepen ventiloquial views of authority by illuminating a hitherto unacknowledged scholastic component to this construct.

Finally, the ‘reciting’ subsection highlights artists’ ventriloquism of the founder on-counter to a customer audience. During various makeup lessons, the verbal introduction of Ella as an authority on knowing supplemented artists’ opinions and reinforced their personal authority. Specifically, ventriloquist performances often exercised authoritative agency with older customers who, due to their age, have more in common, appearance-wise, with the figure being evoked (Ella) than the evoking artist. Conversely, artists’ ventriloquial acts often make little difference to artists’ lessons with younger customers who are often either unaware of, or indifferent to, the figure being evoked.
Furthermore, in some instances, ventriloquizing Ella as an authority on beauty impedes artists’ personal opinions and personal authority. Finally, artists often refer to customers commenting that their ventriloquist acts lack authenticity because their ‘strings’ are being overly and overtly pulled by the founder and their personal connection to her is insincere. Demonstrating audiences’ differential receptivity to artists’ ventriloqual acts extends ventriloqual authority studies’ focus on bi-directional puppet-puppeteer processes and enhances understandings about the nuanced ways ventriloqual authority acts. A synopsis of this subsection and the other two which comprise this section on ventriloquism is provided in figure 3 below.
Figure 3: Ventriloquism section overview

Summary

First order indicative data

"We want people that love Ella as we all do, you know we think she's amazing, we love all of her philosophies and we just need to, we need to be hearing that from our artists"

"Try and listen where you can, get your coaches listening, "I didn't hear you talk about Ella", "did you mention Ella?" no, "mention her on the next one". So I think you're going to have to do a little bit of that to, to be confident to say no, it is now happening"

"What we do is we actually get the new artists particularly who don't talk about Ella as much, is we actually target them to mention Ella three times in their makeup lesson"

"On the Factchart if you look at each section, have your kind of thing that you say for each section... so for instance, with the skincare, you know, Ella likes skin to look like skin. It's as simple as that so when you're doing the skin you can say, "when you're looking for your perfect foundation, Ella likes skin to look like skin"

Second order theme

Theoretical construct

Policing
Through deontic texts and rote readings of the founder's stories, artists are trained how to ventriloquize Ella.

"This whole season we're talking about Ella's stories; bringing back her original stories and everything, so it's a bit of a storytelling seasonal school"

'Rehearsing'

'H ave the artist read the note from Ella in the workbook'

'Katie said Ella believes skin should look like skin and makeup should enhance what you've got. She asked if the lady would like to go half heavy and half natural and see which she'd prefer. The lady said she'd go with what she recommends.'

'Reciting'

'I don't even realize that I'm saying, "Ella thinks eyebrows are sisters, not twins." Like, it just, kind of, comes out without me being like, Oh, I better slot in a sentence here'.

'The founder is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence

"As you're naturally chatting your reason for using what you're using usually comes with a "Ella says" or a "Ella generally thinks this""
5.2.1 Policing

Excerpt 1: National Sales Manager meeting, Nathalie (Regional Sales Manager), Manchester, 30/09/2015

“In building the sale we are losing points on not introducing Ella’s philosophy”.

Referring to the “building the sale” section of the mystery shop, Nathalie’s quote was a common issue uncovered by mystery shoppers across the eight UK regions represented at the Quarter Two National Sales Meeting (NSM): artists’ failure to verbally introduce the founder as an authority on beauty to customers. Through mystery shop and artistry certification programmes, this ‘policing’ subsection details senior and middle managers’ efforts to monitor artists’ on-counter ventriloquism of the founder. In doing so, it advances extant conceptions of ventriloqual authority by revealing a contrived element to this construct. With regards to the mystery shop, the National Education Manager reminded NSM attendees how, for the first time, during quarter one (i.e. July – September 2015) all UK Ella May makeup counters were marked according to a stricter (binary) marking scheme than had been used in previous mystery shops. According to this manager, in this mystery shop no “half marks” were awarded for “half a job”. Attendees were also informed that this new marking criteria will continue to be used throughout the remaining three quarters of the fiscal year by mystery shoppers who – posing as genuine customers – phone and then personally visit makeup counters to assess artists’ artistry skills and customer service. Alongside more self-explanatory requirements (e.g. ensuring artists’ recorded customers’ contact details), as figure 4 below shows, the ‘building the sale’ section of the mystery shoppers’ guidance notes provides NSM attendees with a reminder of the verbal utterances the mystery shoppers are listening out for and that senior education managers are monitoring:

Figure 4: ‘Mystery shop programme notes’ extract, 30/09/2015

1. **What is the product**…foundation stick
2. **What is its use**…foundation stick is a portable and customisable product for touch ups, light targeted area coverage or full make up and is so easy to use, Ella says it is every woman’s handbag essential!
3. **Why is it an appropriate choice for the customer**…this is perfect for you, you told me earlier in the lesson that you often do your make up on the train, but also have
events that you attend straight from the office, this is great as it is matched to your
colour, portable, easy to use and great for freshening up your base for your evening
events. So you can leave your liquid formula you have decided on today at home,
and use this option on the go

The un-italicized parts of this ‘building the sale’ scenario illustrate to mystery shoppers how artists
should be verbalizing the abstract and somewhat ethereal philosophy of ‘helping a woman to look
like herself, only prettier and more confident’. In the scenario, an artist is introducing a product to
customers which complements one that was used previously and, as they do so, shoppers are
instructed to listen out for artists’ verbal introduction of the founder as an authority: ‘*Ella says it is
every woman’s handbag essential!*’ (lines 3 and 4, emphasis added). By stipulating and monitoring
artists’ utterance of this declarative and deontic text, senior managers are attempting to
ventriloquize the founder as an authoritative figure on-counter who accompanies and reinforces
artists’ personal recommendations.

During the annual UK brand conference the importance senior education managers placed on
artists talking about Ella as part of their customer service was similarly reiterated to NSM
attendees, the group president, the brand’s UK CEO, and cross-departmental managerial
colleagues. Within the sales and education part of the agenda, for example, the National Education
Manager emphasized the importance (but relative failure) of artists with regards to: “*Bringing Ella to
life. There was a lack of mention of her overall*. In addition to the various visual attempts to bring
Ella to ‘life’ (introduced in the subsequent aesthetics section), there was a managerial expectation
that this was verbally enacted and for the founder to be made present or presentified (Benoit-Barné
and Cooren, 2009; Brummans et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) in every artist/customer interaction on-
counter.

Mirroring the national trend, the importance regional managers placed on studio managers’ artistry
teams introducing Ella’s opinion to customers was a recurring feature across four of the eight
Studio Manager Meetings attended after the NSM. Within Studio Manager Meetings the regional
management pairings who attended the NSM deliver the same agenda items from it (e.g. sales
updates, recruitment and retention, mystery shop) to approximately eight managers from
standalone ‘studio’ stores and department store counters within their region. Like the NSM, within
the South East Studio Manager Meeting a ‘mystery shopped’ artist’s failure to use a specific verbal utterance which senior education managers expected to hear (illustrated in figure 4) cost her store a mark. In excerpt 2 below, this omission is discussed by a counter manager whose studio is culpable of this, by other studio managers, and by the two regional managers:

**Excerpt 2: South East Studio Manager meeting, Beth (Counter Manager), 16/10/2015**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Anya | So the stick foundation is the one that we always advise is the carry everywhere product isn’t it, that’s the one that Ella always says is you should have in your makeup bag for touch ups”.

During a discussion about the region’s suboptimal mystery shop result, Beth (with the guidance notes from figure 4 in hand) queries why her counter had lost points. Following the regional education manager’s (Anya) affirmation that this is something that can be easily rectified “so that’s another one we can change around by tomorrow” (line 5), Beth refers to her ignorance of the expression the mystery shopper was listening out for “foundation stick was offered as a portable must have” (lines 1 and 2) which (on line 6) she has never heard at “school” (i.e. training). After referring to more detailed written feedback regarding why the counter had lost marks on this component of the mystery shop, Anya (who, as part of her managerial role, is part of the education training team) clarifies on lines 11 and 12 that the stick (rather than the cream) foundation is the “carry everywhere product” (i.e. it’s small in size, light in weight, and versatile in use). What is
particularly instructive about this exchange how a regional education manager, without notes in hand, introduces a similar “Ella always says” (line 12) deontic text to the one detailed in figure 4. This reinforces the point that, essentially, Ella is an authority on knowing what makeup product a woman needs and her opinion needs relaying by artists to customers on-counter. It also shows how, within a meeting environment, a manager is ventriloquizing the founder to a junior management audience with an expectation that they and their team will do likewise to customers on makeup counters.

Two weeks later, artists’ failure to use specific Ella phraseology was similarly a point of contention during the mystery shop feedback section within the Greater London region’s Studio Manager meeting. Like excerpt 2, in the excerpt below studio and counter managers are discussing and querying amongst one another and with their regional managers why their mystery shopped artist had lost points:

**Excerpt 3: Greater London Studio Manager meeting, Lizzy (Studio Manager), 28/10/2015**

1 Lizzy  “I just didn’t realise the detail and how in-depth it is. So, like for example, I’ve got a cross for… erm, they didn’t, “did they share Ella’s ethos?” They said, “they didn’t share Ella’s ethos but she did say Ella wants to make makeup to be simple, easy to apply and modern look,” so that kind of thinks to me that we need to think right, we’re not robotic but we’re saying, “clean, fresh, natural makeup” but it’s about making, you don’t want it, you want it to be personal for each and every individual customer that’s coming across to it so, yeah, to have a look at it with regards to that one

2 Georgia Yeah and how they’re…

3 Jay Yeah what I thought would be a tick is actually not

4 Lucy Ok, like?

5 Jay Like that

6 Lizzy Yeah, she did talk about Ella, but obviously it’s not what they feel is set out to

7 Evie They’re listening out for key words maybe

8 Lizzy Yeah

9 Evie And they didn’t hear those key words

10 Lizzy Yeah, yeah”.
Here, Lizzy is querying why her studio had lost a point for not using a specific Ella phrase. Unlike excerpt 2, the ‘shopped’ artist had name-checked the brand’s founder but had not apparently used the “key words” (lines 14 and 16) required alongside her name to be awarded a mark for sharing her “ethos” (lines 2 and 3). On lines 5 and 6, Lizzy offers some speculation concerning the words she thought the mystery shopper wanted artists to utter (“clean, fresh, natural makeup”) alongside the word “Ella”. However at the same time she cautions against the use of these words being too scripted and sounding “robotic” (line 5). Excerpt 3 is of interest because it illustrates the specificity with which senior managers, via the mystery shop, seek artists’ verbal introduction of Ella as an authority on knowing to customers with the expression “Ella wants” (line 3) not being particular enough. It also stretches extant ventriloquial understandings of authority by demonstrating how acts of ventriloquism are premeditated. Specifically, it shows the planning involved prior to such acts with feedback informing junior managers and artists that, to maximize the ventriloquial act’s authoritativeness, they should strictly adhere to a specific script.

Figure 4 and excerpts 2 and 3 highlight the importance education managers (of varying seniority) attach, via the award of a mystery shop mark, to the opinion of the brand’s founder being introduced by artists to customers as they attempt to ‘build the sale’. The importance of artists accompanying their own opinion with a declarative and deontic “Ella says” text was evident across management meetings. The mystery shop as a (seemingly) invisible yet omnipresent surveillance tool continually monitors and attempts to direct, on management’s behalf, that Ella, her ethos and philosophy is kept “alive” through artists’ specific sayings. Specifically, through such Ella texts, there is an expectation from senior managers for artists to ventriloquize the founder. This demonstrates a hitherto unacknowledged aspect of ventriloquial authority whereby senior managers premeditate ventriloquial acts and, in turn, deploy an elaborate network of covert policing to monitor if and how artists are “correctly” ventriloquizing the brand founder.

In addition to the mystery shop, another (more overt) management monitoring tool came in the guise of the in-house artistry certification programme. Following their ‘basic school’ training (where, according to the Greater London region’s education manager, new recruits learn of Ella’s philosophy, makeup lessons, and how to build/close the sale), artists opt, and are encouraged, to have their artistry skills approved and/or certified by their regional education manager. For each of the three successively more difficult certification awards (basic, intermediate, and advanced),
artists are required to showcase a range of artistry techniques ranging from, for example: ‘tight-lining’ (i.e. applying eye-liner in a specific way) in a basic certification; carrying out a full bridal makeup lesson in an intermediate certification; and matching makeup to, and applying it on, individuals with severe skin conditions (e.g. scarring) for an advanced certification. Once a regional education manager approves an artist’s certification request they are scored on techniques such as these using a marking scheme in either a customer lesson or a “mock” lesson carried out on a colleague. As with mystery shops, a requirement to talk about Ella is evident. For example, as a field note written whilst on a Greater London store visit below displays, the regional education manager’s glee at hearing a specific phrase from an artist attempting to become certified ‘basic’ was apparent:

Field note 1: Greater London store visit, 19/11/2015

When Mandy was doing her basic “cert” she recited Ella’s philosophy ‘Ella’s all about women are pretty but with the right make up they can be pretty powerful’ (Georgia seemed pretty chuffed with her doing this - there was a ‘whoop’ of pleasure). Georgia had earlier said to Monique after her bridal “cert” that one of the (few) marks she dropped was for not mentioning Ella.

In the two certifications briefly detailed in field note 1, mentioning Ella gained one artist marks but cost another, according to the certifier’s marking criteria. Alongside more difficult marks for artists to achieve (for example, investigating customers’ skin concerns and selecting suitable skincare products to address these), talking about the brand’s founder seemed one of the more easily obtainable marks on offer. This point was stressed by the same regional education manager from the above note in her role as a trainer during ‘basic school’ training, which is presented below in excerpt 4:
“It’s also talking about Ella, there’s quite a few points on that, I shouldn’t be telling you this what’s on the marking scheme. But err, but there’s quite a few points like ‘did they share Ella’s philosophy on skincare? Did they talk about how Ella believes foundation should look? And that isn’t to say you need to kind of go back and say “Ella says” ‘cos that’s awkward isn’t it, just say it how you’d naturally talk about it, so like, you know at Ella May we kind of… train to do the no makeup makeup but just getting her name in there… ‘cos we wanna try and keep Ella alive as much as possible on counter… she’s a real person”.

This excerpt is taken from a question and answer session on the final day of newly recruited artists’ ‘basic school’ training. Around the time of the episode, artists are asking trainers (all of whom were in managerial positions) their advice on how to ‘get ahead’ in the brand. Within the opening line, Georgia (who will certify many of the attendees in the future) informs them they could lose “quite a few points” for not talking about Ella. Like figure 4 and excerpt 2, the text “Ella says” (line 5) is again evident, with a lead trainer (like the studio manager in excerpt 3) on this occasion advising artists against using it in an overly formulaic and staccato manner. This is instructive because, in effect, this trainer is warning fledgling artists against delivering the requisite mystery shop “script” too rigidly when ventriloquizing the founder to customers. This again deepens ventriloqual views of authority by demonstrating how artists are expected to attend to the performative quality of their ventriloquism and are “marked” on whether they make a contrived act sound disingenuous to customers.

More implicitly excerpt 4 highlights the transactional and professional value attached to talking about the brand’s founder. Speaking about Ella, alongside other criteria (such as ‘tight-lining’ a customer’s eye with eye-liner), contributes to an artist’s certification across the three levels previously described. In turn, becoming certified is a requisite requirement for artists if they wish to progress professionally and be promoted to roles like that of trainer. To further their career there is therefore an expectation that artists ventriloquize Ella during the certification programme. Although excerpt 4 lacks the “Ella says” deontic text specificity of the mystery shop requirement, there is still a managerial expectation on artists to ensure they talk about Ella as they are applying skincare and/or makeup onto customers.
The above excerpts, figure and field note are illustrative of two policing mechanisms through which senior education managers seek to encourage and monitor artists’ ventriloquism of the founder. Specifically, through the use of a deontic ‘Ella says’ text, artists are required to introduce the founder as an authority on makeup (more specifically her: opinion; ethos and philosophy) during customer interactions. Of course, both the mystery shop and the certification programme also have a punitive element to them with, for example, the potential for a mystery shopped artist to be “named and shamed” for bringing their store, their region, and the national mystery shop’s average score down. A more direct and immediate risk for artists in the certification programme is the possibility that failing to ventriloquize Ella may jeopardise their chances of certification, and ultimately, promotion. In short, this policing subsection furthers extant ventriloqual conceptions of authority by demonstrating how artists’ ventriloqual acts are contrived and monitored by senior and middle managers. Specifically, this subsection detailed the importance placed on artists to ensure they ventriloquize the founder via a specific ‘Ella says’ text. Following this subsection, which has largely drawn from fieldwork experiences in the early part of quarter two, the next ‘rehearsing’ subsection details how, during the end of quarter two and throughout quarter three, artists are trained to meet this managerial expectation.

5.2.2 Rehearsing

Excerpt 5: ‘Seasonal School’ training. Carla (Regional Education Manager), London Head Office, 04/01/2016

1 “It would be nice for them to pick up some Ella speech and go back and make sure they’re educating throughout makeup lessons”.

Carla’s comment, in her capacity as trainer, was made during the ‘Spring/Summer 2016 Seasonal School’ (i.e. training) preparatory day. Essentially a “dress rehearsal”, the preparatory day involved 14 trainers from across the UK running through the content of seasonal school which, as explained below, would soon be delivered during January 2016 in London and Manchester. During seasonal school, regional education managers and UK Pro artists train 25 artists per day from across the UK on how to use and sell the forthcoming season’s makeup and skincare products and past seasons’ reissued products. Prior to seasonal school, the regional education management trainers were
trained on its content at the UK ‘boot-camp’ by the National Education Manager and UK Pro artists who themselves, in turn, had previously been trained by Ella at the global boot-camp held in New York during the previous month. Occurring bi-annually, this lineage of training ensures that, amongst other issues, product knowledge, artistry tips and techniques, and, in the words of Carla above, “Ella speech” is disseminated from the global headquarters to international makeup counters as uniformly as possible. For the purposes of this second subsection of the ventriloquism section, the latter of these aims is of particular interest. Specifically, this rehearsing subsection extends the ventriloquism metaphor and extant ventriloqual views of authority by demonstrating how, through a series of training events, educators train artists to utter specific texts and recite stories when ventriloquizing the founder. In doing so, this subsection also details how educators endeavour to strengthen the attachment/strings between artists (as puppets) and the founder (as puppeteer). The subsection therefore illuminates an unacknowledged scholastic element to this construct. Returning to the same preparatory seasonal school day noted above, Esme (another trainer) provides an in-situ demonstration of such “Ella speech”, while applying illuminating bronzing powder with a brush onto another trainer’s cheeks:

Excerpt 6: ‘Seasonal School’ training, Esme (Regional Education Manager), London Head Office, 04/01/2016

“Another bit to add as well, Ella says it’s like the powdered version of a tinted moisturizer”.

Mid-application, Esme is reminding fellow trainers to remember to use the specific “Ella says” text while performing the same demonstration in front of seasonal school attendees over the upcoming four weeks. Interesting as a standalone comment, this example of “Ella speech” is even more so when set within a wider context, as the discussion following figure 5, below, highlights:

Figure 5: ‘Seasonal School’ email extract, 05/01/2016

1 Please choose 3-4 artists with different skintones to come to the front to colour match to a powder. Ask them to apply to half of their face, the results are very visual and it really shows the soft focus effect of the product. Talk to the fact that Ella says this is almost a powder version of her tinted moisturiser as it does provide a little coverage.
When this is done you can quickly add on to one of the artists and show how you can multi use them using a lighter one to highlight slightly warmer warm and to add definition.

Figure 5 is an extract from an email that was sent with high importance by Sam (the National Education Manager) to all seasonal school trainers at the end of its first week of delivery. In the email Sam is relaying feedback from her initial observations of daily schools which were held at the group’s headquarters in London. On line 3 she places an emphasis on the inclusion of the deontic “Ella says” text which, as the quote below illustrates, was practiced four days earlier during the preparatory day and has, in this manager’s view, been omitted and requires reintroduction. This extract highlights vigilance from, and an active intervention by, the National Education Manager to ensure all trainers uniformly ventriloquize the founder as an authority on knowing. Specifically, she is attempting to ensure trainers introduce what “Ella says” the product is (i.e. a powder version of a cream product) and what it does (i.e. provides a lightly textured finish) while it is being applied onto volunteers in front of nationwide attendees. This stretches extant ventriloqual understandings of authority by demonstrating how trainers are instructed to bolster a product’s kudos ahead of its launch by ventriloquizing the founder’s view to artists. In effect, the soon-to-be ventriloqual “puppets” are therefore being invited, as an audience member, to experience the ‘difference' the founder’s (“Ella says”) opinion makes to a product demonstration. Furthermore, it raises additional questions with regards to whether the contrived nature of Ella’s ventriloquism (detailed in the previous ‘policing’ subsection) is intended for the benefit of both customers and artists.

Another form of training is ‘basic school’. Introduced briefly in the first subsection, during basic school recently recruited artists from across the UK attend the group headquarters in London to be trained in: Ella’s makeup and lifestyle philosophy; the brand’s makeup lessons; and building and closing the sale with customers. In the morning of the first ‘philosophy’ day of school, attendees were shown a documentary-style ‘day in the life’ video of Ella. In the video a news reporter shadows Ella around New York asking her questions about her views on makeup, the makeup industry, and her lifestyle in general. When the conversation turns to the former of these topics, Ella gave the interviewer a makeup lesson and, as she was applying concealer (a yellow based cream
or powder which, amongst other uses, counteracts darkness under the eye) with a brush to the interviewer’s under-eye area, she seriously and sincerely makes the following comment:

**Excerpt 7: ‘Basic School’ training. Ella May (founder), London Head Office, 10/03/2016**

1. “Concealer is the secret to the universe, and the reason I say that is once you learn to use
2. concealer to lighten up under the eyes no matter how tired you are, no one will know”.

Later that day, during a practical demonstration, one of the three trainers replicates the above Ella-interviewer scenario with a volunteer attendee. Like Ella did in the video, the trainer applies concealer to the artist’s under-eye area whilst simultaneously asking the following of attendees:

**Excerpt 8: ‘Basic School’ training. April (Assistant Trainer), London Head Office, 10/03/2016**

1. April “What does Ella say her corrector and concealer is?
2. Several attendees Secret to the universe
3. Georgia Ohh, you guys are good”.

In this short exchange April tests attendees on their recall of the video played only hours previously. Following several attendees’ simultaneously “correct” answer, Georgia (the lead trainer) reinforces the importance of what Ella “says” to new artists with a jovial yet affirmative comment. Taken in conjunction with figure 5, this is instructive because it highlights how, across various training environments trainers, experienced artists, and novice artists have the importance of the “Ella says” text and, by extension, the founder as a beauty authority emphasized to them. Specifically, across these excerpts, artists are experientially trained when and how to introduce Ella’s opinion and view so that they, in turn, can return to counters and repeat it to customers while they are applying products. Artists are therefore regularly exposed to “Ella says” in training environments with an expectation that they will repeat it when they return to counter to supplement their own view and personal authority with customers. Via this text, trainers therefore attempt to orchestrate a connection between artists and the founder and for the former to ventriloquize the latter. Following on from figure 4, this again enlightens extant conceptions of ventriloqual authority.
by demonstrating a scholastic component to this construct whereby artists are asked to observe and then commit a specific utterance to memory. Similarly, in excerpt 9 below, which is taken from the second day of basic school, another trainer is introducing Ella’s opinion mid-way through a demonstration:

Excerpt 9: ‘Basic School’ training, Ceri (Featured Artist), London Head Office, 09/03/2016

“So yeah, you want, Ella always says that you want the blush to almost kiss the
under-eye. So naturally we tend to go for underneath here but you want it to sort of,
can you smile for me? So you want it to feel, it almost feels weird but I always say
that I know it feels a bit weird because it’s so close to the eye but when you relax your
face: it’s gonna go down. So you’re gonna go down like this, sweep it up and then just
with the excess, you’re just gonna take it down to where you would naturally blush
anyway, yeah?”

In excerpt 9 Ceri is demonstrating a specific blusher technique which “Ella always says” (line 1) artists should follow for blusher to be brushed as close as possible to the under-eye area so that they “almost kiss” (line 1). Pointing with a brush to the highest point of the volunteer’s cheek, the featured artist is essentially saying in line 2 (“so naturally we tend to go for underneath here”; emphasis added) that conventionally makeup artists apply blusher to this part of the cheek, however this is not how Ella “says” blusher should be applied. Following Ella’s advice to get the blusher as high up the cheek as possible so it is near the under-eye, she asks the volunteer to “smile” (line 3) so that her cheeks rise and harden into ball-like figures. Then, as Ella “says” artists should, blusher is applied to the tops of these balls and, as the volunteer’s facial muscles relax and her cheeks return to their original resting position, the blusher does likewise. This example highlights a trainer, who is leading a ‘school’ of new recruits in the application of a product, being led by what “Ella says” is the way to do a specific technique. Ella is therefore being presentified (e.g. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009) as a form of thirdness (e.g. Taylor and Van Every, 2011): a figure that gives meaning to the trainer’s actions and, through acts of on-counter ventriloquism, is expected to do likewise to artists’ actions with customers and provide an authoritative on-counter performance to customers. Specifically, in addition to what “Ella says” a product is or does, in excerpt 9 her opinion is directing attendees, via the trainer, how to apply a product with, again, an expectation that attendees replicate this back on-counter with customers. This again adds a
previously unacknowledged scholastic dimension to ventriloqual views of authority because it shows budding ventriloqual puppets being provided with a two-fold example of what “Ella says” about a particular product and the appropriate point in a lesson to repeat this deontic text (Cooren and Taylor, 2007; Taylor, 2006) to future customers.

In addition to the role-playing “scenario” training exercises showcased in the excerpts above, another way artists were continuously coached in the couching of “Ella speech” was through the reading aloud of ‘Ella notes’. These ‘notes’ (essentially short stories) preceded the introduction of a new or reissued collection of products in artists’ seasonal school training workbooks. One of these ‘Ella notes’, shown in the form of trainers’ seasonal school preparatory day PowerPoint slides, is presented below in figure 6:

Figure 6: ‘Seasonal School training workbook’ extract, 04/01/2016

As we see, beneath the ‘Ella note’ there is also a note from Sam (the National Education Manager) which is for the attention and the benefit of trainers. Like figure 5, within the PowerPoint notes section she (in emboldened text) reminds trainers to ensure seasonal school attendees read notes from Ella aloud. This recitation of stories was, like its junior and elementary academic namesakes,
a constant (almost hourly) feature within seasonal ‘school’. With a ritualistic, mantra-like quality attendees are invoking (i.e. ‘calling upon, imploring, appealing to’; Brummans et al., 2013: 348) the founder as a figure of authority. Although some attendees were more reticent than others to do so, volunteers regularly read ‘Ella’s notes’ aloud to their colleagues and, through the use of the pro-noun ‘I’, presentify Ella within the training room. Although these notes did not contain specific Ella phrases, their rote recital across daily seasonal schools meant that attendees were effectively primed in both the familiarization of the stories, in speaking as their author and, more tellingly, as Ella.

Relatedly, and showcasing the lineage between the two boot-camps and seasonal school, during the UK boot-camp the UK Pro artist in the role of trainer requested “can somebody read for me the original story?” Following the ‘corrector and concealer story’, which was duly read aloud by a regional education manager, the Pro artist responded with the following:

Excerpt 10: ‘Boot-camp’ training. Hersha (Pro Artist), London Head Office, 02/12/2015

1. “Love it! And Ella reiterated the story of like, back in the day, we just used foundation stick under the eye and she was just going through literally every foundation stick around this woman’s tone and she just couldn’t get rid of that shadow. So was anyone around in the day of blush sticks? Yeah, so although it was a really dry texture, she’d put a bit under the eye and got that radiance straight away, hence the idea of the corrector was born. I do love when we’re able to touch on those stories, because first of all they’re truuue and they’re also just makes the whole story quite real to customers when you say where the inspiration comes from especially with correctors”.

Following the volunteer’s enthusiastic reading of the workbook note, Hersha’s equally exuberant “Love it!” (line 1) response is followed by a confirmation of the story’s veracity for attendees (who will in turn ask their attendees to read this and other similar stories aloud throughout seasonal school). Also, within the opening line she recounts how during the global boot-camp held the month before this (i.e. the UK) version, Ella personally “reiterated” (line 1) the story to her and other attendees. On line 6, when Hersha speaks of “touch[ing] on those stories” and emphasizes for effect how they are “truuue” she is testifying both from her recent boot-camp experience and her longstanding association with Ella how the story and, by extension, the derivative ‘secret to the universe’ saying are authentic and can be recalled without inhibition throughout the forthcoming
four weeks of seasonal school. Couched differently in ventriloquism terms, soon-to-be trainers are being re-acquainted with the founder’s views and by doing so are having their puppetry ‘strings’ strengthened for when they make Ella ‘speak’ to training attendees. This extends extant ventriloqual views of authority because, in effect, a scholastic chain of agency is (re-)established whereby, through different layers of training, the founder, as puppeteer, makes trainers enunciate specific phrases/texts with an expectation that, following training, customers are the recipients and beneficiaries of these.

On occasions, the National Education Manager and senior Pro artists also re-familiarized trainers with the founder by performing off-the-record impersonations of her. For example, when conversation turned to customers’ preoccupation with smartphones during the first day of UK boot-camp training, Lenee relayed an exchange between her and Ella at the global ‘bootcamp’ held a month previously and, as she did so, spoke the founder’s “part” in a hoarse New-York sounding accent:

Excerpt 11: ‘Global Boot-camp’ training. Lenee (Pro Artist), London Head Office, 01/12/2015

1 “Technology… that’s what Ella told me, she’s like “your neck’s wrinkly” (laughter from attendees), she was like “it’s because you’re younger and you’re always looking [down] at your phone” and I was like “whaaaat”

Met with a chorus of laughter from attendee trainers, this episode “humanizes” Ella to 14 trainers who will be tasked with ventriloquizing her and coaching artists to do likewise during the forthcoming ‘seasonal school’. Similarly, while artists were practicing a ‘glow’ effect on one another during seasonal school, Sam (this time in a mocking shrill American accent) relayed a previous conversation with the founder to three nearby trainers:

Excerpt 12: ‘Seasonal School’ training. Sam (National Education Manager), London Head Office, 05/01/2016
“So, I was in this sweet shop… and I saw candy beans and it was the different colours just shouting out from the jar” (laughter from speaker and trainers)... I was like ‘really Ella’...

“and I thought I need an eye shadow in that colour”.

Again, excerpt 12 demonstrates an occasion when, somewhat subversively, Ella is vicariously made “real” to three trainers who, despite having never met the founder, speak as her throughout the day and train artists to do the same on-counter. Like their re-acquaintance with the “official” Ella (i.e. training workbook) stories detailed in excerpt 10, these impersonations highlight how, after a six month hiatus in training, trainers’ connections to the figure behind the stories are being reinforced through titbits. With such impersonations performed out of artists’ earshot and intended for neither artists’ nor customers’ benefit, they exemplify another way trainers’ ventriloquial “strings” were re-laced to the founder puppeteer.

This rehearsing subsection has enriched existing ventriloquial views of authority by illuminating a scholastic element to this construct. It has demonstrated how, through a succession of training events, artists are continually exposed to the founder’s purported views which, in turn, they are expected to relay to customers. Through witnessing and recalling the deontic “Ella says” text and ritualistically chanting the founder’s stories, artists are rehearsing for future on-counter performances. Specifically, using a puppet-puppeteer ventriloquism metaphor analogy, artists (as the former) are having their ‘strings’ to the latter strengthened in these environments. Via the training of trainers from international to national level, there appears to be a concerted effort for artists to ventriloquize the founder when explaining the features and benefits of a product and as they apply it onto customers. Through experiential role plays trainers and artists become ‘schooled’ in the importance of both uttering “Ella says” and, as excerpt 9 illustrates, carrying out the artistry techniques and applications that “Ella says” artists should be performing. In addition, through the daily rote reading of Ella’s notes (stories) and the authentication of sayings’ and stories’ provenance by those in a position to do so (such as Pro artists who have been trained by her), artists of varying experience from across the UK are inducted into and refreshed on both the importance of and the way to ventriloquize Ella as part of their on-counter service.

After the first policing subsection where the managerial expectation for artists to ventriloquize the founder was introduced, this rehearsing subsection has highlighted the off-counter preparatory scholastic efforts used to mould artists into doing so. Following the respective commissioning and
rehearsing of Ella’s sayings, the next (‘reciting’) subsection illustrates on-counter ventriloquist acts and the differential ways “Ella speech” performances exercise authority within, and make a difference to, artists’ interactions with customers.

5.2.3 Reciting

Contrary to, and potentially because of, the first fiscal quarter’s mystery shop results, artists were frequently overheard ventriloquizing (Caronia and Cooren, 2013; Cooren, 2012, 2015; Cooren and Sandler, 2012; Cooren et al., 2014) Ella via the deontic “Ella says” and/or “Ella believes” texts (Cooren and Taylor, 2007; Taylor, 2006) within customer makeup lessons. Concomitantly, this subsection stretches extant ventriloqual understandings of authority by demonstrating what, to date, is an absent presence within this literature: audiences’ reaction to, and receptivity of, ventriloqual acts. Typical of several artist-customer interactions during the remaining two quarters of fieldwork, the field note below, written shortly after a makeup lesson observed in the Greater London region, illustrates how an artist introduced the brand’s founder into conversation while applying a variety of products onto a customer:

Field note 2: Greater London store visit, 08/12/2015

1 She swatched her skin using 3 shades and asked the lady and I to agree which she
2 thought looked most natural and ‘you’. She went for the darker one but April suggested a
3 lighter one as Ella likes the eyes darker and to pop. Used the lighter of the shades under
4 and around the eye and said words to the effect of Ella believes it’s the secret to the
5 universe (heard this before, PJ?). Seemed a bit weird but lady didn’t seem fussed. Used a
6 different brush to apply (long wear?) foundation and a yellow retouching powder. Said Ella
7 makes all of her products with yellow undertones to even out the pinks and blues in the
8 skin. Then drew a lipliner on. The girl said and I thought how transformed she looked. I
9 stepped away as she filled in the facechart. Seemed to buy a few things. Georgia came
10 over and was praising April when she’d left. Asked her later about the lesson and said
11 those kind are why she loves her job. Spoke about Ella speak and she said it can help
12 lighten the mood for the customer
Field note 2 details part of an approximate 30-minute makeup lesson, held toward the close of the day at a studio, where an artist tries to find a colour shade of skin foundation which most closely resembles a customer’s skin tone. After the young woman revealed the medication she was taking for what appeared quite severe acne, through trial and error the artist applied (‘swatched’, line 1) three colour shades onto her skin before consulting with her about which one was the closest approximation. Via the introduction of ‘Ella likes’ (line 3), the artist essentially disagrees with the woman’s opinion and justifies using a shade lighter in colour because it will set a starker contrast for the eye area, which the brand’s founder likes to be darker.

Following the customer’s acquiesce to this recommendation and who it came from (signalled by a nervous but confirmatory nod), Ella (figuratively) makes a leap onto her skin when the artist then applies said lighter shade to the under-eye area while simultaneously recalling one of the stock phrases regularly used in training and detailed in excerpt 8: “Ella believes it’s the secret to the universe” (lines 4 and 5). After the customer’s again uninterested response to this (which maybe was due to her prioritizing of an underlying skin condition rather than learning about the brand founder’s thoughts) the artist reintroduces a more ‘scientific’ background to this quote by explaining that the yellow undertone of the applied colour will essentially counteract the blue and pink pigment (blood vessels) which, due to the skin being thinner around the eye area compared to other parts of the face, is more visible. Following the successful lesson, where a customer purchased some of the applied products, the artist contextualizes the use of “Ella speak”, offering an opinion that its use added levity to this and other interactions.

This field note also shows how an artist ventriloquizes the founder by introducing her as an ethereal and ephemeral third party into the lesson to justify her course of action and, as she follows this course, to inform the customer of the benefits of doing so. By introducing the founder as an authority on knowing the artist adds kudos to her own opinion and reinforces her personal authority when the customer (in a seemingly uninterested but nevertheless consensual fashion) concedes to both the artist’s and Ella’s opinion that her appropriate foundation colour is one shade lighter than she initially thought. Similarly, while observing a lesson with an older, or as they were frequently referred to in meetings and training events as an “ageless”, customer, an artist in another region introduced Ella as a reason why a certain makeup effect should be attempted within the lesson, as field note 3 presented below details:
Sat in one of her lessons with a lady who began saying she wanted to cover up freckles on her cheeks. Louise said “Ella believes skin should look like skin and makeup should enhance what you’ve got” (she was smiling as she said it- maybe it was for my benefit?). She asked if the lady would like to go half heavy and half natural and see which she’d prefer. The lady said she’d go with what she recommends.

In this shorter field note recorded during a morning lesson in a department store, the artist similarly ventriloquizes the founder (“Ella believes”, line 2) when relaying to the customer why they should attempt a more “natural” (line 5) look than the one they arrived on-counter requesting. Through the saying “Ella believes skin should look like skin” (line 2), the artist is essentially advising the customer against the effect she came to the makeup counter for (to use a foundation with an opaque consistency to conceal her freckles) and, instead, to accentuate this feature of her appearance by using a version of the product with a less dense coverage. Seemingly flattered by this opinion from the artist and/or Ella, the lady, via a wry smile, relents and the artist proceeds to apply foundation with a heavier consistency to one half of her face and to apply a lighter textured foundation (the one “Ella believes” is “right”) to the other, with the customer opting for the latter. In this example, like many others throughout fieldwork, the conversational introduction of Ella into the interaction seems to ‘make a difference’ by justifying an artist’s approach and seemingly influencing the customer’s opinion on which skincare and/or makeup should be applied onto them to achieve a certain ‘look’.

By verbally introducing the founder as an authority on knowing, artists engage their personal authority and an authoritative on-counter ‘performance’ ensues as the (customer) audience finds the ventriloqual performance compelling enough to persuade them to opt for an alternative makeup effect than they initially had sought on-counter. Interestingly, in several off-counter interviews when “Ella speak” was broached as a topic, many artists offered an interpretation that using this style of speech was more effective with older customers like the one above, as a featured artist referred to during an interview:
“And as well, the majority of the artists are within a certain age gap. There’s only sort of a small amount of mature artists that we have on counter and I think it’s extremely intimidating for mature women to come on counter when there’s, you know, 20, 19, 20, 25 year olds on counter looking super glammed and then if they don’t have a lot of self-confidence they’re going to turn around to us and be, like, oh well, you don’t know because you’re this age, or you don’t know what it’s like to have wrinkles. So I think actually the fact that we can bring things back to Ella is very nice for us and it’s very reassuring to the customers as well. Because it’s almost like, I think, if you listen to everybody who does a lesson on Ella, it’s almost like we know her which is really cool because if we can be like... Okay, a really great example is the biggest thing that we’ll have for women from our counter is, oh I don’t want to wear Sparkle because, you know, I’m over the age of 50 and actually I read in an article that Shimmer and Sparkle is really unattractive and it’s going to bring out my lines. But actually for us, we can actually turn around and say, do you know what? Ella made the Sparkle on her 50th birthday because she loves that. She loves the Sparkle but she made it so that she could wear it herself and she’s, you know, coming up to 60 now. So yeah. So for us it’s just reassuring, and again without being patronising. So definitely yeah, it always, always comes back to Ella”.

Like many interviews, Ceri is discussing the suitability of sayings like those presented in field notes 2 and 3 to a specific type of (older) customer. In this account an artist in her early twenties describes how Ella speak has particular agency with more mature customers because, appearance-wise, they have more in common with the figure being ventriloquized (i.e. Ella) than the artist. Specifically, such sayings are particularly persuasive for these customers because, being of a similar age, the brand’s founder has similar associated skin concerns (e.g. “wrinkles”, line 6, and “lines” line 13) and has designed products (like the “sparkle” eyeshadow, line 14) for herself and, by extension, her contemporaries. Similarly, artists and counter managers regularly used older customers’ reticence to try more ‘risqué’ sparkle-based products as a seemingly ideal opportunity to introduce Ella as a form of thirdness (Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014) into the conversation, as a means of justifying why a customer should try a particular product as excerpts 14 and 15 detail below:
Excerpt 14: Fiona interview (Counter Manager), 16/03/2016

1. “This is what Ella uses and she’s you know, 50 something so don’t be scared of using sparkle”.

Excerpt 15: Hope interview (Artist), 23/02/2016

1. “She created these because she liked the way jewellery glistens on the skin and she created this for like, over 50s”.

In such instances, the introduction of the founder as a makeup authority supplants an artist’s personal authority, but an authoritative on-counter performance still takes place. Conversely, across interviews and on-counter observations and chats, the lack of relevance of “Ella speech” to younger customers, or as they are commonly referred to by managers as ‘millennials’, was a recurring issue. Such customers often apparently had little awareness and/or interest in who Ella is and/or what she “likes”, “says” or “believes”, as illustrated in an interview with Melissa below:

Excerpt 16: Melissa interview (Artist), 17/03/2016

1. “Yes, because if a customer doesn’t like Ella and you’re saying well, Ella loves this, Ella loves that, they’re like who’s Ella? They just want the makeup! Do you know what I mean? … Yes so, people don’t know who she is … Like they don’t know who she is. So when you’re saying Ella loves this and Ella loves that, and Ella doesn’t agree with contouring, they’re like… They don’t care what Ella wants, it’s my face. Do you know what I mean?”

In this interview an artist is describing a commonly recited occurrence: where artists ventriloquize Ella in conversations but there is a breakdown in the communicative chain of agency because customers are often unaware of who she is. In this example, the second-hand introduction of a stranger’s opinion into the conversation makes little difference to it: “They just want the makeup!” (line 2). Similarly, often while on-counter the use of Ella speak (e.g. “Ella believes”, “Ella likes”) was also met with disinterested responses from customers like the ones recalled by Melissa as the field note below details:
Field note 4: Greater London store visit, 11/11/2015

She finished putting two colours on her cheek (melon was one I think?) and said how Ella likes cheeks to look the colour after they’re pinched. The lady didn’t seem to hear her or ignored her and was busy looking at herself in the mirror.

In field note 4 the introduction of the brand’s founder into the artist-customer interaction lacks relevance because of the customer’s lack of interest in, or association with, the third party figure being evoked. On such occasions, the supplanting of the artist’s personal opinion with the founder’s view leads to an on-counter performance lacking in authoritative agency. In addition to having little effect on customers’ views, artists regularly raised striking a balance between giving customers Ella’s opinion at the expense of their own as an issue, as illustrated in Leigh’s interview below:

Excerpt 17: Leigh interview (Business Manager), 29/02/2016

“We talk about this sometimes in that does the customer want to know that it’s Ella’s favourite product? Or do they want to know that it’s like, Zoe’s favourite product? Like, what’s more valuable? If Zoe’s like, “I use this every day. Like, it’s amazing”. Is that more compelling than if she’s like, “Ella says that this is the ultimate thing that she uses on all the women she ever meets”. And whether we sound a bit like robots, and we’re like, “Ella says”, “Ella says”. When obviously, everyone’s an individual”.

In this interview, Leigh is referring to what, following the mystery shop and various training events detailed previously, is a topical issue within the brand: ‘Ella speech’. In line 2 a regional education manager, “Zoe”, is introduced to somewhat rhetorically exemplify that artists’ situationally specific opinion (based on, for example, what they can see, touch and question) is more “valuable” (line 3) than the universal and generic: “Ella says that this is the ultimate thing that she uses on all the women she ever meets” (lines 4 and 5, emphasis added). Essentially this manager is setting up a straw-man scenario whereby ventriloquizing the founder is providing a disservice to customers by
obstructing artists' personal opinions and detracting from their autonomy. In such instances, by evoking the founder as a figure of authority, artists are therefore vetoing their own authority.

Relatedly, artists' overreliance on and robotic use of "Ella says, Ella says" (lines 5 and 6) was frequently observed on counter-visits as field notes 5 and 6 detail below:

Field note 5: South East store visit, 20/11/2015

"Ella’s secret in a bottle. This seemed a little forced and shoe-ended to me’

Field note 6: South East store visit, 25/02/2016

Emily said "Ella believes eyes should pop’…This seemed rehearsed and forced’

Artists’ staccato style of speaking about Ella was similarly raised by artists and managers who again use a machine analogy to describe peers who over-use such talk as “Ella-bots” (Excerpt 18: Dale interview (Business Manager), 11/03/2016) and who spoke of the danger of an over reliance on this talk in lessons and of them becoming an “Ella-fest” (Excerpt 19: Chris interview (Business Manager, 08/04/2016). Returning to the ventriloquism metaphor, on such occasions the strings through which artistry puppets are connected to the puppeteer founder have become too opaque and neither the ventriloqual act, nor either party within it, is attributed as authoritative by customers. In addition to several artists’ seemingly ‘pre-programmed’ use of the “Ella says” text, artists also spoke of occasions when customers had questioned their acquaintance with the source of such sayings, as illustrated below in an interview with Rhiannon:

Excerpt 20: Rhiannon interview (Artist), 16/03/2016

1 “You have to say things like that and you constantly talk about Ella and then they’re like “so have you met Ella?” And you’re like, “no”, then there’s a bit like... Now you feel like an idiot because you’re like, “I’ve not met her” so I don’t really know her but you’re just like, “well you’ll just have to take my word for it, don’t you?” And then you end up looking like a bit of an idiot”.

144
In this interview, the connection between the artist and Ella, and the right of the former to speak on behalf of the latter and to introduce her opinion, is challenged. Specifically, once a customer realizes the puppeteer – puppet relationship is spurious, the ventriloquism act is perceived as hollow and the artist’s credibility is damaged as they are perceived to be an “idiot” (lines 3 and 5). Citations of the brand’s founder were similarly called into question on the grounds of authenticity by managers:

**Excerpt 21: Stephanie interview (Business Manager), 11/03/2016**

1. “I’ve spoken to people and they’re like oh, God, I hate it when like I had a makeup lesson and they’re talking about Ella like they know her”

In addition to artists’ delivery of Ella speech being considered as superficial by customers, in this instance its use coupled with the artists’ lack of attachment to its author reflects similarly on them because it counteracts their personal authority.

This ‘reciting’ subsection has detailed the use of, and the difference made by, artists’ ventriloquism of the founder via “Ella speech” across various artist-customer interactions. In doing so it has added a hitherto lacking, yet crucial, relational element to extant ventriloqual views of authority: audiences’ reaction to and receptivity of ventriloqual acts. For example, as field notes 2 and 3 illustrate, the introduction of Ella as an ethereal figure appears to bolster artists’ opinion and personal authority by justifying to, and/or persuading customers, why a particular product should be used or a specific effect or ‘look’ be attempted. Specifically, excerpts detail how deontic texts such as “Ella says” make a difference to, and are more authoritative with, older customers who could more readily relate to the figure being evoked than the evoker. However, as illustrated, the insertion of Ella as a form of thirdness also often made little difference to interactions with many younger customers who often have little-to-no awareness or concern for who she is or what, via artists’ “Ella speech”, she “says” or “believes”. Echoing the previous ‘rehearsing’ subsection, this raises questions about whether senior managers intended for such texts to exercise authority over artists rather than to embolden artists’ personal on-counter authority with customers. Furthermore, artists’ preoccupation with relaying the brand founder’s opinions appeared to be at the expense of their own, and the staccato-like uttering of such phrases seemed to detract from their autonomy and
compromise their personal authority. Finally, in addition to their ventriloquist performance being considered somewhat superficial, the issue of artists being similarly viewed as phony was raised because, essentially, they are speaking on behalf of someone they have not met. By demonstrating the multifarious ways customers respond to bi-directional (puppeteer- puppet) ventriloqual acts, this ‘reciting’ subsection has addressed a deficiency found within extant ventriloqual understandings of authority: the conferring of ventriloqual acts’ legitimacy by third-party audiences.

5.3 Section two: Aesthetics

The second section of this chapter details how, through managers’ two-fold depiction of Ella as an aesthetic authority and an omnipresent purveyor of artists’ activities, the founder is constituted as an aesthetic which exercises authoritative agency over, and is perpetuated by, managers’ and artists’ actions both publicly and internally. The first ‘synonymizing’ subsection details senior and middle managers’ efforts to portray the founder as an authority on aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000). It signals a departure from extant aesthetic taste studies within organization and management fields which predominantly focus on organizations’ attempts to influence external perceptions of ‘it’ and/or its products or services (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000; Hancock, 2005; Wasserman and Frenkel, 2011; Witz et al., 2003). Specifically, it shows managers’ efforts to cultivate internal perceptions of the founder as an aesthetic style guru and, by synonymizing her with stylized artefacts, for this aesthetic to exercise authoritative agency over junior managers’ and artists’ choices when presenting meeting and event spaces. Finally, it details managers’ efforts to ensure the founder’s aesthetic taste is perpetuated both internally and publicly on social media. By demonstrating how managers encourage artists to share images of stylized artefacts with UK colleagues on the company’s private social media platform, it deepens understanding of how a communicatively constituted aesthetic is intended to become routinely propagated within the company and for views of ‘it’ to set a precedent for artists’ future replication attempts.

The second ‘surveilling’ subsection details how, through senior and middle managers’ depictions, the founder is presentified (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Brummans et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) as an omnipresent purveyor of artists’ attempts to conform to, and perpetuate, her aesthetic taste. In particular, it highlights how Ella is portrayed as an ethereal arbiter of artists’ actions: on-counter; in meetings; during training events; and on social media platforms. In doing so, it furthers extant presentification takes on authority by demonstrating a tactical element to this construct. To
elaborate, it demonstrates how efforts to depict the founder as an omnipresent panoptical source exercises authoritative agency over, and is perpetually reinforced by, managers’ and artists’ attempts to aesthetically presentify her. This is both internally and publicly achieved through the selection and stylization of choice artefacts. Specifically, artists use this portrayal as a barometer to gauge whether their aesthetic attempts are “Ella enough” and, by extension, worthy. The surveilling subsection also broadens extant presentification conceptions of authority by showing how Ella’s depiction as an omnipresent authority figure traverses offline and online spheres. In particular, it shows how the founder’s portrayal as an ‘ever-present’ on publicly and internally accessible social media platforms means artists’ attempts to aesthetically presentify Ella are continually subject to her scrutiny.

Finally, by amalgamating landscaping (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) and an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) constructs, the ‘propagandizing’ subsection details how Ella’s portrayal as an aesthetic style guru (Carter and Jackson, 2000) held authoritative agency over managers’ and artists’ actions. Specifically, it demonstrates how the founder’s depiction as an authority on aesthetic taste led to these parties physically and digitally landscaping private and public spaces with ‘approved’ artefacts. In doing so, it moves extant conceptions of landscaping forward by demonstrating how an aesthetic becomes (largely) (re)constituted within an internal vacuum. Specifically, in contrast to extant landscaping studies, it shows how employees outside of, for example, marketing and public relations’ departments landscape an aesthetic for the benefit of, and to be consumed by, their colleagues. It also shows how, through an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) processes, the presence and/or stylization of artefacts which compromise Ella’s position as an aesthetic opinion-leader (Carter and Jackson, 2000) are regularly expunged from digital records of meetings and events. This enables a uniform aesthetic ‘regime of meaning’ (Hancock, 2005: 30) associated with the founder to be perpetuated on social media. This extends an-aestheticization understandings of authority by showing how an element of internal duplicity is at play with managers and artists producing and perpetuating aesthetic “propaganda” which is for the benefit of the general public and their peers. A synopsis of this section and the three subsections is presented below in figure 7.
Figure 7: Aesthetics section overview

Manager (Joanne I think) was telling me about Ella is 'meliacous' about things being on brand and in keeping with her healthy lifestyle. For example, she told me how if they have flowers in store they have to be 'white peonies and they had to be open'

"Look I hate doing this because it's like, I love how creative you are, I love the things you do on counter but we obviously represent Ella and her philosophies and her ethos and these are the things that she wants, if she wouldn't eat or drink it – we don't want to see it"

"That's some of that management that'll always remind of us... Remind us of. So, like here, I'll always say, "I'm going to go and get our Ella snacks and things" and we know straightaway what it's going to be"

"You've seen the food she eats, like the kind of message that she wants to sand out about her so I think just keep it super, like super on brand at all times and, yeah, I mean if you're happy for Ella to see it, post away but like Chantelle said, if you're not sure just check, just check"
"Even on social media, when we're posting photos, there's like an unspoken look for Ella May. So whether it's personal photos or makeup... it's all about that very clean living... like, healthy drinks that you've been drinking. Or, like, a beautiful view that you've seen. Or a great pair of shoes. That's the very Ella look."

"Ella will have to see and approve things, yes, definitely. She definitely wants to understand what the feel is... You know, she comes in and she's like... She could come here and she'd be like I don't like this floor."

"Everything has to be done the Ella way. Your food, the way your counter is presented, the way your team look, as in if they have an event they can't look any different... If you have a breakfast meeting, you're not allowed to drink coffee. You have to drink Elderflower water."

"We're trying to always be like, fresh water with cucumber. You know things like that. Sometimes we try to treat ourselves with something, you know, with like the healthier version of something, so you know. And we're saying, you know, that Ella would love that, so it's nice."

"We'll put on, like strawberries, like fruit. If we need to put chocolate on, because everyone loves a bit of chocolate, we do the dark chocolate. So it is very health-orientated, because Ella's that way."

The founder is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence.
5.3.1 Synonymizing

Excerpt 22: Sara interview (Business Manager), 29/02/2016

“With the healthy food for meetings and things like that: keeping everything very Ella.

So in terms of different meetings that people, maybe, wear jeans and Converse and

they always have the almonds and green apples”.

Sara’s words refer to a recurring feature of managers’ roles within the brand: ensuring team meetings are furnished with artefacts (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) the brand’s founder approves of. Specifically, the requirement for managers to keep such spaces “very Ella” (line 1) was a constant presence within many meetings: either through the provision of “healthy food” (e.g. “almonds and green apples”, line 3) or via talk about the absence or appearance of such foods. This ‘synonymizing’ subsection details senior and middle managers’ attempts to delineate the founder as an authority on aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000): a taste which should be adhered to both internally in meetings and publicly during on-counter events. In doing so, it advances extant conceptions of this construct by demonstrating how, in addition to projecting an aesthetic externally, ‘it’ is intended to exercise authoritative agency internally. This subsection also illustrates these managers’ efforts to direct junior managers’ and artists’ social media sharing of artefact images which adhere to this taste and perpetuate it both internally and publicly on social media. In particular, it details how managers encourage artists to share images of certain stylized artefacts with UK colleagues on the company’s internal social-media platform. In turn, it highlights how these attempts are intended to routinize the aesthetic nationwide and act as a precedent for artists’ future replication attempts. Regarding delineations of the founder’s aesthetic taste, as excerpt 23 exemplifies below the need to have select ‘Ella’ foods within meetings was an oft-cited issue:
Cathy “A chip barm, if anyone asks you, is a chip sandwich

Kim Yeah, a pie barm is even better than a chip sandwich

Attendees Awesome… That sounds carb…What's a pie barm?

Kim A pie barm is a …

Cathy Please don’t put that on anyone’s breakfast meeting, OK?

Valerie It’s not approved, it’s not Ella approved!

Laughter from attendees

Attendees It’s not approved, it’s not Ella approved”.

Excerpt 23 details the opening exchanges to the quarter two National Sales Meeting (NSM). During this, Cathy is welcoming sales and education managers from across the eight UK sales regions to the city of Manchester. After introducing other trivia about the city (for example: the ‘Alfie’ movie remake was filmed here; an espresso fuelled car was once driven from London to here; and the purported footballing rivalry between Mancunians and neighbouring Liverpudlians is exaggerated), the first line details her explaining a northern dialect for a local culinary delicacy, a “chip barm”, which some attendees may be unaccustomed to. Following attendees’ discussion on lines two to six about what other types of food may be included in a “barm” (line 1) or “sandwich” (line 1), she then instructs, with an air of levity, attendees not to have such “carb” (line 3) (i.e. carbohydrate) rich foods present within artists’ regional on-counter breakfast meetings (line 5). Similarly, on line 6, Valerie (the UK brand president) reinforces this request with the declarative and deontic text: “not Ella approved!” Attendees’ general laughter at the use of this phrase, coupled with its subsequent repetition, suggested it had been used before and had connotations reaching beyond the discussed "barm”. In stark contrast to the illicit “barm” in question, the table food within the meeting was minimalist in terms of both calorific content and presentation. Blueberries, almonds, and broken up pieces of dark chocolate were laid out by the National Sales Manager and the two area managers on meeting room tables, and were left largely untouched by attendees throughout the day, in white porcelain bowls. In addition, each attendee had another healthy food (a green apple)
on their designated table place alongside their meeting gift, agenda, and notebook, as shown in an attendee’s social media post in figure 8 below:

Figure 8: Instagram post (National Sales Manager meeting), 30/09/2015

Excerpt 23 is enlightening because, through an ‘Ella approved’ deontic text, Cathy and Valerie are attempting to make a specific aesthetic taste of the brand founder ‘profoundly normative’ (Carter and Jackson, 2000, p. 181) and authoritative. Specifically, these senior managers are endeavouring to direct attendees’, and by extension attendees’ studio and department managers’, attention to a required behaviour (i.e. ensuring choice foods are made available) within staff breakfast meetings. In contrast to the ‘Ella says’ text detailed in the ventriloquism section of this chapter, this text aims to designate the founder as an aesthetic authority or, put differently, an aesthetic opinion leader (Carter and Jackson, 2000) who influences artists’ actions in private spaces outside of the general public’s purview. This adds a new dimension to extant organization and management studies’ interest in, and understandings of, aesthetic taste by demonstrating how managers attempt to synonymize an aesthetic with an individual and, vis-à-vis, for ‘it’ to have organizing effects internally over employees’ daily workings. Taken from an internal document entitled ‘Manager Induction Programme’, breakfast meetings are both ‘Mandatory in all doors’ (‘all
doors’ refer to all UK makeup counters and stores) and must be held ‘at least once a month in the week of launch’ (‘the week of launch’ refers to a four-six weekly occurrence where new products are promoted for sale). With the intended scale of breakfast meetings in mind, the logistics of providing permissible meeting food which conformed to the founder’s aesthetic taste was returned to later in the NSM by Cathy, as excerpt 24 details below:

Excerpt 24: National Sales Manager meeting. Cathy (National Sales Manager), Manchester, 30/09/2015

1 “Sam is putting together the breakfast meeting guidelines, and it’s not that the guys (predominantly women) aren’t doing great breakfast meetings ‘cus as you’ve seen you do an amazing job but I also think sometimes we haven’t told them what they can spend and what they can’t spend and how they can do it. And we’re very good at saying what isn’t Ella and what is Ella but we’re not actually very clear on saying to them, but if you’re buying yoghurts or you’re buying this for the table or almonds or kale or, this is what it needs to look like, this what you can spend so I think some of the, you know, some of them aren’t even providing breakfast when it’s a breakfast meeting”.

Like excerpt 23, the founder is portrayed as an authoritative ‘style guru’ (Carter and Jackson, 2000: 182) who delineates what food “isn’t Ella” (line 5) and “is Ella” (line 5) and, by extension, is allowed for “the table” (line 6) in studio managers’ impending breakfast meetings. Like the deontic “Ella approved” text, Ella is similarly depicted as the purveyor of good aesthetic taste and the arbiter of what food is allowed within these private spaces, with “yoghurts” (line 6) and “almonds or kale” (lines 6 and 7) exemplifying what ‘is Ella’ and therefore permitted. In addition to this binary ‘is’ or ‘isn’t’ inclusion or exclusion of food within meetings, on line 7 the presentation of such ‘Ella’ foods was raised as an issue attendees needed to be clearer about with their studio managers: “this is what it needs to look like”. Clarity over this matter was something Sam (the National Education Manager) was working on in the soon to be introduced “breakfast meeting guidelines” (line 1) which were presented and distributed to attendees in draft copy toward the close of the NSM. These guidelines, which were part of the internal ‘Manager Induction Programme’ document, are shown below in figure 9:
Intended for newly appointed managers and assistant managers of department store makeup counters and standalone ‘studio’ stores, in the presenter’s words the above ‘Breakfast meeting/Event guidelines’ are: “to be crass, a bit of an idiot’s guide” for inductees. Like excerpts 23 and 24, through the ‘Do’s’ (which encompasses the two photographs) and ‘Don’ts’ columns, a binary distinction is framed between which foods (and other artefacts) the founder permits internally (within teams’ breakfast meetings) and externally (during customer events) on makeup counters. As the first row of the ‘Don’ts’ column shows, the deontic ‘Ella approved’ text is again apparent with ‘pastries’ and ‘chocolate’ exemplifying foods the founder does not approve of ‘at the meeting’ and vis-à-vis are not to be offered there. Similarly, in the first row of the ‘Do’s’ column, the specificity
with which the ‘Ella Natural eating philosophy’ should be followed on makeup counters is exemplified and illustrated. For example, in the second row of this column, a part of this philosophy is detailed with inductees being informed of the idiosyncratic way water should be served (‘fresh iced’ and ‘infused with either lemon or cucumber’). An accompanying picture which, as previously discussed, mirrored the layout of food within the NSM illustrates how meeting water should be presented with a photograph of a glass jug containing ice and the latter of these fruits provided. Likewise, the ‘healthy fruit’ part of the founder’s ‘Natural eating philosophy’ is also exemplified by another photograph showing various berries arranged together, again like the food layout at the NSM, out of packaging and wrappers and placed on a white plate.

Within the ‘Don’ts’ column, inductees are instructed not to have ‘multi coloured flowers’ within meetings: a point reinforced by the photograph above the grid of a glass vase containing cream coloured roses. These photographs are of interest because, in addition to the written instructions about which objects are aesthetically appropriate, they exemplify to recipients how such objects should conform to the founder’s taste precepts (Carter and Jackson, 2000). This figure is instructive because it reaches beyond extant organization and management studies’ interest in aesthetic taste by demonstrating managers’ communicative attempts to synonymize an individual with specific textual artefacts which, in turn, are intended to exercise authoritative agency internally by delineating artists’ choices and actions when holding meetings and events.

Approximately six weeks after the NSM, the guidelines in figure 9 became a ‘directive from the brand’ and were sent (in the same format) internally in an email entitled ‘RE: Make Up Lesson Breakfast Meeting – URGENT’ (17/11/2015) which informed all counter and studio managers ‘what is and isn’t on brand’. Furthermore, during interviews with artists and managers, this guideline/directive seemed to have been revised over time and, as the “cocoa” reference from Nathalie below indicates, had become even more circumscribed:

Excerpt 25: Nathalie interview (Regional Sales Manager), 11/04/2016

1 “If we look at the guidelines, and when you go for... When you have a studio manager meeting, it’s very strict. You know, those guidelines for what you eat, you know, the 80% or 2 88% cocoa, it’s got to be almonds and water and elderflower”
This guideline/directive in figure 9 is instructive because it highlights senior managers’ attempts to cultivate artists’ conformity to an aesthetic of the founder with regards to both the presence and the presentation of food internally within meetings. Specifically, they are of interest because they illustrate preparatory efforts to ‘landscape’ (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) these spaces according to an objective ‘Ella approved’ aesthetic standard which should be perpetuated through the stylization of breakfast meeting artefacts (i.e. food, refreshments and adornments such as flowers). Again, this develops a communicative appreciation of aesthetic taste within organization and management studies by exemplifying how managers endeavour for ‘it’ to make a difference both externally (i.e. by projecting a healthy “clean” image to customers during events) and, crucially, for it to exercise authoritative agency over artists’ choices and actions internally when setting up meetings. Relatedly, as the last rows of the ‘Do's' and ‘Don'ts’ columns in figure 9 illustrate, in addition to perpetuating the founder’s aesthetic taste within breakfast meetings, there was also a managerial expectation for it to be promulgated and to ‘live on’ beyond these through its record in online photographs. As field note 7 below exemplifies, during a Greater London Studio Managers' Meeting the same types of table food present (both physically and verbally) within the NSM four weeks earlier were provided by this region’s sales and education management duo. Of particular interest is how the former of these two managers encourages counter and department manager attendees to capture the ‘approved’ aesthetic with their mobile phone cameras and then share it on social media, as detailed below:

Field note 7: Greater London Studio Manager meeting, 28/10/2015

1 At the end of the room where Lucy and Georgia were positioned there was a water
2 dispenser (later referred to as the ‘hydration station’ when Cathy popped her head around
3 the door- this had water with cucumber in it). On the table were grapes, croissants, nuts
4 (almonds I think), dark chocolate and M & S fruit yoghurts. As attendees took their seats,
5 Lucy encouraged them to “please take photos of the room” and asked them to post them
6 on social media “what’s our hashtag? ... make one up, #GLElla”.

Written as the meeting commenced, this field note, in addition to detailing how an ‘approved’
aesthetic previously adhered to by senior managers is being followed in a meeting, highlights how
a middle manager is advocating junior management attendees to share this ‘copy’ online. Of particular interest is the timing of this request as the laid out table food and refreshments have, as yet, remained untouched. Additionally, by suggesting attendees create a hashtag of ‘#GLElla’, the sales manager is encouraging attendees to create a digital landscape. This is so that pictures of unsullied ‘approved’ aesthetic objects can readily be associated by online users (both inside and outside of the internal UK-wide Facebook group for makeup artists) with both the region and the founder. Following attendees’ encouragement to ‘post’ (i.e. upload) a ‘landscaped’ picture online, later in the meeting attention returned to the issue of posting pictures of ‘approved’ foods on social media, as excerpt 26 illustrates below:

Excerpt 26: Greater London Studio Manager meeting. Lucy (Regional Sales Manager), 29/10/2015

```
1 Lucy “OK. Elderflower water or your hydration station, dark chocolate pieces in
2 clear beautiful white bowls, apples, blueberries
3 Georgia Green apples
4 Lucy The end
5 Alice Not red apples?
6 Georgia No. Green apples
7 Alice I’ve just gone and bought a bloody load of red apples
8 Laughter from attendees
9 Lucy I’m so sorry. Look I hate doing this because it’s like, I love how creative you
10 are, I love the things you do on counter but we obviously represent Ella and
11 her philosophies and her ethos and these are the things that she wants, if
12 she wouldn’t eat or drink it – we don’t want to see it
13 Alice Would she eat a red apple?
14 Lucy No, she’d only eat a green one”.
```

The first two lines of this excerpt detail Lucy clarifying the types of food and refreshments that studio and department managers are “OK” to have on-counter in meetings and/or events and to post online. Whilst listing these, this manager (as the guidelines and directive also describe and show) informs attendees how these should be presented with, for example, water being served
from a “hydration station” (line 1) (like the one present in the meeting) and “dark chocolate pieces (being placed) in clear beautiful white bowls” (lines 1 and 2). On line 3, Georgia (the Regional Education Manager) adds greater specificity to this list by stipulating (like “dark” chocolate) what colour one of the items should be: “green apples” (emphasis added), which is followed by an affirmative “The end” (line 4) by her managerial counterpart. After a shared sense of incredulity at the specificity of this request, a Studio Manager (Alice) then probes whether an alternative shade of “red” apple (line 5) she recently bought is allowed, to which her senior manager reaffirms “no” (line 6) that only the “green” (line 6) variety is permitted. Following general laughter at the specificity of these ‘rules’ and their repercussions for attendees, Lucy then introduces the brand’s founder as a form of thirdness (Taylor and Van Every, 2011, 2014) who adds authority to these requests and gives them meaning (i.e. “these are the things that she wants”, line 11). She then attempts to impress onto attendees the founder’s version of what is aesthetically acceptable when making future choices with regards to having food in meetings and then posting pictures online (“if she wouldn’t eat or drink it – we don’t want to see it”, lines 11 and 12).

Excerpt 26 demonstrates a joint effort by two middle managers to ensure a specific type of food is aesthetically emblematic of Ella within attendees’ meetings, events and any digital ‘copies’ they produce. By strictly stipulating both the presence and the presentation of artefacts, these managers attempt to ensure uniformity in the landscaping of these spaces both on-counter and online and, by doing so, perpetuate an aesthetic of the founder. This again deepens knowledge of aesthetic taste because by encouraging artists to share images of stylized artefacts with their UK contemporaries on (internal) social-media, managers are attempting to perpetuate a uniform aesthetic of the founder and, in turn, for ‘it’ to authoritively act as a precedent for artists’ future replication attempts.

This subsection has illustrated senior and middle managers’ attempts to cultivate the founder as an authority on aesthetic taste by synonymizing her with select, stylized artefacts. Specifically, by showing and telling meeting attendees the artefacts Ella purportedly approves of and are permissible within their teams’ breakfast meetings, the founder is portrayed as an aesthetic style guru. In doing so, this subsection develops extant understandings of aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000) twofold: by demonstrating how managers attempt to synonymize an individual with a specific aesthetic taste internally and, in turn, for ‘it’ to exercise authoritative agency by communicatively bounding artists’ choices and actions regarding the presentation of public events and private meetings.
Alongside efforts to perpetuate this aesthetic within meetings, middle managers also endeavour to promulgate ‘it’ beyond meetings by encouraging food items and objects which adhere to the founder’s taste (as an aesthetic opinion leader) to be photographed and then shared on social media. Again, this deepens conceptions of aesthetic taste by highlighting how managers encourage artists to perpetuate an aesthetic ‘Ella’ taste to their peers nationwide on the company’s internal social-media platform and, by doing so, for ‘it’ to set a precedent for artists’ future replication attempts. In short, this synonymizing subsection has highlighted managers’ attempts to promote the founder as an authority on aesthetic taste and, in turn, for this aesthetic to exercise authoritative agency over artists’ actions through the presence and stylization of artefacts both on-counter and online. The next ‘surveilling’ subsection details how the founder is depicted as ethereally omnipresent and a pervasive purveyor of artists’ attempts to emulate this aesthetic taste.

5.3.2 Surveilling

Excerpt 27: South East Studio Manager meeting, Claudia (Counter Manager), 21/10/2015

1 “Do you know what I always think as well, like if Ella walked in would she be happy  
2 with what she sees, ‘cos the girls had put the old Christmas wrapper on limited, old  
3 limited edition stock and if like Ella had walked in what would she say... I try and think  
4 ‘what would Ella say if she walked in?’”.

This comment, overheard from a counter manager during group work, was a common consideration for those similarly tasked with perpetuating the founder’s aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000): would Ella personally approve of their attempt? This surveilling subsection details how, through senior and middle managers’ depictions, the brand founder is presentified (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Brummans et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) as an authoritative omnipresent purveyor of artists’ attempts to conform to and perpetuate her aesthetic taste. Specifically, it illustrates the founder’s portrayal as an ethereal ever-present arbiter of artists’ actions: on-counter; in meetings; during training events; and on social media platforms. It also advances a presentification understanding of authority by demonstrating how Ella’s depiction as a panoptic authoritative omnipresence exercises authoritative agency over, and is perpetually reinforced by, artists’ attempts to replicate an aesthetic of her both physically and digitally. Like excerpt 27, which
referred to on-counter products being wrapped in seasonally appropriate packaging, the ‘what if?’
the founder “walked in” (lines 3 and 4) scenario was a heuristic often used by managers to judge
whether objects and their presentation conformed to the founder’s ‘style guru’ (Carter and Jackson,
2000: 182) taste. Shortly after the meeting above, the founder’s potential personal in-store
presence was similarly referred to at the annual brand conference, as excerpt 28 illustrates below:

05/11/2015

1 “At this point I’ve got to say, and this is me being serious, I do not want to see Father
2 Christmas, green elves, mini Christmas trees. The, you know, pom poms, ball balls.
3 Please, you’ve got to think when you go into a store and pass onto your makeup artist
4 if Ella was, you know, her husband was playing golf, imagine they go and plays golf
5 around the corner, they go into the store, would she be proud of her brand and if you
6 think yes, then that’s fine. If you think no, if Ella was to walk in and I would be really
7 embarrassed then it’s wrong. You don’t need to ask us, you will know but please let’s
8 not go “cuckoo, cuckoo”.

In the opening two lines of this excerpt, the National Marketing Manager is reminding sales and
education managers from across the UK to do likewise with their teams and reiterate the types of
counter decorations that are allowed in the month leading up to, and throughout, Christmas. In
addition to the list of items Cynthia personally does “not want to see” (line 1), what is particularly
instructive about the excerpt for the purposes of this subsection, is the attempted presentification
(Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Brummans et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) of the founder within
makeup stores and counters over the festive period. Specifically, through envisioning an “if Ella
was […] around the corner” (lines 4 and 5) eventuality, attendees are being asked to contemplate
whether the founder’s aesthetic taste their teams are or should be uniformly and universally
emulating on makeup counters and studios would be deemed favourably by Ella (“would she be
proud of her brand”, line 5) if she “was to walk in” (line 6). Through their invitation to imagine
(“Please, you’ve got to think when you go into a store”; line 3) and then share such a scenario with
their teams after the conference (“pass onto your makeup artist”; line 3), the possibility of an
unannounced personal visit from the founder hangs over or haunts (Derrida, 1974: 1982) attendees
and teams. Though attendees were probably aware that an impromptu visit like the one conjured above would be unlikely (for example, store and head office visits from Cosmetico’s senior managers were forewarned and carefully choreographed throughout the fieldwork period), in presentification terms the above portrayal opens up the possibility of Ella having a spectral (Cooren, 2009) presence when attendees and artists make future judgements about artefacts’ aesthetic suitability. For example, on line 7 (“You don’t need to ask us, you will know”), Cynthia is essentially asking attendees and, by extension, their teams to use a prospective unannounced visit from Ella as a barometer to gauge whether their on-counter efforts to conform to her taste as an aesthetic opinion leader (Carter and Jackson, 2000) over the Christmas period are acceptable. This advances extant presentification studies of authority because it demonstrates a tactical element to this construct. Specifically, by making Ella present as a panoptic authoritative source, a manager is attempting to ensure artists’ presentify the founder by replicating her aesthetic on-counter. In addition to this depiction above, the spectral presence of Ella affected senior managers’ landscaping (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) activity after Christmas. As the field note extracts and accompanying interview excerpts below illustrate, Ella haunted managers’ provision of foods within training and meeting environments:

Field note 8: ‘Seasonal School’ training, 18/01/2016

Outside of the room was breakfast which consisted of fruit (apples and oranges), bowls of nuts and sultanas or raisins, and yoghurt pots with granola. A new addition was (Sam later informed me) poached eggs with salsa. An omission from previous weeks was the all butter cookies. Sam asked me whilst the ‘glow tutorial’ with Margot and Georgia was taking place if all of the food had gone? She was a little in disbelief that the eggs had all gone and said how the cookies had to go as Ella would ‘blow her top’ if she knew about them (she raises her hand up to her head at this point as she said this). She said how they can’t be talking about healthy eating whilst munching on cookies.

Field note 8, written during seasonal school training at Cosmetico’s new UK headquarters, details the breakfast table contents provided for attendee artists. In addition to the presence of healthy ‘approved’ foods which conform to the founder’s aesthetic taste (see the synonymizing subsection), this list highlights how, for the first time in two weeks of training, an illicit food (‘all
butter cookies’, line 4) had stopped being provided by Cosmetico’s in-house caterers. This extract is particularly noteworthy because after breakfast, during a practical ‘glow tutorial’ demonstration, Sam (who was a fellow observer seated at the back of the training room) broached the popularity and appropriateness of breakfast food during a one-to-one conversation. Like excerpt 28, the National Education Manager similarly presentifies the founder’s aesthetic taste as the reason why the catering department had been notified to cease the supply of cookies for future training breakfasts. Through saying and gesticulating how ‘Ella would “blow her top” if she knew about them’ (lines 6 and 7), the founder exercises an authoritative and ghostly (Cooren, 2009) presence over her decision making process. Relatedly, when attendee artists began taking cookies off the breakfast tables of other Cosmetico brands who shared the training floor, this issue was privately revisited again by Sam the next day, as field note 9 below illustrates:

Field note 9: ‘Seasonal School’ training, 19/01/2016

1 When I asked about there not being cookies (a point we spoke about the previous day) she said how she always asks herself the question: what would Ella say if she walked in? And
2 Ella wouldn’t approve of cookies.

In addition to its repetition across meeting, conference, and training environments, Sam’s use of the deontic ‘what would Ella say if she walked in?’ phrase is illuminating. Because of her seniority and experience, she is aware that the likelihood of a surprise in-person appearance by the US-based founder at UK training is highly implausible. However, despite this, the manager is still seemingly haunted (Cooren, 2009) by a mirage of her presence. This is instructive because it highlights a hitherto unexplored aspect of presentification whereby a source’s ethereal presence directs employees’ efforts to aesthetically presentify it via the selection and stylization of specific artefacts. Similarly, during an interview with Sam two months after the training events detailed in field note 9, Ella’s presentification was again alluded to:

Excerpt 29: Sam interview (National Education Manager), 11/03/2016

1 “At first they brought up like those really beautiful chunky cookies and things. And I’m sure you remember me saying you know, we’re just going to have to say bye to them.
2 I know they’re delicious, I love them but I think the main thing for me was that… in
this environment, if I’m putting a message across of what Ella would like to see if she was here, how would I feel if she walked round the corner and muffins and cookies were on the table? I would have an absolute heart attack and be actually shovelling them whole into my mouth to just try to get rid of them, you know?... So I think I need to be happy for Ella to walk around that corner and say you are representing my philosophy and my brand with that table”.

As conference attendees were requested to in excerpt 28, in this interview a senior manager is recalling how the ethereal ‘what if Ella walked around the corner?’ threat exercises authoritative agency over her previously detailed actions. Specifically, she is recounting how trying to put a “message across of what Ella would like to see” (line 4), and the founder hypothetically witnessing how she was “representing my philosophy and my brand with that table” (lines 8 and 9), makes her act and landscape this private training space by, for example, substituting illicit cookies with ‘approved’ poached eggs and salsa. Similarly, following a breakfast meeting, Ella’s spectral presence within it was spoken of by Kristen, as illustrated below:

Excerpt 30: Kristen interview (Studio Manager), 19/04/2016

“I think the whole, when we’re doing events. So, with eventing, we’ll have, like, the almonds, the dark chocolate, we’ll have the elderflower. And, she’s really in to her healthy eating and a healthy lifestyle, so that comes across in the breakfast meetings. Like, we had one this morning, you’ll have your blueberry muffin and things like that. I take, to get my breakfast meetings ready, I take a lot of inspiration from her Instagram. So, she’ll put on, like, quirky bowls and things like that, like I brought them in today, and just something like, that’s like Ella could be here. So, I always go, if Ella could walk in now this is what she’d want to see. So, like, it is, like, with the flowers and things like that”.

By offering certain foods (“your blueberry muffin”, line 4) and by stylizing the counter spaces with “quirky bowls” (line 6), the founder’s aesthetic taste exercises authoritative agency over another manager’s actions as Kristen strives to emulate the style guru: it is almost “like Ella could be here” (line 7). Striking because of its similarity to field notes 8 and 9 and excerpts 27 to 29, the line “if Ella could walk in now this is what she’d want to see” (lines 7 and 8) is again apparent with the founder
similarly presentified as the ultimate arbiter of whether attempts to perpetuate her aesthetic taste through the contents and presentation of a breakfast table are satisfactory. Of additional interest is how the manager recounts taking “inspiration” (line 5) from photographs Ella has “put on” (line 6; i.e. uploaded to) “Instagram” (line 6; a social-media platform) and then tries to replicate this image on-counter “like I brought them [quirky bowls] in today” (lines 6 and 7). This again advances extant conceptions of presentification because, in effect, a closed loop is being recalled whereby the founder’s aesthetic taste is delineating this manager’s choices around food and objects in a breakfast meeting. In turn, Ella’s ethereal “if Ella could walk in now” (lines 7 and 8) presence is being used as a heuristic to assess whether the manager’s ‘landscaped’ attempt is a faithful copy of the founder’s Instagram original. As well as her contributions to social-media, Ella’s purported constant checking of platforms like Instagram was also a common consideration for managers and artists, as illustrated in field note 10 below:

Field note 10: Greater London store visit, 29/10/2015

1 Talking about Ella at lunch, Georgia said the reason she and Lucy are so strict about people posting photos is people have uploaded things previously which aren’t on brand (e.g. sausage rolls) and Ella is prolific about social media, checking Instagram and she checks the #Ella on Instagram hourly. When she came to London she dropped her iPhone down the toilet and went immediately to the Apple store so she could buy a new one to get back on Instagram to see what had been posted about the brand.

Noted during a store visit in Greater London, this field note recollects a conversation with the region’s education manager. During this chat, studio managers’ and artists’ uploads to social media of food ‘which aren’t on brand’ (lines 2 and 3) were recalled as a recurring issue within the region both personally and for her managerial sales colleague ‘Lucy’ (line 1). Of particular interest is how such illicit posts (e.g. ‘sausage rolls’, line 3) are construed as particularly problematic because of the purported ‘prolific’ (line 3) presence of Ella on Instagram. Through use of this platform’s hashtag (‘#’) function, the founder reputedly checks images linked to her name ‘hourly’ (line 4) and is undeterred by accidents such as the ‘toilet’ (line 5) tale. In addition to the previously illustrated possibility of Ella being ‘around the corner’ in the UK and witnessing artists’ attempts at replicating her aesthetic taste first-hand, field note 10 is of interest because it similarly depicts Ella as a spectral presence which lurks on social media. Through her purported continual surveillance of this
social-media platform the brand founder is depicted as a digital omnipresence that, irrespective of her geographical location, polices artists’ attempts to emulate her taste through foods and objects. Relatedly, as excerpt 31 details below, approximately five months after the ‘toilet’ tale Ella was similarly portrayed as an ever-present on social media to new starters during the first day of ‘basic training’:

Excerpt 31: ‘Boot-camp’ training. Georgia (Lead Trainer), London Head Office, 08/03/2016

1 Georgia “So we have Brush Up Your Skills, which is the UK Facebook page and that is really your area to share makeup you’ve done that you loove, to look up peoples’ makeup that you love and just anything, I mean what would you say, you’ve put some good things on Brush Up, what do you guys put up there?

2 April When we do like facecharts for different events, like when you get a particularly inspirational moment like customer before and after pictures, errm, sometimes people bring in like 10 year old facecharts and we’ll post that and be like, look at this…

3 Chantelle Just be careful what you put up cus Ella looks at it and so does New York so if you’re not sure just check with your manager, get the ok

4 Georgia I think the general rule is, if you’re happy for Ella to see it, post awaay! ‘Cus she does, she literally when she came to London last time, she errm, she dropped her phone down the toilet as soon as she got to the airport. So she like, first thing she did, she went to the Apple store and bought a new one so she could check her Instagram, so she’s like hot on social, so anytime you put the hashtag Ella May, anytime you put anything Ella in it, my advice is just make sure that you know if it’s a nice team photo make sure you don’t have Dior in the background [laughter from attendees] or you have your breakfast meeting and you’ve got like chocolate brownies and like you’ve seen the food she eats, like the kind of message that she wants to send out about her so I think just keep it super, like super on brand at all times and, yeah, I mean if you’re happy for Ella to see it, post away but like Chantelle said, if you’re not sure just check, just check”.

In the first five lines of this excerpt, Georgia introduces a UK-specific Facebook group (“Brush Up Your Skills”) to inductees. In this group Ella May artists have the opportunity to “share” (line 2) and receive uploaded images of makeup they or their colleagues have created and “loooove” (line 2) (i.e. ‘love’). Referred to as “your area” (line 2), this group is reputedly private, with artists and managers
requiring authorization from a head office administrator to gain membership. Following this brief overview of the group, on line 4 the co-trainers (April and Chantelle) are asked to provide a flavour of the types of photographs they and others typically “put up there” (i.e. contribute). After April’s examples, on line 9 Chantelle forewarns fledgling artists that membership of the group is less private than previously intimated: “’cus Ella looks at it and so does New York” (i.e. senior managers at the brand’s global headquarters). This is interesting because, by using a synecdoche, another influential source (i.e. Cosmetico are headquartered in a city synonymous with power and business acumen) is presentified alongside Ella. In effect, she is presentifying two sources artists should consider if they are to make social media posts in the future. Like the previously detailed ethereal ‘around the corner’ heuristic, a similar “general rule” (line 11) is provided for inductees’ reference: “if you’re happy for Ella to see it, post awaaaay” (line 11). These two trainers’ portrayal depicts to new joiners an impression of Ella as an omnipresent purveyor of their actions within their supposedly ‘private’ members’ group.

Due to Ella’s admittance to and presence within this group, the “advice” (line 16) to attendees is to use the breakfast meeting guidelines/directive introduced in the previous ‘synonymizing’ subsection (“if it’s a nice team photo make sure you don’t have Dior in the background”, lines 17 and 18) and the training room’s breakfast table contents as a yardstick (“you’ve seen the food she eats”, lines 19 and 20) if they are to “hashtag” (line 16) or “put anything Ella” (line 16) in their posts to this group. This depicts Ella as voyeuristically perusing artists’ attempts to replicate her aesthetic taste in an online space which is intended to be accessed by, and for the benefit of, UK brand employees only. Again, this highlights the founder’s portrayal as an omnipresent authoritative source which pervades both public and (allegedly) private spheres of artists’ daily workings. Due to her omnipresence within this group, artists are advised to only post images of food that conform to and perpetuate her aesthetic taste because she could potentially see them. In addition to ethereally haunting publicly accessible physical (i.e. makeup counters) and digital (i.e. Instagram) spaces, Ella’s membership of this private forum contributes to her portrayal as a pervasive presence: one who holds the potential to influence artists’ on-counter and online landscaping attempts to conform to her specific taste.

The excerpts and field notes above illustrate how, through rendering Ella as ethereally omnipresent, the founder is portrayed as presiding over artists’ and managers’ attempts to conform to and perpetuate her aesthetic taste through artefacts. Through imagining an impromptu ‘around
the corner’ visit from Ella, artists and managers are invited to entertain the prospect of the founder witnessing first-hand how foods and objects are chosen and presented in meetings, during training events, and on makeup counters. By introducing this element of doubt, artists and managers are provided with a heuristic to contemplate whether their efforts would meet with this style guru’s in-person approval. In doing so, this surveilling subsection advances extant understandings of presentification by demonstrating a tactical element to this construct. To elaborate, it has shown how a source’s ethereally depicted panoptical omnipresence regularly exercises authoritative agency both internally (in meetings and training events) and publicly on-counter with managers and artists using ‘it’ as a barometer to gauge whether their efforts to aesthetically presentify the source are worthy.

Furthermore, through Ella’s portrayal as an avid social media user, artists and managers are encouraged to use this depiction as a steer for whether the landscape they should be cultivating on-counter and in meetings would be welcomed by the brand founder if she viewed it online. Specifically, Ella’s purported scrutiny of both publicly accessible and closed social media spheres contributes to her depiction as an ethereal omnipresence: one that holds potential to affect artists’ efforts to emulate her aesthetic taste through providing and styling objects and foods in both private and public spaces. This again advances extant conceptions of presentification by showing how a source, presentified as authoritative, traverses and is intended to exercise authoritative agency over artists in both physical and digital arenas. Following the delineation of the founder’s specific aesthetic taste in the synonymizing subsection and Ella’s purported haunting of physical and digital spaces above, the third and final subsection illustrates managers’ and artists’ attempts to conform to and perpetuate her aesthetic taste in meetings and on social media through landscaping (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) and an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) activities. By amalgamating these two constructs, the next ‘propagandizing’ subsection demonstrates how the Ella aesthetic becomes communicatively constituted within, and exercises authoritative agency over, an internal vacuum.
5.3.3 Propagandizing

Field note 11: West End breakfast meeting, 18/11/2015

I arrived in store as Marcus was setting up the meeting. Following Nathalie’s email, he had bought and was laying out on the table: strawberries and blueberries in a white china platter bowl, Jordan health bars, coconut water, Innocent smoothies, Yeo Valley yoghurts, red and green grapes, and bananas. He also brought in a hydration station which was filled with water and lemons. Before, during, and after, very few of the attendees ate or drank from the breakfast goods on offer: they were put after the meeting in the back of the store, in the kitchen area.

Written shortly after a visit to a studio in the West End, field note 11 recalls the food provided within a team’s breakfast meeting. As the opening to the note illustrates, after receiving the breakfast meeting ‘email’ directive (detailed in figure 9), a studio manager (‘Marcus’, line 1) had attempted to follow senior managers’ guidelines and landscape (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) the studio counter with some ‘approved’ foods (e.g. ‘strawberries and blueberries in a white china platter bowl’, lines 2 and 3) in an attempt to adhere to and promulgate the founder’s aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000) in the meeting. Similarly, this final ‘propagandizing’ subsection of the section details how Ella’s portrayal as an aesthetic style guru (Carter and Jackson, 2000) held authoritative agency over managers’ and artists’ actions. Specifically, it highlights how Ella’s aesthetic taste makes a difference to how these parties’ landscape physical and digital spaces through both the provision and stylization of artefacts. It also highlights how through processes of an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) artefacts that do not adhere to Ella’s taste as an aesthetic opinion former (Carter and Jackson, 2000) are expunged from or doctored within physical spaces. This is so that a uniform aesthetic ‘regime of meaning’ (Hancock, 2005: 30) associated with the founder is perpetuated on social media.

Taken together these constructs demonstrate how, in amalgam, an aesthetic ‘propagandizing’ of the founder was internally being circulated within the brand. This shows how landscaping and an-aestheticization is not only performed by marketers and consultants for the benefit of customers or press (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000; Hancock, 2005; Wasserman and Frenkel, 2011; Witz et al., 2003): managers and artists carry out these activities in order to produce aesthetic propaganda that is (largely) intended for the consumption and benefit of their colleagues. Returning to the
landscaping of physical spaces, like many other on-counter and head-office breakfast meetings attended, the meeting above was striking because of the presence and presentation of ‘approved’ foods despite attendees' lack of appetite for them. For example, during a Studio Managers’ Meeting, attendees' continued apparent absence of appetite for table food was, in contrast to my own, noteworthy:

Field note 12: South East Studio Manager meeting, 16/10/2015

1 The majority of the food on the tables had remained untouched… I was hungry at this point
2 but didn’t want to touch the food!

Relatedly, during ‘basic school’ training at head-office, attendees' lacklustre response to the food and the trainer's question about it was similarly worthy of note:

Field note 13: ‘Basic School’ training, 08/03/2016

1 Georgia made a jokey reference ‘Did you like the eggs?’ in relation to the breakfast arrangements outside which were largely untouched and attracted a lukewarm response from attendees

Similarly, whilst attending a studio breakfast meeting in Greater London, numerous ‘approved’ foods and refreshments (e.g. nuts, grapes, berries, water, and juice) were again on offer but left largely intact throughout the approximately one and three quarter hour duration. This is interesting because at different times, across meeting and training environments, artefacts served a window-dressing, rather than a satiating, purpose. Hours later during an interview, the studio manager tasked with providing these foods referred to the importance of aesthetically landscaping this and other meeting spaces through the provision of approved foods:

Excerpt 32: Paige interview (Studio Manager), 03/02/2016

1 “I like that, you know when we have a meeting we can’t have muffins and biscuits and chocolate. We need to do what Ella would do and I think it is a good message to send
As Paige alludes to, the provision of foods on offer is synonymous with and adheres to what, as a style guru, the brand founder “would do” (line 2) and by extension what this managerial meeting host therefore has a “need to do” (line 2). Ella is therefore recalled as exercising authoritative agency in meetings with this manager purportedly conforming to the founder’s precept of good aesthetic taste (Carter and Jackson, 2000). Similarly, during interviews with those present at this and related meetings, the aesthetic association such foods “send out” (lines 2 and 3) to meeting attendees was often recollected as taking precedence over their satiating properties:

Excerpt 33: Alex interview (Artist), 03/02/2016

1 “Some people are like oh I’m not eating that… But you know what you’re going to get when you get there and it, I think it’s quite nice just to feel like you’re in Ella’s world for a day. That’s how people need to see it but I just think they just think oh I’ve got to eat an apple”.

Likewise, the foods’ connection to the founder’s aesthetic taste was similarly prioritized over non-approved foods’ popularity by a fellow artist:

Excerpt 34: Ceri interview (Featured Artist), 27/04/2016

1 “Even when we go to our conferences… a lot of guys are like, why’s there no cookies? I think we have to, we have to stick to that because, again, it’s what Ella would do”.

Field notes 11 to 13 and excerpts 32 to 34 illustrate a recurring pattern whereby healthy foods and refreshments were regularly provided, but left uneaten, in various types of breakfast meeting (e.g. Studio Team Meetings, Studio Manager Meetings, Coach Meetings). Across many regions, the landscaping of table spaces like these was therefore ritualistic with breakfast items serving a decorative, instead of a practical (i.e. satiating), purpose. Following the repeated presence of select foods as props within meetings, the founder’s portrayal as an aesthetic style guru exercises
authority over artists’ actions as meeting hosts use artefacts to ceremonially ‘presentify’ (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009; Brummans et al., 2013; Cooren, 2009) Ella as opposed to them being provided for attendees’ sustenance.

Through hosts’ and artists’ regular social media postings of (typically uneaten) ‘approved’ foods, a healthy aesthetic landscape was often promulgated to, and potentially for the benefit of, those absent. Fulfilling another senior management proviso (to share photographs of meetings on social media), meeting hosts and attendees frequently posted images of breakfast foods like those detailed above to colleagues on Facebook and/or the general public on Instagram. Photographs of untouched foods therefore maintain an aura which implies that meeting attendees were, as the founder is assumed to do, eating healthily without the Ella aesthetic ever being compromised by images of half-eaten foods which would be incongruous with the image of a beauty guru. For example, as figure 10 shows below, the day after the Studio Team Meeting introduced above, an Assistant Studio Manager uploaded pictures of the meeting to the former of these social media platforms.

Figure 10: Facebook post (Greater London Studio breakfast meeting), 03/02/2016

Split into two parts, this figure is taken from the internal ‘Brush Up Your Skills’ Facebook page introduced in the previous subsection. In addition to seeing the contributor’s description and images, visitors can click on the circled (‘+5’) image and view five extra photographs of the
meeting. As the image on the right-hand side shows, in one of these pictures a selection of the (largely untouched) ‘approved’ foods from the meeting were viewable by managers, artists, and, as the previous subsection detailed, potentially Ella. This example is of interest because, alongside other images, it provides pictorial evidence to non-attendees within the brand that the meeting had been landscaped with approved food items which contributed to an ‘Amazing, fun, and inspiring breakfast meeting with our dream team (and David!)’. Through the presence of these photographs, it also demonstrates to these parties that the founder’s aesthetic taste is being adhered to.

Similarly, as figure 11 illustrates below, shortly after a breakfast meeting for coaches in Greater London, a digital copy of the table contents was produced:

**Figure 11: Facebook post (Greater London Coaches meeting), 01/03/2016**

The photograph in this figure is of an attendee’s table place which, later that day, was posted by the meeting chair on ‘Brush Up Your Skills’. Detailed in a field note as: ‘*Glasses with celery cut and placed over the edge… (and) Attendees also had an apple in front of them*’ (Field note 14: Greater London Coaches meeting, 01/03/2016), members of the Facebook group who were not in attendance at the meeting were provided with a digital duplicate of how the table artefacts provided were presented. Like figure 10 illustrated, by providing, photographing and then digitally posting food items like ‘approved’ green apples this manager is both evidencing and perpetuating the founder’s aesthetic taste internally. Again, the depiction of Ella as an aesthetic opinion leader
therefore holds authoritative agency over this manager’s actions, both in terms of providing and documenting artefacts which adhere to her taste. Considered in tandem, figures 10 and 11 are insightful because they demonstrate how two ‘landscaped’ scenes were produced by, and for the benefit of, managers and artists within the brand. Specifically, because membership of the Facebook group was for employees only, these images were not intended for public consumption. An aesthetic landscape therefore not only represents the workings of an organization to external parties (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000; Hancock, 2005; Wasserman and Frenkel, 2011; Witz et al., 2003): an aesthetic text plays a communicatively constitutive role by directing actors’ actions internally. In addition to producing digital copies of meeting food intended for internal purposes, meeting attendees often posted photographs for the benefit of their own social-media followers, the brand’s social-media followers and for the brand founder. For example, as the Instagram posts in figure 12 below highlight, a selection of table food provided for attendees at a ‘Black Friday’ sales meeting was publicly shared on social media:

Figure 12: Instagram posts (‘Black Friday’ Managers meeting), 23/11/2015
Taken at Cosmetico’s headquarters, two of the Instagram posts above were photographed and uploaded by senior artists and the other by a regional education manager. Striking partly because of the symmetry with which these artefacts were arranged and then photographed, these posts were of the breakfast items provided for each of the three meeting room tables that morning. As the field note written at the time details, these foodstuffs adhered to Ella’s ‘approved’ breakfast guidelines introduced in figure 9:
Field note 15: ‘Black Friday’ Managers meeting, 23/11/2015

‘At the start of the day there were 3 shot glasses on the table each containing a healthy antioxidant drink: e.g. wheatgrass, smoothie, and a juice. There were also breakfast pots of yoghurt, quinoa, orange segments and cashew nuts’

Like figures 10 and 11, the drinks within these Instagram posts are all untouched. Again, this intimates to the viewer that an aesthetic food fantasy is at play with the photographs suggestive of a healthy ‘Ella’ aesthetic without the aesthetic ever being sullied by the items’ actual consumption. Figure 12 is also of interest because, alongside each photograph of these items, the poster has written the hashtag ‘#EllaMay’. By explicitly linking their posts to the founder and/or the brand through the hashtag function, the founder and members of the public can find these images and associate their aesthetic taste with Ella as a person and/or a brand. In addition to physically landscaping an internal space at head-office, through social media posts like these depictions of the founder’s aesthetic taste can travel beyond physical meeting spaces and be perpetuated digitally. Through poster uploads and accompanying descriptions on Facebook and Instagram platforms, hosts’ attempts to landscape internal meeting spaces become augmented online and hold the potential to propagate or subvert the founder’s specific aesthetic taste to artists, the general public and, as previously detailed, the founder herself. An aesthetic text therefore not only represents the workings of an organization (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000; Hancock, 2005), it makes a difference to how employees work within, and identify with, an organization. Aesthetics therefore offers a useful, but to date unutilized, theoretical lens to view the communicative constitution of organization.

In light of social media scrutiny and who may see uploaded images, meeting hosts were often mindful of ensuring artists’ social media posts adhered to the founder’s ‘approved’ aesthetic taste. This was often the case even if the physical landscape which posts purportedly depict were incongruous with the aesthetic. Specifically, as figure 13 and the accompanying field note extracts below exemplify, hosts were often prudent about portraying an aesthetic to online outsiders that was physically absent within meetings.
This post was uploaded to the internal Facebook page by a regional education manager two days after she co-hosted the region’s studio manager meeting. In the image on the left, alongside photographs of attendees and their meeting table places, is a photograph of the breakfast food provided on a table at the side of the meeting room. Enlarged in the right-hand image, this photograph closely resembles the contents and stylization of approved breakfast items contained in the breakfast meeting guidelines/directive detailed in figure 9. This upload is particularly interesting because of the host’s partial portrayal of food items both during breakfast and throughout the day, as a field note written whilst the photograph was being taken details:

Field note 16: West End Studio Manager meeting, 19/10/2015

1  ‘On the table were fruit, strawberries, grapes, and croissants and smaller fruits with chocolate dipping sauces. There were also large jugs of water with cucumber slices in them. There was also a vase of peach coloured flowers on the table, roses I think’

Field note 16 reveals the uploader’s selective omission of potentially risqué and non-approved breakfast items such as ‘croissants’ and ‘chocolate dipping sauces’. After breakfast, the food on
offer to attendees continued to deviate from the founder’s purported healthy aesthetic taste with field note 17 detailing how carbohydrates were provided for lunch:

Field note 17: West End Studio Manager meeting, 19/10/2015

‘Posh sandwiches brought in from a shop on Carnaby St, salads with dressing and crisps’.

In turn, as field note 18 details, towards the close of this all-day meeting a marked departure from the ‘approved foods’ philosophy was also apparent:

Field note 18: West End Studio Manager meeting, 19/10/2015

1 Nathalie said to Zoe to “get the contraband” to which Zoe came back with a tin full of cookies she’d bought from Sainsbury’s that morning. Nathalie said to me, jokingly,
2 “not to note this down in my notes” because it’s not on brand and not Ella. She said to me “do you know about the food rules?” And said “Ella likes to have almonds,
3 almonds which are coated in beetroot”.

Field note 18 details one managerial host asking the other to retrieve non-approved (‘contraband’, line 1) foods (‘cookies’, line 2) from the communal kitchen adjacent to their head-office meeting room. Following the introduction of these illicit items to the meeting, one of the hosts (with an air of levity) requests for their presence to be omitted from any notations and provided a rationale for this: “because it’s [i.e. cookies] not on brand and not Ella” (line 3). In the context of her managerial colleague’s choice of imagery for the meeting’s Facebook post, this highlights how the founder’s aesthetic taste exercises only partial authoritative agency over these managers’ actions. Specifically, by erasing (in both note and digital form) the presence of illegitimate food stuffs these managers undertake a process of an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) whereby: ‘whatever is experienced as ugly disappears; its place taken by an image of the process which, rather than compromising all its controversial features is shining clean, with the perfection – or desired perfection – of a work of art’ (Strati, 2007: 74). Likewise, in another Studio Manager Meeting in a different region, prohibited foods were similarly effaced from online records of the meeting, as figure 14 and the accompanying excerpt below highlight:
Like figures 10, 11 and 13, figure 14 was uploaded to the members’ only Facebook group by a managerial host shortly after a meeting. Alongside nine other photographs, the image on the right was accessible by clicking ‘+10’ on the left-hand image. Showing a Christmas gift bag and a personalized hessian sack for each attendee, this image is interesting because, in order for these items to appear as they do in the post, another non-approved meeting item (a can of Coca-Cola) had to be manoeuvred out of the camera shot. Again, this exemplifies a process of an-aestheticization whereby the manager is intentionally projecting a desired perception of the founder’s aesthetic taste and, by doing so, is ‘masking experienced reality’ within the meeting (Carter and Jackson, 2000: 191). It also moves beyond this construct by showing how an element of internal deceitfulness is at play with each meeting host producing a piece of aesthetic propaganda to be consumed by their (non-attendee) contemporaries and subordinates. Furthermore, as excerpt 35 illustrates below, as this photograph was being taken the logistics of staging it were being discussed by the meeting hosts and attendees:
Lucy “Has anyone hashtagged yet?

Georgia Has anyone uploaded any pictures?

Leah Not yet

Emma Nope

Georgia Right

Alice I’m too scared to in case it’s not Ella

Lucy I know

Georgia Just scoop the Coke out the way... But the hashtag for today is obviously teamGL so if you’ve got anything on Facebook, Instagram, hashtag it so we can find it. Just make sure the pictures are nice and safe (nervous laughter)

Leah I only took a picture of the gift bag

Emma Yeah, I done that as well

Georgia Perfect, upload it

Emma That’s alright then, I wanted to check what I could and couldn’t do first”.

Following their previous request for attendees to take photographs of the meeting, in this excerpt’s opening two lines both managerial hosts (Lucy and Georgia) are verbally nudging attendees to post pictures of the table contents on internal and public social media. Interestingly, after two attendees confirm that they are yet to do so, on line 6 Alice justifies her inactivity on the grounds that she is “too scared” of linking (via a hashtag) an image to the brand founder in case it deviates from and defiles the founder’s aesthetic taste. After Georgia empathizes with this reasoning, on line 8 (“Just scoop the Coke out the way”) Lucy an-aestheticizes the scene by disposing of a Coca-Cola can which, as noted earlier that day, were provided for attendees by the meeting hosts:
Field note 19: Greater London Studio Manager meeting, 28/10/2015

Over lunch sandwiches were in the kitchen, alongside cans of Coke (full fat!) and Georgia later brought popcorn into the room for attendees to snack on

Similar to the expunging of non-approved items from social media posts in figure 13, a middle manager is again orchestrating a digital version of an aesthetic which differs from the one physically present. After the removal of the prohibited “Coke” can from the table scene, Georgia reiterates the hashtag for attendees to use when posting meeting photographs which, like the newly re-arranged table contents, should be “nice and safe” (line 10). Following Leah’s and Emma’s admission that they had photographed, but not yet uploaded images of, the gift bag on lines 11 and 12, Georgia confirms that the image is “perfect” (line 13) and authorizes this attendee to post it alongside her own photographs which were uploaded and shown in figure 14. In short, excerpt 35 details middle managers producing a cleansed an-aestheticized digital copy of the meeting which serves as a reference point for attendees’ future efforts. It also illustrates how Ella’s aesthetic taste exercises authoritative agency in one way (i.e. ensuring digital depictions of artefacts conform to the founder’s aesthetic taste) but not another (i.e. the aesthetic was flouted by the presence of non-approved artefacts). Similarly, during interviews with attendees at this and other meetings, the purging of physically present (but inappropriate) food items from social media posts was regularly referenced:

Excerpt 36: Ceri interview (Featured Artist), 27/04/2016

“I remember going to an event once and they had cupcakes and all sorts of stuff and I had to take the picture down (laughter). Because I think if Ella were to have seen it herself it kind of would have been like, why are they serving cupcakes on the counter, do you know what I mean?”

Like figures 13 and 14, in this extract an artist with managerial responsibility is recalling how, as part of her role, she retracted or, put differently, an-aestheticized a junior colleague’s illicit (“cupcakes”, line 1) upload to ‘Brush Up Your Skills’. Despite their presence on a makeup counter, these items were deemed as sulllying an online depiction of the founder’s aesthetic taste which she and others may see. Therefore, again managers are either advocating or recalling episodes of internal propagandizing whereby digital depictions of unsightly artefacts are “whitewashed” to
depict and perpetuate the founder’s uniform aesthetic taste. In several other interviews, artists and managers similarly recalled how they refrained from posting photographs of forbidden food items for fear of tainting an Ella aesthetic on social media. For example, in the excerpt below Autumn recalls how studio managers and studio managers are complicit in allowing non-approved foods on-counter but not online:

Excerpt 37: Autumn interview (Studio Manager), 16/02/2016

1 “So we can only use healthy kind of snack things. So we have fruit or dark chocolate only. We would never put, like, cakes or anything like that. I know sometimes people have done in the past, but... Which, they’re like, Okay, fine. But don’t put it on any social media,
2 because that is not the Ella Way”

Referring to the offering of non-approved food items to customers during in-store events, this studio manager highlights a disparity between what is physically and digitally permissible. Aware of activity on other counters, she recalls how managers (i.e. “they’re like”, line 3) in her region overlook offerings of illicit “cakes” (line 2) on-counter but veto photographs of them being posted online. Relatedly, in an interview with another Studio Manager, a similar tactic was referred to in relation to her team’s breakfast meetings:

Excerpt 38: Kristen interview (Studio Manager), 19/04/2016

1 “We usually do an evening breakfast meeting, so people don’t want almonds in the evening when they finish work, they want their tea. So, a lot of people, you know, we do do, like, sandwiches and things and so I just don’t take pictures. You know, we’ll take, we’ll still do it on Ella, on brand, but with something that they’ll want to eat, but no one puts them pictures on because we want, we’re sticking to the Ella ethos”.

Here, Kristen is referring to the lack of nourishment healthy foods (e.g. “almonds”, line 1) provide to attendee artists at the close of a working day. In light of attendees’ hearty appetites, she departs from the founder’s aesthetic taste by providing carbohydrates (“sandwiches”, line 3) for those present. Despite her non-compliance with the food guidelines/directives with regards to providing
certain meeting foods, by not photographing and posting these online, she and her artistry team refrain from spoiling the digital aesthetic of the founder cultivated by social media posts like those above in figures 10 to 14. Relatedly, three months into fieldwork the need to uphold this online aesthetic façade was personally sensed during another tea-time breakfast meeting as field note 20 below details:

Field note 20: Greater London Studio Manager meeting, 08/12/2015

1. It struck me when I was taking pictures of the Smokey eye challenge not to get pictures of
2. the sweet cups in the background

From figure 13 onwards, a trend has been identified whereby the founder’s aesthetic taste exercises some authority over managers’ and artists’ actions with regards to preserving and perpetuating an online ‘healthy’ aesthetic. However, unlike the faithful online duplicates of on-counter landscapes previously presented in figures 10 to 12, in these instances non-approved items are either: removed from the frame of the camera shot; withdrawn from social media posts if mistakenly uploaded; or not documented at all. Through such activity managers are eradicating or metaphorically whitewashing traces of illicit items and, in effect, creating a digital an-aesthetic of Ella.

The figures, excerpts, and field notes above illustrate how, through the landscaping (Gagliardi, 1990, 1996; Hancock, 2005) of foods and objects, an aesthetic of the brand founder is perpetuated both internally and publicly on social-media. This propagandizing subsection detailed how Ella’s depiction as a style guru held some authoritative agency over managers and artists with regards to them regularly providing food items in meetings which conformed to and perpetuated her aesthetic taste rather than to satisfy attendees’ appetites. Furthermore, by posting photographs of these items on social-media, meeting hosts and attendees were duplicating a digital aesthetic of the founder to colleagues, members of the public, and, potentially, Ella herself. These findings extend extant conceptions of landscaping by demonstrating how managers and artists (as opposed to, for example, marketing and public relations departments) perpetuate an aesthetic for the benefit of the general public and to organize their colleagues’ actions within an internal vacuum. Finally, the portrayal of Ella as an aesthetic style guru was highlighted as holding some authority over managers and artists. Specifically, through processes of an-aestheticization (Carter and Jackson,
2000; Strati, 2007), these parties digitally doctor and/or non-disclose food items which, if posted on internal and/or public social-media, would tarnish associations with the founder’s aesthetic taste. Through such inactivity, online traces of these items are unavailable and the founder’s position as an authority on aesthetic taste is propagated. By utilizing landscaping and an-aesthetic concepts, this subsection therefore develops an understanding of how an aesthetic exercises authority over activities which communicatively constitute and characterize organization.

5.4 Section three: Practice

The final section of this chapter utilizes Schatzki’s (2002, 2006, 2012) concept of teleological hierarchy and demonstrates how practice-based constitutions of the founder make an authoritative difference to how artists work. The three subsections demonstrate how, through artists’ makeup appearance, product demonstration, and sequential makeup application order, a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice is constituted which exercises authoritative agency over artists’ makeup lessons. Sharing Nicolini’s view of practice as ‘routine bodily activities made possible by the active contribution of an array of material resources’ (2012: 4), this section adds to the verbal and sensory constitutions of the founder previously detailed in the respective ventriloqual and aesthetic sections.

The first ‘emblematizing’ subsection begins by detailing senior and middle managers’ attempts to ensure artists follow the founder’s makeup routine on themselves so that they effectuate her approved makeup look to customers. Drawing on Schatzki’s view (2002, 2006, 2012) of how action - activity - task hierarchies culminate in a goal, this subsection demonstrates how a goal (i.e. a homogenous Ella makeup ‘look’) emblematizes to managers whether artists follow the founder’s ten constituent makeup tasks. The Ella look exercises authoritative agency over artists because if they fail to follow the hierarchy required to produce it, managers query their actions and then use the ten makeup tasks to rectify their makeup image on-counter. The subsection also details how the Ella look exercises authority over recruitment decisions because managers use it to decide whether candidates’ makeup looks can be “unpicked” in the future using the ten tasks. Specifically, applicants’ propensity to be trained in the tasks needed to align their makeup image with Ella’s favoured look was recalled as influencing whether they were hired.
Next, ‘proprietorial authority’ uses Schatzki’s ideas (2002, 2006, 2012) about how action-activity-task chains operate and shows how a practice-based goal makes an authoritative difference to artists’ daily workings. The subsection demonstrates how an inextricable tie between a specific makeup task and a goal (i.e. accomplishing ‘natural’ looking skin and transitioning a constituent part of Ella’s favoured ‘look’ onto customers’ faces) exercises authoritative agency on-counter. It details how artists come to have a ‘practical understanding’ (Schatzki, 2012: 3) of why this goal means that, despite customer demand, they can only use a specific makeup task to demonstrate a particular (skin foundation stick) product.

The final ‘teleo-authorizing’ subsection utilizes Schatzki’s theory (2002, 2006, 2012) about how arrangements of actions, activities, and tasks comprise a practice and demonstrates how a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice is constituted by, and exercises authority over, artists’ makeup tasks. It exemplifies how artists’ perpetuation of this practice maintains an Ella goal: to incrementally build, and not compromise, a ‘natural’ Ella makeup effect on customers. The subsection shows how the normative makeup practice and the goal behind it make an authoritative difference on-counter by circumscribing artists’ autonomy to decide the order of makeup tasks within lessons. A synopsis of these subsections is presented below in figure 15.
Figure 15: Practice section overview

**Summary**

An artist’s makeup image is emblematic of whether they have followed Ella’s requisite makeup actions, activities, and tasks.

**First order indicative data**

"I was trained by Steph, who now runs a store up North. And she would always say to me, “oh your makeup’s not Ella. That eye makeup wasn’t Ella”. So I was, like, baffled into thinking, right, I need to look at it through Ella May’s eyes."

"It’s so obvious when a product isn’t Ella. Like, a few times I’ve said to people, “what foundation is that?” And I know its Extra Wear, because you can tell. And they’re like oh, “It’s Single Wear”. And to anyone else, you wouldn’t know. But for me, I can see it."

"When I first started my manager at the time I think probably drummed it into me a lot. Like your makeup is not very Ella today. So that’s where I got it from. So as I was being trained that was a massive thing, I would always be like oh do I fit today, do I not?"

"As Ella May artists it’s your responsibility to empower them to feel amazing ... so you need to ask the question, “Can I just ask, why do you want to contour?” Cus most of the time they’ll go “I don’t know, I saw it on YouTube”, “Great take a seat, let me show what Ella would do if she were here”"

**Second order theme**

Emblematizing

**Theoretical construct**
"What you say is, you never say to someone "I can't sell this to you because we don't do at Ella", sell it! And usually they're makeup artists, and they're quite savvy with it. What you can do, is say is; "We don't actually train it at Ella so I can't demo it on you today."

"I'll obviously say, 'well as a brand that's not something we do. However, I can show it to you in more, kind of, you know... How Ella would do it herself."

"That's why the facechart is set out like that because she (Ella) believes that you should start your makeup with what you can do quickly, and if you need to leave the house you still look good, so corrector concealer first always."

"The real reason for why the face chart is the way it is, is because we're basically doing it in a way so that if at any point in time that woman on counter gets a phone call, she has to leave, she actually leaves looking decent. She's not left with, like, a lipstick and one eye shadow... it's all done in a structure so she looks presentable.

"I think I've adapted like the way I've done things since like working for other brands, like the corrector concealer, I'd never have done that first. That's just kind of the way she (Ella) does it, so she does that first."

The founder is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence.
5.4.1 Emblematizing

Excerpt 39: Lizzy interview (Studio Manager), 05/02/2016

“The Ella look is having: lovely smooth glowing skin; nice pop of colour on the cheeks; having the features defined; smooth, sleek lines; eyeliner; sort of a bright lip. Just about enhancing. Yes, not heavy makeup, but looking your best, really”.

In excerpt 39, Lizzy characterizes a makeup effect widely associated with the founder by artists and practiced by many of them prior to arriving for work: “The Ella look” (line 1). Describing how skin (“smooth glowing”, line 1) and facial features (e.g. “sort of a bright lip”, line 2) should appear once products have been applied, she is referring to a homogenous ‘Ella look’ senior and middle managers expect artists to personally wear themselves and apply onto customers on-counter. Focusing on the former of these requirements, this first 'emblematizing' subsection details how through directives, remonstrations and precepts (Schatzki, 2005, 2012) these managers attempt to delineate and enforce specific makeup actions, activities, and tasks professedly used by Ella so that artists effectuate her preferred look on themselves and, in effect, turn themselves into a physical representation of Ella. Specifically, it illustrates how this look exercises authoritative agency over artists because, if they are not wearing it to work, their private makeup actions are queried and remedial actions are undertaken by managers on-counter to align their look with one favoured by the founder. As excerpt 40 below highlights, ensuring artists’ on-counter makeup appearance were congruent with the founder’s preferred look was a topic for discussion and clarification during day one of ‘basic school’ training:

Excerpt 40: ‘Basic School’ training. Georgia (Lead Trainer), London Head Office, 08/03/2016

Georgia

“If you were to describe to me what the Ella May image is, what would you say?

Attendee

Clean

Georgia

Clean

Attendee

Fresh
Georgia: Fresh. There we go.

Attendee: It’s changing?

Georgia: Yeah, in terms of uniform. We’ll put a question mark around this a bit ‘cos we’re looking at maybe changing it: but it’s not confirmed. But we may be able to introduce like a few more white, grey, navy, fingers crossed. Erm, what other words, when you think of an Ella May artist what do you think?

Attendee: Modern, natural

Georgia: Modern, natural. I was waiting for someone to say. Fresh, clean and modern, just stick with those three... But if you have a look in front of you there at the Ella guidelines. Erm, like makeup obviously, a full face of Ella May makeup is there, so erm, you know that is we are natural but we need to look like we have makeup on. You all look gorgeous today looking around the room”.

In the opening two lines Georgia is asking for volunteers from the 25 new starters in the room to confirm their awareness of the “Ella May image” (line 1). Following her confirmatory repetition of two adjectives on lines 3 to 6 (“clean” and “fresh”), and discussion of the changing uniform guidelines, on line 13 an attendee adds two more adjectives to describe the image: “Modern, natural”. Following Georgia’s repetition of these on lines 14 and 15, three of the four adjectives are strung together in sequence and confirmed as the optimum on-counter image attendees ought to strive for: “just stick with those three” (line 15). Interestingly, after reiterating that artists’ should appear “Fresh, clean and modern” (lines 14 and 15), she then encourages attendees to heed caution with regards to wearing a “natural” (line 18) makeup style suggested by an attendee. Referring to artists’ grooming guidelines (“Ella guidelines”, line 16), Georgia stresses the importance of (somewhat contradictorily) balancing a natural appearance while wearing a “full face of Ella May makeup” (lines 16 and 17) and “we need to look like we have makeup on” (line 18). Echoing the guidelines shown below in figure 16, excerpt 40 details a trainer drawing on a directive (Schatzki, 2012) in an attempt to demarcate a stock ‘Ella’ makeup image artists should arrive on-counter wearing.
Like Georgia’s attempt above, these guidelines aim to circumscribe artists’ on-counter appearance by delineating what constitutes ‘The Ella May look’ (i.e. ‘Fresh, Clean and Modern’) and how they are to accomplish it. Regarding the requisite look, beneath the ‘Makeup’ header artists are informed that ‘A full face of Ella May makeup is required’ and, specifically, on certain areas of the face they should ensure that, post product application, they have ‘skin that looks like skin’ and, vis-à-vis, ‘heavy base makeup and excessive bronzer are not advised’. Of particular interest are the tasks artists are advised to follow to accomplish such an effect. Specifically, under the same header recipients are requested to ‘Please follow Ella’s […] Lesson application’. As the ‘basic school’ workbook supplied to attendees (and presented below) details, this lesson involves ten sequential steps of makeup tasks which encompass the spectrum of skincare and makeup products the brand offers for demonstration and sale to customers.
Through the guidelines in figure 17, senior managers are endeavouring to delimit artists’ at home makeup to ten specific make up tasks or, put differently, ‘steps’ so that, on-counter, they wear the requisite ‘full-face’ of brand makeup and Ella’s prescribed ‘Clean, Fresh, Modern’ makeup look is transitioned onto their faces. This highlights an attempt on these managers’ part for this ‘Ella look’ to have an authority over the actions, activities, and tasks they follow when applying their own makeup prior to arriving for work. The day after the guidelines and workbook were issued at ‘basic school’, an attendee queried one of the requisite effects required to accomplish this look. As excerpt 41 illustrates below, following this question, the trainer clarifies the amount of “bronzer” artists should be wearing at work.
“Ok so, just to clarify, you can either do a double blush definitely very Ella heritage, it’s very Ella. I remember when I went to basic school my trainer said to me we should be able to line up lots of different artists from different brands and pick out the Ella girl with their blusher. It’s not like here underneath, it’s like right there. So, if you don’t currently wear blusher at work, from now on, you do. It is a very Ella makeup: it’s a very Ella finish”.

This excerpt details Georgia introducing the “very Ella” (lines 1 and 2) and, by extension, correct blusher effect attendee artists should wear on-counter. On line 2, she reminisces about blusher advice she previously received and how, some five years later, it remains a unique identifier of an employee: an “Ella girl” (line 3). Of particular interest is how, following this, with brush in hand Georgia demonstrates to attendees the actions which constitute the “double blush” (line 1) action (i.e. when a shade of blusher which most closely resembles the wearer’s natural cheek colour is overlaid with a brighter shade). Specifically, she demonstrates to fledgling artists how, by placing bronzer on the apple of their cheek (“right there”, line 4; the part of the cheek which hardens when one smiles), as opposed to “underneath” it (line 4), this effect can be accomplished. Interestingly, reinforcing the previously introduced ‘guidelines’, she then, with some levity, instructs attendees they need to follow these actions at home (“if you don’t currently wear blusher at work, now you do”, lines 4 and 5) and the brand founder is given as the reason why they need to do so (“it is a very Ella makeup: it’s a very Ella finish”, lines 5 and 6).

By delineating the constituent components required for “Ella makeup” or an “Ella finish”, in excerpt 41 a trainer is demarcating the specific actions artists need to adhere to (i.e. applying two types of bronzer on specific areas of the face) to accomplish the look. This therefore illustrates an attempt by a middle manager to use the founder’s favoured makeup look to direct, and exercise authoritative agency over, artists’ makeup actions and their bodies at home. Despite information about, and surveillance (through the mystery shop exercise introduced in section one) of, the requisite Ella “look”, artists across several regions often flouted this directive. For example, as field note 21 illustrates below, during a store visit in Greater London an artist’s idiosyncratic and non-conformist style of makeup, and her manager’s reaction to it, were noteworthy:
Field note 21: Greater London store visit, 11/11/2015

Georgia was asking the artist who looks a bit like (the singer) Adele (Jessie?) to try one of the new eye-palettes and a new lip colour. Georgia sat her down and was taking her makeup off with pads. She tried a new style of eye makeup and quite a bright orange lipstick. Jessie didn’t like it and was saying yuk to the lipstick and how she wanted to wipe it off. Georgia said to give it a try and half-seriously but in a jokey way to experiment with the new collection. In the end she conceded and put another colour on her. In fairness Jessie does stand out compared to Marianne and Emily and most of the other Ella artists I’ve seen so far. She has quite a heavy face of makeup and puts a lot more blusher by her cheekbones. On the whole, apart from Scarlett maybe, the others seem more natural looking.

Penned shortly after a visit to a department store counter, this field note details how an artist’s face of makeup was markedly different to both her on-counter colleagues that day (‘Marianne and Emily’, line 7) and the majority of Ella May artists observed in the previous two months of fieldwork. Appearing to wear a more ‘heavy’ (line 8) (i.e. more textured) face of makeup and a more noticeable amount of ‘blusher by her cheekbones’ (line 9) compared to other Ella May artists, this artist’s standout choice of makeup effect was similarly detected by her regional education manager (‘Georgia’, line 1). This incident is particularly interesting because, as the opening lines of the note detail, despite the artist’s protestations the manager intervenes and alters her makeup look by removing said ‘heavy’ makeup around the cheek and jaw areas with cotton ‘pads’. Following this, the manager further changes the artist’s look by drawing on a new lip colour and redefining her eye makeup. Considered alongside the guidelines in figure 16, field note 21 illustrates how a manager is using a ‘precept’ (Schatzki, 2002: 79) about the founder’s preferred look to direct her actions and rectify an artist’s makeup effect which she feels should have been accomplished at home. As another field note below details, two days after this store visit the regional education manager relayed this remonstration (Schatzki, 2002, 2012) to her sales counterpart:

Field note 22: Greater London store visit, 13/11/2015

One of the artists in Kingston is paranoid her face is big and so keeps putting “a big orange ring around it” to make it look thinner – Jessie – the one I’d met before? This “isn’t Ella” (Lucy) and Georgia said she tried to make her ‘more Ella’ by applying the new Sterling Knights range on her but she took it off after five minutes. Lucy seemed
shocked and appalled at this and said when on “Ella time...she should wear Ella as
she's representing the brand”

Recollected during breakfast in a café, field note 22 recalls a conversation between Greater London’s two regional managers prior to a joint store visit. Referring to the remonstration detailed above, the education manager contextualizes the incident and cites the artist’s insecurity around her appearance as a reason for it. Placed in the context of the previous note, the next part of the conversation is especially enlightening because, when informed of the incident, the sales manager (‘Lucy’, line 3) dissociates the artist’s illicit makeup effect from the brand founder by referring to an it ‘isn’t Ella’ (line 3) precept (Schatzki, 2002). Of related interest is how the education manager justifies her recent remedial actions on the grounds that she was trying to make the artist look ‘more Ella’ (line 3). During a store visit in a different region the following month, incongruences between artists’ personal makeup and the founder’s preferred look were, similarly, causes for concern. As field note 23 below illustrates, this was also an issue in the South East region:

Field note 23: South East store visit, 11/12/2015

Interestingly Oscar said to me and the store manager how one of the artists (the former Miss Finland) wasn’t wearing her makeup the Ella way (i.e. there was too much of it and she wasn’t wearing it right around the eyes). The two of them discussed who should “tell her” and Oscar took her by the hand, sat her down and touched up her makeup. He also did this with an Asian artist wearing a headscarf saying her foundation was too pale and her lipstick too dark. The Finland artist didn’t look too different to other artists, makeup wise, but the Asian lady’s makeup did look noticeably paler.

Sharing parallels with field notes 21 and 22 from Greater London, shortly after arriving on-counter and greeting artists, this extract details an area manager (‘Oscar’, line 1) identifying an artist’s face of makeup as too dense in appearance. Like their junior colleague one month earlier, this manager similarly remonstrates with the artist and takes corrective actions to redress her makeup. As field note 23 also details, shortly following this the manager deems another artist’s choice of foundation as noticeably too pale in colour to resemble skin and another on-counter intervention is made.
Taken together, field notes 21 to 23 are informative because they highlight how, after senior managers’ attempts to proactively circumscribe artists’ makeup looks through guidelines or directives (Schatzki, 2012), middle managers reactively take actions to control and discipline artists by effectuating a requisite Ella ‘look’ on them. Therefore, the Ella ‘look’, which *should* have agency over artists’ at-home makeup actions, does exercise authority on-counter with middle managers rectifying artists’ appearance. Artists’ deviance with regards to following the necessary makeup actions, activities, and tasks to effectuate this look was regularly referred to by studio and counter managers across different regions during interviews. As quotes from three managers in different studios illustrate, addressing artists’ makeup before they went on-counter was a frequent task:

**Excerpt 42: Stacey interview (Assistant Studio Manager), 03/02/2016**

1 “I say (to artists) “do you feel like your makeup is an Ella May makeup look today?”
2 “Have you got your ten-step Ella May makeup look on?” If maybe they don’t have
3 enough makeup on, “talk me through your ten steps” or “talk me through how you’ve
4 done your makeup today”. If it’s too full on, I would just say like “do you feel like that’s
5 a Ella May brow?” for example … So like I would say, so “do you have your corrective
6 concealer on?” If I found that their under eye didn’t have enough on. Or “what blusher
7 have you used?” “What’s your pop of colour and what’s your natural colour?” So I
8 would just go through it with them if they weren’t wearing it”.

Echoing the image guidelines introduced in figure 16, Stacey is referring to how, when team members unsatisfactorily effectuate an “Ella May makeup look” (line 2), she queries whether they have followed the makeup tasks stipulated in the “ten-step” (line 2; i.e. Makeup Lesson).

Specifically, if unsure about a team member’s look, she recalls requesting artists to guide her through the tasks they (should) have undertaken at home (“talk me through your ten steps”, line 3). After breaking down the constituent steps which comprise this “look”, like the managers in the Greater London and the South East regions did, this manager recalls taking remedial action whereby she personally goes through the ten-step makeup tasks with the culpable artists (“I would just go through it with them”; lines 7 and 8). Likewise, in excerpts 43 and 44 below, managers recalled how a daily roll-call formed part of their job whereby artists were screened and, if necessary, asked to take corrective actions in order to remedy an ineffectual ‘Ella look’:
Excerpt 43: Autumn interview (Studio Manager), 16/02/2016

“...we're always making sure that they [artists] look Ella. And we always tell each other if we don't. Not in a horrible way. We'll just be like, “Sit down, you haven't got any eyeliner on... we'll just need to add a tiny bit to look a bit more Ella”"

Excerpt 44: Jade interview (Studio Manager), 23/02/2016

“I'll do a quick once-over of everybody’s face. And if they [artists] don’t look, I hate to say it, but Ella. Or they don’t have enough lipstick on, I'll say to them, like; “you need to do that before we open up”. But again, there's always problems with, like, you know, people coming in without any makeup on"

Similarly, the high frequency with which artists’ looks required policing was referred to by Lucy who had general managerial responsibility for nine studios/department store counters:

Excerpt 45: Lucy interview (Regional Sales Manager), 15/04/2016

“We look at someone and say “your makeup isn’t Ella”, it’s the classic phrase: we use it all the time. So if someone’s makeup’s too heavy or if someone can’t see someone’s skin through their makeup, if someone doesn’t have the right eyeliner technique on it would be “that’s not the Ella way”"

In short, the Ella ‘look’ exercises, in the presence of managers at least, authoritative agency on-counter. Specifically, artists’ failure to comply with the brand guidelines (Schatzki, 2005) and follow the ‘ten-step’ makeup tasks required to simultaneously accomplish a ‘full-face’ of makeup and a ‘Fresh, Clean, and Modern’ look results in managerial interventions. Via directives (Schatzki, 2002) and remonstrations (Schatzki, 2012), managers of varying seniority attempt to ensure artists wear a stock and homogeneous ‘Ella look’ by following set makeup tasks preferably at home but, if necessary, also on-counter. In addition to effectuating (or not) an Ella ‘look’, for these managers artists’ makeup looks are also therefore emblematic of whether artists have followed the ten requisite makeup tasks/‘steps’ prescribed by the founder. Taken together, the ‘look’ and its constituent tasks exercise authoritative agency over artists’ actions and their bodies either prior to or during working hours.
As well as reproaching artists for transgressions like those above, managers also often referred to preferring to recruit artists who did, or had a disposition toward, effectuating the Ella ‘look’. For example, during an interview with the Greater London regional manager who intervened to redress the artist’s inappropriate makeup, applicants’ makeup style was raised as a recruitment consideration. As excerpt 46 below illustrates, the look purportedly preferred by the brand founder was cited as a barometer in the selection process:

Excerpt 46: Georgia interview (Regional Education Manager), 28/04/2016

1 “I think it’s like when we’re interviewing and things like that like the comment that comes up quite a lot is “ooh she’s so Ella”. Or like “she’s not very Ella, but we can Ella her”. And what that, for me what that means is maybe their makeup is a bit too heavy for an Ella look”.

Recalling conversations held after recruitment interviews, Georgia is referring to how, in her role as an educator, a rule of thumb/precept (Schatzki, 2005) is followed whereby applicants who do not currently wear a ‘Ella look’ can be trained (“we can Ella her”, lines 2 and 3) in the necessary makeup actions, activities, and tasks needed to do so. Similarly, in an interview with Georgia’s regional sales manager counterpart, candidates’ susceptibility to, if necessary, change their actions in order to effectuate this stock on-counter ‘look’ was raised:

Excerpt 47: Lucy interview (Regional Sales Manager), 15/04/2016

1 “Normally it takes people about three months to look the Ella way. So I’d say someone starts and you’ll interview them and you’ll look at them and think they’ve got potential. And then you know you see someone transition. Even myself, I’ve done it to the Ella way, the Ella makeup, you know. Since joining the brand my makeup, everything’s totally changed... But you kind of reflect the Ella image because you’re surrounded by people that... you kind of then end up merging into an Ella person”.

Like her colleague in excerpt 46, Lucy refers to judgements about applicants’ amenability to alter their makeup style on-counter. Mirroring her fellow recruiter’s previous “we can Ella her” comment, candidates’ “potential” to follow certain makeup actions (“Even myself, I’ve done it to the Ella way”, lines 3 and 4) so, if hired, they “look the Ella way” (line 1) was similarly broached as an assessment
criteria by this interview panel member. Recollecting her conversion as a new starter years earlier, Lucy recalls a “three month” (line 1) gestation period where she and other successful applicants typically become versed in practicing this specific “way” (line 1) of doing makeup and, by doing so, effectuate a stock ‘look’ on-counter. Interestingly, echoing this regional manager’s estimate, Paige (a Studio Manager) also referred to this timeframe when discussing how, within her team of approximately ten artists, new recruits became acculturated into performing the necessary actions required to emulate this look on-counter:

Excerpt 48: Paige interview (Studio Manager), 03/02/2016

“I think it takes a while to become an Ella girl. I think it’ll take maybe three months… we’d be like “no you need like pink because Ella loves pink” and they’re like “no, I’m only nude, I only wear nude”. And they’ll wear nude for a while and then it… You have to gently push them. Because if you force them they’ll hate it so you’ll be like “why don’t you just try this colour just for a bit” and kind of put them… Put it on them at [basic] school. Be like “how would you feel if you wore a bit of sparkle” and they’re like “well I only wear matte”. It’s like “but Ella loves sparkle”. I feel like but then as time goes on you kind of… Like we always say like you become an Ella girl. Everyone’s makeup changes once they start working for Ella”.

This manager recounts previous scenarios where, in a similar fashion to field notes 21 to 23 above, new artists have shown initial reticence to change their makeup look. Like the previously detailed instructions from, and remonstrations by, managers, the founder is similarly cited as the reason why artists need to change their actions (“because Ella loves pink”, line 2: “It’s like but Ella loves sparkle”, line 7). Paralleling her line manager’s comments in excerpt 47 (“you kind of then end up merging into a Ella person”), reference is made to an evolutionary process whereby new artists’ continual exposure to, training in (“put it on them at school”, lines 5 and 6) and reminders of, Ella makeup actions leads to their on-counter appearance, altering and, by extension, their metamorphosis as they transition and “become an Ella girl” (line 8).

During an interview with another Studio Manager in the South East region, the manipulation of artists’ appearance through selection and the makeup actions they receive training on was similarly raised:
Excerpt 49: Will interview (Studio Manager), 04/03/2016

“And if I stood everyone up there, you’d be able to pick that Ella girl out because it’s just the way... I don’t know; we’re very lucky in the fact that I think the interview process and the employment process and the way that we train kind of sculpts people”

Taken together excerpts 46 to 49 are instructive because they illustrate accounts of how the Ella ‘look’ is a precept (Schatzki, 2002) which exercises authoritative agency over managers’ decision making when they come to enlist new artists. Specifically, prospective artists’ propensity to change their makeup actions so their on-counter appearance resembles a homogeneous “Ella girl” was raised as holding influence over whether they were hired. In short, these recruitment examples offer an alternative perspective to a common extant conceptualization of nexuses of actions, activities, and tasks culminating in goals (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012). Specifically, they demonstrate how managers regularly approximate whether applicants’ makeup ‘looks’ can be unpicked using the ten basic makeup tasks/’steps’ previously detailed so that, if recruited, they can effectuate the founder’s preferred look.

To précis, this emblematizing subsection has detailed how a specific makeup look preferred by the founder is intended to, and does, exercise authoritative agency over artists’ makeup tasks on themselves both prior to, and during, work. Through directives and remonstrations (Schatzki, 2002, 2005, 2012), managers seek to delineate artists’ makeup actions and activities toward a ‘ten-step’ process of tasks in order for them to effectuate a specific ‘Fresh, Clean and Modern’ makeup image to customers. Specifically, for managers, artists’ personal on-counter makeup looks are emblematic of whether they follow the requisite ten tasks/’steps’ which constitute an Ella look. This subsection also detailed how, in addition to having authoritative agency on-counter, this ‘look’ exercises authority over applicant artists with middle managers using it as a precept (Schatzki, 2002) to gauge candidates’ propensity to be trained in the requisite actions, activities, and tasks needed to personally wear it. Teleological hierarchy is, therefore, a useful construct to help understand the authoritative effects practice has over activities which communicatively constitute and characterize organization. Following this emblematizing subsection, the next ‘proprietorial authority’ subsection details how another goal, achieving a ‘natural’ Ella look, exercises authority over artists by circumscribing how they demonstrate a particular product to customers.
“It’s so funny. So, when I first came to Ella May, people would say to me, like, my trainer, she would say “it’s not Ella yet”. And we’ve all spoken about it in the store. Particularly Jasmine. She was, like, people kept saying to me, “it’s not Ella”. And she was like, “it was driving me mad, because I’m using Ella May products and doing the makeup, but it’s still not Ella”. And I’ve probably got two thirds of them upstairs now to meet Ella. But it’s a very particular look and approach. And it’s quite difficult to explain to somebody why they’re not. Or why they are. Which has been a big part for my job. But it’s a certain way of blending eye liner, the way that the skin looks; it’s a certain level of service in the way that you do things”.

Recalling her experience as first an artist and now a studio manager, Jade describes how artists typically become acculturated into adopting specific makeup actions used by Ella on-counter. This ‘proprietorial authority’ subsection uses a Schatzkian (2002, 2006, 2012) understanding of how action-activity-task hierarchies function to help demonstrate how an inextricable tie between a particular task and a specific goal exercises authoritative agency over artists on-counter. Specifically, it demonstrates how artists come to have a practical understanding (i.e. ‘certain abilities related to actions of a practice’; Schatzki, 2000: 77) of the proprietary way the founder uses a specific makeup tool (a skin foundation stick) so that, post application, customers’ skin appears ‘natural’ and like ‘skin’. Using the coach’s exemplar above, in order to “meet Ella” (line 6; meet her artistry expectations) and accomplish a particular makeup look, managers required artists’ actions or, in the words of the artist above, their “service”, to replicate the founder’s. For example, as figure 18 illustrates below, while attending ‘basic school’ training the importance of following Ella’s specific makeup actions, activities, and tasks was relayed to new starters:
Taken from the basic school training ‘workbook’, figure 18 advises new starters how to perform the third step of ‘Ella’s … makeup lesson’ (detailed in figure 17). Specifically, in addition to ventriloquizing the founder (i.e. ‘Ella believes’), it informs attendees of the ‘looks like skin’ foundation effect Ella requires and, more tellingly for the purposes of this subsection, the actions
and activities she uses and, by extension, they should too to accomplish it. For example, within the ‘how to’ section of the page, fledgling artists are notified that a particular variant of foundation (the ‘stick’) is the founder’s ‘go-to’ product before instructions are provided about how to perform a specific (‘swatching’) task with it. If, after exhausting the mechanics of the ‘swatching’ process, artists have not accomplished the founder’s desired ‘natural’ effect they are then instructed to follow her example (i.e. ‘A good artist – including Ella’) and ‘swatch’ again with alternative foundation stick shades before a final variant is chosen and brushed over the customer’s face. This passage demonstrates a rule-based (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012) component to a makeup practice. Specifically, it specifies a series of basic actions and activities artists should accede to in order to effectuate the ‘skin’ component of the founder’s preferred makeup ‘look’. Relatedly, while instructing attendees about the early steps of the face chart application order during day one of ‘basic school’ training, the trainer expands on the information contained in figure 18 and, as detailed in excerpt 51 below, attributes the use of this makeup task to the founder:

**Excerpt 51: ‘Basic School’ training, Georgia (Lead Trainer), London Head Office, 08/03/2016**

1. Georgia “It’s always good to do a double swatch, not only with the top of the stick, but on the fresh bit with the forehead here. The forehead’s a really good place to get your true colour match. Just because it’s where you catch the most sun. That’s a good place to colour match and if you’re not sure between two colours, the best advice I ever got was Ella would always go for the slightly warm one. Ok. So if you’re really not sure between the two, if Ella was behind you she’d go for the warm one.

2. Jane Foundation?

3. Georgia Foundation. Yeah. So with your stick foundation if you’re struggling between the choice of two and you’ve swatched it on the head, you’ve got swatches all over the place and you’re still not sure. Go with the warm one, OK”.

Spoken shortly before ‘swatching’ an attendee who voluntarily plays the role of customer, Georgia is embellishing on the ‘how to’ instructions from figure 18 in front of attendees. After advising where the optimum place to “swatch” (line 1) foundation sticks on a customer’s face is (“the forehead”, line 2), she refers to the instructions and defers to the founder’s judgement when advising attendees about which colour shade to select. Specifically, on lines 4 to 6, attendees are informed that if they
are unsure which foundation shade most closely approximates their customer’s skin they should co-opt the founder’s opinion and, irrespective of the person’s skin tone in front of them, select the “slightly warm” (lines 5 and 6) hued foundation. Considered in conjunction with figure 18, excerpt 51 is interesting because attendees are being instructed to replicate the actions and activities the founder uses (i.e. select skin foundation sticks and then draw different colour foundation shades onto customers’ cheeks) to effectuate her favoured look. In essence, a makeup task (‘swatching’) is depicted as a sine qua non for accomplishing a goal (i.e. a ‘natural’ look) on-counter. ‘Swatching’ was a makeup task senior managers marked and monitored artists on. As figure 19 illustrates below, to ensure customers' skin resembled ‘skin’ at each step of a makeup lesson, artists were required to follow the actions and activities that make up the ‘swatching’ task.

**Figure 19: ‘Mystery shop programme notes’ extract, 28/11/2015**

**Colour swatching done to match the skin tone**

*Here we are looking at how thorough are when colour matching at each step. Artists should also talk the customer through this process and gain feedback*

*After skincare preparation the artist should colour swatch the skin to assess the right colour match.*

*Foundation stick swatched on areas of discolouration, forehead, cheeks, chin a minimum of three shades, this should also be done with feedback from the customer.*

*Face Powder (if applicable) a minimum of two shades swatched on the side of the face to discover which is skin tone correct.*

*Colour choice can vary on each product, a beige foundation does not always mean a beige concealer; we are looking at how natural all areas of the skin look once make up is applied.*

Lifted from the mystery shop programme notes, this figure details a ‘Colour swatching’ scenario which all artists nationwide could potentially be assessed on during quarter two. After adhering to the face chart order and applying ‘skincare’, artists are required to draw, in vertical lines, ‘a minimum of three’ different colour foundation shades over part(s) of a customer’s face with a stick. By ‘swatching’ foundation, artists and customers can see and discuss which colour shade most closely approximates the latter’s natural skin tone and vis-à-vis looks like ‘skin’, as shown by artists’ Facebook posts of themselves to the internal group in figure 20 below.
Figure 20: Artists' Facebook posts
Following, and potentially because of, the mystery shop exercise, artists were often observed adhering to the actions and activities which comprise the swatching task during store visits. For example, as the mystery shop feedback for a store in the West End region below details, an artist was awarded two marks by the “customer”/shopper for their use of this task and the effect it produced.

Figure 21: ‘Mystery shop: visit breakdown’ extract, 28/11/2015

Corresponding to the guidelines introduced in figure 18, sub-section ‘3.2’ of figure 21 details a mystery shopper’s feedback on an artist’s ‘swatching’ task. As this sub-section documents, after using three colours, the artist ‘settled’ on a foundation shade that, once applied onto the customer’s/”shopper’s” skin, was deemed to approximate the founder’s requisite ‘nice natural look’ and comprised one of the two marks available. Relatedly, on several store visits, artists were regularly observed ‘swatching’ customers’ skin during the preliminary stages of lessons. Paralleling the mystery shopper’s feedback above, this task was often used by artists to exemplify to customers or to themselves which shade was most natural and, de facto, ‘Ella’ as field notes 24 and 25 detail below:
Field note 24: Greater London store visit, 08/12/2015

1. She swatched her skin using 3 shades and asked the lady to agree which she thought looked most natural and "you"

Field note 25: Greater London store visit, 05/02/2016

1. With sticks she put 3 stripes over her cheeks and picked the most natural looking colour which I think was actually called "natural";

On occasion, as field note 26 illustrates, artists deferred to ‘swatching’ despite seemingly being capable of approximating a customer’s skin tone through sight alone:

Field note 26: South East store visit, 18/02/2016

1. (Jay) said she could bet the colour she’d be but she’d swatch three. Used a stick to draw down the side of the ladies cheeks and asked her which she thought was the closest.
2. Seemed a bit of a pointless exercise as one was obvious

These mystery shopper and personal observations highlight artists displaying a practical understanding of how to perform a particular task to achieve a specific goal: effectuating a ‘natural’ looking skin effect after foundation has been applied.

Related to a teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012), across several makeup counter observations some customers requested a makeup task that is antithetical to the ‘natural’ skin goal both Ella and artists aim to achieve through swatching. Commonly referred to by artists and customers alike as ‘contouring’, these customers sought to accomplish an effect which alters the structural appearance of their facial features. For example, in the words of an area manager below, a typical request from customers was to modify the look of their “nose” (line 3) and “cheek bones” (line 3):
Excerpt 52: Oscar interview (Area Manager), 17/05/2016

“You have lots of clients asking for contouring and my first question will be what are you trying to achieve with this? And they will tell me, I want to do this and I want to do this. I want a thinner nose: I want more chiselled cheek bones”.

To realize the contouring effect, customers often request artists to, in essence, repurpose the skin foundation sticks within lessons. Specifically, artists are often asked to use these sticks (which are overtly lighter and darker than a customer’s natural ‘swatching’ shade) to “chisel” (line 3) out or to give greater definition to particular facial features. As Jess explained during an interview, a minimum of three sticks of varying shades were required to set this optical illusion:

Excerpt 53: Jess interview (Artist), 19/04/2016

“Yes the sticks are meant to just be used as a foundation all over, but the way that contouring is online, you have like funny colours. So you’d have your natural colour, a dark colour, which is about four shades darker, and then the lighter colour. So ideally you’re wanting three colours, three foundation stick colours”.

Alluding to the intended “all over” (line 1; i.e. full-coverage) purpose of a foundation stick, this artist is referring to how, influenced by images available “online” (line 2), customers often request foundation sticks to be demonstrated, in both quantity and shade, in extremis by artists to accomplish a different (i.e. ‘contouring’) task. For example, during ‘basic school’ training, the issue of foundation sticks being used by artists on customers to achieve effects which deviate from Ella’s ‘natural’ look was queried by a new starter. As the opening line of excerpt 54 below illustrates, drawing on her brief on-counter experiences, an artist recalls how customers regularly enquire about using foundation sticks to contour:

Excerpt 54: ‘Basic School’ training, Kylie (Artist), London Head Office, 10/03/2016

Kylie

“A lot of people ask about the skin foundation stick for contouring…

Georgia

And it is, so what you say is, you never say to someone “I can’t sell this to you. Because we don’t do that at Ella”, sell it! And usually they’re makeup artists, and they’re quite savvy with it. What you can do, is say is: “We
Following Kylie’s recounting of her on-counter experience, Georgia takes the opportunity to clarify to new starters that they can sell skin foundation sticks for contouring but they are not allowed to demonstrate (“demo”, line 5) them on customers for this purpose. In scenarios such as these, attendees are advised to ‘swatch’ (i.e. “do a foundation match”, line 7) to find a customer’s “base colour” (line 8) and from this advise them on (but not apply) two foundation sticks: one two shades lighter and the other two shades darker. Alongside this technical advice, attendees are provided with a rationale to use with prospective ‘contouring’ customers for why they are unable to fulfil their request: “we don’t actually train it at Ella” (lines 4 and 5). This example highlights how, due to two related goals (‘natural’ looking skin and an Ella makeup ‘look’), a product is proprietarily wed to a specific (swatching) task. Reversing Schatzki’s (2002, 2006, 2012) conception of teleological hierarchy, this demonstrates how an inextricable task-goal tie vetoes artists using a product for a task that would result in a goal (‘chiselled’ looking skin) which is antithetical to, and would compromise, another goal: transitioning Ella’s favoured ‘look’ onto customers’ faces. Echoing this justification, while observing several lessons with typically younger customers prior to ‘basic school’ training, artists similarly evoked the brand’s founder when explaining to customers why they would not be using the skin foundation stick to attempt a contoured effect:

Field note 27: Greater London store visit, 03/02/2016

Lady (20ish?) asked Alice if she did contouring. She asked her what she was after and the lady showed an Instagram(?) page I think with a model’s face on. Alice said not strictly no but she’d show her Ella’s take on contouring and make her skin glowy. Started with a gel cream from the normal(?) range and rubbed it into her cheeks and forehead in a circular way. Applied a moisture balm with her hands to illuminate the skin and give her that high press (?) or fresh (?) finish.

Field note 27 highlights how a customer arrives for a lesson expecting that a contoured look they had seen on-line (the social media platform ‘Instagram’) could be replicated on them. The coach
deflects this request by offering an alternative ‘glowy’ effect advocated by the founder which, after the young lady assents to through a confirmatory nod, she duly begins to perform. Likewise, some two weeks after this store visit, a department store coach similarly ventriloquized Ella when dissuading a customer from contouring, as field note 28 below details:

Field note 28: Greater London store visit, 16/02/2016

Teenager came in asking for a contoured look. Cathy said “Ella ‘doesn’t really believe in contouring’ and “she had high cheekbones so didn’t really need it”. Said “Ella does a softer contour and prefers to highlight through strobing” and asked if it sounded OK. They chatted about what the lady wanted and C said something along the lines of “you want a bronzed and dewy look”. C asked if she was ok with me face charting but the lady didn’t seem fussed. She pressed a clear lotion on her cheeks and forehead and used two different cream types on her face and eyes with her hands

This field note highlights how another coach introduced the brand founder’s stock opinion (‘doesn’t really believe in contouring’, lines 1 and 2), alongside her personal one (‘she had high cheekbones’, line 2), when deterring a customer. Paralleling field note 27, the coach similarly offers a related task (‘strobing’, line 3) which the founder purportedly favours to the customer. Following a brief consultation about alternatives to contouring, the coach proceeds with this revised course of action and the lesson commences with the application of skincare. Whilst discussing customers’ contouring requests during interviews, several artists similarly recalled ventriloquizing the brand founder to discourage customers who aspired to be contoured. For example, during another interview, an artist referred to levying the founder’s beliefs to counteract such requests:

Excerpt 55: Layla interview (Artist), 12/04/2016

“A really good way of approaching it is, well first of all I say: “We don’t really do contouring because Ella believes in, you know, like, you’re pretty as you are and you don’t want to change the way that you look and contouring does that”.”

In this interview, Layla recalls how Ella’s opinion (“Ella believes [...] you’re pretty as you are”, line 2) is used to negate customers’ contouring requests. Similarly, during another interview an artist
recalled how, when customers asked for contouring, another of the founder’s purported stock views on beauty supplanted their own:

Excerpt 56: Eleanor interview (Artist), 13/05/2016

“We have a lot of women come in and then they go: “I want to know how to contour my face”, and we’ll say, I’ll say: “Ella doesn’t believe in changing the shape, but we’ll show you how to use a bronzer and a product and show you how to get the effect without using four or five different things”.”

Mirroring the recollected approach of the artist in excerpt 55 and field notes 27 and 28, Eleanor recalls how, by ventriloquizing the brand founder (“Ella doesn’t believe in changing the shape [of your face]”; line 2) customer requests for contouring are nullified. Like the approach recounted by her colleague, she then recollects how an alternative task is advised which renders the “four or five different things” (line 4; i.e. skin foundation sticks) required for contouring redundant. Echoing the advice given to fledgling artists during training in excerpt 54, several artists recalled how customers who were insistent on contouring were sold, but not shown how to use, skin foundation sticks for contouring:

Excerpt 57: Jess interview (Artist), 19/04/2016

“The foundation stick we sell, I think a lot of people online are using it to contour and then customers come in asking for it. And we’ll say “to be honest, it’s not sold for that because it’s not something Ella believes in. She believes in enhancing natural features, not changing the shape of your face. However, yes, it’s a good product. I can’t demonstrate on you how to use it. I can advise you on colours”.”

This excerpt, set within a teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012), highlights how two goals (what “Ella believes in”, line 3 and “enhancing natural features”, lines 3 and 4) preclude Jess from using a product (foundation stick) to perform a contour task on customers (“I can’t demonstrate on you how to use it”, lines 4 and 5). In essence, she is recalling how customers who are adamant they want contouring are supplied with the ends but not the means to do so.

Similarly, as excerpts 58 and 59 detail below, artists made reference to how they were unwilling to break with protocol and illicitly use the skin foundation sticks:
Excerpt 58: Keely interview (Artist), 13/05/2016

1 “We’re like, “okay, fine, if that’s what you want; this is the colour”… but we don’t actually, you know, teach and show them how to do it, because that’s not what we do”

Excerpt 59: Layla interview (Artist), 12/04/2016

1 “If they want a stick and just want to know what shade it is I will say, “yes this is the best shade for contouring but, unfortunately, I can’t apply it for you’’

Considered alongside field notes 27 and 28 on (the absence of) contouring, excerpts 55 to 59 illustrate how, through ventriloquizing the founder, artists use an antithetical goal (i.e. an unnatural skin effect) to justify why an alternative task (i.e. drawing on different foundation stick colour shades) cannot be attempted on customers. In addition to prescribing the use of a specific ‘swatching’ task, the founder’s purported ‘natural’ look therefore exercises authoritative agency over artists by proscribing how, in some lessons, a specific (stick) product could be sold to the customer to contour with, but could not be demonstrated by the artist for this purpose. Like excerpt 54, these interview snippets highlight how, although two goals thwart artists’ demonstrating a foundation stick product for contouring, a commercial imperative necessitates that artists may sell the product for this purpose.

This proprietorial authority subsection has drawn on a Schatzkian understanding of how action-activity-task hierarchies operate to understand how practice makes a difference to activities which communicatively constitute organization. Specifically, it has demonstrated how a specific (swatching) task’s inextricable tie to goals (i.e. ‘natural’ skin and the Ella ‘look’) exercise authoritative agency over artists by demarcating the proprietary way they may use a particular (stick foundation) product. It has also exemplified how, despite customer demand, these goals have an authoritative hold over artists by demarcating the makeup tasks they are able to demonstrate with this product on-counter. In turn, the next ‘teleo-authorizing’ subsection utilizes teleological hierarchy and demonstrates how, through a hierarchy of makeup actions, activities, and tasks, a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice is constituted. It shows how this practice and the
goals behind it exercise authoritative agency by circumscribing artists’ autonomy to decide the order in which they apply products onto customers.

5.4.3. Teleo-authorizing

Excerpt 60: Millie interview (Artist), 24/02/2016

“...if you then say “tadah, this is the Ella way”, well like, okay, great but I still don’t know how to do it. So you need to talk about why she does that and application and everything in between, so they understand why it’s the Ella way at the end. Step by step. Which is why you have the face chart essentially”.

Taken from Millie’s interview, the “Ella way” is a reference to a sequence of makeup tasks the founder purportedly uses and artists are required to follow. This final ‘teleo-authorizing’ subsection shows how artists regularly adhere to a series of “step by step” (lines 3 and 4) tasks within a range of makeup lessons. It demonstrates how, through regularly adhering to a series of makeup tasks (like ‘swatching’), a normative Ella makeup practice is constituted. In turn, it uses teleological hierarchy to demonstrate how artists perpetuate this practice because of the goal behind it (i.e. to incrementally build and not compromise a ‘natural’ ‘Ella’ makeup effect on customers). It then shows how this practice and its associated goal exercise authoritative agency over artists by restricting their autonomy to decide the order in which they perform makeup tasks on-counter. As referred to above, the “step(s)” (lines 3 and 4) that artists are required to follow in makeup lessons are detailed on a “face chart” (line 4). This chart reminds artists on-counter and customers once they have left the counter of the founder’s prescribed sequence of makeup tasks. Completed by an artist while on a store visit, figure 22 shows a completed ‘face chart’ for a makeup lesson personally experienced during the third month of fieldwork:
Figure 22: ‘Face chart’ (South East store visit), 20/11/2015
Figure 23: Author's makeup lesson (South East store visit), 20/11/2015
As the face chart in figure 22 details, of the variety of lessons available to customers, this particular ‘Skin’ lesson involves the sequential application of various products within the ‘skincare’ category first (one of which, ‘face cream’, is shown being applied in figure 23 above), followed by the administering of two makeup products within the ‘Corrector and Concealer’ category. After the two ‘steps’ outlined in figure 22, during more makeup orientated lessons, artists are required to continue following the ‘face chart’ order by applying products chronologically (i.e. top-to-bottom) in categorical sequence (e.g. ‘foundation’ should be applied after ‘corrector and concealer’ but prior to ‘powder/bronzer’). As figure 24 below shows, artists’ introduction of, and adherence to, the face chart was also a mystery shop criterion.

Figure 24: ‘Mystery shop programme notes’ extract, 28/11/2015

(3 b) educated with the face chart throughout and around a mirror

Here we are monitoring the use of the education tools that should be used in conjunction with the practical lesson. A customised face chart should be introduced at the beginning of the lesson, and explained as the education tool, this will be filled in as the lesson is happening at each step.

Taken from a guidance document provided to mystery shoppers, figure 24 details how artists are judged on whether they note the products used on a customer ‘at each step’ of the lesson on the chart. This is of interest because, via the face chart or as it is otherwise referred to an ‘education tool’, senior education managers monitor artists’ adherence to a set sequence of makeup tasks during lessons where each task complements the one that went before and the one to follow. Relatedly, in addition to receiving a makeup lesson, while observing makeup lessons for nine months, discernible patterns in artists’ tasks which closely approximated the chronological and categorical face chart order were regularly apparent. For example, as a field note written during a store visit in Greater London exemplifies, while shadowing an artist during a lesson, a course of action similar to the one stipulated on the face chart was evident. Field note 29, penned one month after the lesson personally experienced, is presented below:
Field note 29: Greater London store visit, 16/12/2015

She pressed a clear lotion on her cheeks and forehead and used two different cream types on her face and eyes with her hands. Some sort of balm was used next. She drew/swatched three different foundation sticks on her cheeks and both agreed she was a sandy(?) colour and went under and around the eyes with corrector and concealer. She said how it’s yellow based to even out the blue and pink under the eye (similar to April but then again they’re both trained by Georgia). She used a powder across her face, neck and down towards her top. Then used a bronzer and asked her to smile to find the cheek’s apple. C said it looked less severe and asked me to pass a caddie mirror to the lady to see if she agreed. Put gloss on her lips next I think. She said something along the lines of she’d do an Ella smokey and put one greeny shadow up to her crease with her fingers and a brush. A black eyeliner (a gel one from the glass pot) and a mascara were used, followed by a pencil across the eyebrows.

This field note is a synopsis of an artistry coach’s approximate thirty-five minute lesson on a makeup counter within a department store. Recollected shortly after the lesson, it details how the coach’s actions on a young lady (estimated to be in her early twenties) closely, although not perfectly, resembled the face chart order. For example, the lesson commences with three skincare products being applied: ‘clear lotion’ (line 1; which, with experience, could later be more accurately identified as ‘tonic’), followed by an eye cream, and then a face cream. After this, the coach applies two types of makeup product ‘foundation’ (line 3) and ‘corrector and concealer’ (lines 4 and 5) in the opposite order to the face chart before returning to its linear sequence by applying a ‘powder’ (line 7) and ‘then… a bronzer’ (line 7). Omitting blusher from the lesson steps, the coach then draws lip gloss on the lady prior to applying eye products as delineated on the face chart: shadow (‘greeny shadow’, line 11); a ‘black eyeliner’ (line 11); and then ‘mascara’ (line 12) from the category of the same name. Although this artist did not follow the face chart order precisely, the chief product categories which comprise it and, by extension, Ella’s order of product application are (in the main) sequentially being adhered to. Like the lesson personally experienced, this extract is of interest because it exemplifies how, with a different artist at another time and place, a teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002; 2006; 2012) was apparent within a makeup lesson and a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice could be identified. And, as field note 30 details below, during another department store counter visit in a different region a distinguishable teleological hierarchy to artists’ makeup actions was similarly apparent:
She started with hydrating eye cream and said this would act as a base for CC and used face cream from the same range which would help the foundation to ‘sit’. N patted eye cream on parts the lady pointed out were darker and used semi-circular motions to press in face cream. Lady seemed to know her foundation shade but N said she’d double check and picked two shades to swatch by her cheek (maybe again because Oscar was around?). Asked the lady which one she thought and they both went with the nudey one. She dotted this on under and around the eyes and drew stripes on the cheeks and brushed them away. Put a lip-liner of some description on, then a brownish/mauve eyeshadow, a gel-liner and some mascara. Eyes are generally the hardest part to observe, especially on this counter, as they have two or three things done to them in a close space.

Written shortly after shadowing an assistant manager on-counter, field note 30 details a middle-aged lady having skincare then makeup products primarily applied in face chart order. Like field note 29, two skincare category products are applied first with the latter’s use justified by the manager on the grounds it would act as ‘base for CC’ (line 1; i.e. ‘colour correct’ cream): products which were subsequently swept onto the customer’s face. Following this, and despite the lady’s apparent knowledge of her foundation shade, the manager ‘swatch[es]’ (line 5) lines of foundation colour onto the lady’s cheek with a skin foundation stick. Mirroring the previous field note, the manager skips some of the face chart categories before continuing to work her way down it by applying a ‘lip-liner’ (line 8) from the ‘lips’ category. The manager then applies two products from the ‘eyes’ category (‘brownish/mauve eyeshadow’; line 9, and ‘gel-liner’; line 9) prior to applying ‘mascara’ (line 9). Although this lesson did not exactly replicate its pattern, the manager’s tasks closely resembled the chief sequential characteristics of the face chart whereby: skincare is administered first; followed by products around the forehead and cheeks area; then lip colour; and finally the eyes are painted. Relatedly, on numerous other store visits, a detectable pattern to artists’ order of tasks was apparent with ‘skincare’ products typically being applied first (e.g. ‘K started by smearing hydrating face cream over her cheeks’, Field note 31: South East store visit, 24/02/2016; ‘She quickly took off what she had on with tonic and pads and applied hydrating cream (from conference) with her fingers’, Field note 32: South East store visit, 12/04/2016); products in the “eyes” category often used last (e.g. ‘She finished with a light silver/mauve eyeshadow, black eyeliner and black mascara’, Field note 33: Greater London store visit, 14/12/2015); and products from the face chart’s ‘corrector and concealer’ to the ‘brows’ categories sandwiched in-between.
Field notes 29 to 33 highlight how, at numerous times and places, the sequential order of Ella’s makeup tasks detailed on the facechart coalesce to form a teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012) to lessons. In turn, a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice is constituted which holds authoritative agency over artists by stipulating a stepwise series of tasks they must adhere to during lessons. Indeed, while interviewing one of the artists observed above, the regularity with which her and other artists’ tasks were performed according to face chart order was emphasized:

Excerpt 61: Hannah interview (Featured Artist), 11/05/2016

“You always start at the beginning, but depending on what lesson they’re booked in for you might stop at a certain point. So if you were doing Ella’s ten-step lesson then obviously you would go through the whole of the face chart. But say for example you were doing a glowing beauty, yes you will do skin care but then you wouldn’t go into as much detail. If you wanted ultimate skin you wouldn’t go into lips and cheek”.

Hannah is referring to how, depending on which of the ten lessons the customer has pre-booked for (e.g. “glowing beauty”, line 4, is one type), an artist will sequentially follow the face chart but not necessarily complete it entirely. For example, referring to the “ultimate skin” (line 5) lesson (personally experienced and documented in figures 22 and 23), Hannah describes how she will cease the lesson at a set point because the emphasis is on treating the customer’s skin (for example, in the lesson personally experienced, dry skin and dark under-eye circles were discussed as issues). When artists were questioned about the constancy with which their tasks were sequential in lessons, one exception to the categorical order observed was regularly raised:

Excerpt 62: Alicia interview (Artist), 19/04/2016

“With the face-chart that is the order that you should follow for Ella. So, start skincare, and then it’s base, colour… The only way you wouldn’t is if they want a really really dramatic look. You know, by blending loads of eye shadow is just going to fall straight down onto your foundation. So, like nine times out of ten, you’d follow it”.

In this excerpt, Alicia refers to instances where a customer requests a “really, really dramatic look” (lines 2 and 3) around the eyes which deviates from the ‘Fresh, Clean and Modern’ Ella ‘look’ introduced in figure 16. She describes how following the sequential face chart order in these
circumstances would be counterproductive because by “blending loads of eyeshadow” (line 3; a product included in the final ‘eyes’ step on the face chart) there is a risk that this product will “fall straight down” (lines 3 and 4) upon, and ruin, the earlier “foundation” (line 4) work. Similarly, during other interviews, customer requests for a more extreme makeup effect on their eyes was raised as the exception to the face chart rule (whereby eye makeup is applied last), as Sarah’s interview excerpt below exemplifies:

**Excerpt 63: Sarah interview (Artist), 19/04/2016**

1. “I think the only time when I wouldn’t think that it was very consistent was, when a customer comes in and they want a really smokey eye. And if you look at the way that a face chart actually works, it goes from her skin colour onto her concealer. And then it goes to a base, and then her eyebrows and then her eyes…Granted there is going to be a lot of smoking that you need to use with a darker eye shadow, and all that beautiful concealer work that you’ve just done underneath the eye is going to get wrecked… That is the only time when I would think to say that things aren’t really consistent. Other than that, when you’re actually doing the full makeup you would follow that because that is the correct way to put your makeup on”.

Like the “nine times of ten” ratio provided by her colleague in excerpt 62, Sarah refers to the rare (“the only time”, line 1) “smokey eye” (line 2) instances when the face chart sequence ordinarily followed is deviated from. Resonating with the various lessons observed, with the exception of one atypical customer request, this artist refers to how adherence to the face chart order is the norm and is, in the main, “consistent” (line 8). These examples demonstrate how, by sequentially performing set makeup tasks, artists (re)constitute a teleological hierarchy and a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice within makeup lessons. In addition to the regularity of artists’ tasks being of interest, the goal they are orientated toward is also instructive. For example, as the extract from a question and answer session held on the final day of ‘basic school’ training in excerpt 64 exemplifies, artists were instructed to sequentially apply products the way the founder does in order to perpetuate and not subvert her favoured ‘natural’ look:
Georgia: “Lenee has done Ella’s makeup ... so I called her once and was like “tell me what does Ella actually wear”, ‘cus I just wanted to know and she uses all of the extra skincare range she made for herself, and she layers so much skincare so and she has the faceoil on her all day, that she just retops up face oil, ‘cus she’s really dry, but all she does is corrector concealer, a bit of foundation stick around the nose there, a bit on the chin, and then pot rouge on the cheek, lip, if she’s got interviews she does liner otherwise it’s just a bit of mascara... that is it.

Attendee: Doesn’t she wear eyeshadow?

Georgia: If she does interviews she does... but that’s why the facechart is set out like that because she believes that you should start your makeup with what you can do quickly, and if you need to leave the house you still look good, so corrector concealer first always”.

In the first line, the trainer informs fledgling artists how a Pro artist has personally “done” (line 1) (i.e. applied) the founder’s makeup. Then, in (largely) sequential face chart order, the trainer regales the specific products Ella purportedly uses. For example, firstly she “layers so much skincare” (lines 3 and 4), then “corrector and concealer” (line 5) before sparingly using a (skin foundation) “stick” (line 6). Progressing through the linear categorical face chart order, Georgia then relays how Ella uses “pot rouge” (lines 6 and 7) (from the ‘blush’ category) before moving to her “lip” (line 7). Referring to everyday usage, on line 8 the trainer refers to how the founder typically uses “mascara” but, on occasions such as television “interviews” (line 7), she will strictly adhere to the order and apply one of the ‘eyes’ category products; “liner” (line 7). Interestingly, after providing clarification to an attendee’s question, Georgia informs attendees that the founder’s order of makeup tasks is why the face chart that they and all artists are required to follow on-counter and before work is sequentially “set out” (line 12). Echoing the ventriloquism (“she believes”, line 13) of the founder regularly experienced in training and on-counter, attendees are then informed of the founder’s rationale for why she follows this sequence: in case of interruption (“if you need to leave the house”, line 14) she (and the customer) can still ”look good” (line 14). Following this, attendees are instructed this is the reason why, when they return to counter, they should follow the chart’s order and, after skincare products are used, apply “corrector concealer first always” (line 15).

Excerpt 64 demonstrates a goal behind the structured tasks which communicatively constitute a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice. It also extends extant understandings of this concept by showing
how these tasks are informed by, and perpetuate, two nested goals: ensuring customers receive a
standardized level of ‘Ella’ service which, in turn, incrementally builds the founder’s standard
‘natural’ look on them. Relatedly, during Georgia’s interview, this goal was similarly regaled:

Excerpt 65: Georgia interview (Regional Education Manager), 28/04/2016

“I know when I first started there was a big emphasis on the order in which you apply the
makeup. Like when I went to my Basic School, which is now The Academy, I’m not allowed
to say that word anymore, I remember a massive thing I took away from that was you have
to do it in the order of the face chart, keep it simple for the customer. And Ella does it in
that order because she does it in the order to, like if she needs to leave the house in a rush
how is she going to look her best in a quick rush, because she is like a mum of three. Like,
I think the point of it was to be really relatable to the customer and say “if you stick to this
order, if you need to do it in a rush you’re going to be fine, it’s what Ella does”... There is a
way, like skin care you colour match and then it’s concealer first and then foundation.
Whereas a lot of, I know when I was in makeup school it was foundation always first and
makeup, it’s a silly little thing but yes. That’s an Ella thing that got drummed in when I was
at basic school”

Drawing on her induction training, Georgia recollects how the same “it’s what Ella does” (line 8)
rationale for the sequential order of makeup application detailed in excerpt 64 was proffered some
eight years earlier. The manager recalls how her cohort were similarly informed that the founder’s
personal circumstance (“Ella does it in that order because… if she needs to leave the house in a
rush”, lines 4 and 5) was the reason why, both then and now, they recommend customers follow
the face chart: “if you stick to this order, if you need to do it in a rush you’re going to be fine, it’s
what Ella does” (lines 7 and 8). Following this attribution, the artist then refers to the order’s
uniqueness by contrasting it with one typically taught at “makeup school” (line 10) where
“foundation [was] always [applied] first” (line 10), but (as instructed at ‘basic school’) “concealer first
then foundation” (line 19) is an “Ella thing” (line 11). Similarly, as excerpt 66 below illustrates,
during an interview with a counter manager, the ‘Ella’ goal behind artists’ order of tasks was
proffered:

Excerpt 66: Tara interview (Counter Manager), 19/04/2016

“Before working for Ella, because a lot of people do this, I always do my eye makeup
before doing lip and cheek and when I came to work for her I was like this is weird,
we’re doing lip and cheek beforehand. So when I asked it was explained to me that we do it in that certain order because every stage is enhancing...It was initially explained to me if the fire alarm went off and I had to go outside, if I’ve got my eye makeup on but I’ve got no lips and cheeks on I look half done. But they were like if you lip and cheek is done and you’ve got no eye makeup on still, that still works...So it’s just saying at every stage just add an additional stage...Yes, so we’re enhancing at each stage, that’s why we go through it in that specific order that Ella’s put together”.

Mirroring the comments made during, and about the training above, another experienced on-counter manager refers to the distinctiveness of the order of artists’ makeup tasks. Drawing on experiences prior to working for the brand, Tara describes how the required order is the reverse of an industry norm: “I always [used to] do my eye makeup before doing lip and cheek” (lines 1 and 2). Paralleling previous explanations, another potential disruption (“if the fire alarm went off”, line 5) is provided as the rationale for why artists’ tasks across counters are sequentially performed. Specifically, if a customer’s makeup application inadvertently ceased then “because every stage [of artists’ face chart actions] is enhancing” (line 4) their makeup look would still appear ‘natural’ and, vis-à-vis, ‘Ella’. Like excerpts 64 and 65, the brand founder is again recollected as the reason why she and her colleagues sequentially perform makeup tasks: “that’s why we go through it in that specific order that Ella’s put together” (lines 9 and 10). Excerpts 64 to 66 are instructive because they highlight how, over time, artists are trained to disregard more orthodox makeup tasks they have previously been accustomed to and instead adhere to the founder’s sequential tasks. This demonstrates how these tasks not only have a goal behind them, but that the goal exercises authoritative agency over artists’ tasks. Specifically, a requirement to incrementally build and not compromise a specific ‘natural’ Ella look restricts artists’ leeway to draw on their artistry experiences prior to working for the company and personally decide the order in which products should be applied onto customers.

This teleo-authorizing subsection has demonstrated how, within several of the ten makeup lessons available to customers on-counter, artists’ regular adherence to a sequential pattern of product application organizes their makeup tasks into a normative ‘Ella’ makeup practice. It then detailed how this stepwise makeup practice perpetuates the goal behind these tasks (i.e. to incrementally build, and not compromise, a ‘natural’ ‘Ella’ makeup effect on customers). Drawing on Schatzki’s
(2002, 2006, 2012) view of how a practice is hierarchically ordered, it showed how, by circumscribing artists’ autonomy to decide their sequence of makeup tasks, a practice exercises authority over activities which communicatively constitute organization.

5.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has illustrated how the founder of Ella May is communicatively constituted as an authoritative omnipresence within organizing. It has demonstrated how multifarious constitutions of Ella May (the person) become routinized and, as a consequence, exercise authority over activities and practices which re-enact and reproduce Ella May (the organization). In particular, it has shown how, through ventriloqual (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetic (e.g. Hancock, 2005), and practice-based (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) constitutions, the founder makes a difference to the makeup practices, looks and ethos which constitute and characterize Ella May as a beauty organization.

Specifically, the ventriloquism section showed how, despite customers’ idiosyncratic makeup needs and requests, artists often supplanted their own situationally specific opinion by verbally ‘reciting’ the founder’s generic deontic “Ella says” text (Cooren and Taylor, 2007; Taylor, 2006) on-counter. This section highlighted how, through ‘policing’ and ‘rehearsing’, artists were primed to uniformly and universally utter the founder’s stock opinion. Finally, it demonstrated the differential ways ventriloqual puppet-puppeteer acts exercise authority on counter with certain customer “audiences”.

In turn, the aesthetics section highlighted how depictions of the founder as an aesthetic style guru regularly exercise authority over managers and artists as these parties seek to emulate Ella’s aesthetic taste through their (internal and public) provision and presentation of select artefacts. The section also detailed managers’ two-fold efforts to 'synonymize' the founder with a specific aesthetic taste and to depict her as ‘surveilling’ artists’ efforts to imitate and replicate “it”. It closed by illustrating how managers and artists ‘propagandized’ this aesthetic by landscaping (Gagliardi, 1996, 2006; Hancock, 2005) physical and social-media spaces with stylized artefacts and, on occasions where “illicit” artefacts were physically present, an-aestheticizing (Carter and Jackson, 2000; Strati, 2007) social-media records by expunging any “evidence” which could sully the founder’s aesthetic taste. This section showed how the appeal of an aesthetic not only represents
an organization: an aesthetic makes an authoritative difference to activities which communicatively constitute and characterize organization.

Finally, the practice section highlighted how Ella’s approach to applying makeup often circumscribes artists’ makeup practices both privately and publicly. The first ‘emblematizing’ subsection demonstrated how artists’ on-counter makeup image emblemizes to managers whether they follow the founder’s requisite sequential approach to makeup application on themselves. Next, the ‘proprietal authority’ subsection highlighted how a particular product’s inextricable tie to a makeup “look” favoured by the founder meant artists could not demonstrate a makeup task often requested by customers. Finally, the ‘teleo-authorizing’ subsection showed how the goals behind Ella’s normative makeup practice (i.e. to incrementally build and not compromise her favoured “natural” makeup look) bound artists’ autonomy to decide the order of their makeup tasks during lessons. The next chapter discusses the findings in relation to the literature review and constructs the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge. In addition, numerous insights are crafted which further knowledge about how communication constitutes organization.
6.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter discusses and builds-up the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge concerning how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely makes a difference to actors’ day-to-day actions and interactions. This is achieved by crafting the concept of a ‘dominant text’, which is defined as:

- A series of orchestrated texts which simultaneously exercise authority by routinizing the daily workings of organization.

The opening three sections of the chapter discuss the communicative constitution and routinization of multiple authoritative texts which together comprise a dominant text. Through a series of talk-text cycles, ventriloquial (e.g. Cooren, 2012), aesthetic (e.g. Hancock, 2005), and practice texts (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) simultaneously and routinely make a difference to actors’ daily work. Specifically, these texts mediate actors’ conversations with colleagues or clients and exercise authority in the following ways:

- A ventriloquial text directs actors’ and clients’ attention toward a specific course of action and disciplines actors’ actions.
- An aesthetic text directs actors’ attention toward, and disciplines their actions in relation to, representing a preferred collective identity.
- A practice text directs actors’ attention toward, and disciplines their behaviour with regards to, particular actions, activities and tasks. It also links actors’ sayings and doings across sites.

The first three sections of the chapter extend an understanding of how authoritative texts are constituted and function. While CCO studies focus on how authoritative texts are constituted within, and make a difference to, a cycle of talk and text within meetings (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), actors who are not part of talk-text cycles are shown to orchestrate the routinization of several authoritative texts across organizational spaces. In addition, the three
sections broaden an understanding of authoritative texts’ five functions (i.e. ‘representing, mediating, directing attention, disciplining, and linking’; Kuhn, 2008: 1236) and demonstrate how ventriloqual, aesthetic, and practice texts routinely act in nuanced and unanticipated ways. Each section closes with a discussion of how the insights generated facilitate the CCO project of developing a communicational interpretation of organizing.

The penultimate section discusses how the concept of a dominant text contributes to knowledge about how authority routinely acts. Specifically:

- While CCO studies show how an authoritative text periodically organizes actors, a dominant text furthers an understanding of how authority routinely makes a difference to activities which constitute and characterize the workings of an organization.

The final section summarizes the chapter and picks out several novel insights which aid the development of a communicational perspective of organizing and organization. A précis of the chapter’s sections, nine subsections, and main contribution is provided in figure 25 below.
Figure 25: Discussion chapter overview

**Subsection**
- Policing
- Rehearsing
- Reciting
- Synonymizing
- Surveilling
- Propagandizing
- Emblematizing
- Proprietorial authority
- Toloo-authorizing

**Section**
- Ventriloquism
- Aesthetics
- Practice

**Theoretical contributions**
- Ventriloquial sayings routinely function as an authoritative text. This text mediates actor-client conversations, directs these parties’ attention toward a specific course of action, and disciplines actors to follow the actions this advice recommends.
- An aesthetic routinely acts as an authoritative text which mediates colleagues' in-house conversations. It directs these parties’ attention toward, and disciplines their actions with regards to, representing a collective identity.
- Practice-based goals routinely exercise authority as a text which mediates actor-client and actor-actor conversations. This text directs actors’ attention toward, and disciplines their behaviour in relation to, specific actions, activities and tasks. It also links actors’ sayings and doings across sites.
- A 'dominant text' routinizes the workings of organization.
6.2 Section one: Ventriloquism

This section extends ventriloquism theory (e.g. Cooren, 2012) and enhances understanding of the nuanced ways authoritative texts are constituted and routinely act. The first subsection crafts a novel perspective on how authoritative texts are routinely orchestrated. By exposing how ventriloqual acts are arranged, ‘policing’ shows how texts have ample opportunities to enter into, and exercise authority over, actors’ interactions and actions. While studies demonstrate how authoritative texts are constituted through actors’ meeting talk (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), original insight is provided about how actors who are not part of a talk-text cycle increase the chances of a text routinely exercising authority.

Next, ‘rehearsing’ unveils an undiscovered teaching-based element to understandings about how authoritative texts are constituted and routinized. Drawing on Weber (1922/1978), the subsection deepens knowledge about how authoritative texts function by showing how actors come to attribute a text with charisma. In doing so, a clearer conceptualization of how texts come to routinely mediate and make an authoritative difference to a series of talk-text cycles is offered.

Finally, ‘reciting’ enhances CCO studies’ comprehension of how authoritative texts routinely act in nuanced and unexpected ways. Reconceptualising how ventriloqual performances operate facilitates an exploration of how an authoritative text routinely ‘mediates’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actor-client conversations, ‘directs’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) parties’ attention toward a specific piece of advice, and ‘disciplines’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actors to follow the actions this advice recommends. Furthermore, adopting an alternative perspective on ventriloquism enables fresh insight to be constructed into how texts simultaneously exercise authority in one way but not another.

6.2.1 Policing

This subsection adds important background context into how ventriloqual acts are arranged and enlightens theorizing about how authoritative texts are routinely constituted. Identifying senior managers as the “directors” behind actors’ sayings challenges ventriloquism studies’ claims that it
is not feasible to identify who initiates a ventriloqual performance. For example, while studies state ‘figures are not defined a priori’ (Cooren et al., 2013: 264) and ‘what or who is acting or doing something can never be a priori defined’ (Cooren, 2013: 44), senior managers cast a founder figure as the “lead” actor and instruct “supporting” actors (i.e. on-counter sales employees) to make this figure speak to audience members (i.e. clients) as an authority on beauty. Demonstrating senior actors’ regulatory and enforcement activities allows for a more sophisticated understanding of how authoritative texts routinely enter into, and remain a presence within, actors’ and clients’ talk-text cycles. Specifically, sayings have ample opportunities to routinely mediate actor-client conversations and direct these parties’ attention toward a third party’s recommended course of action.

Charting senior actors’ policing efforts also contributes to theoretical discussions regarding the preparatory work involved in ensuring a text remains immutably mobile (Latour, 1987; Law and Singleton, 2005; Wright, 2013) throughout a cycle of talk and text. To extend the ventriloquist metaphor further, if actors’ delivery of sayings stray too far from “directors’” (i.e. senior actors’) pre-given scripts then the ventriloqual act runs the risk of losing its authoritative “punch line”. Exposing actors’ calculated efforts enhances theory about how an authoritative text is routinely (re)constituted. For example, while Cooren et al. (2007) report how interlocutors’ invoke ‘arguments, people, numbers, (and) documents’ (p.183) to ensure a mission statement’s immutable mobility across meetings, senior actors’ attempts to safeguard actors’ verbatim recital of ‘key words’ (excerpt 3) adds empirical foundation to Latour’s claims about the ‘logistics’ (1987: 237) of an immutable mobile. More tellingly, it adds a pre-emptive dimension to a CCO understanding of authority-as-text. While there can be no guarantee that texts will remain immutably mobile, senior actors are trying to ensure that sayings achieve this and are routinely constituted as authoritative texts. Distinguishing who directs a ventriloqual act and then scrutinizing how they do so makes an original contribution to CCO theory by demonstrating how texts are coordinated to routinely mediate conversations and exercise authority by directing parties’ attention toward a specific course of action.
Rehearsing reveals a previously undiscovered teaching-based dimension to the constitution of authoritative texts. It uncovers senior actors’ preparatory attempts to legitimize the source of sayings as a charismatic figure (Weber, 1922/1978) so that actors routinely and authentically make this source speak as an authority figure throughout client conversations. Showing how an authoritative aura starts to develop around this source provides important background about why actors have a greater inclination to convincingly introduce its opinions to clients. More importantly, demonstrating the premeditated efforts involved in ensuring sayings’ content and delivery remain immutably mobile (Latour, 1987; Law and Singleton, 2005; Wright, 2013) enables rich insights to be crafted into how sayings have a greater propensity to routinely function as authoritative texts throughout a series of talk-text cycles.

Senior actors’ preparatory attempts to bolster the authoritativeness of the source behind the sayings are revealing. While authority as thirdness studies presume interlocutors invoke a ready-made source of authority (e.g. ‘the head of an organization’, Taylor and Van Every, 2014: 203; and ‘the Master’, Brummans et al., 2013: 363), in this research senior actors are trying to foster an aura of authority around a source. In particular, senior actors’ attempts to cultivate actors’ belief in the charismatic qualities of a source (Weber, 1922/1978) share a likeness with the work of apostles. Specifically, these actors share first-hand tales of a messiah’s exemplary qualities in order to engender the same attributions from their junior colleagues. Extending Allen’s (2000) view of how texts interrelate, senior actors routinely write a charismatic ‘epigraph’ (p.105) about the source in an effort to make sure it resonates with the actors who are tasked with making it speak. While numerous studies omit a key relational aspect of Weber’s (1922/1978) writings and retrospectively attribute a figure with charismatic authority (e.g. Beyer and Browning, 1999; James and Field, 1992; Madsen and Snow, 1983; Nelson, 1993; Robinson, 1988; Salaman, 1977), senior actors’ testimony to this figure’s extraordinary virtues aim to inspire actors. Specifically, senior actors are trying to ensure that junior colleagues’ routine recital of sayings will function as authoritative texts which direct the topic of conversation and the course of action during client interactions and, as they do so, reinforce the charismatic lustre surrounding the source of the sayings. Divulging how actors are primed to ventriloquize a third-party provides previously lacking context about how texts have an abundance of opportunities to enter into, and make an authoritative difference to, conversations.
Rehearsing also offers substance to theoretical claims about how ventriloqual puppets need to feel ‘attached’ (Caronia and Cooren, 2014: 47; Cooren, 2012: 6; Cooren et al., 2013: 264) to their puppeteer in order for a convincing performance to take place. Demonstrating how senior actors use stories and demonstrations to attach and reinforce the “strings” which hold the lead actor (i.e. the founder) and supporting actors (i.e. workers) together allows for novel insight to be constructed into how a puppeteer remains ‘relevant’ (Caronia and Cooren, 2014: 48) to the actors it animates and who animate it. Rather than (just) being an onerous demand, senior actors’ charismatic characterization of the source mark ongoing attempts to ensure junior colleagues revere it and will make it speak as an authority to audiences.

Alongside their charismatic portrayals, trainers also tutored actors in the timing and the enunciation of sayings. Demonstrating trainers’ efforts to ensure the content and the delivery of sayings remain uniform deviates from a trend within CCO to only focus on the immutability of a text’s content (cf. Cooren et al., 2007). Actors’ efforts to continually ensure both the content and the conveyance of sayings stay intact therefore offers another explanatory reason for why sayings may routinely act as authoritative texts throughout a series of actor-client conversations.

Like policing, rehearsing deepens theorizing about the ‘complex ‘internal’ dynamics of a textual coorientation system’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1243). Specifically, while CCO studies focus on how authoritative texts are constituted within, and exercise authority over, actors’ meeting talk (e.g. Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), both subsections show how actors who are not directly part of a talk-text cycle (i.e. managers and trainers) try to ensure phenomena (in this case, several sayings) routinely function as authoritative texts. Specifically, actors’ regulatory and pedagogic efforts signal ongoing attempts to make sure a text routinely mediates conversations and directs parties’ attention to act in accordance with a particular recommendation. In doing so, a clearer exposition of how authoritative texts routinely enter into, and make a difference to, a series of talk-text cycles is provided.
6.2.3 Reciting

This subsection extends the concept of ventriloquism and enriches an understanding of the nuanced ways authoritative texts routinely act. By conceptualizing clients as audience members, reciting broadens previous ventriloquism studies’ focus on puppeteer-puppet performances (e.g. Caronia and Cooren, 2013; Cooren, 2012, 2013, 2015; Cooren and Sandler, 2014; Cooren et al., 2013) and demonstrates how texts simultaneously exercise authority in one way but not another. Adopting a novel perspective on ventriloqual performances enables a more nuanced appreciation of how authoritative texts act by showing how texts also serve unauthoritative functions.

Conceptualizing ventriloquism as a tripartite (i.e. puppeteer-puppet-audience) performance rather than a dyadic (i.e. puppeteer-puppet) act (e.g. Bergeron and Cooren, 2012; Cooren, 2012, 2015; Cooren et al., 2013; Jahn, 2016; Sorsa et al., 2014) facilitates an exploration of the numerous and subtle ways texts routinely exercise authority. Observing audience reactions provides empirical grounding to theory about how authoritative texts routinely function as a ‘common objective’ (Koschmann et al., 2012: 335) during interactions. For example, sayings routinely acted as an authoritative text within actor-client conversations by directing these parties’ attention toward a particular piece of advice. Following clients’ acceptance of this advice, this authoritative text disciplines actors by aligning their actions with those recommended by their ventriloqual puppeteer. When clients express their satisfaction with the recommended actions’ results (e.g. by complimenting themselves and/or actors, by purchasing products, and booking another appointment), the authority of this text is recursively reinforced. Consequently, an authoritative aura grows around the puppeteer and increases the likelihood that it will pull puppets’ strings in the future and make them speak in specific ways throughout subsequent appointments. By taking into account audience reactions, a sharper view of the nuanced ways texts exercise authority is brought into focus.

Taking a tripartite view of ventriloquism also facilitates an investigation of how authoritative texts routinely function in unanticipated ways. Adopting this perspective shows how clients’ reactions (e.g. ‘[she was] seemingly flattered by this opinion from the artist and/or Ella, the lady, via a wry smile, relented and the artist proceeded’). Field note 3: South East store visit, 24/02/2016) legitimize sayings’ authoritativeness. Furthermore, a tripartite perspective allows for a fuller appreciation of how issues beyond actors’ control influence whether texts routinely exercise authority. To
elaborate, the need of some clients to place sayings in a wider frame of reference provides foundation to theorizing about how intertexts (i.e. ‘all the ways that texts vie to influence, alter, or make possible other texts’; Koschmann et al., 2012: 336) operate and, more specifically, chimes with claims about how an architext (i.e. ‘the social rules, or genres, of formation and enunciation that surround, shape, and pervade a given text and thus influence actors’ expectations’; Kuhn, 2008: 1238) operates. In particular, an audience’s awareness of, and/or preconceptions about, the figure behind the sayings routinely facilitate or hinder its receptivity to actors’ sayings. Substance is therefore provided to claims about how intertextual influences affect texts’ authoritativeness (cf. Fauré et al., 2010; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008). For example, while Koschmann states ‘various intertextual efforts vied to shape [an authoritative text’s] official interpretation’ (2012: 21) no further information is provided about how this happens. By contrast, identifying the presence of audience preconceptions as an architext enables a clearer conceptualization of how texts routinely exercise authority throughout many, but not all, conversations.

Relatedly, although they routinely function as authoritative texts, sayings sometimes had the opposite effect. Specifically, the need to repeat sayings verbatim gave actors little room for improvisation and often left audience members with the impression that an inauthentic or ‘robotic’ (excerpts 17 and 18) performance had taken place. Hence, while Cooren et al. (2007) claim that ‘too great a transformation’ (p.158) may jeopardize texts’ authoritativeness, scrutinizing a tripartite (i.e. puppeteer-puppet-audience) dynamic provides a different viewpoint by highlighting how sayings often require more (not less) alteration by actors both prior to and during performances. Taking a tripartite view of ventriloquism therefore offers original insight into how texts may not only make little difference to an interaction: they may also leave actors being interpreted as unauthoritative by audience members.

Audience expectations and preconceptions, coupled with actors’ delivery of sayings, therefore mean some ventriloqual performances lived up to their billing as a ‘lower form of art or entertainment’ (Cooren, 2012: 4). However, even though senior actors’ recognized ventriloqual sayings lacked authority, ventriloqual acts continued to be commissioned. Questions are therefore raised about why senior actors persisted to do so and opens up the possibility that sayings were intended to exercise authority as a text over actors as opposed to making a difference to their interactions with clients. This subsection therefore enriches theorizing about how authoritative texts
function by revealing how a text can routinely exercise authority in one way (i.e. over a specific group of actors) while simultaneously failing to do so in another way (i.e. over interactions). Whether they exercise authority over interactions or over actors, ventriloquial sayings therefore routinely function as authoritative texts throughout a series of talk-text cycles.

6.2.4 Section summary

This section has extended the concept of ventriloquism and enhanced knowledge about the nuanced ways authoritative texts are constituted and routinely act. Exposing how ventriloqual acts are arranged enriches an understanding of how texts are orchestrated to routinely enter into, and exercise authority over, a series of conversations. While studies focus on how texts are constituted through, and exercise authority over, actors’ meeting talk, original insight is provided into how actors who are not directly part of talk-text cycles work to ensure texts have ample opportunities to be authoritative. Furthermore, a tripartite outlook on ventriloquism facilitates a richer appreciation of the nuanced ways texts exercise authority. Specifically, texts are shown to serve unauthoritative functions and to simultaneously exercise authority in one way but not another.

The insights crafted in this section also contribute to an emerging focus within CCO regarding how communication organizes and disorganizes organization (cf. Cooren et al., 2011; Vásquez et al., 2016). While CCO scholars generally assume that communication has organizing properties (Cooren et al., 2011), interest is growing among proponents of the Montreal School about how communication simultaneously organizes and creates disorder (i.e. ‘confusion, disruption, misunderstanding’; Vásquez et al., 2016: 630). In particular, insights from the reciting subsection add to this line of enquiry by showing how, at times, ventriloqual texts simultaneously organize (e.g. actors’ talk and advice) and lead to disorder within interactions (e.g. by disrupting actor-client conversations and causing confusion among clients). Following Vásquez et al’s (2016) study of the mutually constitutive ordering and disordering effects of written texts, a ventriloqual text provides CCO scholars with another construct to help develop our understanding of how communication simultaneously organizes and disorganizes organization.
6.3 Section two: Aesthetics

This section uses aesthetic theory to enhance knowledge about authoritative texts' forms and functions. Drawing on the concept of artefacts which Hancock (2005) describes as 'products of human action that, by virtue of their very materiality, possess the capacity to be moulded and presented' (p.38), the first subsection offers a clearer conceptualization of how authoritative texts' building blocks are put together. Showing the assembly of a text provides important context about how texts have countless chances to routinely mediate, and make an authoritative difference to, actors' daily interactions. Exposing these arrangements adds novel insight into how texts retain a repetitious quality as they mediate talk-text cycles.

Next, ‘surveilling’ deepens an understanding of how authoritative texts come to have a routine presence within talk-text cycles. Extending the concept of presentification (e.g. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009), the subsection demonstrates how the component parts of a text are continually monitored. In doing so, an original perspective of how texts remain within, and exercise authority over, a series of talk-text cycles is provided.

Finally, ‘propagandizing’ broadens an understanding of the forms authoritative texts take by unveiling how the sensory appeal of an aesthetic routinely exercises authority. Utilizing landscaping (e.g. Hancock, 2005), an-aesthetic (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000), and charismatic authority (Weber, 1922/1978) concepts, the subsection crafts fresh insight into the nuanced ways texts simultaneously exercise authority in one way but fail to be authoritative in another. Co-existing alongside the ventriloqual text, the subsection demonstrates how another text routinely makes an authoritative difference to actors’ daily work. While studies show how an authoritative text periodically organizes actors (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), the ventriloquism and aesthetics sections contribute to knowledge about how authority routinely acts by demonstrating how authoritative texts simultaneously and routinely make a difference to actors’ daily activities.
6.3.1 Synonymizing

This subsection uses aesthetic theory to craft an original conceptualization of how authoritative texts are routinely orchestrated. The construct of artefacts is useful for appreciating the forms authoritative texts take and how they are assembled. Specifically, senior actors’ provision of, and talk about a need to supply, specific artefacts within in-house workspaces provides credence to theory about how the ‘fabric’ which makes up a text is ‘woven’ together (Allen, 2000: 6). In terms of this research, preparatory efforts are underway to ensure that the continual presence of artefacts directs actors’ attention towards their need to routinely put the component parts of an aesthetic text together.

Synonymizing also provides an innovative view of how authoritative texts routinely function. While claims are made about how the repetition of a text is ‘always haunted by the risk of a mis; misunderstanding, miscommunication, miscalculation, misperception’ (Cooren, 2009: 46, emphasis in original), senior actors are trying to achieve the opposite. By continually providing an aesthetic template, ongoing attempts are made to ensure a text remains a hermetically sealed phenomenon throughout in-house meetings and actor-client appointments. Like policing and rehearsing in the ventriloquism section, a newfound understanding of how several texts are choreographed to simultaneously exercise authority over actors’ actions and interactions is therefore provided. Specifically, this subsection shows how preparatory efforts are underway to ensure aesthetics routinely serve as authoritative texts which mediate in-house conversations and direct actors’ attention toward a need to constantly represent ‘who “we” are’ (Koschmann et al., 2012: 343) to clients and colleagues.

6.3.2 Surveilling

Surveilling broadens the concept of presentification (e.g. Benoît-Barné and Cooren, 2009) and offers a fuller comprehension of how authoritative texts routinely enter into, and remain within, a series of talk-text cycles. While studies demonstrate how actors momentarily presentify a source to ‘accomplish’ (Benoît-Barné and Cooren, 2009: 6) personal authority to or ‘channel’ (Cooren et al., 2008: 1358) another party’s authority, presentifications of a source in this research augment a text’s authoritativeness. Specifically, portrayals of a figure’s continual ‘lurking’ (Koschmann and
McDonald, 2015: 236; Kuhn, 2008: 1236) presence gives actors the impression that their provision and presentation of artefacts are constantly being watched. Presentifications of a figure therefore strengthen its association with an aesthetic text and increase the likelihood that actors will routinely supply a text’s artefactual building blocks.

Extending the concept of presentification also provides a means to better understand the work involved in ‘shielding’ (Kuhn, 2012: 555) the meaning of authoritative texts. While studies claim shielding is done by humans (e.g. ‘an organizational figure […] usually a single individual’; Kuhn, 2012: 555 or ‘certain persons in certain circumstances’; Taylor et al., 1996: 35), in this research presentifications of a figure serve this purpose. Specifically, impressions of a figure’s ‘spectral’ (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009: 10) omnipresence routinely directs actors’ attention towards providing the artefactual components of a text. Therefore, even if senior actors are absent from meetings or appointments, presentifications of a figure increase the likelihood that an aesthetic will routinely feature and exercise authority by disciplining actors’ actions with regards to representing a collective identity. Like rehearsing in the ventriloquism section, surveilling adds further clarity to understandings of how texts routinely enter into, and exercise authority over, a series of talk-text cycles.

### 6.3.3 Propagandizing

This subsection advances theorizing about the forms authoritative texts take and the nuanced ways texts exercise authority. The aesthetic concepts of landscaping (e.g. Hancock, 2005) and an-aesthetics (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000) are instructive for understanding how the sensory appeal of an aesthetic routinely exercises authority. Propagandizing also offers a clearer exposition of how authoritative texts function by showing how texts are authoritative in one way but simultaneously fail to exercise authority in another way.

Showing how actors’ landscape (i.e. ‘to generate a specifically aestheticized regime of meaning or pathos’; Hancock, 2005: 38, emphasis in original) in-house workspaces provides original insight into how an aesthetic routinely exercises authority as a text. Using a ‘sensory map… learned instinctively through intuition and imitative processes’ (Gagliardi, 1996: 573), actors sense (e.g. ‘you don’t need to ask us, you will know’; excerpt 28: ‘when we’re posting photos, there’s like an
unspoken look for Ella May’) how certain artefacts should be presented together (e.g. ‘fresh iced water infused with either lemon or cucumber’; figure 7) in order to represent a collective aesthetic identity. Demonstrating how an aesthetic exercises authority over actors’ sensory experiences broadens existing theorizing about the forms authoritative texts take and shows how, at the same time as the ventriloqual text, another text routinely exercises authority over a further aspect of actors’ daily work.

Weber’s (1922/1978) claims about charisma’s routinization are also instructive for developing an appreciation of the forms authoritative texts take and how texts routinely function. Using Weberian terminology, followers’ (i.e. actors) belief in the ‘sanctity’ (1922/1978: 215) of a figure are expressed through their routine landscaping of workspaces with artefacts. Despite artefacts’ unpopularity, actors sense the need to routinely pay homage to a figure and, by doing so, recursively reinforce a figure’s charismatic aura. Charismatic authority therefore helps to conceptualize how texts routinely serve as authoritative ‘reference point[s], [which] encourage actors to subordinate personal interests to the collective good’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236).

The concept of an-aesthetics (i.e. ‘a process of masking and denial of the experienced reality of organization’; Carter and Jackson, 2000: 180) also aids theorizing about the nuanced ways authoritative texts routinely function. By circulating social-media photographs of artefacts that are physically absent from workspaces, actors perpetuate an an-aestheticized impression among their peers that the requisite artefacts are present and the collective identity these artefacts represent is being adhered to. Although the aesthetic fails to exercise authority as a text by ‘disciplining’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actors’ physical actions (i.e. displaying specific artefacts during meetings and/or appointments), the need to routinely represent a specific aesthetic identity serves as an authoritative text that ‘directs’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actors’ attention toward producing and promoting a digital illusion of its presence. Landscaping and an-aesthetics are therefore valuable constructs for conceptualizing how texts are simultaneously authoritative in one way but not another way.

6.3.4 Section summary

This section has deployed aesthetics theory to deepen insight into authoritative texts’ forms and functions. Drawing on the concept of artefacts (e.g. Hancock, 2005), synonymizing offered an original perspective on how texts are assembled and how texts have innumerable opportunities to
enter into, and exercise authority over, conversations. Next, by broadening presentification theory (e.g. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009), surveilling provided a novel view of how texts come to routinely have an authoritative presence within a series of talk-text cycles. Finally, using landscaping (e.g. Hancock, 2005), an-aesthetics (e.g. Carter and Jackson, 2000) and charismatic authority (Weber, 1922/1978) concepts, the propagandizing subsection revealed how the sensory appeal of an aesthetic routinely exercises authority over actors’ interactions and actions in a variety of nuanced ways. Co-existing alongside the ventriloqual text, the section demonstrated how another text routinely makes an authoritative difference to actors’ daily work. While studies show how a single text periodically exercises authority (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), the ventriloquism and aesthetics sections contribute to knowledge about how authority routinely acts by demonstrating how two texts simultaneously and routinely make an authoritative difference to actors’ day-to-day activities.

The insights generated in this section also help further knowledge about how ‘symbolic-material’ (Ashcraft et al., 2009: 24) relations communicatively constitute organization. While CCO studies generally focus on the symbolic dimension of communication (Ashcraft et al., 2009), the section demonstrates how relations between the material and aesthetic qualities of artefacts constitute organization. Specifically, as the propagandizing subsection demonstrates, the sensory appeal of artefacts shapes, and is shaped by, actors’ actions across organizational spaces. Introducing an aesthetic understanding to CCO provides researchers in this field with fresh insight into how the material and sensory elements of communication interrelate and constitute organization.

**6.4 Section three: Practice**

This section utilizes practice theory (e.g. Schatzki, 2006) to develop a richer appreciation of the ways authoritative texts are constituted and routinely function. The first subsection deepens insight into how authoritative texts enter into, and remain a routine presence within, a series of talk-text cycles. Demonstrating how actors plan for, and intervene within, conversations offers clarity about how texts have plentiful opportunities to exercise authority over interactions. In addition, emblazoning broadens theory about the types of function authoritative texts perform by showing
how a text simultaneously makes a difference to actors’ actions in the “here and now” and exercises authority over an organization’s longer-term strategic focus.

‘Proprietorial authority’ enriches existing views of how authoritative texts routinely act. Drawing on intertextuality theory (e.g. Allen, 2000), a novel perspective on how authoritative texts routinely mediate, and make a difference to, interactions is put forward. Furthermore, the subsection adds to theorizing about authoritative texts’ functions by demonstrating how a text exercises authority over actors’ tasks while, at the same time, signalling and making an authoritative difference to an organization’s priorities.

Finally, ‘teleo-authorizing’ advances theory about the scope of texts’ authoritativeness. While authoritative texts are claimed to represent the workings of an organizational collective (e.g. Kuhn, 2008), this subsection moves beyond existing theory by showing how authoritative texts routinely make a difference to how actors work as a collective. Concepts of routinized charisma (Weber, 1922/1978) and deontism (e.g. Cooren and Taylor, 1997) are instructive for appreciating how authoritative texts routinely make a difference to how various parties work.

6.4.1 Emblematicizing

Emblematicizing provides novel insights into how authoritative texts are orchestrated and explicates the nuanced ways texts exercise authority. While texts are claimed to sporadically enter into and make an authoritative difference to talk-text cycles (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), senior actors were observed to plan for and intervene in conversations to maximize a text’s opportunity to routinely exercise authority. Specifically, precepts, directives, and remonstrations (Schatzki, 2005, 2012) are used to ensure a text routinely represents the types of work actors perform and reminds actors about how work is to be carried out. Exposing senior actors’ proactive and reactive measures offers a fuller appreciation of how authoritative texts enter into, and routinely make a difference to, actors’ conversations and the actions which emanate from them.

This subsection also broadens existing views of how authoritative texts function. While studies demonstrate how authoritative texts make a difference to an aspect of actors’ actions (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann,
2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), in the case of this research a text routinely exercises authority over several aspects of actors’ daily activities. Specifically, after mediating senior actor-junior actor conversations, a practice-based text directs the former’s attention to whether the latter had performed all or only some of the required teleological hierarchy (Schatzki, 2002, 2006, 2012) of actions, activities, and tasks. The text then performs another authoritative function by disciplining senior actors’ actions as they take remedial actions to ensure junior colleagues follow all of the teleological hierarchy in the future. Emblematicizing therefore enhances thinking about how authoritative texts act by demonstrating how a text routinely makes a difference to actors’ interactions before directing actors’ actions.

Furthermore, emblematicizing extends existing claims about the types of function authoritative texts perform. The subsection adds to Kuhn’s (2008) assertion that authoritative texts ‘perform at least five functions [...] representing, mediating, directing attention, disciplining, and linking’ (p.1236) and demonstrates how authoritative texts also perform a strategizing function. To elaborate, senior actors use the required outcome of a practice (i.e. a specific cosmetic image) as an ‘assumptive base’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1237) to assess whether job candidates future adherence to the mandatory teleological hierarchy would bring their appearance in line with this outcome. Authoritative texts, therefore, do not only mediate, direct and discipline actors’ actions in the “here and now” of organizing: texts also routinely serve a longer-term strategic purpose by exercising authority over which personnel have the opportunity to work for an organization.

6.4.2 Proprietorial authority

This subsection adds further clarity to theory about how authoritative texts routinely function. Specifically, proprietorial authority provides foundation to theory about how intertexts (e.g. Allen, 2000) influence authoritative texts’ meaning. Showing an inextricable link between the purpose of a practice and the tasks which constitute a practice enables rich insight to be crafted into how texts can simultaneously make an authoritative difference to actors’ day-to-day work and exercise authority over an organization’s long-term priorities.

The concept of an architext (i.e. ‘social rules, or genres, of formation and enunciation that surround, shape, and pervade a given text and thus influence actors’ expectations’; Kuhn, 2008: 1238) aids
an appreciation of how texts come to routinely exercise authority. To explain, an industry trend whereby a client uses a product to perform a task it is not designed for (e.g. ‘the lady showed [the artist] an Instagram … page with a model’s [contoured] face’. Field note 27: Greater London store visit, 03/02/2016) functions as an architext. Specifically, this trend surrounds a text and bolsters its authoritativeness by reminding actors about the rationale for why they can only perform a proprietary task on clients (e.g. the artist said ‘no [to contouring] but she’d show her Ella’s take on contouring’. Field note 27: Greater London store visit, 03/02/2016). Demonstrating how architexts function therefore adds important background context about how texts retain an authoritative meaning throughout a series of talk-text cycles.

Proprietorial authority also enlightens existing understandings of how authoritative texts function. In particular, this subsection extends Kuhn’s (2008) view that authoritative texts perform at least five functions by showing how texts routinely perform another (prioritizing) function. Specifically, at the same time as directing actors’ attention and disciplining the tasks actors may perform, a text serves a prioritizing function by communicating to actors how upholding the integrity of the organization (i.e. the work actors’ produce and are known for) is of greater importance than short-term profit. Baring this undiscovered function of authoritative texts provides a clearer exposition of the multifarious ways texts routinely and simultaneously exercise authority.

6.4.3 Teleo-authorizing

Teleo-authorizing enriches theorizing about how authoritative texts function. The subsection develops current thinking that authoritative texts represent the work of an organizational collective (e.g. Kuhn, 2008) and demonstrates how authoritative texts routinely make an authoritative difference to how actors’ work as a collective. Furthermore, concepts of charismatic authority (Weber, 1922/1978) and deontism (e.g. Cooren and Taylor, 1997) aid an understanding of how texts routinely exercise authority over actors’ actions and interactions.

While authoritative texts are claimed to represent ‘who “we” are and where we are going and why’ (Koschmann et al., 2012: 343), teleo-authorizing extends this viewpoint by demonstrating how texts also make an authoritative difference to how “we” work as a collective. To elaborate, a practice-based text routinely exercises authority by ‘directing […], disciplining, and linking’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actors’ otherwise disparate ‘set of doings and sayings’ (Schatzki, 2002: 73) into a coherent
practice and acts as a ‘common object’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1236) actors work towards. Utilizing practice theory therefore helps to conceptualize how an authoritative text routinizes how actors work as a collective and, by doing so, provides a richer account of authoritative texts’ functions.

Weber’s concept of charismatic authority is also beneficial for comprehending how authoritative texts routinize the workings of a collective. To explain, actors’ ‘devotion to the […] normative patterns of order […] ordained’ (1922/1978: 215) by the figure behind the text leads them to disregard current (i.e. freelance) or previous ways of completing tasks and to eagerly commit to working one ‘correct’ way (excerpt 63). Actors’ attributions of charisma are therefore expressed through, and recursively reinforced by, their order of task completion. Weber’s view of charisma therefore helps to appreciate how a text routinely enters into, and makes an authoritative difference to, a collective’s day-to-day work.

Deontism (Cooren and Taylor, 1997; Taylor, 2006; Von Wright, 1951; Wright, 2016) also aids a fuller appreciation of how authoritative texts routinely function. To explain, throughout appointments, the deontic quality of a written document (see figure 22) compels actors to work in an incremental manner and to record that they have done so. Demonstrating the presence of a deontic text substantiates claims that the presence of one text ‘supplements’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1238) the meaning of another text and helps to comprehend how a text routinely makes an authoritative difference to actors’ daily actions. Furthermore, a requirement on actors to provide the document to clients at the close of the sale opens up the possibility that a text will continue to exercise authority after appointments finish. Specifically, the document’s deontic qualities reminds clients about the sequential way tasks were performed and instructs them to do likewise with the products they purchased. Articulating how deontic texts operate facilitates a discussion about how texts continue to exercise authority after they become distanced from the scene of their initial production (cf. Taylor et al., 1996) and, more importantly, helps to conceptualize how texts routinely make an authoritative difference to various parties’ actions and interactions.

6.4.4 Section summary

This section used practice theory to enrich an understanding of how authoritative texts are constituted and routinely make a difference to actors’ daily work. By demonstrating how actors plan
for, and intervene in, conversations, emblematizing offers important context about how texts are orchestrated to routinely exercise authority. Furthermore, the subsection deepens insight into how authoritative texts function by showing how a text simultaneously exercises authority over actors’ day-to-day activities and makes an authoritative difference to an organization’s longer-term strategy. Next, proprietorial authority utilized intertextuality theory (e.g. Allen, 2000) to enhance a comprehension of how authoritative texts enter into, and remain a routine authoritative presence within, conversations. Furthermore, the subsection provided a fuller appreciation of how authoritative texts function by demonstrating how, while exercising authority over actors’ tasks, a text also signals, and makes an authoritative difference to, the priorities of an organization. Finally, teleo-authorizing broadened existing theory about how authoritative texts function by showing how texts not only exercise authority by representing the work of an organizational collective: authoritative texts also routinize how actors work as a collective. In addition, drawing on charismatic authority (Weber, 1922/1978) and deontism (e.g. Von Wright, 1951) facilitated a clearer exposition of how texts make an authoritative difference to the daily interactions and actions of various parties.

The insights crafted in this section also add to a developing interest within CCO about how organizations endure. Although organizations are widely conceptualized as precarious communicative accomplishments within CCO (cf. Cooren et al., 2011), there are growing calls for research to explore how organizations maintain continuity (e.g. Brummans et al., 2014; Vásquez et al., 2016). The subsections above contribute to this endeavour by demonstrating how, as texts organize actors, a stable pattern of working is established which guides actors’ actions across sites and gives the organization a persistent quality. Revealing how texts endure over time provides CCO researchers within a process to help develop knowledge about how organizations perpetuate their existence.

Operating at the same time as the ventriloqual and aesthetic texts, the section showed how another text routinely exercises authority over a further feature of actors’ daily work. While authoritative texts are claimed to intermittently make a difference to actors’ work (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), the three sections which make up this chapter demonstrate how several texts simultaneously and routinely exercise authority over activities which constitute and characterize an organization. The next section draws on this insight to craft the thesis’s main
theoretical contribution to knowledge about how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts: the concept of a ‘dominant text’.

6.5 Section four: A dominant text

This section discusses the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge about how authority routinely makes a difference to actors’ daily workings. This contribution takes the form of a ‘dominant text’, which is defined as:

- A series of orchestrated texts which simultaneously exercise authority by routinizing the daily workings of organization.

While coorientation studies focus on how a single authoritative text periodically organizes actors’ actions within meetings (Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), the previous three sections show how ventriloqual, aesthetic, and practice texts are orchestrated to simultaneously and routinely dominate actors’ day-to-day workings across organizational spaces. Although they are introduced separately, the arrangement and the authoritative effects of each text happen contemporaneously. For example, while a ventriloqual text directs actors’ attention toward recommending a specific course of action to clients, aesthetic and practice texts simultaneously remind actors to represent a collective identity and discipline their order of product demonstration.

To describe this phenomenon, the thesis therefore introduces the concept of a ‘dominant text’. This concept provides management and organization studies’ researchers with a vocabulary to comprehend how authority routinely makes a difference to activities which constitute and characterize organization. Furthermore, demonstrating the nuanced ways a dominant text is orchestrated and functions offers researchers with a framework to develop this concept and to further enrich our understanding of how authority routinely acts.

The authoritative effects of a dominant text also offer an alternative viewpoint to typical organizational discourse understandings of textual agency. To elaborate, within an organizational discourse, texts’ agency are often considered to be produced by actors or shaped by ‘something else’ (Cooren, 2004: 385). For example, the agency of texts within Phillips et al’s (2004)
institutionalization discourse are claimed to be enabled or constrained by actors’ ‘formal authority’ (p. 643) and prevailing ‘coercive pressures’ (p. 639). By contrast, the workings of a dominant text deepen text-based understandings of authority by demonstrating how texts’ and actors’ authoritative agency are routinely coproduced and worked out on the ‘terra firma’ of communication (Cooren, 2012: 9).

While crafting the concept of a dominant text, several other contributions which facilitate the CCO project of developing a communicational interpretation of organizing were made. For example, exposing the workings of a ventriloqual text adds to an emerging interest within CCO about how communication simultaneously organizes and disorganizes organization (e.g. Cooren et al., 2011; Vásquez et al., 2016). In addition, revealing how the sensory appeal of an aesthetic text shapes, and is shaped by, actors’ actions contributes to a call for CCO research to focus on how relations between the symbolic and material dimensions of communication constitute organization (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009). Finally, showing how a practice text organizes actors’ actions into a stable working pattern across sites helps inform a developing body of literature within CCO interested in how organizations endure (e.g. Brummans et al., 2014; Vásquez et al., 2016).

6.6. Chapter summary

This chapter discussed the thesis’s main contribution to knowledge about how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts: the concept of a ‘dominant text’. It showed how a dominant text is made up of several texts which are orchestrated to simultaneously and routinely exercise authority over actors’ day-to-day workings. By crafting this contribution, the chapter redirects a relational understanding of how authority is routinized and revives a phenomenon that has long been considered as integral to the workings of organization (cf. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009).

The chapter also makes a number of novel insights which aid the development of a communicational perspective of organizing and organization. For example, adopting a tripartite view of ventriloquism (e.g. Cooren, 2012) provides researchers with a lens to explore the effects audiences’ legitimization or contestation of puppeteer-puppet acts has on organizing. In addition, broadening views of presentification (e.g. Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009) offers an original perspective on how this concept serves a surveillance purpose and organizes actors’ actions.
across spaces. Furthermore, insights were crafted about how the deontic qualities of communication (e.g. Von Wright, 1951) not only organize actors: they encapsulate how an organization acts. The next chapter draws the thesis to a close. It reflects on the thesis’s contributions, its limitations, the lessons learned whilst producing it, and identifies future directions for further research into the workings of a dominant text.
Chapter seven: Conclusion

7.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter draws together the contributions of the thesis, its limitations, the lessons learned while producing it, and identifies potential directions for future research. The first section begins by reiterating the main contribution to knowledge about how, as a relational phenomenon, authority routinely acts: the concept of a dominant text. It then recaps how, while crafting this concept, several other insights were generated which aid the development of a communicational interpretation of organizing and organization. Next, consideration is given to how the findings heighten awareness of the workings of an important, but under-researched, sector and hold interest for practitioners operating outside of it. The section closes by discussing how the findings offer potentially interesting avenues for future research into imprinting theory (e.g. Hsu and Lim, 2014; Marquis and Tilcsik, 2013; Nelson, 2003; Ormrod et al., 2007) and brand narrative theory (Avery et al., 2010; Visconti, 2010).

The second section addresses the thesis’s limitations. It opens with a reflection about whether interviewing clients would have added a further layer of insight to the claims made in this research. The section then discusses how this ethnography, like all ethnographies, can only relate a partial account of the phenomena encountered and explained. Discussion then turns to how a need to anonymize visual material whilst presenting findings may detract from readers’ capacity to share or challenge the claims made. Finally, queries are raised about whether a doctoral student’s research inexperience affects their suitability to undertake mystery construction (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2011) and limits the utility of the interpretations drawn from using this analytic approach. An argument is raised that presenting conference papers helped to develop the repertoire of theories needed to use mystery construction and, compared to more experienced academics, my relative lack of research experience meant I was less inclined to be anchored to a particular theoretical camp.

The next section reflects upon the lessons learned whilst producing the thesis. It starts by reflecting on the need for ethnographers to be open to activities that take place outside of “formal” organizational spaces. It then discusses how ethnographers must embrace their role as a research
instrument which continually contextualizes experiences inside the field with those encountered outside of it. The section concludes by reflecting on the need for ethnographers who conduct fieldwork in sectors with high staff turnover to have multiple gatekeepers.

The final section identifies directions for future research. The first of these relates to the methodological and reflexive practice of ‘doing gender’ (Katila and Meriläinen, 1999; Ortiz, 2005; Thomas, 2017; West and Zimmerman, 1987) during fieldwork. Reflections on my field experiences add to a limited discussion within Organization and Management Theory (OMT) about conducting cross-gender research and provide guidance to other male researchers interested in carrying out research in an almost exclusively female environment. Next, a call is made for future research to develop the concept of a dominant text. Specifically, by interrogating the forms and functions of this concept, future studies can refine an understanding of the nuanced ways authority routinely acts. Building on the foundations of a dominant text therefore offers potential to further enhance an understanding of how authority routinely makes a difference to activities which constitute and characterize organization.

7.2 Contributions

Crafting the concept of a dominant text is claimed to enhance an understanding of the communicative constitution and routinization of authority. While several CCO studies demonstrate (e.g. Fauré et al., 2010; Güney and Creswell, 2012; Holm and Fairhurst, 2017; Jordan et al., 2013; Koschmann, 2012; Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), or theorize (e.g. Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008) about, how a single text periodically organizes actors’ actions, the findings show how several authoritative texts are orchestrated to simultaneously exercise authority by routinizing actors’ day-to-day work. This study therefore provides a welcome alternative to studies which view authority as an entity that is either transmitted through (cf. Carpenter and Krause, 2014) or transformed by (cf. Huising, 2015) communication and redirects an understanding of authority as a relational phenomenon that is constituted and routinized within communication. The concept of a dominant text is therefore claimed to reinvigorate an understanding of authority within OMT which has become staid and formulaic.

While developing the concept of a dominant text, several other insights which facilitate a communicational understanding of organizing and organization were generated. Specifically, novel
perspectives were crafted about how: communication simultaneously organizes and creates disorder (e.g. Vásquez et al., 2016); how relations between the symbolic and material dimensions of communication constitute organization (cf. Ashcraft et al., 2009); and how organizations endure (e.g. Brummans et al., 2014). Furthermore, existing views of ventriloquism (e.g. Cooren, 2012), presentification (Benoit-Barné and Cooren, 2009) and deontism (e.g. Taylor, 2006) were extended. Therefore, in addition to its main theoretical contribution, the thesis also enriches the field of CCO by offering innovative views of various topical phenomena and widely drawn upon concepts.

Alongside its main contribution and theoretical insights, the thesis also furthers understanding about the day-to-day workings of an important, yet under researched, industry. While cosmetics are claimed to make valuable economic (Cosmetics Europe, 2014; Cosmetics Toiletry & Perfumery Association, 2015; Ernst & Young, 2015) and cultural contributions (Chun, 2016; Kumar, 2005) to society, little is known about how companies working in this sector operate. This research provides insight into how the work of actors in a market-leading cosmetic company compares to those of actors in other sectors. Like workers in various other sectors, actors regularly work long (and often mundane) hours to achieve increasingly unrealistic targets. However, unlike these workers, actors in the cosmetics industry are under constant scrutiny from colleagues and clients who instantaneously assess if their appearance and outputs are acceptable. Raising awareness of these issues enhances understanding about the important, but under-explored, work of actors in this sector.

The thesis is also of interest to practitioners who work outside of the cosmetics sector. While the findings are not intended to be empirically generalizable (Alvesson, 1996), they are nevertheless interesting to actors in sales and service-led organizations who are expected to routinely deliver a standardized yet personalized customer experience. For example, the idea that a dominant text routinely makes a difference to how actors converse with customers, arrange workspaces, and practice their craft on clients is of potential interest to companies operating in hospitality (e.g. restauranteurs), arts (e.g. museum curators), and personal care (e.g. hairdressers) sectors, respectively. Furthermore, the idea that a person can be communicatively constituted and routinized as a dominant text offers a novel alternative for companies that focus on how, for example, actors’ or products’ authority are based on technology or science. Anthropomorphising a company is therefore one possible way managers can seek to attract and retain actors and
customers who are wary of working for, and purchasing from, a “faceless” corporation or conglomerate.

In addition, the thesis opens up fresh possibilities for research interested in how a founder’s legacy has lasting effects on the workings of an organization. While numerous imprinting studies report that a founder’s way of working shapes actors’ performance of tasks years later (e.g. Hsu and Lim, 2014; Marquis and Tilcsik, 2013; Nelson, 2003; Ormrod et al., 2007), they fail to explain how this happens. A dominant text therefore provides imprinting researchers with a concept to help understand how a founder’s legacy legitimizes, and is recursively reinforced by, actors’ actions on a day-to-day basis.

A dominant text may also be of potential interest to researchers who study brand narratives. Showing how narratives about a founder routinely organize actors’ daily workings provides an alternative perspective to studies which demonstrate how actors invent founder narratives in order to strengthen consumer-brand bonds (Avery et al., 2010; Visconti, 2010). Showing how managers craft a founder biography that makes a difference to, and is legitimized by, actors’ daily workings offers researchers a novel way of conceptualizing how brand narratives function.

7.3 Limitations

Like all research, the thesis has several limitations. The first relates to a decision to interview actors but not clients. While interpretations were predominantly drawn from extensive observations of actor-client interactions and from prolonged conversations and interviews with the former, conversations with clients were rare and, on the handful of occasions they did happen, brief. Therefore, while numerous claims are made throughout the thesis about how texts often make a difference to, and are legitimized by, clients’ reactions these are largely attributions made about clients as opposed to interpretations made with them. However, while interviews provide repeated and lengthy opportunities to interpret actors’ actions with them, client interviews were not possible. The only alternative option would have been to question clients either during or following appointments. Adopting the first strategy would have undoubtedly resulted in me overly influencing actor-client interactions and leave open the (unwanted) possibility of this thesis becoming a form of action research (cf. Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). On the other hand, questioning clients after appointments was impractical because, from actors’ perspectives, “closing the sale” was the most
important part of the appointment where they take clients’ money, cross-sell products, and secure repeat bookings. Relatedly, the high number of repeat appointments witnessed leaves open the possibility that my questions would unduly influence clients’ actions within, and perceptions of, future appointments. Pursuing this approach again runs the risk of this thesis turning into an action, as opposed to an ethnographic, piece of research.

A further limitation relates to the choice to observe and interview actors within several sales and education teams rather than focus on one team. This has repercussions for the thesis’s claims about authoritative texts’ routinization. Specifically, one potential criticism is that I routinely “spot” the presence of texts across teams rather than trace texts’ routinization over time. However, in defence, the iterative and ‘messy’ (Sinkovics and Alfodi, 2012: 817) abductive logic used throughout this thesis meant the linear tracking of, for example, a concrete text (e.g. ‘documents, products, images, rules, instruments, emails, or memoranda’; Kuhn, 2008: 1234) was neither desirable nor possible.

Another limitation concerns the need to anonymize findings. This was particularly problematic during the “writing up” of the thesis because parts of social media photographs and messages required pixelating. While the original copies of these materials helped me to interpret how actors “make sense” of their own and others’ actions, readers’ capacity to share or challenge these assumptions are compromised by their partial view of this media. Although anonymizing findings is commonplace in research, the largely ocular effects produced and promoted by actors during fieldwork makes this a particularly frustrating limitation of the thesis. However, while they are not privy to the original copies, the images provide readers with a supplementary way of making sense of actors’ actions and my sense making. Therefore, although they are partially presented, the inclusion of images still makes a valuable contribution to this thesis.

Finally, a potential limitation relates to the choice to follow Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007, 2011) mystery construction technique whilst analyzing material. This was a challenging and, in Alvesson and Kärreman’s view, a risky analytic strategy to pursue (i.e. ‘a surprise should be an outcome of knowledge, not ignorance. This point may restrict the usefulness of our approach for junior scholars in general and doctoral students in particular’; 2011: 70). Indeed, iterating between large volumes of empirical and theoretical material was a difficult and, in the early stages of fieldwork at least, a daunting task to undertake. However, as Alvesson and Kärreman acknowledge, novice researchers can enhance their knowledge by ‘test(ing) ideas in the larger research community.'
Seminars, workshops, and conferences […] can provide ample opportunities to test whether one’s scholarship is up to scratch’ (2011: 70). Presenting three conference papers through the lifespan of this doctoral research and its pilot study provided welcome opportunities to add to, challenge and refresh the ‘theories, basic assumptions, commitments, metaphors, vocabularies, and knowledge’ (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007: 1273) which form the basis of its claims. Furthermore, a counter-point to Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2011) warning is that, unlike experienced academics, I am less likely to be entrenched in particular theoretical or methodological schools of thought. This openness affords me greater opportunities to combine and contrast concepts from theoretical camps which academics may have become blinkered to over time. On balance, the use of mystery construction is therefore considered to be a strength of this research.

7.4 Lessons learned

Several valuable lessons were learned whilst producing this thesis. The first ethnographic lesson relates to my concern during the opening weeks of fieldwork about whether enough hours were being accumulated. Anxieties about whether meetings in coffee shops and cafés “counted” were commonplace. Throughout this period I naïvely worried that something else more interesting was going on within more “official” spaces (e.g. head office and department stores). A valuable lesson for my own and others’ future ethnographic fieldwork is to therefore soften a misguided stance about a need to be “in” specific spaces and to instead appreciate time spent with and around actors irrespective of where this happens.

Another methodological learning is to embrace the all-consuming role of an ethnographer from the outset. Throughout the first few months of fieldwork in particular, I was conscious that reflections made in the field were continually being interpreted and contextualized in light of my experiences outside of it. For example, commutes made to and from counters were often spent wondering if a female passenger was a client of, or would benefit from a visit to, the host organization. Similarly, weekend visits to or through shopping centres invariably involved peering into the host organization’s makeup counters’ windows and briefly circling competitors’ shop floors. While I initially queried the appropriateness of these behaviours, a realization soon dawned that, unlike researchers’ selection and application of research methods, an ethnographer is the research instrument and their reflections, intuitions, and hunches cannot be, and should not be, switched off.
While I neither set out to nor claim to have conducted an ‘everyday ethnography’ (Watson, 2012: 15), an important learning is that the lines between interpretations drawn within and outside of the field are necessarily blurry.

A further learning relates to the process of securing and maintaining research access during ethnographic fieldwork. While these are common concerns for researchers, this issue is exacerbated for ethnographers who plan a lengthy and immersive ‘stay’ (Bate, 1997: 1150) in a retail organization where, consistent with the sector as a whole (cf. Hancock et al., 2013; Siebert and Zubanov, 2009), staff turnover is high. The departure of key gatekeepers within the host organization left open (in my mind at least) the possibility that access would be inadvertently curtailed. For example, weeks after granting access, the Chief Executive left the organization and, five months later, was followed by the National Sales Manager. Both of these departures led to periods of flux within the organization and no guarantees were given about whether research access would continue. These changes led to self-doubts about whether I had “enough” empirical material to start making or to substantiate the claims made throughout this thesis. While access was, thankfully, undisturbed, a lesson for researchers carrying out future ethnographic research in this sector is to try and make sure access is not reliant on a few gatekeepers and to have a contingency plan in mind.

7.5 Directions for future research

Insights drawn from the study highlight several potential avenues for future research. The first of these relates to the methodological and reflexive practice of researchers’ gendered identity performances during fieldwork. Although it is tacit throughout, the topic of gender is not a central focus of this research due to a decision to focus on contributing to textual understandings of authority. However, this research does add to an underdeveloped literature about how a male researcher performs, and is attributed, a gendered identity in an almost exclusively female setting. In particular, drawing on my experiences provides other male researchers with advice about how ‘doing gender’ (Katila and Meriläinen, 1999; Ortiz, 2005; Thomas, 2017; West and Zimmerman, 1987) in cross-gender research affects how a researcher and actors make sense of one another’s actions.
To elaborate, like Thomas (2017), I often perceived my gender to be a ‘welcome novelty’ (p. 4) for the female actors I observed, spoke with, and worked alongside. However, while Thomas (2017: 5) and Ortiz (2005: 265) ‘muted’ a hegemonic masculinity of ‘aggression, arrogance and conversational dominance’ (Thomas, 2017: 5), my experience of crafting and being cast a gendered identity were more nuanced than the caricature these authors describe. In retrospect, I iterated between a muted and more amplified masculine identity on a daily basis. In particular, during the opening months of fieldwork I was assigned and undoubtedly played an 'acceptable incompetent' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 57) role to my advantage. For example, during store visits, actors frequently labelled men as clueless with regards to the type of makeup their girlfriend or wife prefers. My inability to recall, for example, my fiancée’s preferred makeup brand or lip colour undoubtedly reinforced this stereotype. In hindsight, conforming to this persona of a 'harmless' (Horn, 1997: 302) novice facilitated access to aspects of appointments (e.g. skin consultations) a female researcher may not necessarily have been privy to. Similarly, I felt the acceptable incompetent tag was an advantage during interviews. Like Ortiz (2005), my perception is that actors’ divulged details about their actions they may otherwise have withheld from researchers of the same sex. I often felt actors assumed they needed to make the implicit explicit during interviews and would have been less inclined to do so in the presence of a female interviewer who wears or is presumed to have previously worn makeup.

A more specific example of amplifying a masculine identity came about during a training event. In this situation actors took turns to tell the other 20 or so attendees what their favourite product was and why. When the trainer turned to me for an answer, I opted for one of the company’s soap products and justified this on the grounds that its shiny coloured packaging could be seen in the shower without glasses. Looking back, this decision to opt for one of the arguably more “manly” products in the company’s portfolio, coupled with the functional (rather than cosmetic) rationale for my choice, exemplified and reinforced a frequently encountered perception during fieldwork that men do not understand or “get” makeup. However I was mindful of overplaying the acceptable incompetent role and, while relatively comfortable perpetuating the well-worn cliché of a hapless man, wanted actors to respect and trust me as a researcher.

On reflection, performing an academic identity was more straightforward than a gendered one. Actors often assumed that being a PhD student meant I was automatically clever. For example, if an actor struggled to perform mental arithmetic during a sales update they often turned to me for
the answer. However, heeding Van Maanen’s advice that an ethnographer should ‘live with and live like those who are studied’ (1988: 2), I often played down these requests through laughter. Mindful of Van Maanen’s suggestion that an ethnographer should act like a ‘native’ (1988: 49), I also sought to downplay the gendered incompetent role. By offering to do their chores (e.g. clean utensils and dust product stands), actors began to distance me from their lazy stereotype of an idle man. Relatedly, receiving a makeup lesson in-store (and having a manager share photographs of the lesson among colleagues on a WhatsApp messaging group; see figure 23) contributed to some actors’ perception of me as “one of the girls” or “Davina”. Being cast and playing up to this alias was, in my view, a contributory reason for relatively unbridled access to actors’ daily work. Though difficult at times, iterating between Davina and the acceptable incompetent role were important factors in accessing and interpreting actors’ actions. Sharing these experiences provides a welcome addition to the limited pool of reflexive discussions about how a male researcher performs a gendered identity in a female dominated environment.

Therefore, my advice to other male researchers who conduct cross-gender fieldwork is to be mindful of overplaying the amplified or the muted masculine identity. Overly exaggerating the former persona may lead to a researcher being perceived as less relatable by participants and has the potential to make observations and interviews problematic. Conversely, overemphasizing a muted identity may result in the same unwanted outcome as participants assume that their actions and viewpoints do not need to be made explicit. Rather than settling on one persona, a male researcher is therefore recommended to iterate between the two identities when observing, conversing with, and interviewing participants. However, caution should be applied when doing this because flitting between an amplified and a muted masculine identity too often will likely lead to a researcher being labelled as inauthentic and untrustworthy by participants. In addition, researchers should regularly reflect on whether they are overindulging in either persona and remember that the practice of ‘doing gender’ is a means to the end of researching their chosen topic of study.

Another direction for future research is to develop the concept of a dominant text. This study’s insight that aesthetic and practice texts routinely exercise authority leads the way for further research into how ethereal phenomena function as authoritative texts. While numerous studies demonstrate the communicative constitution of a single ‘concrete’ (Kuhn, 2008: 1227) text (e.g. a budget sheet, Fauré et al., 2010; a map, Jordan et al., 2013; a strategy document, Spee and Jarzabkowski, 2011), in this research less tangible texts are also shown to routinely make an
authoritative difference to actors’ daily actions and interactions. Broadening existing conceptualizations of the forms authoritative texts take allows deeper insights to be crafted into the nuanced ways authority routinely organizes activities which constitute and characterize organization.

Another direction for future research is to investigate how authoritative texts are routinely choreographed. Developing the concepts of routinized charisma (Weber, 1922/1978), immutable mobile (Latour, 1987; Law and Singleton, 2005; Wright, 2013), and intertextuality (Allen, 2000; Fauré et al., 2010; Koschmann, 2012; Koschmann et al., 2012; Kuhn, 2008) provides researchers with an instructive suite of concepts to conduct further research into authoritative texts’ orchestration. A fuller comprehension of how texts come to routinely, rather than periodically, organize actors’ actions and interactions will advance OMT’s understanding of how authority makes a difference to the daily functioning of organization.

7.6 Chapter summary

This chapter reiterated the thesis’s main theoretical contribution: the concept of a dominant text. Comprised of several orchestrated and simultaneously authoritative texts, this concept routinely exercises authority over the day-to-day workings of organization. It then reflected on the thesis’s other theoretical insights and additional practitioner-focused and theoretical contributions. Following this, the focus turned to how methodological, ethical, and analytical choices potentially restrict the utility of these contributions. Attention then turned to how the lessons learned while producing the thesis may benefit ethnographers’ approaches to fieldwork. Next, the chapter discussed how the experience of carrying out fieldwork offers valuable insights to other male researchers about the practice of ‘doing gender’ in cross-gender research. Finally, calls for further research into the forms and functions of a dominant text were made and reflections were given about how developing this concept will advance an understanding of authority as a relationally routinized phenomenon.
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