

Who's afraid of the senses? Organization, management and the return of the sensorium

Timon Beyes, Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany

Boukje Cnossen, Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany

Karen Ashcraft, University of Colorado, Boulder, USA

Nicolas Bencherki, Université TÉLUQ, Montréal, Canada

Abstract

Organization and management are the perpetual, and perpetually fraught and resisted, ordering of sense experience. However, banning the senses into the outside of thought, and of organizational analysis, was – and to a large degree still is – the default and mostly implicit and unquestioned mode of thinking and studying organization and management. Introducing the special issue on ‘The Senses in Management Research and Education’, this essay historicizes and contextualizes the neglect of the senses, dwells upon possible reasons for keeping the sensory at bay and discusses recent attempts to remedy this situation. The contributions to the special issue are introduced into this context. In conclusion, we speculate on what might happen next.

Keywords: senses; sense perception; organization; learning; knowledge; affect; aesthetics; body; Simmel

A more recent version of this article has been published as:

Beyes, T., Cnossen, B., Ashcraft, K., & Bencherki, N. (2022). Who's afraid of the senses? Organization, management and the return of the sensorium. *Management Learning*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076221111423>

Who's afraid of the senses? Organization, management and the return of the sensorium

‘The social question is not only an ethical one, but also a question of smell.’ (Simmel, 1997: 118)¹

Introduction

What is *special* about a special issue aiming at undoing some of the neglect of the sensory in the field of management and organization? We are certainly not alone in wanting to bring the senses to the fore after a long period of mistrust towards them in the social sciences. It is not by chance that this special issue is published in *Management Learning*, as the notion of learning poses the question differently: it problematizes the immediacy of sensual perception and forces us to reflect on the process by which the senses allow us to know about the world we often take for granted. The problem, then, is not whether sensory input may help or hinder learning, but rather what happens when we position learning itself as a sensuous endeavour, challenging the primacy of language, cognition and rationality in the development of knowledge and skill. Inviting contributions exploring this question placed us in the midst of a vibrant network cutting across management and organization studies (MOS), and the social sciences more broadly. These diverse perspectives enriched our understanding of what the senses do, but also revealed stubborn roadblocks when it comes to more fully engaging with the sensory. Some of these seemed of a practical, and even trivial, nature, but exposed deeply held assumptions about knowledge and learning: that is the case, for instance, with the fact that academic publishers still not facilitate text being printed in colour (Péretz, in this issue). Other issues have to do with the

¹ In the original German, the term is ‘Nasenfrage’, so literally, the question of the social is a *nose question*; see Simmel (1992): 734.

still existing blind spots of how the sensory is made *sense of*, as in Warren's (this issue) effort to surface how occupational legitimacy is achieved through subtle sensory learning.

The roadblocks we experienced in preparing this special issue are reminders that while the aesthetic, the symbolic, and the affective are growingly established as legitimate objects of investigation within organizations and the organizational, but also as valuable heuristic or analytical categories through which to analyse organizational phenomena, the sensory continues to lag behind. What then, is the issue with the senses? As we will suggest, part of the answer may come from their apparent transparency, ubiquity and immediacy, and their resistance to entrenched habits of thought that more or less unwittingly prefer modes of disembodied and supposedly reasoned, 'civilized' deliberation and analysis, unsullied by the fleshly, seemingly irrational and messy world of the senses, so difficult to study and express in the language games of scholarship. But power, management and control have always entailed sensory orders, and the work of sensory ordering. By examining the part played by the senses in learning and organizing, the contributions in this special issue reveal, instead, that they condition and mediate individual and collective experience.

In this introductory essay to the special issue on 'The Senses in Management Research and Education', we therefore frame our endeavour by historicizing and contextualizing the neglect of the senses, dwelling upon possible reasons for keeping the sensory at bay and aligning this special issue with a heterogeneous group of scholarly turns to the senses in the study of organization and management. We then briefly introduce the contributions to this special issue into this context, and speculate on what might happen next.

A particular history of the senses and their role in socialization

Where to start? We might begin with what is commonly held as *the* beginning, at least in Western social theory: In 1908, the sociologist and cultural philosopher Georg Simmel published a sketch on the ‘sociology of the senses’ as part of his sociological investigations on the forms of socialization (Simmel, 1997). In social-theoretical terms, the title itself already entailed a provocation (and it might still be one today, see Stäheli, 2018; Strati, 2007): a sociology of the senses, of smelling, hearing, seeing, touching and tasting, and their interplay? Aren’t these psychological and physiological phenomena, as such alien to the study of the social, which is predicated on intersubjective meaning and sensemaking, ordered through norms, discourses, networks, structures or processes of structuration, individual or distributed agencies?

What’s more, Simmel went further than merely expanding the repertoire of scholarly objects, as if sensory impressions would simply be effects or symptoms of different (more sociologically ‘valid’) causes. He positioned the senses, and sensing, as pivotal and erstwhile conditions of socialization. These conditions take effect (or affect) ‘before words’, shaping perception before cognition and action kick in. As such they cannot be disconnected from cognition (or relegated to a secondary substance, or an afterthought); they invariably influence and shape cognition and knowledge. While sense impressions obviously denote physiological sensation and emotional impact, then, they are fundamentally social and collective phenomena, relating human bodies to each other and to their environments, showing ‘a communalizing sociological effect’ (Simmel, 1997: 116), conditioning what can be felt, thought and expressed. Senses, Simmel wrote, ‘lead us into the human subject as its mood and emotion and out to the object as knowledge of it’ (p. 111), and ‘it is obvious that the entire nature of human intercourse is supported by this structure of our senses and their objects’ (p. 114). Simmel thus

foreshadowed a phenomenology of the senses by differentiating between different senses and their specific social effects (but also inadvertently reproducing an ‘ocularcentric’ hierarchy of the senses that seems dated now, see Kavanagh, 2004). Yet he also emphasized the interplay of different senses and the multi-sensory set-up of modern, organized life, or the modulation of the ‘sensorium’, as media theorist Walter Ong (Ong, 1991) later coined it, also through non-human objects. Consider only the contemporary barrage of sensory stimulation effected by the ubiquitous ‘digital devices’, in which human bodies are embedded, and which reshape the human sensorium and what a body is, can do and can become (Serres, 2014).

This, then, was (and arguably still is) the main provocation: We cannot separate, really, between *mundus intelligibilis* and *mundus sensibilis*, between cognition and emotion, thought and affect (Fischer, 2015: 426). Simmel’s sociology of the senses is already ‘postdualist’, leaving behind the mind/body split (or the mind-over-body split) that bugs (not only) the study of organization and management (Zundel, 2013). The aesthetic realm of sense perception is precisely not the other to cognitive and disembodied thought, but invariably entwined with it. What comes to (be) thoughts and meanings is processed through the senses, and how thoughts and meanings take place is modulated by them.

The extent to which Simmel’s provocation continues to feel germane and even novel – particularly in the context of MOS – is striking and telling. Among the things it reveals is the cultural and political specificity of the bodies and settings for whom this provocation comes as an unsettling surprise. Namely, Simmel’s challenge runs counter to entrenched Western habits of splitting mind from body, linguistic sense-making from other physical forms of sense-sharing, conscious interpretive processes from those beyond or at the edges of awareness, and so forth. Still, these binary habits have us regularly elevating the former over the latter, and doing so by

associating rational thought with a self-contained ‘universal subject’ who keeps his bodily senses in check (Brennan, 2004). Known in Black feminist studies as ‘Western Man,’ this animating figure has long been made by contrast with the ‘irrational’ feelings and fleshly vulnerabilities of racialized, gendered, and sexualized Others, whose bodies, lands, knowledges, and ‘territories’ of all kinds he marks as adjacent and susceptible to nature and, on that basis, colonizes in the name of civilization and progress (Weheliye, 2014). For instance, racialized colourism has long associated the ‘savage’ and the ‘primitive’, or, in gendered and sexualized terms, the feminine and the queer, with a propensity to bright and gaudy colours (Taussig, 2009). A presumably refined, civilized ‘colour sense’ and a corresponding management of the senses propelled colonial forms of domination and shapes contemporary orders of inclusion and exclusion. Moreover, to the extent that this universal subject admits some reliance on the senses, it is generally the visual and sonic stimuli he concedes, devaluing the ‘lower’ faculties of smell, taste, and touch to comparatively ‘simple’ domains, such as those aligned with ‘primitive’ and feminized peoples (e.g., Classen, 1997; Howes, 2003).

We have only begun to develop the point, but it is made well enough for our purposes here: *This* is the partial world in which Simmel’s claims continue to be read as novel and underexplored. However, even in its time, the provocation was not so much ‘new’ as actively forgotten by some, as is still the case in MOS research today. Simmel’s ‘sociology of the senses’ may indeed be a useful beginning – especially for a Western field steeped in Eurocentric philosophy (Cruz and Sodeke, 2021) – but we must be clear that it is just that: *a* (not *the*) beginning.

It is not only that the field of MOS is rooted in Western thinking *about* managing and organizing. Rather, the field’s central objects of study are themselves Western practices whose

objective entails achieving the triumph of mind over ‘mere’ bodily senses. Consider just the ‘classical’ principle of dividing labour – ‘managers plan; workers implement the plan’ – or the Hawthorne studies’ effort to control environmental conditions like lighting for optimum output. Perhaps it is no surprise, then, that Simmel’s treatment of the senses turns to organizational examples, as so often in his work. If we do not account for the senses, he asks, then what do we make of the fact that ‘the workers in a factory workshop, the students in an auditorium, the soldiers in a battalion somehow feel themselves to be a unity’ (Simmel, 1997: 117)?

Sensemaking, if it is at the basis of organizing, is literally made through the senses. What, for example, is the role of the eye in this, and what of the ear? Simmel hazards that the modern notion of the worker only becomes intelligible when one takes into account ‘the techniques of the senses’, for instance the phenomenon of ‘visual proximity’ in conjunction with ‘a lack of conversational proximity’ (p. 117), as is the case on the factory floor. Being able to see people without hearing them establishes a regime of oversight and reciprocal visibility that seeks to prevent the potentially democratic chatter and the whispering of secrets (schematically put, sound surrounds and ingresses; sight situates and distances). Aesthetically, this is how labour is abstracted, becomes a disciplined, manageable body of workers. The fundamental sociological and organizational importance of the senses is that they are socially constitutive; they are employed to regulate the social. They are organizational forces, and they are perpetually modulated, organized, managed. Social organization is a ‘distribution of the sensible’, and any kind of reorganizing of the social to some degree implies a ‘redistribution of the sensible’ (Rancière, 2004). Organization and management are the perpetual, and perpetually fraught and resisted, cultivation and ordering of sense impression.

Marginalizing the Senses in MOS

The sheer ubiquity of the senses in the ordering and disordering of the social is matched by its marginality in social and organizational thought.² Simmel's sketch was long forgotten or overlooked; it only returned to prominence at the end of the 20th century, and since then it is heralded as the foundational text for reconsidering the role of the senses in cultural and social theory. In general terms, it is striking how little engagement there was with what arguably is a central phenomenological, epistemological and methodological problem of studying organization and management: how the senses, and sense perception, organize and shape organizational life, what we can know of it, and how we might study it. Before we embed this special issue in more recent currents of thought that attempt to salvage the senses, it is worthwhile to briefly dwell on possible reasons for their neglect.

We have already mentioned one major reason: Foundational to 'Western Man' is the split of reason from emotion, the alignment of the former with the mind and the latter with the body, and the corresponding demotion of all senses (the abjection, arguably, of touch, taste, and smell) as friend of feeling, hence foe of thought. Gender, racial, and sexual Othering undergirds this split; and the senses play a critical role. They are cast as that suspect drag of nature to which the Others are enslaved whereas the universal subject has miraculously wrested free, a condition that justifies his colonization of all this 'inferiority' (i.e., 'rescuing' Others from their primal urges

² The distinction of ubiquity and marginality with regard to aesthetic perception is from Reckwitz (2015), see also Reckwitz (2017): 9-32. For a sampling of efforts that take the senses more seriously in Western thought, see, among others, the heterogeneous field of 'vitalist' thought (from Bergson to Deleuze, say); neo-Marxist thought and irreverent Marxisms (Benjamin, Lefebvre, Horkheimer/Adorno, Kluge); phenomenology and neo-phenomenology that take 'the felt body' seriously (Merlau-Ponty, Schmitz); anthropology (e.g. Mauss' 'body techniques'); pragmatism (Dewey); psychoanalysis (Kristeva, Lacan); media theory (McLuhan, Ong, Simondon); visual studies (Mirzoeff); performance studies and 'doing gender' (Butler, Schechner). See, e.g., Howes (2020); Prinz and Göbel (2015).

and/or putting them to their ‘natural’ use). Accordingly, a deep-seated distrust of (or even disdain for) the vagaries of sensory perception marks the history of Western thought.

In Plato’s famous allegory of the cave, sense perception grapples with shadows, not real ideas or accurate representations. The senses deceive. For instance, strange sensory substances like colour ‘deceive continuously’ and are to be kept out of serious scholarship or held at arms’ length (Albers, 2013; Beyes, 2017). Theoretical contemplation, after all, is a disembodied, putatively asensual practice; reason (*logos*) is the other to perception (*aisthesis*), and *res cogitans* needs to guard itself against the treacherous fallacies of *res extensa*. As Zundel (2013) has argued in the pages of this journal, management learning is still implicitly or explicitly in thrall to a ‘Cartesian split’, according to which sensations and affections are bracketed out in favour of mind-over-body assumptions – reflection is first and foremost a cognitive and disembodied exercise (with regard to learning, see also Beyes and Steyaert, 2021).

Consider the notion of sensemaking. If the discursive and narrative making of sense as a pivotal organizational practice is dependent on what is given to experience, then it needs ‘to enrich its own sense of sense’ (Holt and Cornelissen, 2014: 3) by taking on board the senses as both the constitutional force and the regulated ‘material’ of the making of sense. Otherwise, as Holt and Cornelissen point out with regard to the work of Karl Weick, studies of sensemaking are busy ‘ignoring or discounting experiences of sensemaking in ordinary organizational life’ (p. 526), such as the organizational force of mood, which sensemaking studies tend to studiously overlook or expel through the focus on cognitive, meaning-based practices of talk and understanding, aka mind over body. Yet, it literally makes little sense to limit the making of sense to a disembodied notion of sensemaking.

Then, there is of course good reason for relegating the senses to an afterthought or a secondary sphere, or so (seem to) assume the most influential diagnoses of organized life in modernity. Disenchantment, rationalization and alienation imply a loss or a degradation of sensory experience, a de-sensualization. To refer to what is held to be Max Weber's foundational theorem of organizational research (which is also deemed to be organization theory's foundational gesture), instrumental rationality is a disenchanting social force, and bureaucratic organization its disenchanted social form, dull, grey and devoid of sensory stimulation. This is one of the reasons, after all, why work is alienating, as Simmel pointed out with regard to the factory floor and the birth of the figure of the modern worker, and as Marx explicitly framed as a depletion of sensory experience, less a redistribution than an estrangement of the sensible.³ So the "old" cultures of managerial administration (and exploitation) are depicted with the image of a non-sensuous machine largely devoid of affects. This non-sensuousness, or at least the impoverishment and the diminishing importance of the senses, is a presupposition that arguably and implicitly underlies much of the MOS research to this day.

The senses – and the body they suppose – are also marginalized as they are perceived as unappealing, or uncanny (Beyes and Steyaert, 2013). They disrupt our routines, challenge our comfort, and spring up at the most inconvenient time. That is why some research has focused on the unwelcome place for anything to do with the physical body in the workplace. That is the case of the problematic presence of the pregnant and maternal body in the workplace (Gatrell, 2013; Liu and Buzzanell, 2006), which leaks and cannot be kept in place (Agostinho and Thylstrup,

³ It should be noted that 'the early Marx' intimately related a proper materialism to sensuousness. The problem with abstract materialism is precisely that it relegates sensuousness to an object of contemplation, rather than affirming its practical charge. To use Rancière's term, if philosophers want to change the world, they have to recover and cultivate their sensory capacities and join forces with redistributions of the sensible; see esp. the posthumously published *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx (1964/1932).

2019). The same goes with the auditory, as organizational control extends over speaking and noise, requiring silence despite its alleged invitations to speak up (Blackman and Sadler-Smith, 2009; Morrison and Milliken, 2003). What is happening, then, is a ‘sanitization’ of the senses.

Yet the old adage of modernity’s organized de-aestheticization has come under increased scrutiny, not least with regard to what has been called the rise of aesthetic capitalism (Murphy and Fuente, 2014), experience economy (Pine and Gilmore, 1999), post-Fordist and post-bureaucratic forms of work in the last fifty years or so – a development through which, perhaps, creativity has become the driving principle of social organization (De Molli et al., 2020; Reckwitz, 2017). The senses loom large here, and it is indeed not surprising that the renaissance of scholarly ‘sensory analyses’ follows a wide-ranging aestheticization of different social fields, not least the economic one. Capitalism, we might say, always was – and more than ever is – attuned to ordering and manipulating the senses. Creating experiences for customers is a ‘battleground’ for marketing (Dixon et al., 2013), and all the five senses are harnessed in selling products (Hussain, 2019; Lund, 2015). This phenomenon is far from being new, as Simmel showed in his studies on early 20th spaces and styles of consumption, which was all about enchantment and excitement, or like Roland Barthes (Barthes, 2009/1957) had already pointed it out in his famous analysis of pasta advertisements.

And yet, even though capitalism seems to have caught on with the senses, the odds are stacked against those who wish to understand what is going on exactly. We can speculate that the senses have been marginalized MOS just as much as in broader social theory because they tend to evade customary methodological assumptions, frames and techniques, but also that we have failed to develop the methodologies we need precisely because of that marginalization. How to study the formlessness and effusiveness of smell, the intricacies of touch and taste, the affective

charge of everyday soundscapes and their interplay in sensory atmospheres? The exception perhaps is the study of visual organization – but then, the problem is precisely that many visual analyses resort back to a disembodied, semiotic approach, which reduce images to their meanings, or to ‘a visual mode of discourse and meaning construction’, which is ‘part of the cultural tool-kit’ (Meyer et al., 2013: 490–491). And of course, the very materiality and disembodied nature of scholarship, black ink on white paper or black dots on white-ish screens, itself feeds into the epistemological and methodological avoidance of “sensescapes” – haptic and tactile spaces, smellscapes, soundscapes and colourscapes.

Sensualizing organization

Broadly put, banning the senses into the outside of thought, and of organizational analysis, was – and to a large degree still is – the default and mostly implicit and unquestioned mode of thinking and studying organization and management. To be sure, challenges to this state of affairs have been on the rise for some years. Feminist scholarship has produced one major stream of challenge, including – for example – critiques of bureaucratic rationality (e.g., Bologh, 1990; Ferguson, 1984), analyses of affective labour before it was called that (Weeks, 2007), studies of the managerial manipulation of the senses and commercialization of feeling as ‘emotional labor’ (e.g., Hochschild, 1983), phenomenologies of the senses at work (e.g., Young, 2005), and efforts to incorporate the senses in alternative writing (Höpfl, 2000; Pullen and Rhodes, 2015). Due in significant part to challenges like these, the field has begun to revisit the senses. This special issue participates in this broader return to the senses, one that is enacted through different approaches and sensibilities. Without any claim to comprehensiveness, we would like to indicate key strands of this reconsideration of the sensory constitution and modulation of organization.

First, there are a number of studies that, very much in Simmel's sense, zoom in on specific senses. Research has focused, for example, on the role of scent and smell in a high-end perfume company, and how ideas materialize (Endrissat and Noppeney, 2013; Islam et al., 2016), or on how wine tasting is done by experts (Hennion, 2015). Studies on craft beer (Pozner et al., 2021), slow food (van Bommel and Spicer, 2015), and design work (Bell and Vachhani, 2020) all engage with the pivotal role of the sensory. In those studies, though, the senses can appear to be limited to a productive role, and are mobilized to account for the production of luxury, high-end or artisanal goods that map onto class-based distinctions. When reading studies from this stream of research, one can experience a lingering feeling that the senses are often commodified and sanitized, to the extent that they are instrumentalized for productive purposes and cleansed of any disruptive potential.

Second, there is the slightly more established discourse of organizational aesthetics, in which the aesthetic is understood in the broad sense of *aisthesis*, as denoting the study of sense perception. The aesthetic here thus denotes the study of sensori-emotional experience, a way of seeing or apprehending, 'that takes as its subject matter the already aesthetic nature of everyday perception', sensation and affectivity (Bennett, 2012: 3). Scholars like Clair (1998) and Strati (1999) have suggested applying aesthetico-intuitive forms of understanding to organizational reality, counting upon the emotions and sensory faculties of both researcher and researched as rich material for analysis. In this issue, Pérezts draws on sensory faculties and a form of synesthetic inquiry, through the form of poetry, to investigate organizational numbness. Warren (2002, 2008), whose work is also included in this issue, has also advanced aesthetic approaches on methodological and empirical fronts, developing a repertoire of sensory techniques for examining the sorts of sensory encounters people pursue at work and the ways in which

managerial practices facilitate and/or hinder such encounter. Other scholars likewise treat the aesthetic as a form of organizational knowledge and knowing (Ewenstein and Whyte, 2007; Mack, 2013; Strati, 2007). With Simmel, one should caution against positing the aesthetic as different from cognition and signification, however. After all, the senses clearly affect how we feel about matters *and* how we think about them.

Third, the senses have been a concern for scholarship on affect, which, to put it simply, is predicated on the capacity of bodies to be affected through different registers of sensation (Massumi, 1995). As Linstead (2018: 329) argues, the ‘aesthetic and sensuous frame of the physical experience’ permits ‘a heightened awareness of what the body senses, alerted to different dimensions of a no longer taken-for-granted context.’ Being sensitive to one’s physical affections thus unveils the richness of everyday experience, but also their politics. For instance, our bodies and senses are instrumental to our experience of the ‘perpetual squeeze’ we feel as our work is constantly appraised (Ashcraft, 2017: 37). Attuning to our pre-individual senses and to ‘molecular politics’ can help account for the way our collectives are constituted beyond language: indeed, ‘Capitalism [...] is a compulsive glance at the smart phone, the balm of retail therapy, the numb exhaustion of overwork’ (Ashcraft, 2021: 8). Like convicts on a galley, we are taught to perceive and move to the fast beat of business (Katila et al., 2019). For this body of work, the body must be brought back into the picture (Ashcraft, 2008), for as long as we keep our conversations at the level of abstract structure, we risk overlooking the ‘subtle and confusing ways’ in which power affects us as intimately as in our gendered selves (Pullen et al., 2017: 116). In adopting an affective perspective on the senses, though, we might be too easily lured into the promise of an accessible politics, within the reach of one’s own body, without paying attention to the specific differences of what those bodies look like, are perceived as, or can do. In

other words, although our collectives are constituted beyond language, we need to keep asking question about who the ‘our’ is in this. Although affect scholars have used a focus on the affective to investigate the micro-level making or manifestation of hierarchies of difference (Stewart, 2007, 2012, 2017), MOS research drawing on affect theory has so far not explicitly linked affect to the (re)production of hierarchies of gender, class, and race.

Fourth, there is an increased interest in the spatio-sensory environments of organizing, and their affects. Such interest has been expressed in terms of ‘spacing’ and ‘atmospheres’, the latter corresponding to ‘spaces with a mood’ (Böhme, 2017). Research in this stream has focused on the embodied experience of space (Best and Hindmarsh, 2019; Jørgensen and Holt, 2019), and has identified the sensory power of space to be a crucial aspect of organizational thinking (Beyes and Holt, 2020; Beyes and Steyaert, 2012; Cnossen et al., 2020). Viewing space as more than a mere container, this scholarship recognizes that ‘everyday life [is] made up of atmospheric scenes one walks into, senses, and responds to’ (Michels and Beyes, 2016: 315). In this line of work, a phenomenological approach to the senses, where organizational members’ learning consists in ‘bringing their bodies and senses in tune with practical situations’ (Willems, 2018: 23), sits next to a relational or performative notion of spacing that emphasizes the materiality and affectivity of organizing that works on all the senses yet invariably beyond what a body can sense, perhaps calling for a ‘diffractive’ mode of analysing the differences that ‘sensory spacing’ makes (Kuismin, in this issue). This emerging body of work is marked by a keen awareness of the ‘felt body’ and embodied experience, too. Yet there seems to be a tendency to engage in an indistinct sensing and (perhaps correspondingly) a faithfulness in the visual, ocularcentric register of organizational analysis in lieu of a more fulsomely multi-sensory approach that would enrich the study of organizational atmospheres.

Fifth, and finally, methodological options have been formulated to better account for the centrality of the senses. This is the case of sensory ethnography (Pink, 2015; Warren, 2012), affective ethnography (Gherardi, 2019), sensory archeology (Day, 2013), multi-modality (Stigliani and Ravasi, 2018), affective ethnographic history (Marsh and Śliwa, 2021), and the role of sensing in the field (Cnossen, in press; Willems, 2018). These methodological proposals, while diverse, share a common interest for the way researchers can know about the organizations and practices they observe – but also touch, smell, hear and move along with. These studies also point us to other, heterotopic spaces of organization, management and learning, where sensory registers are perhaps more easily foregrounded: they extend to bars (Drysdale, 2016), psychiatric units (Brown et al., 2020), ships (Mack, 2007) and immersive art interventions (Beyes and Steyaert, 2013). Another crucial similarity is that these studies all note the sensuous and aesthetic ‘truth’ that is produced within the researcher’s body (also see McConn-Palfreyman, Mangan, and McInnes in this issue) – for example, her work led Mack (2007) to experience “*beautiful memories*” (p. 386) – challenging the expectations of validity and generalizability we have come to forge through our own training. In adopting such methodological orientations, however, we must be careful not to cede to the temptation of believing that the senses provide unfiltered – and possibly morally superior – access to reality.

Reconsidering the senses in management and organizational learning and research

The avenues for research that current theorizing of the senses offers can be understood as sharing somewhat of an unproblematic partiality to them, risking not acknowledging that what the senses mean to us is mediated by other phenomena – whether discourses, structures or practices – but also that they are themselves mediations of our knowledge of the organized world. An

attunement to these mediations is a common theme across the articles that compose this special issue. This is most explicitly articulated in the provocation piece by Juhlin and Holt, who argue that the way many scholars have taken the sensory turn may give the impression they overlook the many mediations involved in sensing. As a result, the illusion of immediacy – as if we could access knowledge with our senses, without any other interference – may give rise to a ‘sensory imperative’ that is particularly thorny for it is often associated with a *political* position from which knowledge is assessed. For Juhlin and Holt, we must study the senses themselves to recognize the many mediations that take place when we attempt to know *with* the senses. They thus invite us to be wary of the opposition between, on one hand, the mind and the analytical, and, on the other, the embodied and incarnate, as while we believe we free ourselves from the shackles of rationality, we may also deprive ourselves from the ability to know how we know.

In this issue, moreover, reconsidering the sensorium means being attentive to the many ways in which access to, or expression of, the senses is denied. Péretzs’ article proposes the notion of organized numbness to account for the ways in which organizational settings require their members to ignore their sensory experiences. Courageously drawing from her personal experience with an intense physical experience in the workplace, and the ways this was felt to be taboo, she argues that processes of socialization into organizations and certain professional contexts often imply what she refers to as ‘learned desensitization’. Inspired by the writings of Rimbaud and Baudelaire, who used elements of synaesthesia (a mixing of the senses) in their work, to explore a synesthetic exploration of blood, Péretzs’ article offers a potential gateway into undoing the systematic and organized denial of the senses in work settings, and points at creative writing and art as allies in opening up this gateway.

Investigating an entirely different empirical setting, in this issue, McConn-Palfreyman and colleagues offer a phenomenological exploration of learning in the context of a professional rugby team. Drawing on the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the researchers propose what they refer to as a ‘sensuous ethnography’. Specifically, they suggest bringing the researcher’s body back into the practice of ethnography and advocate for a conception of the body as a site of learning. Building on the first author’s engagement in participatory fieldwork in a professional rugby team, the article develops a sensorial depiction of rugby, focusing specifically on the role of pain, touch, and hearing in being a ‘sensory apprentice’, which is how this author made sense of his learning experiences within the team. The article highlights the sacrificial nature of playing rugby, and the role of pain and violence in this. In so doing, the authors demonstrate an interesting paradox, which is that pain must be had, and violence must occur, but that the impact of these bodily experiences must also be downplayed at all times.

This kind of attention to sensory denial dovetails with another concern foregrounded in this special issue, namely that reclaiming the senses is a way to make *sense* of Othering at work in occupational and organizational settings. Warren, for example, expands our understanding of occupational gender segregation by attending to ‘sensilation’ among women electronic music artists – the process of learning to experience and perform sensory knowledge according to occupational norms. In this context, occupational identity is not exactly a social construction of self in relation to normative practitioners. Instead, it is a learned, rehearsed bodily capacity to exercise and display sensory skill in line with normative expectations. Identities of work arise through occupational ‘sensilation’; they are social and physical, conscious and less so, all at once. Warren develops ‘sensilation’ as an avenue for deepening our understanding of occupational Othering, for example, along the lines of gender, race, sexuality, and ability. Here,

reclaiming the sensory is politically productive: It helps to both explain and reclaim activities, technologies, and spaces of work dominated by masculinity and heteronormativity.

Kuismin's contribution on 'A sense of spacing' brings what is at stake in 'sensilation' to the study of organizational space. Aligning himself with relational approaches to spacing that foreground the sensory-affective constitution of organizational and managerial sites (see above), this paper explores a more sustained engagement with spatial difference and other possibilities of sensing space through the notion of diffraction as developed by Karen Barad (2014). As illustrated through a case-study of a university-based entrepreneurship hub, apprehending spatial differentiation through different sensory registers problematizes methodological assumptions that might still govern even the relational approaches to organizational space. Being able to better experience the multiple register of sensation involved in the making of organizational space is pivotal for reimagining these spaces in more inclusive and accessible ways, and for an everyday spatial practice more attuned to the heterogeneity of sensing.

The special issue concludes with another provocation piece that repositions and politicizes the 'sensory imperative' problematized by Juhlin and Holt. Chris Steyaert invites us – following Ahmed's queer phenomenology – to embrace dis/orientation as a 'sixth sense' through which we can refuse the homogenizing registers of sensing, in his case the inheritance of heteronormative education. Written in a personal, almost confessional tone, the essay urges us to defamiliarize our senses and to rediscover how we inhabit the scenes of our learning and teaching. Only then will the younger generation of teachers and scholars be able to decide for themselves on how they wish to inherit and, in doing so, make a place for queer becomings in academia, but also for 'queer forms of sensuous pedagogy'.

Conclusion

It is our hope that this special issue contributes to redressing the neglect or sanitization of the senses in MOS research, helping to give them their due that is long overdue. Sensory experience enables and conditions how we know of, and participate in, organized life. Any kind of organizational form implies and is enabled by a distribution of the sensible, of what can be sensed, felt and expressed. Knowing more *about* the senses implies learning to know *with* them; and such knowing may thus help us know *how* we can shape more equitable organizations. The papers assembled here evoke a few final, speculative notes for future research.

First, as all contributions make clear, research on the senses should avoid viewing them mainly in utilitarian terms, thus de-aestheticizing organizations to the benefit of control and production, and brushing under the rug any bodily and sensuous experiences that do not correspond to hegemonic expectations. In fact, the neglect of the senses (also) in managerial and organizational thought seems itself embedded in a larger (gendered, racialized) history of which kind of knowledge and empirical and analytical approaches are deemed acceptable. We believe that this special issue's focus on the senses in more general terms can help us understand the force of sensory ordering at work in scholarship itself, and how a style and habit of disembodied ocularcentrism holds sway and governs our accounts. Yet of course, the unsettling potential of engaging with the senses goes way beyond research. There is a kind of sensory politics of organization woven through the following texts: from questioning how we (as scholars) approach the senses through investigating phenomena such as organized numbness, pain and organizational sensilisation to opening up our imagination and our senses to everyday sensory difference and a queering of pedagogy. In this sense, we think that this special issue offers an

invitation to zoom in on critical analyses of organization and management as practices and processes of the making and unmaking of sense experience.

Second, a broader turn to the senses makes us more attentive to the way bodies affect their surroundings and are in turn affected by them, and such heightened attention can help us reveal the everyday micropolitics through which organization's sensing selves are shaped. However, as Juhlin and Holt emphasize, there is no unmediated access to what can be sensed. Future studies of the senses in MOS cannot be restricted to an imaginary of embodied immediacy. As the COVID-19 pandemic and its pervasive mediation of many organizational processes almost overwhelmingly demonstrated, sense perception is technologically mediated; organizational life is embedded in and shaped by what we might call atmospheric media or technological 'sensespaces'. Yet this is not new. As Walter Benjamin (2006/1936) pointed out almost a century ago, technological apparatuses foremost work on the mediation of the human sensorium and everyday sense experience. Consider, for instance, how today's media technologies inform the affective organization of work and everyday life (Gregg, 2011; Just, 2019). More research is needed, we think, that investigates how everyday technologies of organizing constitute forms and infrastructures of sensory ordering and disordering.

Third, another thread that runs through this special issue concerns questions of method, writing, and research presentation. An emphasis on haptic and tactile spaces, on smellsapes, soundsapes and coloursapes throws up methodological challenges to the regime of disembodied scholarship. Usually, much of what is given to our senses is falling prey to the 'resentment that presents itself as a method' (Sloterdijk, 2011: 267–268). In relation to the following contributions and to exemplary studies referenced above, making the senses central to organizational analysis is an invitation to methodological experimentalism. In broader terms, it

points to the question of a poetics of MOS and its performances of doing and writing up research – and of teaching, as Steyaert’s contribution to this special issue shows. In particular, Steyaert and Péretzs’ texts present interventions also in terms of the styles that scholars adopt in writing on the senses. These texts not only exemplify how scholarly sensemaking is predicated on what is given to scholarly senses. They also point to registers of writing attuned to the organizational sensorium.

References

- Agostinho D and Thylstrup NB (2019) ‘If truth was a woman’: Leaky infrastructures and the gender politics of truth-telling. *Ephemera. Theory and politics in organization* 19(4): 745–775.
- Albers J (2013) *Interaction of Color*. 50th anniversary edition ; 4th edition. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ashcraft KL (2008) Bringing the body back to work, whatever and wherever that is: Occupational evolution, segregation, and identity. In: *Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association*, 2008.
- Ashcraft KL (2017) ‘Submission’ to the rule of excellence: Ordinary affect and precarious resistance in the labor of organization and management studies. *Organization* 24(1): 36–58. DOI: 10.1177/1350508416668188.
- Ashcraft KL (2021) Communication as constitutive transmission? An encounter with affect. *Communication Theory* 31(4): 571–592. DOI: 10.1093/ct/qtz027.
- Barad K (2014) Diffracting diffraction: Cutting together-apart. *Parallax* 20(3). Routledge: 168–187. DOI: 10.1080/13534645.2014.927623.
- Barthes R (2009) *Mythologies* (tran. A Lavers). London: Vintage Classics.
- Bell E and Vachhani SJ (2020) Relational encounters and vital materiality in the practice of craft work. *Organization Studies* 45(5): 681–701. DOI: 10.1177/0170840619866482.
- Benjamin W (2006) The work of art in the age of its technologocal reproducibility (second version). In: Eiland H and Jennings MW (eds) *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings. Volume 3: 1935 - 1938*. First paperback edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 101–133.
- Bennett J (2012) *Practical Aesthetics: Events, Affects and Art after 9/11*. Radical aesthetics, radical art. London: I.B. Tauris.

- Best K and Hindmarsh J (2019) Embodied spatial practices and everyday organization: The work of tour guides and their audiences: *Human Relations* 72(2). SAGE PublicationsSage UK: London, England: 248–271. DOI: 10.1177/0018726718769712.
- Beyes T (2017) Colour and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies* 38(10): 1467–1482. DOI: 10.1177/0170840616663240.
- Beyes T and Holt R (2020) The topographical imagination: Space and organization theory. *Organization Theory* 1(2). SAGE Publications Ltd: 2631787720913880. DOI: 10.1177/2631787720913880.
- Beyes T and Steyaert C (2012) Spacing organization: non-representational theory and performing organizational space. *Organization* 19(1): 45–61. DOI: 10.1177/1350508411401946.
- Beyes T and Steyaert C (2013) Strangely familiar: The uncanny and unsiting organizational analysis. *Organization Studies* 34(10): 1445–1465. DOI: 10.1177/0170840613495323.
- Beyes T and Steyaert C (2021) Unsettling bodies of knowledge: Walking as a pedagogy of affect. *Management Learning* 52(2). SAGE Publications Ltd: 224–242. DOI: 10.1177/1350507620979713.
- Blackman D and Sadler-Smith E (2009) The Silent and the Silenced in Organizational Knowing and Learning. *Management Learning* 40(5). SAGE Publications Ltd: 569–585. DOI: 10.1177/1350507609340809.
- Böhme G (2017) *Atmospheric Architectures: The Aesthetics of Felt Spaces* (tran. A-C Engels-Schwarzpaul). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Bologh RW (1990) *Love or Greatness: Max Weber and Masculine Thinking – a Feminist Inquiry*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Brennan T (2004) *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Brown SD, Kanyeredzi A, McGrath L, et al. (2020) Organizing the sensory: Ear-work, panauralism and sonic agency on a forensic psychiatric unit. *Human Relations* 73(11). SAGE Publications Ltd: 1537–1562. DOI: 10.1177/0018726719874850.
- Clair RP (1998) *Organizing Silence: A World of Possibilities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Classen C (1997) Foundations for an anthropology of the senses. *International Social Science Journal* 49(153): 401–412. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2451.1997.tb00032.x.
- Cnossen B (in press) Sensing what a place can become: the role of place in an alternative urban community. In: Aroles J, Vaujany F-X de, and Pérezts M (eds) *Phenomenologies and Organization Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cnossen B, de Vaujany FX and Haeffliger S (2020) The Street and Organization Studies. *Organization Studies*. SAGE Publications Ltd: 0170840620918380. DOI: 10.1177/0170840620918380.
- Cruz JM and Sodeke CU (2021) Debunking eurocentrism in organizational communication theory: Marginality and liquidities in postcolonial contexts. *Communication Theory* 31(3): 528–548. DOI: 10.1093/ct/qtz038.

- Day J (ed.) (2013) *Making Senses of the Past: Toward a Sensory Archaeology*. Center for Archaeological Investigations Occasional paper 40. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- De Molli F, Mengis J and van Marrewijk A (2020) The aestheticization of hybrid space: The atmosphere of the Locarno Film Festival. *Organization Studies* 41(11). SAGE Publications Ltd: 1491–1512. DOI: 10.1177/0170840619867348.
- Dixon M, Toman N and DeLisi R (2013) *The effortless experience: Conquering the new battleground for customer loyalty*. Illustrated édition. New York: Portfolio.
- Drysdale K (2016) Tactile places: doing sensory ethnography in Sydney's drag king scene. *Continuum* 30(2): 206–217. DOI: 10.1080/10304312.2016.1143190.
- Endrissat N and Noppeney C (2013) Materializing the immaterial: Relational movements in a perfume's becoming. In: Carlile PR, Nicolini D, Langley A, et al. (eds) *Perspectives on Process Organization Studies: How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts and Materiality in Organization Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 58–91.
- Ewenstein B and Whyte J (2007) Beyond Words: Aesthetic Knowledge and Knowing in Organizations. *Organization Studies* 28(5): 689–708. DOI: 10.1177/0170840607078080.
- Ferguson KE (1984) *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy*. Women in the political economy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fischer J (2015) Simmels Sinn der Sinne. In: Göbel HK and Prinz S (eds) *Die Sinnlichkeit Des Sozialen: Wahrnehmung Und Materielle Kultur*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript, pp. 423–330.
- Gatrell CJ (2013) Maternal body work: How women managers and professionals negotiate pregnancy and new motherhood at work. *Human Relations* 66(5): 621–644. DOI: 10.1177/0018726712467380.
- Gherardi S (2019) Theorizing affective ethnography for organization studies. *Organization* 26(6): 741–760. DOI: 10.1177/1350508418805285.
- Gregg M (2011) *Work's Intimacy*. London: Polity.
- Hennion A (2015) Paying attention: What is tasting wine about? In: Berthoin Antal A, Hutter M, and Stark D (eds) *Moments of Valuation: Exploring Sites of Dissonance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 37–56.
- Hochschild A (1983) Comment on Kemper's 'Social Constructionist and Positivist Approaches to the Sociology of Emotions'. *American Journal of Sociology* 89(2). The University of Chicago Press: 432–434. DOI: 10.1086/227874.
- Holt R and Cornelissen J (2014) Sensemaking revisited. *Management Learning* 45(5). SAGE Publications Ltd: 525–539. DOI: 10.1177/1350507613486422.
- Höpfl H (2000) The suffering mother and the miserable son: Organizing women and organizing women's writing. *Gender, Work & Organization* 7(2): 98–105. DOI: 10.1111/1468-0432.00097.
- Howes D (2003) *Sensual Relations: Engaging the Senses in Culture and Social Theory*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Howes D (2020) Skinscapes: Embodiment, culture, and environment. In: Classen C (ed.) *The Book of Touch*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 27–39. Available at: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781003135463> (accessed 16 March 2022).
- Hussain S (2019) Sensory marketing strategies and consumer behavior: Sensible selling using all five senses. *IUP Journal of Business Strategy* 16(3). IUP Publications: 34–44.
- Islam G, Endrissat N and Noppeney C (2016) Beyond ‘the Eye’ of the Beholder: Scent innovation through analogical reconfiguration. *Organization Studies* 37(6): 769–795. DOI: 10.1177/0170840615622064.
- Jørgensen L and Holt R (2019) Organization, atmosphere, and digital technologies: Designing sensory order. *Organization* 26(5): 673–695. DOI: 10.1177/1350508419855698.
- Just SN (2019) An assemblage of avatars: Digital organization as affective intensification in the GamerGate controversy. *Organization* 26(5). SAGE Publications Ltd: 716–738. DOI: 10.1177/1350508419842710.
- Katila S, Kuusmin A and Valtonen A (2019) Becoming upbeat: Learning the affecto-rhythmic order of organizational practices. *Human Relations*. DOI: 10.1177/0018726719867753.
- Kavanagh D (2004) Ocularcentrism and its Others: A framework for metatheoretical analysis. *Organization Studies* 25(3). SAGE Publications Ltd: 445–464. DOI: 10.1177/0170840604040672.
- Linstead SA (2018) Feeling the reel of the real: Framing the play of critically affective organizational research between art and the everyday. *Organization Studies* 39(2–3). SAGE Publications Ltd: 319–344. DOI: 10.1177/0170840617717552.
- Liu M and Buzzanell P (2006) When workplace pregnancy highlights difference: Openings for detrimental gender and supervisory relations. In: Fritz JMH and Omdahl BL (eds) *Problematic Relationships in the Workplace*. Peter Lang, pp. 47–68.
- Lund C (2015) Selling through the senses: Sensory appeals in the fashion retail environment. *Fashion Practice* 7(1). Routledge: 9–30. DOI: 10.2752/175693815X14182200335619.
- Mack K (2013) Taking an aesthetic risk in management education: Reflections on an artistic-aesthetic approach. *Management Learning* 44(3). Sage Publications Sage UK: London, England: 286–304.
- Mack KS (2007) Senses of seascapes: Aesthetics and the passion for knowledge. *Organization* 14(3). SAGE Publications Ltd: 373–390. DOI: 10.1177/1350508407076150.
- Marsh D and Śliwa M (2021) Making a difference through atmospheres: The Orange Alternative, laughter and the possibilities of affective resistance. *Organization Studies*. SAGE Publications Ltd: 0170840621989008. DOI: 10.1177/0170840621989008.
- Marx K (1964) *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* (ed. DJ Struick; tran. M Milligan). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Massumi B (1995) The Autonomy of Affect. *Cultural Critique* 31(The Politics of Systems and Environments): 83–109. DOI: 10.2307/1354446.
- Meyer RE, Höllerer MA, Jancsary D, et al. (2013) The visual dimension in organizing, organization, and organization research: Core ideas, current developments, and promising

avenues. *The Academy of Management Annals* 7(1). Routledge: 489–555. DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2013.781867.

Michels C and Beyes T (2016) Spaces with a temper: on atmospheres of education. In: Steyaert C, Beyes T, and Parker M (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Reinventing Management Education*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 312–329.

Morrison EW and Milliken FJ (2003) Speaking up, remaining silent: The dynamics of voice and silence in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies* 40(6): 1353–1358. DOI: 10.1111/1467-6486.00383.

Murphy P and Fuente E de la (eds) (2014) *Aesthetic Capitalism*. Social and critical theory 15. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

Ong WJ (1991) The shifting sensorium. In: Howes D (ed.) *The Variety of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, pp. 25–30.

Pine BJ and Gilmore JH (1999) *The Experience Economy: Work Is Theatre & Every Business a Stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pink S (2015) *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. Second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pozner J-E, DeSoucey M, Verhaal JC, et al. (2021) Watered down: Market growth, authenticity, and evaluation in craft beer. *Organization Studies*. SAGE Publications Ltd: 0170840621993236. DOI: 10.1177/0170840621993236.

Prinz S and Göbel HK (2015) Die Sinnlichkeit des Sozialen. In: Göbel HK and Prinz S (eds) *Die Sinnlichkeit Des Sozialen: Wahrnehmung Und Materielle Kultur*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript, pp. 9–51.

Pullen A and Rhodes C (2015) Ethics, embodiment and organizations. *Organization* 22(2): 159–165. DOI: 10.1177/1350508414558727.

Pullen A, Rhodes C and Thanem T (2017) Affective politics in gendered organizations: Affirmative notes on becoming-woman. *Organization* 24(1). SAGE Publications Ltd: 105–123. DOI: 10.1177/1350508416668367.

Rancière J (2004) *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible* (tran. G Rockhill). London: Continuum.

Reckwitz A (2015) Sinne und Praktiken. In: Göbel HK and Prinz S (eds) *Die Sinnlichkeit Des Sozialen: Wahrnehmung Und Materielle Kultur*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript, pp. 441–456.

Reckwitz A (2017) *The Invention of Creativity: Modern Society and the Culture of the New* (tran. S Black). Malden, MA: Polity.

Serres M (2014) *Thumbelina: The Culture and Technology of Millenials* (tran. DW Smith). London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Simmel G (1992) Exkurs über die Soziologie der Sinne. In: Rammstedt O (ed.) *Soziologie: Untersuchungen Über Die Formen Der Vergesellschaftung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 722–742.

- Simmel G (1997) Sociology of the senses. In: Featherstone M and Frisby D (eds) *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings*. London: SAGE, pp. 118–119.
- Sloterdijk P (2011) *Neither Sun nor Death* (tran. S Corcoran). Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).
- Stäheli U (2018) Soziologie der Sinne. In: Müller H-P and Reitz T (eds) *Simmel-Handbuch: Begriffe, Hauptwerke, Aktualität*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, pp. 526–530.
- Stewart K (2007) *Ordinary Affects*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stewart K (2012) Precarity's forms. *Cultural Anthropology* 27(3): 518–525. DOI: 10.1111/j.1548-1360.2012.01157.x.
- Stewart K (2017) In the world that affect proposed. *Cultural Anthropology* 32(2). 2: 192–198. DOI: 10.14506/ca32.2.03.
- Stigliani I and Ravasi D (2018) The shaping of form: Exploring designers' Use of aesthetic knowledge. *Organization Studies* 39(5–6). SAGE Publications Ltd: 747–784. DOI: 10.1177/0170840618759813.
- Strati A (1999) Putting people in the picture: Art and aesthetics in photography and in understanding organizational life. *Organization Studies* 20(7): 53–69. DOI: 10.1177/017084060002000704.
- Strati A (2007) Sensible knowledge and practice-based learning. *Management Learning* 38(1): 61–77. DOI: 10.1177/1350507607073023.
- Taussig MT (2009) *What Color Is the Sacred?* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- van Bommel K and Spicer A (2015) Slow food movement. In: *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Consumption and Consumer Studies*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 1–2. DOI: 10.1002/9781118989463.wbeccs213.
- Warren S (2002) 'Show me how it feels to work here': Using photography to research organisational ethics. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 2(3). 3. Ephemera: 224–245.
- Warren S (2008) Empirical challenges in organizational aesthetics research: Towards a sensual methodology. *Organization Studies* 29(4). SAGE Publications Ltd: 559–580. DOI: 10.1177/0170840607083104.
- Warren S (2012) Having an eye for it: Aesthetics, ethnography and the senses. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 1(1): 107–118. DOI: 10.1108/20466741211220705.
- Weeks K (2007) Life within and against work: Affective labor, feminist critique, and post-Fordist politics. *Ephemera. Theory and politics in organization* 7(1): 233–249.
- Weheliye AG (2014) *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Duke University Press.
- Willems T (2018) Seeing and sensing the railways: A phenomenological view on practice-based learning. *Management Learning* 49(1): 23–39. DOI: 10.1177/1350507617725188.
- Young IM (2005) *On Female Body Experience: 'Throwing like a Girl' and Other Essays*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Zundel M (2013) Walking to learn: Rethinking reflection for management learning. *Management Learning* 44(2): 109–126. DOI: 10.1177/1350507612440231.