

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306199612>

The sense-makings of the senses – Perspectives on embodied aisthesis & aesthetics in organising & organisations

Article · January 2013

CITATIONS

11

READS

1,422

1 author:



[Wendelin Kuepers](#)

Karlshochschule International University

123 PUBLICATIONS 1,672 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

The Sense-Ma®king of the Senses –
Perspectives on Embodied *aisthesis* & Aesthetics in Organising & Organ-isations
– Or why *sensing* (and *sense*-making) makes *sense*
and no *senses* lead to non-*sense*
by
Wendelin M. Küpers,
and the Senses

*‘...if a revolution is to come, it will have to come from the five *senses*.’*
(Serres 1995: 71)

Let the silence speak.
Let the unseen be seen.
Let the smell of ambrosia fill the air.
Let the untouched move us
Let the untouched be touched.
(Ackerman 1990)

*‘Je dis qu’il faut être voyant, se faire voyant. Le poète se fait voyant par un long, immense et raisonné dérèglement de tous les *sens*.’* (‘I say one must be a seer, make oneself a seer. The poet makes himself a seer by a long, immense and deliberate derangement/disordering of all the *senses*.’)
Rimbaud Letter to Paul Demeny (May 15, 1871)

Every object, well contemplated creates an organ for its perception (Goethe)
Every subject, well contemplating creates a perception for an organ
Every subject-object relationship well contemplated, co-creates subjects and objects and their relations...

In(tro-)duction

This is our story, a tale of us, we the five **senses** as we experience an organ-isation. In this narrative, we ex-press and discuss our experiences as ‘Erlebnisse’¹ as a body in the every-day life of a ‘corporation’. As we would like to show you our role in **sense**-making and -giving in organ-isations, our **sensual** perceptions and qualities are described as concrete as well as generative media of meanings and aesthetics.

We, the different **senses** are telling you about our embodied situations and letting you know about when, how and why (not) our **sensitivity** and potential for ‘aesthesia’ are activated and vivid or stifled and excluded. The later one happens also because we **senses** have been deprived and atrophied under the regime of modernity, dominating in organ-isational life. As a structural and functional system this organ-sation seems to organise itself rather formal and mechanistic. Thus we face various snags, difficulties, obstacles and troubles while trying to enact our creative possibilities. Powerful conditions and constraints inside and around the context of current organ-isations try to use us in a limited, often instrumentalised way. At the same time we yearn for our aesthetic expressions and responses to be awakened, and reinvigorated **as we accompany the company**.

Thus by our reporting we try to communicate to you about our belonging and longing to play a more deliberate **sensuous** role and about the hindrances to do so. This re-telling aims at re-**embodying** us **senses** in order reconceive how we are always already present in the life-world you call organ-isation, which for us has diverse givens and affordances by materialities and immaterialities, facts and arte-facts, but also passions and actions.

Thus, we **senses** are given a form and forum here for in-forming you about our very presences, but also our pressing challenges and sufferings, as we are neglected or merely one-sidedly exploited.

You will learn about how we that is **sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch, plus one⁺** the mediating body and embodiment, experience and strive for an creative life – each alone and together. With regard (look!) to the latter one, it seems important to understand that and how our significance as a responsive community of **senses** in organ-isms and organ-isations can be considered and approached. The goal we are trying to realize here is not to fall into a romantic **sentimentalism**, but to reveal us in our inherent, living and expressive **sensuality** respectively **sensorium** and its impact on a different kind of **sense**-making! As what you call “sense-making” is mediated by us enlivened and enlivening **senses**, we are a **sense**-ful part(ner) of the work of

you as member of your organ-isation or you as a researcher. Accordingly, your understanding of us, **the look, sound, smell, taste and tactual feel** is the very base for all your individual and collective perceiving, knowing, deciding, communicating, acting, in its i-n-t-e-r-relational being and becoming...



Out-Lining _____ over-

To convey our messages, we **senses** first each describe our specific phenomenal qualities, followed by sharing with you our embodied experiences and perspectives in organ-isation while inviting you for **sensual** experiments and hearing poetic expressions or related quotations. Furthermore, you are incited to listen to inspiring ideas voiced by the **sensitive** philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962; 1964; 1995). We will **flesh** out selected facets of his important phenomenological understandings of the role of us embodied **senses** for singing the world in a new key (Toadvine, 2004). These ideas may help not only to describe organ-isations as **sensuous** embodied life-worlds, but also to explore its implicit embodied aesthetics. Finally, we **senses** suggest some implications for an embodied research practice and offer implications for practices in ‘corporations’. By concluding, we address some limitations and raise open-ended questions.

Reading the following with an attitude of empathetic curiosity and explorative openness will be helpful for perceiving what is ^{below}, above and b e t w e e n the lines. Please try to allow complimentary space and time throughout the perceiving of the following text and its con-+Text so that your **sensate** thinking, intuiting and empathetic feelings can take timely place. This musing mood will then be beneficial for actually making and letting us **senses** and out i-n-t-e-r-play with **sense** be experienced, reflected and then disseminated, circulated in spiralling cycle of associations and imaginations.

Let us **senses** now tell you about our storied perspectives on organ-isations and its members:

Seeing / Sight

You, who decipher these letters on this white background here; hey look at me! Can you see me, the capacity to perceive visually? I would like to make visible what and how I see things. Let me share with you my vision(s). You know my secret is that I do not need to touch or feel the outside objects in order to reach them. Instead, I feel the vibrations of the light-waves meeting my organ

of sight. In this way, I provide the means for that vision and its mirroring re-flection. It is due to me that the one who sees, is seeable and seen, and it is my task to help my embodied human being to embrace life's challenges visually and visibly. Moreover, I am an embodied gaze and move b/e/t/w/e/e/n the visible and its implicit invisible (Merleau-Ponty, 1995). While seeing, I do not hold an object at the terminus of my look. Rather I am delivered over to a field of the **sensible**, which is structured in terms of the difference b/e/t/w/e/e/n things and colors, as a momentary crystallization of colored being or visibility (Merleau-Ponty, 1995: 132). With regard and in viewing this company here, seeing is quite basic to all that is going on and what is visible. Starting with visions and strategies, futures are imagined, often with quite ambitious foresight, but enacted time and again by ridiculous attempts and short-term or tunnelled myopic views. My hindsight is the foundation for all kinds of ex-post re-flections and rationalisations in organ-isational and managerial practices.

In every-day life, in this apparently over-loaded world of organ-isations, seeing seems indispensable. Look at all these knowledge-workers working at their papers and watching at their computer screens. Without seeing they could not read or write anything at all; neither processing information nor communicating. Have a look also at these post-industrial service-workers at the front line. Without seeing their objects, colleagues and customers, they would not be able to deliver what they try to offer or respond to. All their specific needs and problems and those of their clients need to be re-garded.

Observably, what I see in this organ-isation is very ambivalent, as I perceive colourful sides, brightness as well as darkness, sallow or staid aspects, but mostly greyness. A lot of superficial seeing prevails on the visible surfaces. With this surfacing, my faculty of stereopsis, the perception of depth is underestimated or hardly used at all in these often flat and unexciting worlds of shallow and shadow-like organ-ising and managing.

Yes I know, I have been criticised with re-gard to a visual primacy, which I'm supposed to propagate. Sometimes I face the reproach of being responsible for an ocularcentricism of the visual by which I with my eyes appear to pursue hegemony in late-modern culture. My alienating look is objectifying the hellish Other (*être-pour-autrui*) to external materiality and thus makes the on-looker unfree (Sartre, 1943) and my gaze has been used as a disciplinary mechanisms and technique of social panoptical control (Foucault, 1977; McKinlay & Starkey, 1998).

But let me make it clear, originally I did not intend to privilege my eye to the exclusion of other ways of perceiving in the natural and social world. By my own nature and being socially inclined,

I do not remain ignorant of the embodied and symbolic functions of my colleagues, the other **senses**. Please understand that much of what my dear **sensual** mates and I are and do today is due to our transformation by industrialization and technology as well as our separation by physiology (Jütte, 2005: 180-236). Being ruled by a scopic regime, my looking has been systematically sharpened and disembodied, becoming an errant, clinically fixed and clouded gaze (Jütte, 2005: 186).

However, my actions, events of seeing (sights) and visual **sense**-making (Belova, 2006) are more complex and i-n-t-e-r-related with the other **senses** than many of the harsh critics allege. Yes, I am aware that being more **sensitive** to the other **senses** helps overcoming my ocularcentric vision-paradigm. If there weren't so many eye-catching distractions, humans would better consider the non-conceptual, pre-linguistic 'silent practice' that is implicit in all feeling, thinking, listening, speaking and actions in living organ-ising practices.

Yet, there is a way of re-**sens**itation this extensively visually-overloaded society by simply practicing to shut the eye more often and contemplating and knowing in other ways of **sensual** perception via my co-**senses**. Subsequently such closing is an opening and as a freed pondering it allows the 'third eye' of knowledge (ājñā) to receive images and exploring more intensive creative and meaningful paths-ways.

Let me share with you a fearful feeling: I'm afraid of blindness. What would you do without seeing? What happens when an epidemic blindness afflicts a society can be seen in Saramago's novel (1979) or the corresponding film directed by Fernando Meirelles (2008).

What can we learn from blind people? Isn't our blindness our sight's blind spot? Does the sight of the supposed evidence makes us blind? How can you cultivate me, in a way that you can see through or behind the appearance of things?

Please close your eyes for an in-stant ... and listen! What and how do you 'see' with your inner eye, and what do you feel and hear? What do you imagine and visualise? What would your vision of an aesthetic organ-isation be like? I m looking forward to hear and learn about what you see!

Apropos hearing it seems that

INSERT SIDEBAR 1 (Seeing) HERE

Hearing / Listening

Psssssssssssstttttt... Can you hear me? Let me have a word. I'm called hearing or audition, and I'm the receptor of all kinds of sound perception. Integrating listening and voice, I provide the base for rich phenomenologies of sound (Ihde, 2007). Let me invite you to attend to me and my often non-perceived role of the auditory in your and human life, obsessed with visual representations.

My inner ear detects even subtle vibrations and frequencies dulled only by the noise of this loud world. Can you still listen to that 'silent practice' that is before all those speaking noises and visual over-loads? How can you retrieve this stillness for making listening again a 'critical and emancipatory praxis' (Levin, 1989). You know, I am always open as I cannot shut my ears! But remaining open for what?

Well, in this organization, I have to bear all kinds of chatter and cluttering noise. I have to receive all kinds of resonances with sometimes odd, strange voices, ranging from gossip to all forms of more demanding communication. These are sounds ranging from informal chatting to serious conversations and from pretentious rhetoric of empty promises and lip-serving speeches to meaningful stories full of beauty and depth. In a way, I am ubiquitously present during all these talks among and b/e/t/w/e/n colleagues and managers as part of every-day life. Likewise, I'm there in conversing with customers as part of the service or I am at stake in communication with stake-holders. Even meetings in tele-spaces via phone- or videoconferencing in 'inter-places' (Küpers, 2010), all verbal communication is in a way based on me. It is through my receptive capacity that people and contents are brought together. Do you hear my message: *To listen is to relate*! Listening is the very found for unfolding dialogue and meaningful relationships!

However, what I **sense** in the sound-scapes of this organ-isation is that there is quite fragmented and barely melodious. When did you listen to pleasant sounds or even uplifting music in your organ-isation? How would it be different if you were to listen more intensively while you work? (Oldham et al., 1995). A 'listening Self' (Levin, 1989) and the *sounds of silence* as part of social learning and i-n-t-e-r-subjective meaning generation (Jacobs & Coghlan, 2005) have hardly a chance in organ-isations these days. Yes unfortunately, **sensitive** hearing and active listening are very much neglected and unappreciated not only here in organ-isations, but also in human (Western) society in general.

There are specific requirements for a ‘quiet time’ (Kaeser, 2007), a ‘sound organ-isation’ and ‘psycho-sonic management’. Listen for more about this and the ‘human **sensorium**’ by pinning your ears back into what Corbett (2003a,b) has to say. For **sensing** how listening can be a form of **sensuous** bodily leadership knowledge, and the significance of a much-needed **auditive culture** listen to the voices of Ropo and Parviainen (2001) and the sound of Koivunen’s ideas (2006) about an auditive and even musical leadership culture.

How can you become all ears for realising what is silenced and to sense that how listening is vitally important for understanding your organ-isational life? How can you support unheard layers of meaning? Are you aware about what happens before the voice of reason takes over and the subtle echoes of responsibility involved (Kleinberg-Levin, 2008).

Finally, let me acknowledge, I’m afraid of deafness! What can we learn from the incapacity to hear? Isn’t much of our deafness the result of inattention and acoustic overload by imposed sounds from all the noisy media and acoustic pollution? How to regain access the delights of stillness? I do hope that a cultivated art of ‘hearkening’ that is being attuned by the sonorous field and its auditory relationships as a whole (Levin 1989 p. 230) will enable you to listen more deeply and playfully. This then may allow responding with much greater situation-appropriateness and care, while eavesdropping or taking delights in releasing soundful beings and songssssssssss

INSERT SIDEBAR 2 (Listening)

We **Senses of Smell, Taste and Touch**

We the **senses** of taste, smell, and touch have been rendered inferior, and therefore ‘secondary’, and as such ‘anesthetized’ in the modern West (Diaconu, 2005). Historically, we were considered unable to produce knowledge and art forms, and the process of civilization was not interested in our cultivation, which led to our physical and psychic underdevelopment. Also the academic ‘silence’ on us is due not in the least to the absence of a specific **sensory** education and to the terminological imprecision concerning experiences, as well as to culturally deep-rooted anti-**sensual** and dualistic preconceptions with regard to the supposed separation of body and mind.

Basically, our realms are partly pre-reflexive, pre-intentional and collective, which challenges orientations focusing on conscious, intentional and subjective experience. A true inclusive

aesthetics of **haptic, olfactory, and gustatory** experiences may help to overcome our repression and deprivation. In this way we might be able to contribute to a deepened constitution of personal identity, social functions, and even more **sensual** ethical practices. With regard to the latter, did you know that tactfulness, flair, sagacitas and sapientia referred initially to us smell, taste and touch? All this raises an intriguing question: What would a relearned aesthetics of **smelling, tasting and touching** (Diaconu, 2006) mean for you and an organisation and its management?

Smelling / Smell

SniffnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnnNose stench, stink, scent... ahhhhhh arising aromatic, granting fragrant ...

It's me, smelling or olfaction! Yes I am quite subtle; my constantly open nose potentially perceives all kinds of odours, but mostly you are not consciously aware of me. Why is there an absence of language to describe my meaning? Yes there is that nomenclature of me which is trying to provide access to the 'narrative structure of different scent feature: aroma, bouquet, fragrance, perfume, odour, fetidness, reek, effluvia, exhalations' and other material emissions (Bronwen & Ringham, 2003: 47). But can you be sure about quality judgments in relation to those terms for describing my whiffs?

Due to my ephemeral character and over-layering qualities, the more you **sense** of me, the less you will smell at all the particular qualities of distinct odours.

Being a medium of olfaction from very early on in evolution and human history, why have I been marginalised in Western culture? Is it because this culture has a bias, which follows a push towards vision-oriented rationality (Borthwick, 2000: 132)? Do I connote a dangerous realm and manifest a threat to ‘good’ hale and hearty social order because I have a long historical association with bad health, decay, or disease and being connected to putrid death?

On the other hand people believed that more fragrant odours and aromatic therapeutic treatment could serve as a prophylactic against all kinds of suffering and part of celebrating life and love. Thus, odour is **sensed** as an ambivalent force for ill and good, holding the power of stenching stress and fetid death, but also festive life and fond's strive.

One of my qualities is that the scent is an inescapably raw, unmediated, pure **sensation**. Instead of re-presenting an object via odour you directly access what is there. In your culture, which is so heavily dependent on images and the verbal for approaching the so-called 'real', privileging presence through me serves as an effective counterpoint. By allowing receptive olfactory experience you could return anew to a vital **sensory** existence.

You know, there is a ‘cultural conundrum’ of me smell, and my organ the nose (Corbett, 2006). Ironically, although having such immediacy, I am nevertheless redolent with personal connotations and cultural significance, linked to individual and social identity and cultural **sensibility**. While these meanings may varied considerably from context to context smell-factors are present prominently in acts of memory, social affinity and definitions of place, character, and mood. Rather than serving as a means to bypass cultural values, smells have been utilized to underscore and express worths insistently (Drobnick, 1998; 2006).

Negotiating and structuring the complexities of the experienced world beyond Eurocentric orientations, smell, knowledge and art are no longer mutually exclusive realms (Classen et al., 1994: 95-158).

Interestingly the ‘deodorisation of Western culture’ reveals the playing out of three i-n-t-e-r-related political processes: namely, discrimination, location and regulation (Corbett, 2006).

Yes I function as a boundary-marker As a status symbol and impression management technique, I make a statement of who my human being is or pretends to become (Synnott, 1993: 183).

Did you notice, the olfactory symbolism mediated by me is expressed in prescriptive language? For example, if you say that you cannot smell someone or if someone smells bad, then you assess him or her as such. Yes it is true, I cannot smell certain people, and I know I can make my human being nosy that is becoming arrogant by an overbearing manner.

What about the smell of money and capital? According to the Latin proverb ‘Money does not smell’. This quotation was stated by the emperor Vespasian after reintroducing a urine tax on public toilets, as the coin could not smell, even though it was generated as a result of urination. However, it was clarified recently that money does not smell, only until it is touched <http://www.ufz.de/index.php?en=10473>. In singing its praises to the neo-liberal supposed free-market economy, money as a modern form of also social and symbolic capital still finds its materialisation that declares its physical and moral odorlessness (Sloterdijk, 1988: 315).

You can learn more about my role and functions in organ-isation by sniffing into Corbett (2006). But let me tell you, what I smell in organ-isations is rather dull and not very exiting. In all those sterile offices dealing with smell-free paper and working on the barren computer work-stations is mostly not related to smell at all. On the other side, industrious work-places can be smelly, even pungent, and service workers must bear redolent odours in their smelly work-environments. What do people perceive, who are exposed to uncommon smells of work (Reinarz 2003), and shameful stinks on a daily basis in their filthy work places, envired by omnipresent industrial pollution.

Have you ever **sensed** the malodorous stench of a sweat-shop and its often horrible unsanitary surroundings? Of course there are pleasant odours and stimulating i-n-t-e-r-mingling of smells. Several work- places do take care of pleasurable scenting ventilation and even provide aroma lights.

What would it mean to i-n-t-e-r-pret organ-isations as exposing 'smell-scapes'? How does your workplace smell? When did you breathe in the scent of a blooming flower at your workplace? How did the food smell that you had for lunch in the canteen? Can you smell your colleagues? Haven't you felt sometimes that someone's behaviour 'stinks' or that you could not smell someone, as the German proverb goes? Which perfume do your co-workers or managers use and why? Are you affected by it?

I am really concerned with the question about how I can encourage you to become more **sensitive** to smelling without falling prey to **commercialisation**! What would it mean for you if for example fragrance devices (marketed e.g. by AromsSs) release aromatic-blends in your or other's offices or customer areas through the ventilation and air-conditioning system? Did you know that the success for example of Singapore Airline's sensory is in part due to their consistent olfactory branding using a slightly exotic fragrance?

There is already a body of research suggesting that aromas e.g. cinnamon and peppermint odor, can influence cognitive performance and workplace productivity (Raudenbush, 2005). Today there are even scent-computerized devices and olfactory digitized cell phones designed, and the nose of the future may get olfact-aides (Hertz, 2007: 233, 238). You sniff it don't you: an instrumentalisation of scenting i.e. "smell sells", could be used for all kinds of vested interests in politics and business (Classen et al., 1994). But let me ask you: How dangerous could it become, when fragrances are used to manipulate the mood of people? What happens when you get obsessed to find the perfect scent? Smell the message of Süsskind's book on perfume and realise also the dialectics of its 'enscentment' (Gray, 1993).

On the other side experiencing me authentically, I can enrich and deepen your life. For how much I may awaken your memories, think about or even experiment with the Proustian phenomenon of smell-triggering memory via a biscuit in tea as described in '*A la recherche du temps perdu*' (Proust, 1913; Chu & Downes, 2002). Furthermore, I may prompt your affects and com-passions, thus intensifying your emotional life. Moreover these smell-related qualities may also be i-n-t-e-r-laced with your mental health and influence your sociability with others.

Frankly speaking, yes, I'm afraid of anosmia. Related to this lack of olfaction, I fear hyposmia the decrease in my ability to smell. Oh what a life would it be without smelling the fresh-brewed coffee in the morning, or one of the other 10,000 different scents there are. Losing an established and sentimental smell memory, causes feelings of deprivation and perhaps even depression. Furthermore, a loss of olfaction may lead to the loss of appetite and libido, even to the point of impotency. Now, how impoverished a life would that be?! Can you recall those moments of intensive **sensing** after you have recovered from a cold or depression and smelled again? By the way, without me you would not experience flavour, as this manifests from the combination of smell with basic taste **sensations**. Mentioning my dear sister taste, she is already urging me to bring my narration here to an end. 'Smell well' and good luck for sticking your nose in whatever you are curious about; trust me, just follow your nose, because the nose knows....

INSERT SIDEBAR 3 Smelling

Tasting / Taste

Hmmmmmmm, hello, it is me the taste or gustation. What do I taste like? How do I operate? Well, my receptors convey tasteful information to the body and brain. I am triggered by somato**sensory** stimuli, mostly, working together with my colleague smell, processing by various clustered taste buds and brain shuts. Thus, you can define me as the ability to detect and respond to dissolved molecules and ions, which make out flavor of substances.

You know I am totally underestimated compared to the other **senses**, although, as I said, I do partner with my buddy the more direct **sense** of smell. I can tell you stories about sweet, salty, sour, and bitter experiences. Interestingly Eastern traditions also know about further qualities of me, like spicy and what is called umami (旨味). This is found in fermented and aged foods, described as pungent "meatiness", "relish" or "savoriness". More recently, psychophysicists and neuroscientists have suggested even further sub-categories of me like fatty acid taste as well as the **sensation** of metallic tastes. In any case, I am – like my colleague smell - a transient **sensory** experience. What do my ephemeral and amorphous qualities mean for you?

As a bodily **sense**, I am linked like the other **senses** but in a particular way with pleasure and/or displeasure. For example, I invoke the immediate enjoyment or disgust of eating and drinking, kissing and savour licking. Have you realised how much you rely on me while tracing ingredients, like herbs or other flavours for relishing what you consume? I am also applied to

human beings: For example why do you say someone has a ‘sweet personality’ or ‘sour character’?

Compared to all other **senses**, I am considered to admit to the most variety and idiosyncrasy: ‘there is no disputing about taste’. Nevertheless, there has been quite controversial debate about whether I am only relative or whether and how universal standards can be developed for me. Figuratively, I am used as a metaphor, that is a expression for a set of preferences and dispositions that admit shared social standards and public criticism. Elucidating the subtle nature of aesthetic **sensibilities**, I refer to aesthetic discernment and appreciation.

Let us get a taste of what a master of intellectual taste and high priest in the church of reason Kant said about this.² According to Kant’s philosophy (1781/1999) of subsuming particulars under concepts or universals is only pure judgement as aesthetic taste, which pertains to beauty - in contrast to the merely subjective, **sensuous** pleasure and displeasure of bodily **senses**. Due to our link to practical desires and carnal drives we **senses** can only relate to individual judgement of pleasing and displeasing taste thus not having universal validity. For Kant the a priori character of me taste reflects the transcendental principle of the general acceptability, and only transcending from individual whims and idiosyncrasy, there can be a ‘**sensus communis**’. Consequently, while advocating the mastery of **sense** by reason alone, he consigns me the smell with my friends ‘to the dust heap of the **senses**’ (Classen et al. 1994: 89). For him it is the objective, disinterested, pure aesthetic pleasure in the presentation (Vorstellung) that allows a universal agreement, validity and judgement.

How do you distinguish and judge good from bad taste? And does the capacity to draw and enact such differentiation imply for you and other human beings? As I am an emergent effect of working with the other direct **senses** of my embodying human being and his social and cultural context, also my appraisal and evaluation of aesthetic qualities are influenced by this i-n-t-e-r-play.

After enjoying a tasty meal, and pursuing empirical research, Bourdieu (1984) theorised how aesthetic preferences of me the taste are a social im-position and means of social distinction often in disguise or rendered invisible. Rejecting the pretence of universality for matters of preference to me, he claimed that the philosophical superiority of me as aesthetic taste is an illusion. I welcome Bourdieu's debunking contest of formal theories of culture, language, and aesthetics as well as agree that the main force of these discourses is producing and maintaining hierarchies of power and domination. Further, I and my co-**senses** find much valuable insights in his relational

approach of fields (as patterned set of practices), habitus (as preforming schemata of perception, feeling thinking, acting and evaluating), and his distinctions attempting to overcome 'subjectivism' and 'objectivism'.

But as taste, I am more and different than an acquired cultural competence and a classifier, even as classifying the classifier (1984: 6) or resource used to legitimise hierarchical social differences. With his focus on the complex economic, social and cultural capitals and battles in which I function and reproduce class and status structures, he did not sufficiently consider me as bodily living experience (Shilling, 1993: 146-7). For me his grand theory, with its tendency towards exclusive authority claims, tastes itself too much like socio-corporeal determinism, which is reducing my embodied being to reproductive function. This leaves too little room for non-necessary or non-conforming taste choices e.g. new foods (Lupton, 1996: 94) and emergent transformations

Have you ever asked yourself what and how taste tastes like? Is there ultimately 'One Taste' (Wilber 2000) or rather infinitely many tastes and variations?

What does it imply to value the flavourless rather than the flavourful? Could you enjoy the absence of taste with pleasure, as a richness of bland meaning (Jullien, 2004)? What would it mean to learn that the bland comprises the unnameable union of all potential values, embodying a reality whose very essence is change providing an infinite opening into the breadth of taste? Can you allow the undifferentiated foundation of all things in blandness to appear elusively, similar to clearing the palette before tasting, such as tasting ginger b/e/t/w/e/e/n bites of sushi; or drinking water b/e/t/w/e/e/n sips of wine? What are the consequences of recognising that the bland is not associated with a lack, but an intensifying quality for aesthetic and even ethical dimensions? Together with all the other **senses**, I the taste, I am particularly connected and applicable also to *style*, as pervading 'being-in-the-world' and synergic synthesis of the perceiving body (Singer, 1993). Basically, perception 'already stylizes' (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 455) that is I cannot help, but constitute and simultaneously express in my tasting a point of view, better to say a **sensual** perspective.

You cannot imagine what I experience as good and bad tastes in this tasteful and tasteless organisation (Corbett, 2006). I must say, many if not nearly all workplaces and their distasteful designs are unappealing. The atmosphere of industrial or service-work and most offices are distasteful in excess and demonstrate awful, organisational kitsch (Linstead, 2002) quite unrefined taste of mawkish **sentimentality** and faked **sensation**, for my taste.

What do you taste at work? What are the gastronomic styles of eating in your organization? What style of taste do you perceive in your organ-isational culture? How does the after-taste of being all day in your organ-isation tastes like?

The good news is that I am not only naturally given, but can be educated and cultivated, like all my co-senses. Can you envision strategies for refined existence (Küpers, 2005a) that has a fine taste? What kind of lingering taste do you perceive after this ‘finish’ of my ex-pressions here? Tasting is better without haste! Test and taste it!

INSERT SIDEBAR 4 (Taste)

Touching / Touch

Touch Touch Touch me, and be touched by me! Welcome to the worlds of touch (Katz, 1989; Classen, 2005)! I am an elementary sense, as it is from me the other senses have evolved.

It is by means of me that you are able to become aware of the size, form, shape and delight of material objects. With those millions of receptors throughout the body I can detect degrees material hardness, roughness, elasticity; and other physical characteristics including vibration as well as pain. With me you aware of changes of vital states in your bodies, such as thirst, hunger, sexual-feeling, and other ‘internal sensations.’ During tactual perception (Loomis & Lederman, 1986) my skin - your sensitive surface and largest, most various organ - perceives variations in pressure and shows the spatial possibilities and limits of your lived body (Connor, 2004). Did you know that your well-being is related to your enveloping ‘skin-ego’ (Anzieu, 1989).

When you reach out to caress an animate being, your immediacy of sensation is affirmatory and comforting, due to a mutual co-implication of your own body with another’s presence. Thus, as an index-sense, I operate in ways like grasp, feel, and tact, re-presenting the value of sensitivity itself.

Similar to taste, I the touch have these two complementary meanings: on the one hand being a sensual experience and on the other hand being an affective metaphor (Paterson, 2007). Through both the sensuous immediacy and the metaphorical mediality significance are imported for bringing distant objects and people into nearer proximity. Being linked to em- and sympathy and serving the need for connection, I influence the kind and degree of togetherness. Thus, I am present during handshakes or hugs, but also can be misused for uninvited grappling or harassments.

Currently, I am touched by the increasing yearning for embodied contact due to the growing isolation and alienation of today's modern life-worlds with its superficial spheres of production and consumerism? No wonder that I am exploited by a commoditisation of tactility (Paterson, 2007: 148). But I also still **sense** much apprehension and uneasiness of what is so called 'touchy-feely'.

How does your organ-isational life-world touch you and your body? Who and what touch you and how do you 'handle' your every day working life? Have there been experiences of vulnerability, which went 'under your skin'? Why isn't there a regular soothing massage provided to you at work? What and how have you consciously (been) touched lately at work? Have you noticed the touch of your hand using a pen, a computer mouse or a keyboard? What is happening to touch in tele-presences via human-computer interfaces and virtual realities of inter-places (Küpers, 2010)? What role does touching have for workplace behaviour (Fuller et al. 2010), negatively i.e. as influence tactic, sexual harassment or as touch anxiety as well as a positively for example to communicate support and caring for feeling closer to each other (Edwards 1984: 770)? Are there 'untouchable' issues banned in your meetings?

What touches me personally, is that I fear not feeling and **sensing** anything at all. What difference would it make for you not to touch or being touched? What kind of a life would that be? Aren't we all losing touch more and more in our insular and eye-minded world, overloaded by appalling and dreadful news and superficial contacts without being deeply touched. Instead of getting out of touch, please keep in touch with me!

INSERT SIDEBAR 5 (Touch)

*"**Sensation** is the most fundamental domain of cultural expression, the medium through which all the values and practices of society are enacted. ... **sensual** relations are also social relations...." (Howes, 2003, Foretaste XI)*

Other Senses & Synæsthesia of Sensation

Of course there are also we the other **senses**. For example me, equilibrioception, the vestibular **sense** perceiving position, location and balance, a **sense** of direction or orientation. And there are also we relatives of this **sensing**: Me for example the **sense** of place (Stedman, 2002) and me nociception, the **sensual** perception of pain.³ Furthermore, I exist, the so-called proprioception, the kinesthetic **sense**, refering to the perception of body awareness. Today you know us five **senses**, but in ancient times there were more **senses** known like animation, feeling, and speech. You **sense** it: we **senses** are relative to historio-cultural interpretations. Different significances are given to us in different times and cultures.

Sensuality and **sensibility** of us **senses** as the fertile though contingent ‘ground’ of your temporally relative being-in-the-world. They not only have their own intelligibility (Lingis, 1996) but relates you to **sensible** materialities and exposes you in a **sensuous** mediality of luminosity, tactility, and sonority.

There is one other more complex **sense**, which is commonly overlooked; it is I the common **sense**. Based upon what is conceived as knowledge held in common or as self-evident knowledge (Reid, 1764), sometimes particularly as prejudices, I can become an impediment to critical thinking. I common **sense** do not mean only that good **sense**, which is common or commonly needed in the ordinary affairs of life. Rather, I am a **sense** that is common to all of the **senses** or better to say the point where they meet in their intersensorial embodiment.

Importantly our experiences are multi-sensory and synæsthetic having an i-n-t-e-r-modal perception. Synæsthesia is usually described as a form of sensory slippage (Harrison, 1996), by which sensory experience with one modality involuntarily triggers percepts in another. However, in a non-clinical **sense**, Synæsthesia is an alternative way of considering sensoriality. This implies that one **sense** evokes another, which in turn, can evoke others, thus links i-n-t-e-r-sensory within the body and engage in the world and its objects in your everyday-lives. According to Merleau-Ponty synæsthetic perception is the rule, and we are unaware of it only because scientific knowledge shifts the centre of gravity of experience, so that we have unlearned how to see, hear, and generally speaking feel” (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 229; 2004). Seen in this way, synæsthesia is part of the way in which, moment by moment living beings re-constitute and re-create their world; in which they immersed as a stream of pre-reflective encounters

situated day by day. Following a kind of **sensorial** intelligence we **senses** i-n-t-e-r- act by implying and invoking each other in our politics of **senses** which cause that “at times conflicting messages are conveyed by different **sensory** channels, and certain domains of **sensory** expression and experience are suppressed in favour of others” (Howes, 2003, Foretaste XXII), practising a kind of opposing “dysæsthesia” (Drobnick, 1998). It is this orchestrated dissonance, which is essential for interrogating the perceptual decisions that go into the emotional and cognitive understanding of experience. You sense it we are traversing a **sensational** dance full of ambivalences.⁴

Understanding us embodied **senses as an ‘intelligent’ part of the living body**

–Merleau-Ponty’s Advanced Phenomenology

We **senses** provide our embodied beings, like those members of organ-isations, with the base or media for their multiple kinds of awareness and ‘intelligences’: visual, musical, logical, linguistic, movement, naturalistic, kinesthetic, intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences. Unfortunately the relationship b/e/t/w/e/e/n our **sensory** perceptions and reason is not really considered properly. This is also because our body and embodiment are not considered integratively, due to mentalist and cognitive biases, dominating (Western) rational culture.

Let us re-mind you, we **senses** are not just raw data or input for information-processing by cognitive procedures and a disembodied computational brain. This reductionist approach seems to be based on a prevailing mistrust of the actuality of our **sensory** knowledge, judged by empiricists and rationalists as impoverished. Correspondingly we have been reduced to a set of variables to be factored into calculated objects for influencing or even. In contrast to such appropriation, we are not isolated factors or informational bits, but are all i-n-t-e-r- twined parts of our situated embodiment. Our bodies do our living as **senses** and allow us to make **sense** for you. We the bodily felt **senses** of qualia (sensual qualities), our i-n-t-e-r-play of experiences and the **sense**-based situations constitute **sensual** beings and meaningful ‘be-comings’. Bodies are the media for all your i-n-t-e-r-actions and -passions. We are a material nexus of **sensuality** and **sensuous** phenomena and thus a kind of processual reality, enabling **sensuous** interactions.

Our body and processes of embodiment are at work and full of play for transforming mere **sensitiveness** into **sensibility** and meaningful **sense**-making. For understanding and revalorizing these dimensions, basic ideas of one of the most profound philosophers of us embodied **senses** will be helpful.

With the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty we **senses** found some-body, who really understood our constitutive tasks and services. Yes indeed, with you can turn to the body and to embodiment as a basic nexus of living meaning.

As an unruly, unpredictable and unmanageable reality, the body and embodiment are – although focusing – decentring. They are not only ‘mastering’ subject and collectives, but are also disrupting, undermining and escaping the purposive and boundary-drawing processes including those of organization and management. With this understanding, bodily and embodied forces underline and allow an entrée into the processual, dynamic and unfinished nature of any organizing and managing.

By means of bodily and affective insertion into reality, humans are always already vitally responsive to the demands and needs, but also problems and claims of our situation, upon our **sensual** body. In this way the body ‘moves’ in terms of pre-reflective wisdom, which exceeds conscious awareness and control, dominating your organ-isational practices and studies.

Furthermore, the perceiving **sensual** body, the Self and its consciousness, as well as others and the world, are intricately involved and mutually ‘engaged’ within an ever-present corporal scheme and chiasmic ‘flesh’.⁵

Re-membering Organ-isations as **sensuous embodied ‘Life-Worlds’**

We the **senses**, (y)our body and the **fleshy** embodiment have been and are still marginalized or merely functionalised in conventional organizational practices and theory (Hassard et al., 2000; Casey, 2000: 55). Facing the prevailing separation of body and consciousness (Dale and Burrell, 2000; Dale, 2001) – underpinned by bifurcation of ‘mindless objects’ and ‘disembodied minds’ – and considering the ‘absent presence’ of the body in social theory (Shilling, 1993: 19; Leder, 1990), there is a need for a ‘re-membering’. How can you re-member us your **senses**, the body, the embodiment and its significance for organ-isations, thus re-integrate the lived, embodied experiences of **sensing** as a base for **sense**-making and acting?

Following the embodied turn in social science (Hassard et al., 2000: 12), **sense**-sensitive phenomenology offers possibilities for developing an understanding of a (re-)embodied organization (Styhre, 2004) and integrating **sensual** processes in its inter-relational nexus. For us **senses** organ-isations are and organ-ising takes place in particular **sensuous** embodied life-worlds. We know that our perspective contrasts reified i-n-t-e-r-pretations. By such appropriating approaches organ-isations are seen as immutable ‘objects’ that supposed to operate somehow independent of

human embodiment, intentions, unconscious motives or inter-subjective agencies. Following our focus on the lived **sensual** realities of organ-izational perceivers and actors, you can **sense** that for us organising is realized through embodied (en-)acting and experiential processes. Therefore for us **senses** members of organ-isations are first and foremost embodied beings, who are both a part of their world and coextensive with it, constituting but also constituted meaningfully (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 453). For the perceiving ‘body-subjects’ this situatedness comprises both the ways in which they act within the life-world, and which acts upon them (Crossley, 1996: 101). This acting and enactment implies that they never know about things or encounters independent of their lived experiences as bodily-engaged beings and their embodiment. Here embodiment does not simply refer to physical manifestation. Rather, it means that the **sensing** perceiver, knower and actor are being grounded in everyday experience and integrally connected to herself and her environment in an ongoing **sensual** interrelation. With this connection, the embodied experience and thus all organising practices are built upon an original, **ambiguous** ‘ground’. This base functions as a primordial world-horizon on which members of organ-isations experience and ‘body-forth’ their possibilities into the situated world **sensually**.

Accordingly, the constituents of the lived world of organ-isations are not ‘objective’ properties, or autonomous ‘subjects’, but situations and modes of being-in-the-world. As situations always have both a ‘subject-side’ and an ‘object-side’ they inextricably linked to each other. Thus the **sensual and sensitive** ‘body’ and its **sensation** and perception are the medium for a pre-reflexive yet active communion (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 212). Without the bodily-perceived **senses** of the individual situation and intentional and volitional energies, you would not know where you are or what and how you are being situated and doing something competently, nor how to communicate to other some-bodies. Thus living bodies and their **sensuous** embodiment are embedded in a social context that ‘are’ your situation; they ‘do’ your living (Gendlin, 1992). From an advanced phenomenological perspective, being embodied is always already a way of **sensing**, knowing and acting through con-textual encounters. Within this situatedness, the **sensual** ‘living body’ mediates b/e/t/w/e/e/n ‘internal’ and ‘external’ or ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’ as well ‘individual’ and ‘collective’ experiences. Thus the body is the i-n-t-e-r -mediation of all practices and negotiation of meanings in organ-isation.⁶

A re-integration of embodied dimensions can be based on the fundamental insight that, through embodied, perceptual and **sensual** selves, the ‘subjects’ of the organising processes are situated in their environment in a *visual, auditory, olfactory, tasteable, and tactile way*. Whatever they think,

feel, know or do, they are exposed to the aforementioned synæsthetic and synchronized field of us *i-n-t-e-r-r-e-l-a-t-e-d* senses (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 207). Accordingly, members or organisations are always embedded in the midst of our world of *sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch*. It is through the sensing and sensed body that those involved in organizational process directly reach their perceived and handled ‘objects’ and all relations at work. Moreover, members of organisations sense, ‘know’ and act, respectively i-n-t-e-r-act, while being situated spontaneously and pre-reflectively, in accordance with their bodies and their embodiment. The ‘occupational body’ is produced through the work of specific, commonplace and i-n-t-e-r-connected sensory practices as convincingly shown in the case of sensory work in military life of an infantry (Hockey, 2009).

In order to approach the i-n-t-e-r-r-e-l-a-t-e-d processes, they can be understood as embodied intentions and responsiveness. All involved in organizing processes encounter perceived realities through bodily organs from an intentional and responsive point of seeing, hearing or touching. With an intentionality of the bodily consciousness, the agent within the sphere of organising does not only feel ‘I think’, but also ‘I sense’, ‘I can’ or ‘I relate to’ - or ‘I do’ (Macmurray, 1957: 84).⁷ In other words, the atmosphere within which organ-ising takes place is not only what people think about it, but primarily what they ‘live through’ with their ‘operative intentionality’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: xviii) and responsiveness understood as answering practice (Jacobs, 2003; Stacey, 2001; Waldenfels 1994; 2007).⁸

Combining a non-regressive phenomenological ‘re-turn’ towards embodied pre-subjective, pre-reflective and pre-objective constituencies offers perspectives for an integrative ‘turn forward’. This turn implies an inclusive ‘immanent transcendence’ towards an integrative processual and post-dualistic yet practical perspective, realized by a specific integral ‘pheno-practice’ (Küpers, 2009) and co-constituting embodied aesthetics.

Understanding Embodied Aesthetics in Organisations

In which way are we senses also a pedestal for a genuine understanding of aesthetics in particular in and for organization? Etymologically deriving from the Greek *aisthesis*, aesthetics comprises expressions that designate us embodied sensation and perception taken as a whole, prior to the assignment of any cognitive or artistic meaning. The Greek verb *aisthanomai* denotes the capacity to perceive with us senses. Having an aesthetic experience means being sensually responsive to the pattern that connects (Bateson, 1979), giving the subject a sensual perception

and feeling of wholeness and of belonging to a heightened reality. Phenomenologically, art-related and aesthetic experiences are constituted by us **sensual** based, embodied-perceptual, emotional-responsive, and expressive-communicative relationships. Aesthetic knowledge and understandings comes from us perceptive bodily **sensuous** faculties of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching. Thus, all forms of aesthetics require a full engagement and refinement of us all and our **sensibilities** in human perception, feeling, thinking and acting.

For having an aesthetic experience, an ‘aesthetic attitude’ marks a basic requirement. This stance needs to be one of an openness and attentiveness to experiencing an object or process fully, **sensually** and aesthetically. It suggests that there is a certain way to look, hear, smell, taste, and touch and also to feel and imagine an object or process that lends itself to a more profound experience. Following a detachment from purpose, to experience an object or process truly aesthetically is to experience it for its own sake and not for any practical or ulterior motive. Accordingly, the aesthetic attitude is conventionally characterized by disinterestedness and a distance from any instrumental relation to the object or process. However, despite the romantic ideal of acknowledging art for art’s sake, people in their aesthetic experiences, cannot ignore who they are and where they have come from. In the pragmatic spirit of breaking barriers b/e/t/w/e/e/n emotions, imagination, reason, culture, and behaviours art can be experienced simultaneously for its social, moral, or intellectual values. Yet, an aesthetic lens shifts the attention to that which is **sensuous** and calling for, a focus that does not deny or exclude other valid aspects of perception. The form and content of aesthetic experiences are response-dependent, qualitative, or expressive dimensions of the object or process. Aesthetic responses can then be followed by aesthetic i-n-t-e-r-pretations, aesthetic judgments, and aesthetic communication (Küpers, 2002: 28) all carrying a transformational potential.⁹ As aesthetics relates to experiential and transformative processes this implies that value of art and aesthetics are not in artifacts per se, but in the dynamic experiential activity and passion perceived and evaluated individually and collectively.

Complementing our aesthetic expert the taste, all of us **senses** contribute to an aesthetic **sensible** judgement. As a ‘judicium **sensitivium**’ it processes via integrated operations case by case in a situation-specific way of assessing particular phenomena.¹⁰

In a way aesthetics’ and aesthetic-like processes are a pervading part of the fabric of organisations` everyday activities, experiences, judgements and reality. They imply evocative processes of **sensing** and imagination (Alvarez & Merchan, 1992), which always concern the i-n-t-e-r-weaving with prior experiences and us **sensory** faculties of aesthetic understanding (Strati,

1999: 14). Moreover, art-like forms invariably not only reflect the life within organ-isations, but are also often attempts to influence this very life. Furthermore, what is reflected in an aesthetic appraisal of organising and managerial processes is the specific embodied, emotional, cognitive as well as relational and con-+-Textual involvement. However, much art-like forms and processes are unrecognised as such. What would it mean to push the limits of aesthetics by looking at the i-n-t-e-r-section of **sense**-based art/aesthetics and daily life (Novitz, 1992)? How can you rethink our conception of the relations b/e/t/w/e/e/n **sense**-constituted aesthetics, ‘art’ and life in a way that reflects more adequately the role that enacted aesthetics play in the lives of organ-isations and their transformation?

Organ-isations are embodying aesthetic ‘properties’ and use various aesthetic symbols and artefacts. Certain arrangements of designs and artifices are agreeable, while others are disagreeable. Both types effect your embodiment and bodily states in the con-+-Text of workplace settings and organ-isational life. But to ask whether ‘organ-isations’ have aesthetic artefacts or are ‘aesthetic’ is perhaps already a wrong-footed or one-sided starting point. These materialisations, manifestations and results only partially cover what we **senses** offer and how we work and play. It is the **sensual** *process* of organ-isational activities and dynamics that needs to be examined and understood, if we are to find aesthetic realisations into the ‘nature’ of transformations of individuals and organ-isations. Again it is the relational **sensual** aspects, which are critical for approaching these activities as aesthetic. Instead of static notions¹¹ it is the *transformational quality* realised by aesthetic dynamics of embodied and felt performance processes that is imperative. Aesthetic processes of transformation need to be considered as to how they are making and remaking perceptions, persons, relationships, constructions, structures and entire ‘worlds’ in an ongoing process of i-n-t-e-r-r-e-l-a-t-i-n-g within organising. Embedded in con-+-textual relations, aesthetic processes ‘author-ise’ or constellate the manner of the performances. Aesthetic relating may create multiple realities as different but equally valid expressions, avoiding the imposition of one voice, which all too often dominates organ-isational practices. The transformational potential of aesthetic process in organ-isations – both as creation and/or reception refer to its capacity for questioning the **sense** of the real and gaining a **sense** of the possible. Activating both theses **senses** irritates productively and offers creative re-evolutionary changes for a differently shaped practice. Aesthetic events elicit genuine experience and by this open opportunities for intensifying the process of **sensual**, emotional and mindful

states, mediating creative processes for more integral and sustainable practices of organ-isations, to be re-researched.

Implication for embodied research practice

In this paper, (we) the **senses** have argued how the life-world of organ-isations discloses itself through various **sensual** experiences and their i-n-t-e-r-play. However, all too often, the researcher's presence – let alone bodily and **sensual** experience – is eradicated out of his or her research conduct and its accounts. How can the body and we senses be included in research practices and publications? How to realise and show the ambiguity by which the **sensuous** body reveals, informs but also discloses and hints indirectly?

We **senses** suggest to you researchers to begin by refining your own embodied **sensory**, and perceptual faculties (Strati, 2000: 17). With Sandelands and Srivatsan (1993: 19), a science is “fully alive and creative when wide-eyed and involved, when it sees, touches, hears, tastes, and feels”. With such integration, embodied researchers may rely more on their intuitive and aesthetically responsive skills and on their expressive capabilities, thus conducting a more **sensually** complete methodology (Warren, 2002: 229-230). We **senses** welcome Samantha Warren's critique (2002) of a prescriptive methodological recipe for researching us and our aesthetics in organ-isations, as such an approach does not do justice to our tacit, largely ineffable, always moving, embodied spatial, temporal and cultural realities nor the transitory experiences involved. Consequently, we are happy when she says “...surely the more **senses** that are employed in the communication of aesthetic experience the better...” (ibid. 2002: 235). Being impressed with her aesthetic ethnography, we agree with her plea for a more **sensual** methodology advancing **sensory** possibilities in organ-isation studies (Warren, 2008).

Indeed, we need research practices where “method meets art” (Leavy, 2009), in which researchers conduct narrative, poetic, musical, performative, dance, and visual forms of inquiry while they also employ rigorous methods of data collection, analysis, and i-n-t-e-r-pretation. Correspondingly, we invite you to experiment with alternative forms of expression like images, photos, videos, stories, scenes, sounds etc. We encourage you to endeavor ways of presentational symbolism (Langer, 1957) that are more inclusive, and able to capture the gestalt of aesthetic experiences with its fully nuanced qualities of us different **senses**. Furthermore, there is a need to develop a new kind of practice-based language facilitating transdisciplinary research and evaluation (Leavy, 2009: 257).

Based on embodied self-awareness, there is a need for reflexive embodied empathy (Finlay, 2003; 2005). A corresponding research process involves engaging reflexively, with the embodied i-n-t-e-r-subjective relationship researchers have with phenomena and participants. ■

There are many ways how an embodied approach makes use of us the lived **senses** and the body by which an intimate and implicit understanding of each experiences, feelings, thoughts and actions not only happen for the researcher and during the research process, but give rise to new meanings.

Importantly an embodied methodological research practice pays due regard to artistic and aesthetic dimensions involved (Küpers, 2002). Therefore, part of this emerging field of embodied research practice is that of an art-based transformational inquiry and art-based research (McNiff, 2007; 2008). Provoked by art (Cole et al., 2004) an art-oriented research uses artistic processes and expressions in all of the different forms and media, as a way of understanding.

Moreover, taking art practice itself as research realises that creative inquiry employed by artists can be a form of research (Sullivan, 2005). Investigating artistic inquiry and their use of **senses** and imagination may inspire social scientist to develop a community of artist-researchers (Cole & Knowles, 2008).

However, using art in qualitative research or developing arts-informed research (Knowles & Cole, 2008; 2008a) and creating a scholARTistry (Knowles et al., 2007) requires reflecting the persistent tensions in art-oriented research (Eisner, 2008).¹³

Although arts-informed research runs counter to more conventional research endeavors with their more linear, sequential, compartmentalized form and distancing of researcher and participants, the challenge will be to keep an internal consistency, coherence and communicability as well as to advance some kind of generative knowledge that reflects the multidimensional, complex, dynamic, i-n-t-e-r-subjective, and contextual nature of human experience in organ-isations.

Finally, the communication of research findings would also dare to find more aesthetic forms like experimental writing (Neilsen, 2001), blurring the boundaries b/e/t/w/e/e/n science and art (Glesne, 1997). There is much more to think about further implications for an embodied aesthetic research for example for knowing, learning or improvising in organ-isations (Küpers, 2002; 2005). Forms of research along those spiralling lines outlined here, can contribute to become **sensible, and sense-able** about us **senses** and our **sensations** (Mills & Mills, 2006). We **senses** very much hope that emerging experiential and reflexive re-search can find ways to incorporate integral practices that actually or potentially ‘make **sense**’ as well as let us **senses** and our **sense**

unfold and being creatively told. We wish that such a research remains not only an agenda, but becomes realised by embodied agents, and incorporated in institutionalised agencies.

Conclusion – Limitations and Perspectives

Dear Reader, you have perceived, read and come to know about us the different **senses** and our i-n-t-e-r-connections. We provided you with some – admittedly selective – perspectives on and examples of our embodied significance in the life of organ-isations. There are so many other subtle dimensions and details, which we would like express beyond what is possible here. Speaking about limitations, let us address some final thoughts.

Facing the complexities of current organ-isations and their contexts, we know that not all of it can be understood by us **senses** and our bodily processes. The corpus of corporation is much more than what can be captured by us. What makes **sense** and what is non-**sense** in modern and post-modern lives in organ-isations implies more than what we ephemeral **senses** can do or tell.

But as we tried to outline, we are part of those inherent dimensions of embodiment, which refer to more than our mere **sensual** appearances. Being somewhat restricted to direct evident experience from a first-person-perspective, there is the need to advance inclusively towards second- and third-person perspectives in i-n-t-e-r- and transdisciplinary endeavours (Küpers & Edwards, 2008) and pheno-practical research (Küpers, 2009a). Moreover, a truly **sense**-ful and aesthetic inquiry deals not only with us **senses**, but moves beyond our appearances towards a more comprehensive integration of **sense**-making. Nevertheless, considering us mindfully may contribute for organising and managing more **sensitively** and sustainable.

The need to embrace a ‘new **sensoriality**’ and a further exploration of our **sensory** potential cooperation will become even more important as the desire for more intensive experiences and meanings will probably grow. We **sense** and hope that in near future our significance as rich, complex, and perplexing phenomena both in our own right and as guide towards a highly pan-**sensorial** culture (Verbrucken, 2003) will be more recognised.

Let us conclude by a few open questions: What did you perceive **sensually** while reading this paper? What could not be expressed in this format of a linear presentation and written language? How would it be like, if our ideas were presented in a different way? What would be a more adequate form or artistic mode for conveying our messages? How to develop a kind of writing – or intervention – which does not reduce or seek to limit the art(istic) experience, but rather opens it up to further adventures? What would this kind of writing look like?

How can researchers and communities of researcher be more (re-)sensitized?

How can we the senses be more in-corporated consciously into your life existentially and as a research practice?

Did you carry out the experiments, read the poems and quotations? What did you experience?

Were they helpful for you? How do you feel now?

Did the ideas discussed throughout this paper make you sense, see and listen, smell differently, and, if so, how? Have you been sensitised even touched? What kind of after-taste do you perceive sensually at present?

As we the senses are and will be with you, we would like to invite you to be mindful of and to us in your every-day-life, in your organ-isation, or in those you do research on as well as wherever you are, go or be-come!

Wishing you uplifting, inspiring sensual experiences!

Yours Sincerely and Senuously,

The Senses

References

- Abram, D (1997), The spell of the **sensuous**: perception and language in a more-than-human world, New York, Vintage Books.
- Ackerman, D. (1990), A natural history of the **senses**, New York: Random House.
- Anzieu, D. (1989) *The skin ego*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Bateson, G. (1979), *Mind and Nature: A necessary Unity* New York: Bantam Books.
- Belova, O. (2006) The Event of Seeing: A Phenomenological Perspective on Visual **Sense-Making**, *Culture and Organization*, 12(2), 93-107.
- Borthwick, F. (2000) Olfaction and taste: invasive odours and disappearing objects. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 11, 127-140.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bronwen, M. and Ringham, F. (eds), **Sense** and Scent: An Exploration of Olfactory Meaning. London, Philomel, UK.
- Burk, P. (1990) Listening at the abyss. In: G. A. Johnson & M. B. Smith, eds., *Ontology and alterity in Merleau-Ponty*, pp. 81-97. Evanston: Northwestern University Press
- Casey, C. (2000) 'Sociology **Sensing** the Body: Revitalizing a Dissociative Discourse', in Hassard, J., Holliday, R. and Wilmott, H. (ed.) *Body and Organ-isation*. London: Sage. pp. 52-70.
- Chia, R. (2003) 'Organ-isation theory as a post-modern science.' In: H. Tsoukas and C. Knudsen (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Organ-isation Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Chu, S. & Downes, J.J. (2002) Proust nose best: odors are better cues of autobiographical memory. *Mem. Cogn.*, 30, 511-518.
- Classen, C. (2005) *The Book of Touch*. Oxford: Berg.
- Classen, C., Howes, D. & Synnott, A. (1994) *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell*, New York, London: Routledge.
- Cole, A. L., Neilsen, L., Knowles, J. G., & Luciani, T. (2004) *Provoked by art: Theorizing arts-informed research*. Halifax, Nova Scotia & Toronto.
- Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (2008) Making space, Growing Fire: Creating a community of artist researchers. In A. P. Samaras, C. Beck, A. R. Freese, & C. Kosnic (Eds.) *Learning Communities in Practice*. New York, NY: Springer Press.
- Connor, S. (2004) *The Book of Skin*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Corbett J. M. (2003a) 'Sound organ-isation: a brief history of psychosonic management'. *Ephemera: critical dialogues on organization*, 3, 261-272.
- Corbett, J. M. (2003b) 'I sing the body (in)corporate: identity, displacement and the radical priority of reception'. In: M. Brigham, C. Brown and Associates (eds) *Critique and Inclusivity: Critical Management Studies 3*. Lancaster: AMS Press.
- Corbett, J. M. (2006) **Scents** of identity: organ-isation studies & the cultural conundrum of the nose; *Culture and Organ-isation*, 12, pp. 221-232.

- Crossley, N. (1996) *Intersubjectivity: The Fabric of Social Becoming*. London: Sage.
- Crossley, N. (2006) *Reflexive Embodiment in Contemporary Society*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Dale, K. (2001) *Anatomising Embodiment and Organ-isation Theory*. London
- Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2000) 'What shape are we in? Organization theory and the organized body' in J. Hassard, R. Holliday and H. Willmott (ed.) *Body and organization*. London: Sage. pp. 15-30.
- Diaconu, Mădălina M. (2005) Tasten, Riechen, Schmecken. Eine Ästhetik der anästhesierten Sinne, Wuerzburg „The Rebellion of the «Lower» Senses: A Phenomenological Aesthetics of Touch, Smell, and Taste', in: *Essays in Celebration of the Founding of the Organization of the Phenomenological Organ-isations*, Ed. Cheung, Chan-Fai, Ivan Chvatik, Ion Copoeru, Lester Embree, Julia Iribarne & Hans Rainer Sepp, web-published at www.o-p-o.net, 2003
- Diaconu, Mădălina M. (2006) Secondary Senses', entry for *Handbook of Phenomenological Aesthetics*, ed. by Lester Embree, Hans-Rainer Sepp, The Hague: Kluwer, 2005, 6 p
- Drobnick, J. (1998) Reveries, Assaults and Evaporating Presences: Olfactory Dimensions in Contemporary Art, *PARACHUTE* #89, Winter 1998, pp. 10-19
- Drobnick, J. (2006) *The Smell Culture Reader*, Oxford: Berg Publishers
- Ediger, J. (1993) *A phenomenology of the listening body*. Doctoral dissertation, Institute of Communication Research, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.
- Edwards, D.J.A. (1984) The experience of interpersonal touch during a personal growth. *Human Relations* 37(9): 769-780
- Eisner, E. (2008) Persistent tensions in art based research in: M. Cahnmann, M. & Siegesmund, R. (2008) (Eds.) *Arts-Based Research in Education: Foundations for Practice*, London, pp 16-27, New York: Routledge.
- Finlay, L (2003) Through the looking glass: intersubjectivity and hermeneutic reflection. In L. Finlay and B.Gough (eds) *Reflexivity: a practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Finlay, L. (2005) Reflexive embodied empathy: A phenomenology of participant-researcher intersubjectivity. *The Humanistic Psychologist*. 33(4) 271-292
- Finlay, L. (2006) Dancing between embodied empathy and phenomenological reflection, *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, volume 6 August Methods Issue.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish*, London: Allen Lane.
- Fuller, J. B., Simmering, M. J., Marler, L. E., Cox, S. S., Bennett, R. B., & Cheramie, R. A. Exploring touch as a positive workplace behavior. *Human Relations* , XX(X) 1–26.
- Gendlin, E. T. (1992) The primacy of the body, not the primacy of perception: How the body knows the situation and philosophy, *Man and World*, Vol 25 No 3/4, pp. 341-353.
- Glesne, C. (1997) That rare feeling: re-presenting research through poetic transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3, 202-222.
- Gray, R. T. (1993) The Dialectic of 'Enscenment': Patrick Suesskind's 'Das Parfum' as Critical History of Enlightenment Culture." *PMLA* 108 (1993): 489-505.
- Guillet de Monthoux, P. (2004) *The Art Firm - Aesthetic Management and Metaphysical Marketing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Harrison, J. (1994) *Synaesthesia: Classic and Contemporary Readings*. Blackwell.
- Hassard, J., Holliday, R. & Wilmott, H. (2000) *Body and Organ-isation*, London: Sage.
- Hertz, R. (1997) Introduction: reflexivity and voice. In R. Hertz (Ed.) *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hertz, R. (2007) *The Scent of Desire. Discovering Our Enigmatic Sense of Smell*, New York: William Morrow.
- Hockey, J. (2009) 'Switch on': sensory work in the infantry, *Work, employment and society* Volume 23(3): 477–493.
- Howes, D. (1991) *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Howes, D. (2003) *Sensual Relations: Engaging in the Senses in Culture and Social Theory*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Howes, D. (2004) *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ihde, D. (2007) *Listening and Voice: Phenomenologies of Sound* Albany: SUNY Press.
- Jacobs, C. (2003) *Managing Organizational Responsiveness – Toward a Theory of Responsive Practice*, Wiesbaden: DUV.
- Jacobs, C. & Coghlan, D. (2005) Sound from silence: On listening in organizational learning, *Human Relations*, Vol. 58, No. 1, 115-138
- Jullien, F. (2004) *In Praise of Blandness: Proceeding from Chinese Thought and Aesthetics* Carolyn Korsmeyer, *Making Sense of Taste, Food and Philosophy*, Cornell University Press.
- Jütte, R. (2005) *A history of the senses: From antiquity to cyberspace*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Käser, P. (2007) *Quiet Time: A Positive Organizational Intervention?* Paper presented at the European Academy of Management (EURAM) Paris (France) 16.-19.05.2007.
- Kant, I. (1781, 1999) *Kritik der reinen Vernunft / Critique of Pure Reason*, edited by Paul Guyer and Allen Wood Cambridge University Press.
- Katz D, (1989 orig.1925) *The World of Touch*, translated by L E Krueger Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kleinberg-Levin, D. (2008) *Before the Voice of Reason, Echoes of Responsibility in Merleau-Ponty's Ecology and Levinas's Ethics*, Albany: SUNNY.
- Knowles, J. G., Cole, A. L., & Promislow, S. (2007) *Creating scholartistry: Imagining the arts-informed thesis or dissertation* (Vol. 4, *Arts-informed Inquiry Series*). Halifax, Nova Scotia & Toronto, Ontario: Backalong Books & Centre for Arts-informed Research.
- Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (2008) Arts-informed research. In L. Given (Ed.) *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 56-70.
- Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (Eds.) (2008a) *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Koivunen, N. (2006) Auditive Leadership Culture. Lessons from Symphony Orchestras. In Dian Marie Hosking and Sheila McNamee's (eds.): *The Social Construction of Organization*, 91 - 111. Oslo: Liber.

- Küpers, W. (2002) 'Phenomenology of Aesthetic Organising - Ways towards Aesthetically Responsive Organisations', In: *Journal Consumption, Markets and Cultures*, Volume 5, Issue,1, pp. 31-68.
- Küpers, W. (2004) 'Art and Leadership', In: Burns, J. M, Goethals, R. R & Sorenson, G. J. (2004) *Encyclopaedia of Leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE; pp. 47-54.
- Küpers, W. (2005) 'Embodied Implicit and Narrative Knowing in Organizations', In: *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Volume 9, No 6, 2005, pp. 113-133.
- Küpers, W. (2005a) Envisioning a Refined Existence between the **Sense** of Reality and the **Sense** of Possibility through a Responsive Encounter between Art and Commerce'; In: Brellachs; M. & Schraat, H. (2005) (Ed) 'Sophisticated Survival Techniques - Strategies
- Küpers, W. (2009) Perspective on integral 'Pheno-Pragma-Practice' in organizations'', *International Journal of Management Practice* Vol. 4 No. 1. pp. 27-50.
- Küpers, W. (2010) "Inter-Places" Embodied Spaces & Places of and for Leader-/Followership - Phenomenological Perspectives on relational localities & tele-presences of leading and following, in: '*Environment, Space, Place*' *Journal*, Volume 2 / Issue 1 2010, 79-121.
- Küpers, W. & Edwards, M. (2008) Integrating Plurality - Towards an Integral Perspective on Leadership and Organ-isation' In: Wankel, C. (Ed) (2008) *Handbook of 21st Century Management*: London: Sage 311-322.
- Langer, S. K. (1957) *Philosophy in a New Key, A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Arte* Boston, Harvard University Press.
- Lash, S. (2006) Experience, In: *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2-3, 335-341.
- Leavy, P. (2009) *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. New York: Guilford. Press.
- Leder, D. (1990) *The absent body*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, D. M. (1989) *The Listening Self. Personal Growth, Social Change and the Closure of Metaphysics*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Levin, D.M. (1985) *The body's recollection of being: phenomenological psychology and the deconstruction of nihilism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Levinas, E. (1969) *Totality and Infinity*, trans. Alphonso Lingis Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lingis, A. (1996) *Sensation: Intelligibility in sensibility*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Lingis A (1998) *The Imperative*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Linstead, S. (2002) Organizational kitsch. *Organization* 9(4), 657-682.
- Loomis, J. & Lederman, S.J. (1986) 'Tactual Perception' In: Boff, K. R., Kaufman, L. and Thomas, J. P. (Eds) '*Handbook of Perception and Human Performance*' ; John Wiley & Sons; New York.
- Lupton, D. (1996) *Food, the Body and the Self*, London: SAGE.
- Macmurray, J. (1957) *The Self as Agent*. London: Faber.
- Madison, G. B. (1992) Did Merleau-Ponty have a theory of perception? In T. W. Busch & S. Gallagher, eds., *Merleau-Ponty, hermeneutics and postmodernism*, pp. 83-108. Albany: SUNY Press.
- McGough, R. (2004) **Sensational!** Poems Inspired by the Five **Senses**, London: Macmillan
- McKinlay, A. & Starkey, K. (1998) *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory: From Panopticon to Technologies of Self*, London: Sage.

- McNiff, S. (2007) Giving Voice to Art and Imagination: A Method of Transformational Inquiry, in The Power of Words: A Transformative Language Arts Reader, Ed. By Caryn Mirriam-Goldberg. Keene, NH, Transformative Language Arts Press,
- McNiff, S. (2008) Art-Based Research & the Spectrum of Possibilities, In Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research, Ed. By J. Gary Knowles & Ardra L. Cole. pp 29-40, Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1960) Signs, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962) Phenomenology of Perception, Routledge, London; (orig. 1945) Phénoménologie de la Perception, Paris, Gallimard.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964) **Sense and Nonsense**, Evanston: North-western University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968) The Intertwining the Chiasm. In The Visible and the Invisible. Northwestern University Press, Ilhnios, USA. pp. 130-155.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1995) The Visible and the Invisible, Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press .
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2004) The World of Perception. London Routledge.
- Mills; A. J. & Mills, J. M. (2006) **Being Sensable about Sensation: Introduction to the Special Issue Culture and Organization**, Vol. 12(3) pp. 199-206.
- Neilsen, L., Cole, A.L. & Knowles, J.G. (Eds.) (2001) *The art of writing inquiry*. Halifax, NS: Backalong Books.
- Novitz, D. (1992) The Boundaries of Art, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Oldham, G. R., Cummings, A., Mischel, L. J., Schmidtke, J. M. & Zhou, J. (1995) Listen while you work? Quasi-experimental relations between personal-stereo headset use and employee work responses, in: *Journal Applied Psychology*, 80(5), 547-564.
- Paterson, P. (2007) The **Senses** of Touch: Haptics, Affects and Technologies, **Senses** and Sensibilities, New York.
- Patriotta, G. (2003) Organizational Knowledge in the Making: How Firms Create, Use and Institutionalize Knowledge, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Proust, M. (1913) A la recherche du temps perdu. Paris: Grasset.
- Raudenbush, B. (2005) Positive Effects of Odorant Administration on Humans: A Review prepared for the **Sense** of Smell Institute http://www.senseofsmell.org/papers/B_Raudenbush_pos_effects.pdf
- Reid, T. (1764) An Inquiry into the Human Mind on the Principles of Common **Sense**, Edinburgh: Kincaid and Bell
- Reinarz, J. (2003) Uncommon Scents: Smell and Victorian England in F. Ringham and B. Martin (eds) **Sense** and Scent: An Exploration of Olfactory Meaning. London, Philomel, UK.
- Ropo, A. & Parviainen, J. (2001) Leadership and bodily knowledge in expert organizations: epistemological rethinking. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol 17, Number 1, pp. 1-18.
- Sandelands, L. E. and Srivatsan, V. (1993) The Problem of Experience in the Study of Organizations, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 14, 1 - 22.
- Saramago, J. (1997) Blindness, London: Harvill Press.
- Sartre, J. –P (1943) Being and Nothingness A Phenomenological Essay On Ontology. Paris: Gallimard.

- Serres, M. (1995) *Angels: A Modern Myth*. Paris: Flammarion Press.
- Serres, M. (2004) *The Five Senses*. Paris: Flammarion Press.
- Shilling C. (1993) *The Body and Social Theory*, London/Newbury Park/New Delhi: Sage.
- Shusterman, R. (2000) *Somaesthetics and the Body/Media Issue in Performing Live*, pp 137-153 Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Shusterman, R. (2008) *Body Consciousness: A Philosophy of Mindfulness and Somaesthetics* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, L. (1993) Merleau-Ponty on the concept of style In: G. A. Johson (Ed) (1993) *The Merleau-Ponty Aesthetics Reader*. Philosophy and Painting, Evanston Ill. Northwestern University Press.
- Stacey, R. (2001) *Complex Responsive Processes in Organizations: Learning and Knowledge Creation*. London: Routledge.
- Sloterdijk, P. (1988) *Critique of Cynical Reason*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stedman, R. C. (2002) Toward a social psychology of place - Predicting behaviour from place-based cognitions, attitudes and identity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 34 (5):561-581.
- Stoller, P. (1997) *Sensuous Scholarship*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Strati, A. (1996) Organ-isations through the lens of aesthetics. In: *Organ-isation* 3(2): 209-218.
- Strati A. (1999) *Organ-isation and Aesthetics*, London: Sage.
- Styhre, A. (2004) Rethinking Knowledge: A Bergsonian Critique of the Notion of Tacit Knowledge, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 15, No. 2, June 2004, pp. 177-188.
- Sullivan, G. (2005) *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Synnott, A. (1993) *The Body Social: Symbolism, Self and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, S. & Hansen, H. (2005) Finding Form: Looking at the Field of Organizational Aesthetics. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42 (6): 1211-1231.
- Toadvine, T. (2004) Singing the World in a New Key: Merleau-Ponty and the Ontology of *Sense*, *Janus Head* 7, no. 2 (Winter 2004): 273-28.
- Verbrucken, M. (2003) Towards a New *Sensoriality*. In: *The New Everyday*. Arts, Emile. et al. Philips Design.
- Waldenfels, B. (1994) *Antwortregister*, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Waldenfels, B. (2007) *The question of the other*, Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Warren, S. (2002) 'Show me how it feels to work here: Using photography to research organizational aesthetics' *ephemera: theory and politics in organizations*, Vol 2(3) pp. 224 – 245.
- Warren, S. (2008) 'Empirical challenges in organizational aesthetics research: towards a *sensual* methodology' *Organization Studies*, Vol 19(4) pp. 559-580.
- Weiss, G. (2000) *Ecart: The Space of Corporeal Difference*. In: Evans, F. & Lawlor, L. (eds.) (2000) *Chiasms. Merleau-Ponty's Notion of Flesh*, State University of New York Press, pp. 203-218
- White, J.D. (1990) 'Phenomenology and Organizational development', *Administrative Science Quaterly*, Spring, 14(1), 76-85.
- Wilber, K. (2000) *One Taste*, Boston: Shambhala.

¹ „Erlebnis” is a common German word, which has the normal connotation of event, occurrence, adventure, vivid experiential **sensing**; something memorable and as a process which happens to someone. Being a process of directly perceiving events or reality, it refers to enliven experiences lived through. It is recognized as a particular qualitative type of passion and action, related to aesthetic and aesthetic experiences in contradistinction to Kantian Erfahrung. (See Lash 2006) For the etymological structure of Erlebnisse see also: <http://www.phenomenologyonline.com/articles/burch2.html>

² Interestingly Meister Eckhart understood ‘reason’ in the **sense** of ‘Vernehmen’, i.e. hear, harken, of being receptive to in contrast to ‘Verstehen’ (understand, comprehend), as a faculty of mental insight, thus initiating a switch from the platonic metaphors of vision (insight, evidence, intuition, light of reason, enlightenment, etc.) to auditory metaphors

³ Nociception (physiological pain) is the nonconscious perception of near-damage or damage to tissue. It can be classified as from one to three **senses**, depending on the classification method. The three types of pain receptors are cutaneous (skin), somatic (joints and bones) and visceral (body organs). For a considerable time, it was believed that pain was simply the overloading of pressure receptors, but research in the first half of the 20th century indicated that pain is a distinct phenomenon that intertwines with all other **senses**, including touch. At present pain is defined scientifically as a wholly subjective experience.

⁴ As you you know from experience and as indicated before, we **senses** can offer **sensual** and aesthetic pleasures as well as become sources of less pleasurable, even afflicting encounters. If we ‘the **senses** go awry’ (Howes, 2003: 357), we can become uneasiness. Often through **sensorial** disorientation and by being thrown off balance we provide a source of discomfort. Yes we **senses** and **sensations** although being intentional that is givens of **sense**, or give **sense**, orientation and meaning, both can be an i-n-t-e-r-ruption or an instigation. Paradoxically, **sensations** can announce the absence of **sense** or the onset of **senselessness**. This happens particularly when we **senses** and our **sensation** function as a kind of short-circuit of your **habitual** affects, your perceptual routines, and your calculated taming of the environment. Even more, your bodies can be displaced by **sensations** and intervene in your practice. Did you notice that we sometimes let slip your hold on things and on yourself? Our very embodiment is a **sensual** event, which is replete with impractical drives, amorous and deadly ones; but what would your life be without them? Yes it is true that we **senses** can be deceptive, but only to an epistemology bent on certainty. So please remember and bear in mind that we are not first and foremost an epistemological theme, but an experiential reality....

⁵ Let us give you some more philosophical ‘**flesh**’ to these abstract matters: **Fleshing** out We **senses** and our **sensuality** are part of and participating in the ‘**flesh**’ of the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1995: 248; 302). As the formative medium for us **senses** and of all objects and subjects, this **flesh** is neither a fact nor a collection of facts. Likewise it is not a mental representation, nor the locus of an intersection of body and mind. Being more a ‘concrete emblem of a general manner of being’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1995: 147), this very **flesh** is not matter or substance, but a midway b/e/t/w/e/n the spatio-temporal individual and the idea, a sort of incarnate principle. Our ‘**Flesh**’ refers to the capacity of being to fold in upon itself, its simultaneous orientation to inner and outer that is the reversibility of **sensing**. Therefore it is itself beyond and prior to the subject-object distinction that is the sources out of which this distinction evolves, but is itself beyond or shall we say underlying this distinction. Criss-crossing or reversibly b/e/t/w/e/n the touching and the tangible, of toucher and touched, of seer and seen, the speaking and being spoken to, our **flesh** can be qualified as an indeterminacy of the ‘boundaries’ of each of us **senses** and our inherent transposability. In its ‘elemental’ **sense**, we conceive it as a surface of **sensibility**, a skin or fabric, into which our own **enfleshed sensitivities** – the sight of our eyes, the sound of our ears, the scent of our nose, the depth of taste on our tongues and languages, the touch on our skins – are indivisibly interwoven or enmeshed. Within this **fleshy** ‘wild being’⁵ the In- B/e/t/w/e/n provides a ‘fullness of void’, that is a kind of creative and fulfilling emptiness. Accordingly, it is through this ‘**flesh**’ that we **sense** a speaking silence, full in its barrenness of potential meaning. The **flesh** divides itself and self-returns to itself. It is a wild principle in its archetypal movement and, at the same time, the all-pervading element in which we **senses** and our body participate and all transformation takes and loses place, carrying a pregnancy of possibility and meaning. Understood in a dynamic **sense**, our **flesh** is self-propagating, that is self-organising, self-sustaining, and self-transcending through a never-ending play of differentiation by articulation and gesticulation, and reintegration through intertwining. Characterised by a **chi**-asm, reversibilities and a continuous inter-playing our **flesh** serves as a kind of moving groundwork of **sense**-based, **sense**-giving and **sense**-carrying inter-corporeity, with all those inter-subjectivities and inter-passions of being and becoming of all creative trans-+t-formations. To understand these i-n-t-e-r-relations, we need to turn to the wonderment of an ‘eternal splitting open of Being into the touching and the touched, the seeing and the seen, the site of their differentiation as well as their union and intimacy’ (Burk, 1990: 90). With this approach it becomes possible to **sense** and to make **sense** of even what does not appear, and yet which is the very condition for appearance. All the **sensations** you have are never purely our own, but belong to this transcendental **flesh**. As a coded, affective elementality, **flesh** unites and separates

while inducing you to movement with appeals to your **sensitivity**. In a way this **sensory** enfolded world performs your identities for you, inviting and disrupting your practical movements and serving **sensorial** mastery, with all of their habitual investments and practices. The patterns of meaningful perception, feelings, thoughts and action exist neither in the 'mind' nor in the 'external world'. From the perspective of our **flesh**, mind and matter are neither 'subjective' nor 'objective'. Rather they are constituted by a kind of world in-b/e/t/w/e/n, an inter-relationality of 'individual', 'social' and 'trans-subjective' dimensions and practices. It is this b/e/t/w/e/n within an ontological continuity of self, others and the natural world that is the fluid base for all our **sensing** and your organising. Ultimately, it is this in-b/e/t/w/e/n that is the birthplace of all there is in i-n-t-e-r-twined realities and creative relationships and also of added value in organizations as embodied life-worlds.

⁶ In Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of embodiment and perception as creative receptivity, there is a non-monadological **sense** of 'sense-body-world-connectedness', in which the postures and initiatives of living bodies interact with an environment, as those specific **sensuous** bodies 'understand' it. It is us, the vivid **senses**, our body and the living embodiment, not an disembodied occupying consciousness, which co-constitutes, understands and relates to the world of organising as a 'lived experience'. As mentioned before this experience of **sensing**, perceiving, knowing and acting is in every instance corporeally constituted that is located within and as the pre-reflective and proto-reflective 'body-subject's' incarnation. Thus, the **sensual** 'body-subject' is an intelligent, holistic process, which directs behaviours in a fluid, integrative fashion, thereby coordinating relations b/e/t/w/e/n feeling, thinking, communicating, behaving or doing in an embedded environment. Therefore, the **sensing** 'body-subject-object-connection' is a kind of experienced structure by which things 'outside' of the body are 'encrusted' in its joints. Thus, embodied being covers the 'subjective' and socially situated phenomena also in your organ-isation—particularly through language and communication as expressive media of inter-relation⁶ - and at the same time is related to '(inter-objective)' artefacts, institutions as infra-structural 'incorporation'. The incarnate status of the perceiving 'subjects', as **sensual** perceivers, knowers and actors with their embodied pre-interpretation and situated embedment, provides the ontological foundations of all human being, thinking, feeling, knowing and acting, opening the way to a phenomenological description and interpretation of how to re-integrate embodied being in organisations.

⁷ As Macmurray (1957) pointed out, the concept of 'action' is inclusive: "... most of our knowledge, and all our primary knowledge, arises as an aspect of activities that have practical, not theoretical objectives; and it is this knowledge, itself an aspect of action, to which all reflective theory must refer (p. 12) ..." "In acting the body indeed is in action, but also the mind. Action is not blind... Action, then, is a full concrete activity of the self in which all our capacities are employed." (p. 86).

⁸ Phenomenologically, responsivity comprises manifold interpretations of a giving and receiving proactive re-action, being reagible and ready to answer. In this regard, and as part of responsive nexus (Waldenfels, 1994), responsivity is a basic feature of all sensing, saying and doing, of all embodied and linguistic behaviour and acting. Enacted responsiveness creates a multidimensional space for thoughts, feelings, moods, conversations and agency of being-relationally-in-the-world. Thus, all forms of experiencing, communicating and operating are always a kind of situated and process-oriented practice of answering. In responding to open requests, demands, claims and problems to every-day life 'something' is co-created. Accordingly, being responsive refers to an open event, which allows its own set of criteria or standards to co-emerge. The significance of specific acts of responses is that it summons, evokes, invites, requests, inspires, effects and provokes, while being processed through challenging media demanding a further, potentially value-creating development. This processing moves as a responsive difference between 'what' is answered (contents). and 'towards what or whom' (claim/entitlement). A phenomenology of responsiveness takes as starting point the claims or demands of the preceding Other, thus tries overcoming the one-sidedness of intentionalistic, rational choice, and normativistic conceptualizations. Responsiveness as an answering behaviour can be defined specifically as one in which there is openness for the points of view of both (or various). parties involved, and by which the setting of pattern and standards co-evolve and are co-created. Response is therefore not simply filling a gap, but rather contributes to the form and formulation of the questions it is answering. Thus, it does not grow out of individual insufficiency, nor out of individual initiative, but out of the acceptance of external offers and expectations, which demand an answer. Responsiveness in practice therefore means engaging with that which comes from an external source. (cf. Waldenfels, 1994). Response thus makes use of possibilities that are offered and also in certain ways demanded. Such responsiveness begins, therefore, within the context of regulations and meaning, and forms a new rationality. This "responsive rationality" is defined by Waldenfels (1990: 27; 1994, pp.333ff). as a rationality that exists in the form of answers and relates as a contextual resonance to something not arising out of itself, without being replaced or taken over by complete order. A responsive-rational postponement of the pattern of interpretation allows disorder to show through the new order. The inadequacy of reasons and the incalculability of talking, acting and enduring are not seen as failures to be addressed, but as

constitutive for this form of responsive rationality. There is not complete and clear determination of what will happen. Something is experienced in responding, which is not actually available in the present state but will be in the future. In this realm *between* order and the extraordinary, a creative and productive response exists, indeed, is born, in the very act of response itself. As by giving answers, those involved are giving something, which they do not have; they are creating, inventing so to speak, surplus answers in the act of giving answers.⁸ Their mutual otherness and foreignness makes the fields of organisational realities, and their respective people, into “respondent” and “co-respondent” in a difference-sensitive relationship of a formation-process (“Inbeziehungsetzung”). Specifically, there can be reproductive and productive answering. While a reproductive answer reproduces the same or existing meaning, a productive answering is inventing or creating new answers, thus starts from somewhere else, which could not have been planned or pre-ordered. In a realm between order and the extraordinary, a creative and productive response exists, indeed, is born, in the very act of the response (as practice). itself. As by giving answers, those involved are giving something, which they do not have; they are creating, inventing so to speak, surplus answers in the act of giving answers. Parties and elements involved in actual responsive processes are mutual “respondent” or “co-respondent” in a relationship, which is sensitive for differences as part of a formation-process. Instead of calculated exchange, rather being responsive is living practice of processing an interactive give and take, providing the base for re-interpreting responsibility. The responsive interactive development takes the form of a process of differentiation – in the sense of a diastasis (Waldenfels 1994, 355). – whereby the differences first come to exist. Diastasis is in this sense the creative power of an incomplete experience, which by its disintegration, separation or destruction, allows someone or something to emerge. Diastatic developments are events, in which something rises to prominence by connecting with something else where there was previously no connection. Something occurs here which can be attributed neither to the initiative or capability of individuals or groups, nor to the mediating structural situation, nor to encoded regulations. Such an occurrence is demanding and may be experienced as jolting, rousing or challenging. It can be divisive as it unites and uniting as it divides interweaving in a crossover of internal and external movements within and beyond place. With this, hinges and pivots appear as embodiments of the intermediate as it articulates itself in its multiple referentiality. Metaphorically expressed responsiveness is what a sculptor (imagine Michelangelo). experiences, who is guided and influenced in certain directions in the realization of his idea by the resistant nature of the stone, all creators are engaged in a responsive and interactive relationship with their material, including intangible material. Or is resembles experiences of a dancer (imagine Matisse painting). where each step of the dance calls for responding to another, the Other and the environment, evoking to be creative in finding variations or to improvise, allowing the rhythm of an unfolding life.

⁹ The transformational potential of aesthetic processes, both as creation and reception, refers to its capacity to call into question one’s *sense* of what is real and its ability to offer a *sense* of what is possible. Hence, artistic processes and experiences are productive irritants (the critical dimension) that offer a vision of what can be (the utopian dimension), and with that vision, access to creative changes that can lead to a different-shaped practice (the pragmatic dimension). What leaders can learn from art is that reality extends beyond conscious rationality. Art’s nonrational elements give it the power to go beyond instrumental rationality. By using the fantastic, leaders may reveal unrecognized assumptions and neglected visions: Art can help people see beyond the taken-for-granted meanings of things. Art’s critical dimension makes it possible for people to escape established principles of reality. The encounter with art makes perceptible, audible, visible and expressible that which is no longer, or not yet, perceived, heard, seen or said in everyday life. In doing so, art can make people aware of new and different perspectives on familiar or novel phenomena. What the playwright Bertolt Brecht called the “estrangement effect” of art can free people from ordinary ways of thinking that blind them to the strangeness of the familiar. Art does this by breaking the habits of organized routine and making it possible to see the world as though for the first time. In this way art provides a *sense* of new possibilities, particularly when old solutions are no longer effective. With its utopian potential, aesthetic experience provides those involved with a taste of qualities of experience that are typically not accessible or available in corporate contexts, dominated as they are by exchange value and instrumental reason, the profit motive, and the performance principle. By being “unreal,” art awakens people to the possibility that things could be otherwise; art provides an emancipatory opportunity to play, giving the mind’s eye and *sensibility* free rein. An aesthetic experience frees people to examine particulars without the pressure to classify them under a general concept or purpose. When one uses metaphor and imagination as tools to explore the realms of “as if,” it becomes possible to probe the particular for its possible meanings. One can construct alternatives, and one is open to diverse passing *sensations* rather than being preoccupied with the effort to corral the experience under a single determinate concept. Being valuable intrinsically, aesthetic experiences and deployed imagination offer a relative freedom from the governance of concepts and from predetermined interests, whether moral, practical, financial, or other. Allegorically, it represents an antidote to the encroachment of rationalization, identified by the sociologist Weber with modernity, as a site of resistance against exchange value and instrumental reason.

¹⁰ How much we **senses** contribute to the appraisal and evaluation of aesthetics phenomena can be realised when you consider what Shusterman (2000; 2008) calls *somaesthetics*. For him somaesthetics refers to a critical, meliorative study of the hands-on experience and use of our body as a locus of **sensory**-aesthetic appreciation and creative self-fashioning within a social context for the attainment of fulfilling experiences (Shusterman, 2008: 19). It is devoted also to the knowledge, discourses and disciplines that structure such somatic care or can improve it. By focusing on immediate, non-discursive experience of us **sensual** dimensions different forms of experiential, representational and performative somaesthetics entails the interdependent relationship of feeling-thinking-doing and allows corresponding judgments.

¹¹ Aesthetics is a category that we create in language. Like every linguistic creation, this category is a double-edged sword that can be empowering or tranquillising. We need to realise that by labelling something as aesthetic we are articulating a view that involves us – the observers- as much as the observed in a common system. The language of aesthetics needs itself to be understood as a device for connection, creation and co-ordination.

¹² According to Finlay (2005) in this kind of research there are three interpenetrating layers of reflexivity implied, each involving different but coexisting dimensions of embodied intersubjectivity. A) connecting-of the Other's embodiment to our own, B) acting-into the Other's bodily experience, C) merging-with the Other's bodily experience. The 1st layer-connecting-of demonstrates how people can tune into another's bodily way of being by using their own embodied reactions. The 2nd layer-acting-into focuses on empathy as imaginative self-transpersonal and calls attention to the way existences (beings) are intertwined in a dynamic of doubling and mirroring. The 3rd layer-merging-with involves a "reciprocal insertion and intertwining" of others in oneself and of one in them (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968: 138), where self-understanding and other-understanding unite in mutual transformation.

¹³ For Eisner these are tensions b/e/t/w/e/e/n using open forms that yield diverse i-n-t-e-r-pretations and forms that yield common understandings; b/e/t/w/e/e/n the particular and the general; b/e/t/w/e/e/n the desire to aesthetically craft form and the desire to tell it like it is. Furthermore, the tensions move b/e/t/w/e/e/n the desire to pursue new questions and puzzlements and the need in the practical world for answers, seeking what is novel or creative and the need to create work that has verisimilitude, the appearance of being true or real to the furniture of the world. Therefore, as expressed succinctly: "The concepts and processes that we have used in arts-based research are much more likely to work at the edge of possibility and address questions of meaning and experience that are not likely to be as salient in traditional research. Put another way, our basic concepts and methods participate in a new universe" (Eisner, 2008: 25).