



The territorial organization: History, divergence and possibilities

Garance Maréchal , Stephen Linstead & Iain Munro

To cite this article: Garance Maréchal , Stephen Linstead & Iain Munro (2013) The territorial organization: History, divergence and possibilities, Culture and Organization, 19:3, 185-208, DOI: [10.1080/14759551.2013.812703](https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2013.812703)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2013.812703>



Published online: 18 Jul 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 282



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

The territorial organization: History, divergence and possibilities

Garance Maréchal^{a*}, Stephen Linstead^b and Iain Munro^c

^aUniversity of Liverpool Management School, Chatham Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZH, UK;

^bThe York Management School, University of York, Freboys Lane, Heslington, York, YO10 5GD, UK; ^cDepartment of Organization and Learning, University of Innsbruck's School of Management, Innsbruck, 6020, Austria

(Received 30 April 2012; final version received 31 March 2013)

This paper introduces a new field to organization studies – that of organizational territoriality – as well as introducing the papers to the special issue on *The Territorial Organization*. Organization seen as territory may function symbolically, offering an additional metaphor to those suggested by Morgan, or materially, taking into account existing studies of organizational space and architecture. This paper integrates perspectives from anthropology, human and economic geography, psychology, philosophy, history and literature to provide conceptual tools for developing the field. This includes considerations of macro-level nation-state political economy and corporate power, with boundary marking and defence; the micro-level of psychosocial spaces; the meso-level of organizationally networked spaces; the role of maps and mapping; the materialities of landscape, terroir and practices of dwelling; the symbolic significance of taskscapes and vistas; mobile practices of wayfaring and nomadics; and processes of territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. We argue that *organizational territoriality studies* (OTS) brings together a number of disciplinary perspectives that combine understandings of space and time with power, embodiment and materiality to shed new light on issues of culture, identity and meaning. As such it forms not simply a disciplinary subfield of organization studies, which in one sense it clearly is, but also a space of articulation, translation and exchange between disciplines.

Keywords: organizational territoriality; organizational space; terroir; taskscape; landscape; deterritorialization; reterritorialization; vistas; nomadics

If issues of territoriality have been widely examined and discussed in the fields of international relations and economic geography, with the concept of territory being widely mobilized, these remain underexplored in culture and organization studies (OS). This is in spite of an interest in the concept of space as applied to organizations over the past decade (Clegg and Kornberger 2006; Dale and Burrell 2008; Taylor and Spicer 2007; Van Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). In this literature, and beyond the well-known panoptic metaphor (Foucault 1977), organizational and/or corporate space has been studied as materiality (Dale 2005), workplace layout (see Taylor and Spicer 2007, for a review), architecture (Hopfl and Allen 2011; Kornberger and Clegg 2004), generative building (Kornberger and Clegg 2004), organizational geographies

*Corresponding author. Email: g.marechal@liverpool.ac.uk

in slow motion (Beyes and Steyaert 2012), parkour (Daskalaki, Stara, and Imas 2008), bunkers (Bennett 2011) or ruins (Dale and Burrell 2011).

Although issues of territory and territoriality are often considered in relation to space or place – as marking, manifestations of attachment, belonging, exclusion and inclusion or identification – these can be freed from the confines of space and place. ‘Having’ and possessiveness in organizations (Bencherki and Cooren 2011) or appropriation processes such as surrealist collages or situationist detournements (Evans 2009) have much to do with territoriality without always involving a direct relationship with space for example.

In this special issue,¹ we consider both material and symbolic aspects of the territorial dimensions of organizing with a view to redressing their relative neglect in organization and management studies. In the introduction that follows, we sketch the contours of an imagined cultural and organizational territoriality using a palette of layered and overlapping metaphors: border, identity and belonging, control and power, terroir, root, patrimonialization, landscape, cartography, route, navigation, and wayfaring. The five contributions to this special issue are blended within this canvas.

Two recent contributions to the understanding of organizational space draw on Lefebvre (1991) as a seminal source. Taylor and Spicer (2007) distinguish between space as a pattern of proximity/distance; materialized power relations; and as imagination. These distinctions mirror three of Lefebvre’s processes of spatial production: physical practices, planning, and imagining, which are deployed across three different scales (micro, meso, and macro). Dale and Burrell (2008) also deploy Lefebvre’s distinction between absolute and abstract space. The first two sections of our introduction relate to the abstract concept of space, whilst the two middle sections shift to a consideration of territory that is closer to ‘absolute space’. The concluding section adopts a more poststructuralist, particularly Deleuzian, consideration of the dynamics of territorialization and deterritorialization. In our first section, our conceptualization of territory slides from a bounded, macro-level ‘powerscape’, characteristic of the modern nation-state, through discussions of the dissolution of geographical embeddedness in deterritorialized, meso-, network-based corporations; making a brief landfall with Hardt and Negri’s macro-level analysis of powerscape shifts, before briefly tarrying with the maintenance and dissolution of boundaries in academic territories. Closed forms of territoriality are further explored and problematized in our second section on mapping from the perspectives of power, sensemaking, and materiality. This latter aspect is more directly unpacked in our third section on landscape with a focus on vistas and dwelling, and in our fourth section on terroir with a focus on roots and groundedness, both sections introducing a more open form of territoriality. In the last section, the groundlessness of territoriality as it emerges from processes of territorialization and deterritorialization, fuzzy routes, and flows is discussed using the materialist philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari on nomadics and mobility. This also allows us to weave together the micro-psychosocial level, the meso-level of organizations and networks, and the macro-level of transnational corporations and political economy points of view in conclusion.

Territory as defended space: borders, boundaries, and modern power

In contemporary understanding, it is only through the marking of a difference – through the projection of a border that the notion of history and interpretation makes sense ... We

navigate our meanings across these borders. They always materialize from elsewhere. (Terdiman 2001, 399–400).

Ardrey in *The Territorial Imperative* ([1966] 1997) synthesized a mass of contemporary biological and evolutionary evidence to argue that it was the natural instinct to territorialize that had helped humans to dominate the animal kingdom. If most animals have home ranges, it is humans who, in their social lives, display the most discernable examples of defended territories (Witchel 2010, 5) in recondite ways that are inconceivable in the animal world (Tuan 1977, 4). Ardrey's work influenced the interpretation of human activities as diverse as the taming of the American West, the building of the Berlin Wall, the behaviour of aristocratic elites and NASA putting a man on the moon. Much of this sort of spatializing activity could, Ardrey suggested, be understood through the lens of biological evidence such as the behaviour of the Ugandan kob (*Kobus kob thomasi*), a sub-Saharan species of antelope that gave to our everyday language the concept of the 'stamping ground'. Offering quite a different insight from the abstractions of cartography, animalistic accounts of human behaviour have generally displayed little resilience in the still rationally dominated mythscapes of management and organization studies, evolutionary psychology notwithstanding (Nicholson 2000). Their somewhat intimate and physical understanding of territory, territorial dominance behaviour, and their symbolic significance mobilizes the prevalent definition of territory as *defended space*.

As Goertz and Diehl (1992, 31) emphasize, there has been, throughout history, 'a constant link between territory and national power'. But sovereignty based on closed forms of territoriality should be historicized in the context of the rise of the modern nation-state as a specific and bounded geographic entity (Cuttitta 2006; Lacher 2006, 32; Smith 2005). The organization of the modern state as primarily a territorial association, where political authority and physical territory are considered interdependent, is a historical product of a new political order in Europe called the Westphalien system, which transformed the structure of international relations from 1648, the date of the peace of Westphalia, into the still ongoing modern international system of states, multinational corporations, and organizations (Lacher 2006, 31). These still dominant, modern forms of state sovereignty are rooted in the mediation of a *closed* form of *territoriality* relying on the size of the lands – the amount of ground surface – controlled, which act as an index of power and as a 'foundation for superior authority' (Cuttitta 2006, 32), as well as on the establishment of clearly delimited borders, the 'visible expression' of power relations (Cuttitta 2006, 29). In this context, international relations as interaction between bounded sovereign states may be considered as 'a particular variation of the military pursuit of power' (Lacher 2006, 32). From the perspective of the institutional structure of modernity, international relations become based on difference between the internal and the external and 'the reorientation of political action towards different ends' from feudalism (Lacher 2006, 32), which was informed by kinship entities led by lineage chiefs (Sahlins 1968, 6, cited in Smith 2005, 834).

The development of national ideas of delimited space emerged simultaneously with 'common property law predicated on the division of the landscapes in which ownership was absolute, boundaries were fixed, and legal restrictions were placed on trespass' (Smith 2005, 834) to define two types of territorial borders, private estate property borders and sovereign state borders, in a way that could be marked, physically reproduced, and legitimized administratively. As Cuttitta (2006, 35) further notes, the development of modern, scientific forms of rationality led to a shift from border zone to

border line, the latter being a geometrical, abstracted version of the former. The activity of line drawing enables the delimitation of territories within fixed boundaries and the maintaining of spatial exclusivity, a characteristic feature of modern, closed territoriality, as materialized by maps.

In this closed or bounded understanding, the notion of territoriality becomes ‘an integral component of government’ (Smith 2005, 834), acquiring an organizational quality (territorial *organizing*). Such governance is based on an expectation of state control over the landscape, and an incorporation of both kinship and a ‘qualitative shift to bureaucracy as a governing mechanism’, the state and its subdivisions being organized into territorial entities (Smith 2005, 834). States, Lefebvre (1991, 281) explains, produce abstract spaces using the political principle of unification to subordinate and totalize various aspects of social practice whilst claiming to produce a space where something is brought to perfection: ‘namely, a unified and hence homogeneous society’. Accordingly, a territorial definition of modern nationhood implies not only a sense of togetherness but also a common destiny, supported by an overarching, ‘territorially anchored’ special sense of solidarity and identity and ‘common cultural markers and/or history’ shared by members of a group (Béland and Lecours 2008, 64–65). These warrant their claim to a distinct political status, with territory working here as a ‘space of cultural identification or belonging’ (Bonnemaison 2005, 117).

Although *closed territoriality* is meant to define areas of homogeneity maintained through ‘fixed, immobile and continuous’ impermeable borders (Cuttitta 2006, 34), boundary maintenance work is constantly necessary. Material borders are not often constituted by a physical impermeable barrier, especially when, because of the geography, the cost of firm delineation is prohibitive, as in the long running territorial dispute between Ecuador and Peru, or when reaffirmation is costly politically as in the case of the Falklands war (Smith 2005). In this sense, territorial demarcation disputes are integral to international conflicts (Shannon 2009). Similarly, and notoriously, British industrial relations were obsessively preoccupied with occupational demarcation distinctions at the level of workplace organization from the 1960s to the 1980s, with consequences of huge losses of working time and productivity.

Cultural borders tend to be very fuzzy, dynamic, and plural rather than fixed, unproblematic, and continuous. More dynamic, direct, and immediate forms of relationality could be enabled through more open, elastic forms of territoriality (Cuttitta 2006, 34). For instance, a frontier zone may be made of heterogeneous ‘scattered signals’ such as ‘enclaves, outposts or offshoots of a given territory’, that take shape from diverse, and sometimes fragmented, cultural elements such as ‘habits, folkways, languages or any other cultural features distinguishing peoples and communities’ (Cuttitta 2006, 36). Frontier zones or *frontiers* are themselves fuzzy and variable in widths – as opposed to boundaries which are ‘simple and clear-cut lines’ (Febvre and Prescott cited in Cuttitta 2006, 34). Interestingly, the nineteenth-century Paris displayed such a frontier zone, a ‘buffer zone’ and liminal area called ‘the Zone’, a 250 metres wide fortified military *zone non aedificandi*, an officially bare strip of land that was delimited by the double set of surrounding fortifications that demarked Paris’ inner city from the line against enemy invasions (Maréchal 2009, 11). Michel Leiris described such a contrasted liminal area as ‘a sort of bush county, a no man’s land that extended between where the fortifications lay and the race course at Auteuil’ which characterizes this fantasized space as ‘one of taboo – supernatural, textual and sacred – and of contrast between the Bourgeois city [inner Paris] and the savage bush [the suburb]’ (cited in

Morton 2000, 12). The Zone was ‘a site of marginal life, a refuge for ragpickers whose economic activities were based on the collection and transformation of urban waste and detritus’ (Maréchal 2009, 11). Such representation resonates with the discursive and imaginative texture of a liminal construct like the slum, ‘a representational category into which the variegated lives of poor people were squashed’ but one with no fixity (Jenner 1997, 102). As with many cultural representations of plague whether social, hygienic, or foreign – ‘the poor, the diseased, or transgressive countercultures potentially subversive to social order’ – inside/out or low/high dichotomies were used to locate, distance and marginalize the otherness of the Zone. Here, territorial cultural differentiation is used to reinforce social normativity (Maréchal 2009, 11). As Burgess and Vollaard (2006, 18) note,

contemporary pressures on the modern state as primarily a territorial association whose integrity, stability and legitimacy derive from its capacity and effectiveness to provide physical security and general welfare for its citizens [what we called *closed territoriality*], have served to call into question its fundamental role and relevance to the needs of a new age.

The crisis of modern forms of territoriality resulting from the

de-territorialization of power relations (both economical and political) and any other kind of human relation (cultural, religious, emotional) raises problems with regard to the traditional role of the nation-state, which is necessarily connected to the direct and exclusive control over a territory. (Cuttitta 2006, 28)

As Hardt and Negri (2000) have observed, the capacity of states to warrant their integrity within their own boundaries has been undermined in recent years by the new informed forms of what they call Empire. This is not the geopolitical form of empire that powered modernity, but rather a more insidious form driven by cultural and economic forms of colonization – flows of capital and information. Relatedly, Castells (2000, 244–245) outlines the emergence of international, decentralized inter-firm networks that ‘transcend national boundaries, identities and interests’ as the characteristic organizational form of the informational, global economy.

The proliferation of embedded patterns of interorganizational networks and collaborations – whether deployed as supplier/producer/customer networks, as in global commodity chains or production networks, or as technological cooperation – and the continuing extension of the geographic boundaries of corporations renders the delineation of firm boundaries, and what Dicken and Malmberg (2001) call the *firm-territory nexus*, problematic. The flexible, fuzzy territoriality of transnational corporations can also wield a fluid form of deterritorialized power that is capable of manipulating and threatening the sovereignty of the nation-state (Dicken and Malmberg 2001). Such a dissolution of *bounded territoriality* at the level of both states and corporations can thus be viewed as an extended and accelerated version of a powerful tendency already endemic within capitalism, which Lefebvre (1991) calls the phallic dimension of abstract space.

Rather than being strictly limited to the confines, and the control, of space or place, territoriality also pervasively manifests as a worldview (Bonnemaison 2005, 115), an ideology, or a state of mind that triggers various behaviours of empowerment: those cultural display, marking, or gathering behaviours that signify ‘ownership, occupancy

and belonging – regarding places, objects and other human beings’; and sometimes a social connection that defines ‘who belongs in and who should be kept out’ (Witchel 2010, 6–7, 9). One may then wonder, in that sense, whether culture has a territorial function or at least territorial effects, or perhaps investigate its territorial flavours? As Grosby (1995, 147) notes, territoriality can be viewed as an ideological phenomenon in that territory is not primarily ‘the spatial location of interaction; rather it is *in* the image of the territory . . . that individual members of the collectivity participate’ (cited in Smith 2005, 285; emphasis in original). In the modern context, territoriality becomes ‘part of the ideology of group life absorbed by individuals who view the landscape as a whole, unbroken entity to which there is a sense of belonging’ (Smith 2005, 285).

Applying a similar perspective to the field of higher education, Becher (1989) launched a study that attempted to identify academic tribes and territories, where tribes were culture and territories paradigms. Individual disciplines developed their orientation to the educational field as a whole by participating in shared ideologies that bonded them as groups whilst differentiating them and marking out scholarly territories both externally and internally. Becher’s original study was highly influential, if controversial, in education but not in organization studies despite its attractive face validity. For instance, Martin, Frost, and O’Neill’s (2006) review of the subfields of organizational culture studies in terms of struggles for intellectual dominance exhibits related concerns to those of Becher without engaging with his contribution. Two follow-up volumes by Becher and Trowler (2001) and Trowler, Saunders, and Bamber (2012) both developed and critiqued the original. They incorporated more discursive, post-colonial and social constructionist approaches in redefining the concepts of tribe (which was effectively dropped in favour of other cultural markers) and territory (which received more sophisticated epistemological consideration). Mark Hughes, in a review article that concludes this issue, undertakes a ‘vertical tasting’ of three editions of this project, tracing developments within educational research, on the one hand, and relating them to the trajectory of the contemporary paradigm debate in Organization Studies, on the other hand.

In the late 1970s, organization studies witnessed the burgeoning of two conceptual threads. The first, organizational culture, drew from sporadic previous work to congeal around adaptations of anthropology that treated modern organizations as primitive villages, populated by tribes, with all the rites, rituals, customs, and taboos familiar to classical anthropology (Trice and Beyer 1993). The second developed the work of Thomas Kuhn in studies of scientific knowledge in arguing that scientific progress was not linear, but depended upon the development of paradigms of thought and practice, progress being retarded until support for an emerging paradigm reached a tipping point that provoked a revolution. The organizational culture movement exploded in popularity with both scholarly researchers and management consultants during the 1980s, with culture becoming a canonical concept in organization studies; similarly the application of the paradigm concept to organization studies by Burrell and Morgan (1979) became part of the OS methodological canon during the same period. Perhaps curiously, the two streams have not been explicitly related in other studies. Hughes identifies some intriguing points of contact where cross-disciplinary fertilization might occur and makes some recommendations for breaking down the boundaries between cognate territories. Hughes continues the project of cultural ‘mapping’ begun by Becher, and it is to this wider activity that we will now turn our attention.

Culture as navigation: maps and mapping

This map was sublime. Overcome, he began to tremble in front of the food display. . . . The essence of modernity, of scientific and technical apprehension of the world, was here combined with the essence of animal life. (Houellebecq 2012, 36)

First observed by Korzybski (1933), the distinction between the map and the territory has served as a marginal but important concept in modern management theory (Argyris and Schon 1978; Chia and Holt 2009; Cooper 1992; Weick 1983, 1990). But if the activity of mapping has received sustained attention in the context of organizational design or the social psychology of organizing, the complementary concept of *territory* remains relatively unexplored. The literature in organization and management studies concerning the map–territory relationship has tended to prioritize an overly narrow focus on interpretation and sensemaking with regard to the map. Throughout this section, we explore the different forms that this relationship can take depending on whether the map is considered in relation to power, vision, sensemaking, and/or materiality.

Maps have been used politically from the Renaissance, playing an important role in the territorial organization of imperialist claims to newly discovered land. Used by maritime powers to visualize the extent of their discoveries, maps were powerful technologies of power/knowledge that materialized national dominance and worked as ‘a critical sign of possession’ (Day 2008, 26). In discussing conquest, Day (2008, 26) develops a compelling argument about the power of maps, which, in materializing superior knowledge about a particular region – knowledge ‘which could have been obtained only by exploration’ – legitimized the claims of imperialist nations towards that piece of land, even when they were not themselves the first discoverers. The act of mapping ‘formed part of the process of laying claim to new regions’ in America by the Dutch against the British in the seventeenth century, for instance, or between the British and the French in Australia in the early nineteenth century (Day 2008, 26).

Historically, the understanding of maps as interpretive devices is symptomatic of the emergence of the modern territorial nation-state, already discussed, where firm boundaries and homogeneous control of territory are implicit (Smith 2005, 832). Indeed, mapping, by providing a simple, objective and homogeneous graphical representation of a complex set of cultural and bureaucratic elements can engender new and meaningful relationships amongst otherwise disparate, sometimes incoherent or conflictual, elements, whether cultural, political, or organizational (Smith 2005, 834). The resulting cartographic depiction can also suggest uniformity and materialize political centralization (Smith 2005, 837), a tendency that creates a ‘god’s-eye’ view (Ingold 2000). Such a tendency is amusingly elaborated upon in Houellebecq’s (2012) award winning novel when a journalist reviews Jed Martin’s art exhibition *The map is more interesting than the Territory*.

Describing himself as a cartographer of the social field, Michel Foucault produced a radically novel conception of power that can be understood in terms of mapping. Foucault’s maps, or ‘diagrams’ as he termed them, are transversal in nature, outlining overlapping relations of power, in ‘a cartography that is coextensive with the whole social field’ (Deleuze 1988, 34). The map of the prison resembles that of the factory, the school, and the barracks, which in turn resemble the prison. These maps reveal how institutions function and the forces that compose and traverse them. The map outlined by Foucault is not primarily a visual representation, but ‘combines in a single figure

discourses and architectures' (Foucault 1977, 271). A map is already a composite of powerful forces that enfolds both discursive programmes and material mechanisms. Foucault exemplifies his conception of power with the nineteenth-century philosopher Jeremy Bentham's design of the panopticon, a disciplinary structure intended for prisons, where prisoners in transparent cells are observed from a central tower, so lit that the prisoners are fully visible but the occupants of the tower, if any, are not. Prisoners, unable to tell whether they are being observed, are forced to behave as though they *were* being observed, the central logos being the point of view, potentially, of nobody.

Maps tend to imply a similarly central and elevated point of view that disciplines their content. Historically, the map's 'god's-eye' view was developed from a series of ground or sea-level observations by European explorers or aboriginal indigenes, and only since the arrival of manned flight has it been possible to fully confirm or refute these constructions. Yet as Ingold (2000) notes, the creation of an objective viewpoint, although based entirely on human observations, is not anthropocentric as it removes the human from the picture. Abstract forms of mapping indeed combine two of the three elements of Lefebvre's concept of *abstract space*: the geometric and visual, which produce an ocularcentrism whose distancing effect displaces the immediacy of objects into the realm of representation. Logical and mathematical, the geometric promotes the reduction of lived and embodied space to the representations of plans and maps (or human relations to algorithms) whilst the visual reduces social life to the decoding or deciphering of symbolic (and metaphoric and metonymic) messages. For Roth (2009, 209), who draws on Ingold, abstract forms of mapping are inadequate to engage with the embodied and lived processes by which the world continuously comes into being for and around its inhabitants. Culture is not a matter of attaching forms and meanings to a world that preexists but is grounded in the practice of being alive together and emerges from it.

From a cognitivist perspective on organization that was particularly influential in the 1980s, Argyris and Schon's (1978) account of organizational learning makes a different use of the metaphor of the map in describing learning's collaborative nature. The 'map' serves as what they term a theory-in-use that organizational members employ when interacting with their environment. When there is a mismatch between expectations and actual outcomes the members can correct the 'errors' on their maps and engage in learning. The map is presented as both a representational device and a political instrument for demarcating and ordering the organizational territory, where managers and their advisors are generally portrayed as being those in control of the interpretation process. Weick (1983, 1990) also sees management as being a distinctive class of map maker within the organizational hierarchy, recognizing the importance of symbols and stories as sensemaking devices in the creation of a territory and maps' socially constructed character. From this symbolic perspective, Weick offers an 'anecdote of the map' based on a geographical metaphor originating in a poem that tells a probably fictional story about a group of soldiers lost in the Alps (Basbøll and Graham 2006). He transposes the story into organization theory in order to highlight the representational practices of simplification at work in all processes of organizing. A detachment of Hungarian soldiers wandering lost in the Alps² mistakenly use a map of the Pyrenees but nevertheless find their way to safety. However amusing this story may be, seriously to propose the use of a wrong map in a potentially hazardous real-life situation might be seen as a rather irresponsible move. Although the facts Weick cites and the conclusions he draws from them have been placed into question by recent research (Basbøll 2010; Basbøll and Graham 2006), his insight that maps

act as heuristics to facilitate organizational action rather than being accurate depictions of reality, and are primarily instrumental in purpose, remains valid. Weick also portrays mapping as a political strategy where he draws an analogy between the invasion of a country (surprisingly, Grenada) and the function of management. Indeed, for Weick, sensemaking is itself a form of cartography, an 'act of interpretation that involves creating maps or representations that simplify some territory in order to facilitate action' (1993, 361). Nevertheless, it takes a considerable leap of faith to argue that any map will do so long as it gets us moving (Basbøll 2010; Rowlinson 2004).

Whilst it is important to recognize that maps can be used for a variety of ends, including political and motivational ones, we should not ignore the possibility that our existence is very much bound up with the material territory that we inhabit. A key limitation of the sensemaking approach lies in its neglect of the materiality involved in processes of territorialization. As Ingold reminds us, the walls of an institution cannot be reduced to a mere, even a panoptic, story. Although there may be many stories told about them, their histories, and their effects, always exceed their stories. The scars on the body certainly have their stories, but they nonetheless remain scars. It is against the storied occlusion of these wounds that such experimental 'maps' as Foucault's locate 'certain relatively free or unbound points, points of creativity, change and resistance' (Deleuze 1988, 44). Creativity in processes of strategy formulation has recently been approached through a critical revival of the mapping metaphor by Chia and Holt (2009), drawing significantly on materialist arguments made by Ingold (2000). The key proposal of Chia and Holt's critique is that mapping is part of storytelling, which has primacy as a means of 'wayfinding', rather than understanding a map as a representational tool. In doing so, they attempt to differentiate themselves from the cognitivist heritage underpinning Weick's sensemaking approach where the map is mostly seen as a heuristic that facilitates improvisation and enactment (Weick 2001).

Chia and Holt follow Ingold in seeing maps as an element of a storied relationship between actors and their environment. They correctly observe that the use of maps presumes a certain level of contextual knowledge both of how maps are used in practice and of the reality of the territory itself. They thus distinguish between the map as an abstract artefact and the process of mapping which requires 'active perceptual engagement with one's experiences'. The precise nature of this engagement is revealed through storytelling where one's way is 'not found in reference to the map' but rather 'in relation to narratives' (Chia and Holt 2009, 165). Once in motion, the process of responding to the environment dynamically, rather than by reading it off the map, takes over and sense is made of the environment as it unfolds.

Transposed into an organizational rather than anthropological context, Chia and Holt's (2009) overarching depoliticized assumption of a metaphysical predisposition of life to action and movement suppresses the recognition that stories could just as well serve the cause of inactivity rather than provoking action. There is nothing inherently active about the nature of storytelling nor inherently passive in the use of maps, and even stories of process can have stabilizing effects. The conceptual interest that assumes and prioritizes fluidity, hybridity, and the processual nature of reality that is found in the work of Weick, Chia, and Holt is sometimes associated with what has been termed 'critical' postmodern theory in organization studies. Their narrative is somewhat different, however. Where critical postmodern theory has an explicit political interest in the marginalized, the dispossessed, the itinerant, and the nomad, those fluid entities that slip between the cracks of grand designs, management theorists are rarely found to display such an affinity. A scholarly interest in strategy is often implicitly (if

not explicitly) aligned with the interests of management – and professionally expected to improve its performance, as even critical scholars are currently being exhorted to embrace ‘critical performativity’ (Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman 2009). This contradictory mixture of allegiances can only be resolved at the rhetorical level of the story, thereby neglecting the material reality of the territory. Like the cartographers in Jorge Luis Borges’ (1999, 325) fragment ‘On Exactitude in Science’, whose art ‘attained such Perfection that . . . (they) . . . struck a Map of the Empire whose size was that of the Empire, and which coincided point for point with it’, it seems that management scholars have become so enchanted by their map that it assumes the reality of territory, and the ‘desert of the real’ has long since been abandoned (Baudrillard 1994; Smith 2003).

A notable exception within the field of management studies is the exemplary work of the late Robert Cooper, whose analysis of the role of mapping and representation in organizations conceived such processes as being fundamentally embodied and prosthetic, in ‘compensat[ing] for the body’s deficiencies and, at the same time, extend[ing], magnify[ing] and mak[ing] more durable’ the body’s power (Cooper 1992, 257). A materialist conception of the map can also be found in the works of postmodern theorists that inspired Cooper, Chia, and others – notably the work of Deleuze and Guattari ([1980] 1987). Deleuze and Guattari ([1980] 1987, 12) have distinguished between the concept of the map and that of the ‘tracing’, where the former should not be reduced to a mere ‘tracing’ that simply reproduces blockages, structures, and points of impasse. For them, the map is a site of experimentation with reality. They propose that the map be understood not as an autonomous artefact but as a part of a rhizome, in that it is ‘open and connectable in all of its dimensions: it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation’ (Deleuze and Guattari [1980] 1987, 12). Their conception of the map brought to the fore a concern for lines of flight, processes of deterritorialization, and what they termed the ‘nomadic war machine’, which introduce processes of radical novelty into social and organizational change, a conception we will come back to later in this introduction.

Culture as landscape: movement, vistas, and dwelling

The idea of territory . . . a convenient fiction for both modern analysts and ancient rulers, built upon a landscape abstraction. (Smith 2005, 835)

Tensions between vision, narrative, material, and movement make territory a compelling concept across the field of social inquiry. Ingold (2000, 188) notes one significant tension between two general and formative assumptions about the landscape: first, the naturalistic view of it as a neutral, and external, backdrop to human activities, and second, the cultural view that every landscape is a particular conventional cognitive or symbolic ordering of space. A distinction should therefore be made between landscape and environment. Whilst the latter tends to be defined in terms of *function*, from the perspective of a specific organism (this holds emphatically true in the contingency theory of organizations, where fit with the environment defines success and failure, even in its more adventurous variations as population ecology), with landscape the emphasis is on *form*. The visual *experience* of a landscape unfolds as a sequence of *vistas*, Ingold (2000, 238–240) points out, with the body and landscape mutually unfolding together, a visuality different from the way in which vision is conceived,

imagined, and enacted in map-making (see also Stewart 1996, 3, 4, 125; 2007, 29–30). Moles' distinction between two ways of experiencing or marking space, the grid and the labyrinth, with the former materializing rationality and enacting a *panoramic gaze* under the form of maps and plans, and the latter being 'canonical forms of the constrained space enclosing the exploratory tendency of human beings' (cited in Lash 1999, 61), offers a variation on Ingold's different forms of vision. In its urban version, the *cityscape*, landscape is indeed often best experienced through *locomotion* rather than through *panoramic gaze* as vision is often blocked off by semi-enclosed corners, alleys, dead ends, and may suddenly open out into squares, parades, parks, boulevards, or car parks; or is transected by ring roads and railway lines, intersections and shopping centres, canal wharfs and river landings, bridges, and tunnels. Baudelaire's *flâneur*, a central figure in nineteenth-century Paris, impersonates such a hermeneutics of seeing, where emblematic cultural fragments, imprints of time and events are perceived and deciphered from the materiality of urban architecture through deambulation (Maréchal 2009, 24–25). In rural landscapes where open fields may be surrounded by steep hills, narrative is one way of connecting, or laminating the negotiation of passes, creeks, cliffs, crags, and hollows that bound our vision then open out onto new scenes, with new boundaries, whilst previous vistas slip away.

Taking a Bergsonian view that dissolves the boundary between inner and outer worlds, Ingold (2000, 191) argues that landscape is constituted by

the experiences it affords to those who spend time there – to the sights, sounds and indeed smells that constitute its specific ambience. And these, in turn, depend on the kinds of activities in which its inhabitants engage. It is from this relational context of people's engagement with the world that each place draws its unique significance. Thus whereas with space, meanings are *attached* to the world, with the landscape they are *gathered from* it. ... While places are centres. ... They have no boundaries. (192)

Landscapes should be viewed as places where people dwell, and have dwelt, as an 'enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left something of themselves' (Ingold 2000, 192). Landscape is therefore not land, or nature, or space. Where land is quantitative, insofar as one part of the globe can be rendered comparable to any other in measurable terms, difference in the landscape is experienced qualitatively – its appearance, its contours, its temperature, its humidity, its soil, its vegetation, its fauna, its buildings, its sounds, the field of vision available.

Ingold (2000, 195) captures this distinction in differentiating between the landscape and what he terms the *taskscape*. He defines the *taskscape* as the combination of practical acts that people undertake as part of their normal life – technical and social, qualitative, and heterogeneous, which mutually interlock across time. Where Durkheim sees tasks as being given chronological temporality by society in sequence, order, recurrence through rites, feasts, and public ceremonies, as in a clockwork mechanism, a more Bergsonian view sees human beings as embedded in and involved with their actions, which become social not by dint of imposed external rules, frames, and measures, but by the attentiveness with which humans as task-doers relate to one another, with mutual presence, adjustment, and involvement. Accordingly, Ingold's landscape is incorporated into the unending flow of the *taskscape*. In pilgrimage, for instance, landscape and *taskscape* merge through walking, which as an activity becomes 'the most immediate of rituals' (Bauman 1996; Bonnemaïson 2005, 118)

ritualistic as the visiting of sacred places along the way. To illustrate the co-creation of landscape and taskscape further, we could consider the South Yorkshire coalfields, where one of us grew up, between 1950 and 1990. The whole area was notorious for the effects that mining wrought upon it – villages were overshadowed by the towering pit-wheels and black slag-heaps of unusable slurry, stone streets were stained with the ubiquitous black dust from pit boots, unbagged coal-allowance deliveries tipped on the rattling cobbles by rumbling diesel trucks, and intemperate gusts of wind whistling through the pit-head. Brick terrace walls were blued with the smoke that puthered from each domestic chimney, and the air could sting your nostrils with the bitter sulphurous pungency of fumes from the coking plants, tar plants, coal-gas plants, and a periodic table of chemical derivative plants, the horizon lowering with semi-permanent dark clouds and the occasional puff of a yellow upstart or a skyward finger of flame. Drying laundry was a stained and perilous undertaking. Grass and leaves were of a curious mottled colour. Even nature was filthy. And in winter the smoke became fog as smoggy clouds hung low in the streets, street-lighting being almost useless as its beams were instantly diffused into the dense grey darkness that would billow presumptuously through an open door like an icy phantom seeking comfort by a blazing February hearth. The taskscape determined by heavy industrial processes dominated both the physical structure and shape of the villages, and the ways of life within them. Yet strong communities of humans and nature formed amongst the town rows of houses, with the laughter and chatter of social clubs, the echoing of brass band practice, the busyness of vegetable and flower allotments on the fertile clay beds, clucking coops of chickens and cooing racing pigeons, the restful quiet of angling ponds topping off bottomless disused flooded shafts, the fellowship of class consciousness and the proudly embroidered bannered discipline of bodies parading in union solidarity, the improvised mutuality of shared business and shared welfare amongst the tin baths and outside netties under the hoot of the shift siren and the looming shadows of heaps of surplus minerality. The taskscape was blended into landscape by human compassion and collaboration, identity, and community emerging in the everyday relations of people and places, clogs, and cobblestones.

After the miners' strike of 1984, the government was able to accelerate its project of changing the taskscape, closing the mines, demolishing buildings, watching the ancillary businesses collapse, the mortgages default, the houses boarded up go under auction, the musicians disband for want of a practice hall and sell their championship instruments for a month's rent. Capital, having extracted its surplus value, moved away and communities collapsed. New industries on a much smaller scale gradually moved in, the land was replenished beautifully and the air and streets became clean and healthy again. But without the sense of human community and continuity the new taskscape has no history or lived connection to the place in which it finds itself – it is merely the meshwork of media and economic vectors. It is stressful in activity and hollow of values and motives; the land, though wonderfully *landscaped* in design, does not fully form a *landscape* because it is not imbued with human relationality. Dislocated communities are not yet resurgent, and people have not yet learned to live in and engage with this new unstoried and unencultured land rather than performatively on and through it, or passively by watching it.

This should not be understood as though 'layers of meaning' need to be 'storied' onto the landscape, forming a semantic blanket requiring interpretive unpeeling by anthropologists or cultural sociologists. Ingold, quoting the Western Apache, prefers to see stories as media that allow listeners to place themselves in relation to the

landscape, permitting meanings to emerge into focus, to be revealed and disclosed, new ones to be crystallized or ambiguities to be savoured, opening up the textured mystery of the world rather than cloaking it in abstract symbols and explanations. Stories allow taskscape and landscape to be related. This approach to culture is radically different to the dominant interpretive approaches in organizational culture studies, which tend to defer to a Geertzian cloaking/uncloaking process (Geertz 1983). Organizational landscapes as a result remain underexplored, the embodied concept of landscape being displaced by that of the disembodied environment and the metaphor of the map being implicitly related to the pragmatics of the taskscape.

Culture as patrimonialization, roots, and terroir³

In-depth studies of food systems remind us of the pervasive role of food in human life. Next to breathing, eating is perhaps the most essential of all human activities, and one with which much of social life is entwined. (Mintz and Du Bois 2002, 102)

Networks of fragments, such as those constitutive of the contemporary global economic geography of food supply and commodity production, based on increasingly globalized, consolidated, and deterritorialized linkages, have squeezed nature out of the production process, simultaneously leading to an 'enhanced consumer sensitivity to the ways and means of food production and processing', promoting a re-embedding of food production processes in local contexts (Murdoch, Marsden, and Banks 2000, 111; Phillips 2006). This has prompted the rise of a new materialism that seeks to redefine the character and quality of foodstuffs (Gade 2004) and the importation of new terminology into the social science vocabulary.

The French word, 'terroir', is derived from the Latin 'territorium', meaning territory, and it has retained its original meaning of 'territory' (ground, country, region) whilst developing a more specialized connotation as 'location' or 'soil', specifically considered in terms of its ability to support specific types of agricultural production (Maréchal 2010). Food products that have a distinctive regional character, such as tea, coffee, the new 'grand cru' chocolate, and of course viticulture, are associated with the use of the term. Of these, wine is where the term is most redolent and recognizable, appearing in evocative expressions like 'goût du terroir' (tasting of terroir) or 'sentir le terroir' (smelling of terroir).

Given its association with characteristic attributes of locality and terrain, the term has more recently been used as a synonym of the word 'origin' in order to implicitly evoke a distinctive 'sense of place'. Here it denotes a rural region that is considered to shape the idiosyncratic characteristics of its inhabitants, language, or local culture, including the local accent ('accent du terroir'). This more inclusive usage explicitly associates social and cultural practice, and place, with genealogical connotations of roots and origin, tradition and heritage, and identity. A more interactive and dynamic dimension to terroir considers the rhythmic synchronic and diachronic interplay of several factors, such as the distinctive elements of a region that render its produces unique, distinctive, and typical of a place. In the winemaking context, terroir results from a combination of ecological, geological, historical, and human factors (Van Leeuwen and Seguin 2006).

Strictly delineated agronomic definitions of terroir as applied in such an industry exclusively refer to the natural elements which contribute to shape the ecology of

wine (termed *innate* or *matter terroir*), including climate and geology (topography, soil, and subsoil type). This is probably closest to a commonsense understanding of the term. An element of human and technological intervention is also relevant, which is captured by the expression '*terroir effect*'. This term refers to the intimate relationship between soil and subsoil, grape and winegrowing and winemaking *savoir-faire*, and practices which can influence the expression of the material characteristics of *terroir* in wine, a material outcome often referred to as the literal 'taste of the soil'.

Grounded in these origins in viticulture, the usage of concept has historically been extended considerably. Political and cultural aspects of locality and regions, place, land, and territory are captured by the term '*space terroir*'. By extension, reference to *terroir* is now widely used commercially to market and strengthen brand identity for gourmet foodstuffs (wine, cheese, oil, meat products, nuts, vegetables, or regional culinary specialties), connoting tradition, locality, distinctiveness, or quality more generally. These systems clearly have a *political* character as well as a quality objective (Colman 2008). In the case of French wine, the legal institution and labelling system that authenticates local origin is the Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée, established in 1935 to translate *terroir*, making it the oldest and strictest of the European label of origin systems (Barham 2003). By laying out a set of production requirements for 'a specific bounded space', Appellation Contrôlée underpins a process of *patrimonialization* that transforms a 'colloquial, environmental space (*terroir*)' into a jurisdictional space (*territory*), identified with quality, both materially and symbolically (Gade 2004, 849). Now extended to a variety of products, this mediating system between producers and consumers is instrumental in creating *symbolic value* by locating products of the *terroir* within an 'economy of qualities', through a process of 'singularization and attachment that establishes product individuality' by guaranteeing symbolic qualities such as uniqueness and place reputation (Gade 2004, 849; Ravasi and Rindova 2008). Place-of-origin labelling is now viewed as an 'especially effective method of attaching locality to commodity through the fabrication of brand names and trademarks' (Murdoch, Marsden, and Banks 2000, 111), a move that contributes to the increasing *commodification of terroir*.

The concept of *terroir* has also been applied in other fields of endeavour away from the field, the farm, or the laboratory. In literature and philosophy, it has been used to emphasize regionalism in authorship, usually denoting conservatism and a celebration of rural or traditional wisdom and cultural roots (Allhoff and Monroe 2007). Michel De Certeau (De Certeau, Giard, and Mayol 1988; Tomasik 2001) also introduces the idea of 'discursive *terroir*' which roughly corresponds to indexical and untranslatable elements in a discourse and is realized in his rich and evocative French, playing with words, layering cultural allusions and idiosyncratic expressions. *Terroir* can thus have significant symbolic and discursive connotations and as a concept can enrich organizational research in two ways: materially and metaphorically. *First*, *terroir effect* (the material influences of *terroir* on the character of the wine) might be considered for complex human beings in social systems: what influences from the material environment might combine in unacknowledged but sophisticated ways to influence behaviours? This aspect of cultural research, not exclusively on organizational culture, which demands a much deeper consideration of the effects of the material environment, is still largely unacknowledged, with the exception of some branches of cultural anthropology (including the anthropology of food – such as Civitello 2011; Counihan and van Esterik 2012; Watson 2004) and actor–network theory

(Latour 2005). *Second*, the *micro-focus of terroir* opens up distinctive and more detailed considerations of the symbolic complexity of human beings for ethnography in particular (De Certeau 1984). Terroir as metaphor then offers a way of combining the micro-material and the micro-symbolic within a conceptualization of a dynamic and interconnected whole.

There is, however, one alternative take on the term by Deleuze and Guattari who offer an understanding of the concept in terms of territory that is non-originary. Terroirs for them are how concepts and representations – such as capital, words, or things – are culturally realized and *acquire* qualities, taste, aroma, or savour. Rather than being seen as material sites of cultural origin, they are to be understood as constructed outcomes of the cultural processes of territorialization and deterritorialization discussed next. For instance, capital, as an abstract term, depends upon terroir for its realization in different material and social forms which change across time and place (such as money, exchange rates, and property).

Wayfaring from territorialization to nomadics: culture as psychosocial space

Civilised modern societies are defined by processes of decoding and deterritorialization. But what they deterritorialize with one hand, they reterritorialize with the other. (Deleuze and Guattari [1972] 1984, 257)

Modern anthropology until the end of the twentieth century saw culture as very much ‘in place’ (Augé 1995), connected to a specific material site or sites through grounded ‘local knowledges’ (Geertz 1983), and organizational culture was initially understood accordingly (Linstead and Grafton-Small 1992). Although few early studies of organizational culture actually took the material environment as their focal object, the groundedness of culture was more or less implicit, even in cognitive approaches and where organizations were multisited. Post-cultural lines of spatial thought emerging in philosophy were taken up in social geography and sociology in the 1990s and an inventive influence here was the work of Deleuze and Guattari (Doel 1995, 1999) on territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization. Whilst still being connected to geography, the term territory is used by Deleuze and Guattari ([1972] 1984, 32–34, 184–192, 240–262) to indicate the additional psychological dimension whereby an area or domain becomes ‘owned’ by a person, a gang, a pack of animals, the common people – where they feel secure, comfortable, and responsible. It is of course possible that the same physical terrain may be territorialized in different ways by several bodies or species without conflict, which is particularly pertinent for organizations and may even be a defining feature. A territory is simply the environment of a group (such as a pack of wolves, a pack of rats, or a group of nomads) that itself has no objective location – it is created by the patterns of interaction that give the group/pack some stability and a sense of common location whilst also being mobile. Similarly, the environment of a person (their social environment, domestic living space, or personal habits) is a psychological territory, and they act out of and return to it as a relatively secure ontological base. Processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization therefore indicate the variable status of group relationships or the different ways that people will react to change.

Deterritorialization may literally mean to take previously established control and order away from a land or place (Deleuze and Guattari [1972] 1984). It is a process

of undoing typical of colonial oppressions, where subjugated peoples have their beliefs forbidden, the use of associated symbols and ritual practices proscribed, and tribal boundaries removed. Psychologically, deterritorialization is illustrated in the fragmenting or breaking down of the means of sustaining identity and accordingly may have positive or negative consequences for those involved. When recruits are inducted into the military, for example, their established encultured individual and social identity systems are stripped away along with their civilian sense of self, to be replaced by the more collectivized and disciplined culture of the military as a total institution, allowing for the inculcation of a 'warrior self' (Goffman 1957). Joshua Ewart and Jessy Ohl in this issue critically and imaginatively consider the extent to which identity is tied to territory in the case of the US Military. The US armed forces are involved in greater numbers in more areas of the world, both conflict and strategic zones, than any other force at any time in history. Consequently, members of the armed forces spend more time away from domestic bases than in the past, are likely to face different sorts of combat situations in a range of theatres, and even when no longer enlisted may be called upon to return to a theatre of war in which they have served. These considerations dislocate them from their ties to their home territory, mediate against them reterritorializing on foreign soil, and disrupt their abilities to restabilize their identity on their return: as they say, 'we are still in the desert'. Ewart and Ohl use film and research reports to explore the effects of this deterritorializing dispersal on individuals.

Reterritorialization usually follows colonial forms of deterritorialization, with the imposition of colonial control structures, practices, social status, and belief systems that may include religion. But as Karl Palmas shows in this issue, global agribusiness can be similarly active in reterritorializing apparently innocent agricultural fields in Asia, which are not in any way what they might at first seem to the innocent eye of the visitor or traveller. Corporations sponsor farmers to plant visually appealing but lower yield plants in fields close to the road in order to influence other farmers to buy their products – but sponsored farmers are only subsidized for the areas immediately bordering the road and have to pay normal prices for the rest of the crop. Other initiatives ensure that fields and crops are striated according to the strategic initiatives of global business, in tension with but not overriding the demands of local terroir. This indicates a much wider process at work. Organizational networks can be understood as vectors of deterritorialization that traverse national and geographical borders and are then reterritorialized within organizations through processes of ownership and access rights, such as branding and the imposition of intellectual property rights. Still in the realm of agribusiness, the Monsanto corporation deterritorializes an Indian variety of wheat, Nap Hal, in terms of its abstract genome sequence, and then reterritorializes it by imposing its own corporate patent upon this genetic sequence. With even less subtlety, Monsanto were a major supplier of the chemical Agent Orange that was used during the Vietnam War to deterritorialize the jungle so that it could then be reterritorialized by the US Army. The very bodies of soldiers and civilians that were exposed to this chemical also became another vector of deterritorialization. Deterritorialization is big business – the foundational movement of capitalism itself (Virilio 1997).

Although *deterritorialization* may be oppressive, it can also be a form of resistance, and a form of the exercise of freedom, reasserted as a process against *reterritorialization* – taking lines of flight that evade imposed control. Jonathan Paquette and Aurélie Lacassagne offer a new perspective on territorialization in which the lines of flight or escape routes are subterranean. They study the work of Ontarian artist Jean Marc Dalpé

whose performance art recreates the lives of regional miners, a marginalized and exploited group, whose existence nevertheless represents a destabilising otherness within the operations of the postcolonial relations of the cities they inhabit. Bringing their collective existence, as narrative lines, up from underground, creates them as lines of resistance, disrupting the smooth running of the oppressive territorializations of the transnational mining conglomerates that use and abuse their labour, and even their lives, in extracting wealth that leaves the region and the state. Their lines of flight are set against the control strategies of extremely powerful global interests. Mining corporations elsewhere in the world are implicated in the deterritorialization of the trade in rare minerals such as Coltan (columbium–tantalum), which is essential for modern-day networked mobile electronics, especially cellphones, and of which Central Africa is one of the world's richest resources in meeting huge market demand. On the borders of the Congo Democratic Republic (CDR), Rwanda and Uganda, guerrillas meet the needs of industrial consumers by operating unregulated mines in collaboration with, and armed and supported by, the military forces of both neighbouring states. The British Government recently withdrew aid from Rwanda because of this involvement which has perpetuated civil war in the CDR (Ayres 2012; Bussmann 2009, 344–345; Smith 2011).

A further elaboration of these categories into relative or absolute forms can be illustrated by the recent global financial crisis. Deterritorializations may be relative or absolute (Deleuze and Guattari [1980] 1987). *Relative deterritorializations* always have the possibility of being reterritorialized and may be intentionally so. For example, after the financial crisis and bailouts of 2007–2008, the banks were insistent that the fundamental relationship of the financial world (Wall Street or the City [of London]) should be untouched, that new rules, obligations, or structures of governance should be about re-aligning and fixing a malfunction in a system that was basically sound – a relative deterritorialization. *Absolute deterritorializations* have no possibility of being territorialized again and produce what Deleuze and Guattari ([1980] 1987) call the 'plane of immanence', of intensity and consistency of relations in flow, an ontology of process. Many critics of the financial world wanted to see a fundamental change in the relation of capitalism to society as a whole, and insisted that any change needed to be radical, an absolute fundamental and irreversible change in the nature of the financial system that reconnected it to human realities. Others felt that the absolute deterritorialization had already happened with the freeing of the markets, and this principle could not be reversed without destroying the system itself. Absolute deterritorialization may thus have a positive organic aspect, in the sense of the graceful embracing of natural creative and connective flows, but it may also have a negative ideological one, in the sense of a superficial and depthless engagement with appearance rather than substance, an empty dynamism such as that of which the financial markets were accused.

Reterritorializations are always absolute and never relative, because they are inflexible and non-open: defined by a psychological territory, secured up by ideology, attitude, or discourse. Even though they may not be presently or ultimately sustainable, they occlude grounded and negotiated alternatives and are thus normatively transcendent. They operationalize an either/or logic. But because the territory itself inevitably functions as an unavoidable determining reference for relations, these reterritorializations, despite their fantasized absolute character, will crumble if the territory is challenged because they have no other grounding and are not adaptive. Organizational examples are plentiful in the 1980s and 1990s where companies determined their activities in terms of a traditional sense of identity and mission that held their aspirations so

firmly that only crisis could prompt change – either going out of business (as with the once market-leading UK menswear company Foster Brothers [Johnson 1987]) or changing the nature of their business, as did the mass-market white-goods leader Tube Industries, becoming a specialist alloy supplier to high-value industries (Grinyer, Mayes and McKiernan 1988).

Processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization are closely implicated in processes of organizational innovation and the creation of new organizational forms. Ironically, lines of flight as vectors of deterritorialization of the existing order of things can be in fact definitive of organization, alongside the emergence of new territorial assemblages. The network society is traversed by diverse deterritorializing influences including multinational corporations with their vast and interchangeable supply chains. So complex can these be that major international fashion retailers when challenged in the wake of the disastrous collapse of the Rana Plaza factory in Savar, Bangladesh, that left 1127 people dead, were unable to ‘unravel’ their sources – some were uncertain exactly where their products were being manufactured (Siegle 2013). A different and more positive deterritorialization has occurred in the process of software production led by open source communities through modular programme designs, project ‘forking’, and the development of pack-like teams. And perhaps one of the most powerful deterritorializing forces in modern times is the increasing use of information as a weapon (Munro 2005). Deleuze and Guattari’s ([1980] 1987) original description of the ‘nomadic war machine’ revealed nomads to be pioneers who have created new weapons and forms of combat in the preservation of their way of life. Today we can see such forces at work in the Zapatista rebellion in Mexico and their use of informational weapons in their fight to create and preserve their own territory and way of life, warding off neoliberal forms of organization (Arquilla and Ronfeldt 1997; Marcos 2001). Information warfare has also been pioneered by the WikiLeaks project, which has created a deterritorialized form of network organization. In their efforts to undermine and destroy WikiLeaks, corporations and nation-states have attempted to reterritorialize the organization around the body of its founder Julian Assange, and around critical nodes in its financial infrastructure. The Zapatista rebels and the WikiLeaks project are both close to becoming an absolute deterritorialization where they exist only as a line of becoming – through continuous movement ‘we will not be [reterritorialized]’ (Marcos 2001). The ‘nomadic war machine’ is a ‘vector of deterritorialization’ that describes forces of organizational becoming in terms of processes both of escape and organizational innovation.

Deterritorialization therefore implies *mobility* – beyond movements in the political economy of capital and information, cultural subjects and objects no longer depend on a specific location in space and time for their identity and there is an increasing looseness in the relation between culture and place that marked modern anthropology. Locations become multicultural; cultures become multisited. Cultural significance transcends specific territorial boundaries, or even makes them irrelevant, in a world that is constantly in motion (Banerjee and Linstead 2001; Urry 2000). Organizations move their operations across the world in negative deterritorializations that rarely embed themselves in the new host culture enough to be changed by it and invest their identities in branding and design rather than values and beliefs, which were the lingua franca of the cultural movement in organization studies.

Lash (1999, 59–61) argues that there remains a stickiness about these processes arising from the tension in territoriality between ground and groundlessness, expressible as the difference between roots and routes. As discussed in our earlier section on

terroir, roots imbricate and transform the materiality of the ground through the immaterialities of time, culture, and affect. Routes refer to ways of representing or marking space, invoking different metaphors: boundary or border (see the first section), grid or map – providing cognitive and psychosocial security (see the second section), and labyrinth or rhizome, which are exploratory processes allowing multiple simultaneous and spontaneous connections with heterogeneous others.

When static lines as ‘uninterrupted series of dots’ are signs characterized by immobility and abstraction and ‘by the absence of any spatial development in depth’, *open* forms of *territoriality* can emerge from the coexistence of ‘a plurality of borders’, sometimes ephemeral or mobile. Territory can be marked by ‘any border-dots’, and take the shape of ‘mobile and potentially ubiquitous dots’, a border as permeable and mobile as the ‘portable borders’ of nomadic communities (Cuttitta 2006, 33, 36).

Organizational cultures cannot generate ‘routes’ without fully considering ‘roots’ aspects of territoriality and vice versa. This is emphasized by Cuttitta (2006, 33) for whom territoriality as a modern form of state power solely rooted in the control of a bounded space is not ‘inevitable’ nor even ‘necessary’, ‘only possible’. As he further stresses, albeit minority, the aterritoriality of the cultural borders of many nomadic tribes, communities where social and political control is mostly exercised relationally through exchange networks or routes, challenges and unsettles strictly territorially bound forms of cultural identity. The rejection of borders as set by colonial powers in Africa, these being viewed as ‘arbitrarily imposed, artificial barriers separating people of the same stock’ and responsible for a balkanized Africa, has repeatedly been mobilized within postcolonial discourses of cultural emancipation and autonomy (Touval 1967, 102). In nomadic cultures, mobility is instrumental in practising cultural identity. This is exemplified by North American Sioux tribes whose migrations followed the movement of buffalos, movement that made ‘the borders of their political community ... consequently mobile’. In geographical areas where forms of nomadic life still survive,

the relations between individuals or clans still tend to develop in a more direct and elastic way (more horizontally than vertically, more dynamically than statically, in a more immediate than mediate way), on the basis of a mobility that the principle of territoriality imposed by colonial borders curbs every time. (Cuttitta 2006, 32)

Whilst Deleuze and Guattari deploy the concept of the nomad philosophically rather than literally, their distinction between absolute and relative deterritorializations can be extended to understanding types of movement. Metaphorically, the negative form of nomadic movement is like movement through a landscape, gazing like a tourist but taking nothing in – perhaps even abstracting like the theorist (the words have the same Greek root, *theoria*), reading or decoding the signs but being emotionally or bodily unmoved and unconnected. For instance, Mafessoli’s (1996) neotribalism depicts the elasticity of postmodern nomadic cultures as deterritorialized heterogeneous fragments of communities that gather around their similar lifestyles and tastes, but also quickly disintegrate. Being nomad, for Deleuze and Guattari, is not just about moving through landscapes, but is an intimate movement within and between terroirs, being alive to changing nuance and detail in a dynamic relation. This positive movement is intensive, the movement of a nomad who engages in wayfaring – connecting with each step to the terrain in which they travel, knowing it intimately, being able to read it, to unravel its secrets, to live in it, even temporarily (Deleuze and Guattari [1980] 1987).

Conclusion

As we have seen, the concept of *organization as territory* can function symbolically. Organization studies could take up this insight by incorporating an additional metaphor to those suggested by Morgan (1986). Additionally, taking into account and building on existing studies of organizational space and architecture it could be approached materially. Both perspectives retain the focus on organizations at the meso-level as their centre of gravity, whilst remaining open to other levels of reflection. What we have attempted to demonstrate in this paper is the necessity of opening out the understanding of organization processually, symbolically, and materially, to reveal the interwoven nature of macro-, meso- and micro- levels. We have brought together perspectives from anthropology, human and economic geography, psychology, philosophy, history, and literature to provide conceptual tools for developing the new field of organizational territoriality studies (OTS) bridging field sciences, social sciences, and humanities. We have identified relevant work on considerations of macro-level nation-state political economy and corporate power, with boundary marking and defence; the meso-level of organizationally networked spaces; the role of maps and mapping; the materialities of landscape, terroir, and practices of dwelling; the micro-level of psychosocial spaces; the symbolic significance of taskscapes and vistas; mobile practices of wayfaring and nomadics; and processes of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization. We have identified some developments of, rereadings and critiques of existing approaches to management and organization that this conjunction inspires. Furthermore, OTS offers a space for the articulation of differing formulations of similar and related concepts across disciplines; a means of translation of different conceptual logics and lexica; and exchange of perspectives, arguments, and stories that not only illuminate the weave of organizational life and the organization of life, but reflect their own embodied status as part of that weave. Specifically in relation to conceptualizing culture, OTS identifies a ground for combining understandings of space and time with power, embodiment, and materiality to shed new light on issues of organizational culture, identity, and meaning. It opens out this area of organization studies from identification with the taskscape as conditioning its object of inquiry to reconsidering a new vista of how materialities such as terroir and landscape combine with human qualities and creativities to continually and dynamically respond to the question of what humanity means, what practices this involves, and how both of these are changing.

Notes

1. This special issue began life as a stream – *The Territorial Organization: Social Terroir and Organizational Assemblage* – at the 27th European Group for Organization Studies Colloquium *Reassembling Organizations* in Göteborg, Sweden, 7–9 July 2011.
2. Weick puzzlingly specifies Switzerland, whose longstanding policy of armed neutrality and forbidding defensible terrain has successfully rendered it impregnable to invasion since before the First World War: there was, however, considerable military activity along the Austrian–Italian Alpine border during that war, and Hungary was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In 2004, the frozen and partially preserved bodies of three Austro-Hungarian troops were found near the peak of San Matteo in the Italian Alps, presumed killed in the fighting there on 3 September 1918.
3. In the section on “Terroir”, we draw upon and extend the entry by Maréchal (2010) on the topic in the *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. We are grateful to Sage Publications for permission to use some of this material.

References

- Allhoff, F., and D. Monroe, eds. 2007. *Food and Philosophy. Eat, Think and Be Merry*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ardrey, R. [1966] 1997. *The Territorial Imperative: A Personal Inquiry into the Animal Origins of Property and Nations*. New York: Kodansha Globe.
- Argyris, C., and D. Schon. 1978. *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arquilla, J., and D. Ronfeldt, eds. 1997. *In Athena's Camp: Preparing for Conflict in the Information Age*. Washington, DC: RAND National Defense Research Institute.
- Augé, M. 1995. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Super-Modernity*. London: Verso.
- Ayres, C. J. 2012. "The International Trade in Conflict Minerals: Coltan." *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 8 (2): 178–193.
- Banerjee, S. B., and S. A. Linstead. 2001. "Globalization, Multiculturalism and Other Fictions: Colonialism for the New Millennium?" *Organization* 8 (4): 683–722.
- Barham, E. 2003. "Translating Terroir: The Global Challenge of French AOC Labeling." *Journal of Rural Studies* 19 (1): 127–138.
- Basbøll, T. 2010. "Softly Constrained Imagination: Plagiarism and Misprision in the Theory of Organizational Sensemaking." *Culture and Organization* 16 (2): 163–168.
- Basbøll, T., and H. Graham. 2006. "Substitutes for Strategy Research: Notes on the Source of Karl Weick's Anecdote of the Young Lieutenant and the Map." *Ephemera* 6 (2): 194–204.
- Baudrillard, J. 1994. *Simulacra & Simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bauman, Z. 1996. "From Pilgrim to Tourist – or a Short History of Identity." In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Hall and P. du Gay, 18–36. London: Sage.
- Becher, T. 1989. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press/SRHE.
- Becher, T., and P. R. Trowler. 2001. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press/SRHE.
- Béland, D., and A. Lecours. 2008. *Nationalism and Social Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bencherki, N., and F. Cooren. 2011. "Having to Be: The Possessive Constitution of Organization." *Human Relations* 64 (12): 1579–1607.
- Bennett, L. 2011. "The Bunker: Metaphor, Materiality and Management." *Culture and Organization* 17 (2): 155–173.
- Beyes, T., and C. Steyaert. 2012. "Spacing Organization: Non-Representational Theorizing and the Spatial Turn in Organizational Research." *Organization* 19 (1): 45–61.
- Bonnemaïson, J. 2005. *Culture and Space: Conceiving a New Geography*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Borges, J. L. 1999. "On Exactitude in Science." In *Collected Fictions*, translated by A. Hurley, 325. London: Penguin.
- Burgess, M., and H. Vollaard. 2006. *State Territoriality and European Integration*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Burrell, G., and G. Morgan. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. London: Heinemann.
- Bussmann, J. 2009. *The Worst Date Ever*. London: Pan.
- Castells, M. 2000. *The Rise of the Network Society: Economy, Society and Culture: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture (Volume 1)*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chia, R., and R. Holt. 2009. *Strategy Without Design: The Silent Efficacy of Indirect Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Civitello, L. 2011. *Cuisine and Culture: A History of Food and People*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Clegg, S. R., and M. Kornberger, eds. 2006. *Space, Organizations and Management Theory*. Copenhagen: Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Colman, T. 2008. *Wine Politics: How Governments, Environmentalists, Mobsters, and Critics Influence the Wines We Drink*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cooper, R. 1992. "Formal Organization as Representation: Remote Control, Displacement and Abbreviation." In *Rethinking Organization: New Directions in Organization Theory and Analysis*, edited by M. Reed and M. Hughes, 254–273. London: Sage.

- Counihan, C., and P. van Esterik, eds. 2012. *Food and Culture: A Reader* 3rd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cuttitta, P. 2006. "Points and Lines: A Topography of Borders in the Global Space." *Ephemera* 6 (1): 27–39.
- Dale, K. 2005. "Building a Social Materiality: Spatial and Embodied Politics in Organizational Control." *Organization* 12 (5): 649–678.
- Dale, K., and G. Burrell. 2008. *The Spaces of Organisation & the Organization of Space: Power, Identity & Materiality at Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Dale, K., and G. Burrell. 2011. "Disturbing Structure: Reading the Ruins." *Culture and Organization* 17 (2): 107–121.
- Daskalaki, M., A. Stara, and M. Imas. 2008. "The 'Parkour Organisation': Inhabitation of Corporate Spaces." *Culture and Organization* 14 (1): 49–64.
- Day, D. 2008. *Conquest: How Societies Overwhelm Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- De Certeau, M., L. Giard, and P. Mayol. 1988. *The Practice of Everyday Life. Vol. 2: Living and Cooking*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. 1988. *Foucault*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. [1972] 1984. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Vol. 1*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. [1980] 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Vol. 2*. London: Athlone.
- Dicken, P., and A. Malmberg. 2001. "Firms in Territories: A Relational Perspective." *Economic Geography* 77 (4): 345–363.
- Doel, M. A. 1995. "Bodies Without Organs: Deconstruction and Schizoanalysis." In *Mapping the Subject: Geographies of Cultural Transformation*, edited by S. Pile and N. Thrift, 227–241. London: Routledge.
- Doel, M. A. 1999. *Poststructuralist Geographies: The Diabolical Art of Spatial Science*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Evans, D., ed. 2009. *Appropriation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin.
- Gade, D. W. 2004. "Tradition, Territory and Terroir in French Viniculture: Cassis, France, and Appellation Contrôlée." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (4): 848–867.
- Geertz, C. 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goertz, G., and P. Diehl. 1992. *Territorial Changes and International Conflict*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Goffman, E. 1957. "Characteristics of Total Institutions." In *Symposium on Preventative and Social Psychiatry*, 43–93. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Grinyer, P. H., D. Mayes, and P. McKiernan. 1988. *Sharpbenders: The Secrets of Unleashing Corporate Potential*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grosby, S. 1995. "Territoriality: The Transcendental, Primordial Feature of Modern Societies." *Nations and Nationalism* 1 (2): 143–62.
- Hardt, M., and A. Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hopfl, H., and B. Allen. 2011. "Editorial - Architecture and Organization: Structure, Text and Context." *Culture and Organization* 17 (2): 87–90.
- Houellebecq, M. 2012. *The Map and the Territory*. London: Random House.
- Ingold, T. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Jenner, M. S. R. 1997. "Underground, Overground: Pollution and Place in Urban History (Review Essay)." *Journal of Urban History* 24 (1): 97–110.
- Johnson, G. 1987. *Strategic Change and the Management Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kornberger, M., and S. Clegg. 2004. "Bringing Space Back in: Organizing the Generative Building." *Organization Studies* 25 (7): 1095–1114.
- Korzybski, A. 1933. *Science and Sanity*. Boston, MA: The Colonial Press.
- Lacher, H. 2006. *Beyond Globalisation: Capitalism, Territoriality and the International Relations of Modernity*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Lash, S. 1999. *Another Modernity: A Different Rationality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Linstead, S., and R. Grafton-Small. 1992. "On Reading Organizational Culture." *Organization Studies* 13 (3): 331–355.
- Mafessoli, M. 1996. *The Time of the Tribes: The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society*. London: Sage.
- Marcos, S. 2001. *Our Word Is Our Weapon*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Maréchal, G. 2009. "The Paris Underground as an Urban Artefact. Living Memory, Liminality and Imaginary." Unpublished MA thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Lancaster.
- Maréchal, G. 2010. "Terroir." In *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*, edited by A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe, 921–923. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J., P. Frost, and O. A. O'Neill. 2006. "Organizational Culture: Beyond Struggles for Intellectual Dominance." In *Sage Handbook of Organization Studies*. 2nd ed. edited by S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence and W. Nord, 725–753. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mintz, S. W., and C. Du Bois. 2002. "The Anthropology of Food and Eating." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 99–119.
- Morgan, G. 1986. *Images of Organization*. London: Sage.
- Morton, P. A. 2000. *Hybrid Modernities. Architecture and Representation at the 1931 Colonial Exposition, Paris*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Munro, I. 2005. *Information Wars in Business*. London: Routledge.
- Murdoch, J., T. Marsden, and J. Banks. 2000. "Quality, Nature and Embeddedness: Some Theoretical Considerations in the Context of the Food Sector." *Economic Geography* 76 (2): 107–125.
- Nicholson, N. 2000. *Managing the Human Animal*. London: Texere.
- Phillips, L. 2006. "Food and Globalization." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 37–57.
- Ravasi, D., and V. Rindova. 2008. "Symbolic Value Creation." In *Handbook of New Approaches in Management and Organization*, edited by D. Barry and H. Hansen, 270–284. London: Sage.
- Roth, R. 2009. "The Challenges of Mapping Complex Indigenous Spatiality: From Abstract Space to Dwelling Space." *Cultural Geographies* 16 (2): 207–227.
- Rowlinson, M. 2004. "Challenging the Foundations of Organization Theory." *Work, Employment and Society* 18 (3): 607–620.
- Shannon, M. 2009. "Preventing War and Providing the Peace? International Organizations and the Management of Territorial Disputes." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26 (2): 144–163.
- Siegle, L. 2013. "Ethical Shopping: How the High Street Fashion Stores Rate The Guardian Friday May 17th." Accessed online June 16, 2013. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/fashion/2013/may/17/ethical-shopping-high-street-fashion>.
- Smith, R. G. 2003. "Baudrillard's Nonrepresentational Theory: Burn the Signs and Journey Without Maps." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21 (1): 67–84.
- Smith, M. L. 2005. "Networks, Territories, and the Cartography of Ancient States." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95 (4): 832–849.
- Smith, J. H. 2011. "Tantalus in the Digital Age: Coltan Ore, Temporal Dispossession, and 'Movement' in the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo." *American Ethnologist* 38 (1): 17–35.
- Spicer, A., M. Alvesson, and D. Kärreman. 2009. "Critical Performativity: The Unfinished Business of Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 62 (4): 537–560.
- Stewart, K. 1996. *A Space by the Side of the Road: Cultural Poetics in an "Other" America*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stewart, K. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. London: Duke University Press.
- Taylor, S., and A. Spicer. 2007. "Time for Space: A Narrative Review of Research on Organizational Spaces." *Internal Journal of Management Reviews* 9 (4): 325–346.
- Terdiman, R. 2001. "The Marginality of Michel de Certeau." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 100 (2): 399–421.
- Tomasik, T. J. 2001. "Certeau a la Carte: Translating Discursive Terroir in the Practice of Everyday Life: Living and Cooking." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 100 (2): 519–542.

- Touval, S. 1967. "The Organization of African Unity and African Borders." *International Organization* 21 (1): 102–127.
- Trice, H. S., and J. Beyer. 1993. *The Cultures of Work Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Trowler, P., M. Saunders, and V. Bamber, eds. 2012. *Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century: Rethinking the Significance of Disciplines in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Tuan, Y.-F. 1977. *Space and Place. The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Urry, J. 2000. *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, C., and G. Seguin. 2006. "The Concept of Terroir in Viticulture." *Journal of Wine Research* 17 (1): 1–10.
- Van Marrewijk, A. H., and D. Yanow, eds. 2010. *Organizational Spaces: Rematerializing the Workaday World*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Virilio, P. 1997. *Pure War*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Watson, J. L., ed. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Weick, K. 1983. "Misconceptions About Managerial Productivity." *Business Horizons* 26 (4): 47–52.
- Weick, K. 1990. "Introduction: Cartographic Myths in Organizations." In *Mapping Strategic Thought*, edited by A. S. Huff, 1–10. Chichester: Wiley.
- Weick, K. 1993. "Organizational Redesign and Improvisation." In *Organizational Change and Redesign*, edited by G. P. Huber and W. H. Glick, 346–382. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. 2001. *Making Sense of the Organization*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Witchel, H. 2010. *You Are What You Hear: How Music and Territory Make Us Who We Are*. New York: Algora Publishing.