

Spring 6-10-2017

SOUNDING OUT IS? MOODS AND AFFECTIVE ENTANGLEMENTS IN EXPERIENTIAL COMPUTING

Mads Bødker

Copenhagen Business School, mb.itm@cbs.dk

Tina Blegind Jensen

Copenhagen Business School, blegind@cbs.dk

Follow this and additional works at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2017_rip

Recommended Citation

Bødker, Mads and Jensen, Tina Blegind, (2017). "SOUNDING OUT IS? MOODS AND AFFECTIVE ENTANGLEMENTS IN EXPERIENTIAL COMPUTING". In Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS), Guimarães, Portugal, June 5-10, 2017 (pp. 3003-3012). ISBN 978-0-9915567-0-0 Research-in-Progress Papers.
http://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2017_rip/49

This material is brought to you by the ECIS 2017 Proceedings at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in Research-in-Progress Papers by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

SOUNDING OUT IS? MOODS AND AFFECTIVE ENTANGLEMENTS IN EXPERIENTIAL COMPUTING

Research in Progress

Bødker, Mads, Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, Denmark, mb.itm@cbs.dk

Jensen, Tina Blegind, Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, Denmark, blegind@cbs.dk

Abstract

How do we experience living in a world in which soundscapes from digital technologies are increasingly pervading our everyday lives? In this paper, we pay attention to moods, ambiances, and other ephemeral aspects that give shape to how working with digital technology feels. Too often glossed over in search of more concrete narratives of ‘effect’ or ‘impact’ of digital technology, we argue that the socio-materiality of practice can be complemented by a notion of affective entanglement; i.e., the embodied materiality of feeling. Highlighting in particular how soundscapes and noise from ubiquitous computers performs and matters in the emergent composition of embodied being and subjectivity, we urge IS researchers to pay attention to everyday phenomena that involve digital technologies. Towards this aim, we present three autoethnographic vignettes that help unpack situations in which sounds shape or perform certain kinds of subjectivities and felt, embodied dispositions. Based on these everyday narratives, we analyse the different ways in which soundscapes from digital technology shape the body’s ability to act, feel, think, and experience. We conclude this research in progress paper by suggesting some opportunities for advancing a material, sensory, and ‘experiential turn’ in the IS discipline.

Keywords: Sound, Experience, Digital technology, Autoethnography

1 Introduction

This research-in-progress paper provides an exploratory study of the experience of *sounds* from digital machines, interfaces, and spaces increasingly pervaded with information technology (IT). Standard screen/mouse/keyboard interfaces would seem to become less tenable as computers shrink in size and disseminate into the world at large (Janlert & Stolterman, 2014), and we see a burgeoning of devices that require little eye/hand interaction and instead rely on sounds to communicate about their state.

As a starting point, we are not concerned with the design of new interfaces, but rather with the ways in which sounds of digital technology may modulate moods, feelings, and the felt shapes of mundane lives. The intention is to begin a dialogue about the rather subtle – yet *vital* – qualities of interaction with digital technologies under what we might broadly term the ‘experiential turn’ in the information systems (IS) discipline. This, we hope, may lead to more sensitive (and sensuous) experience-centric approaches and understandings for the development of ways of living with the ubiquitous computer.

As a sensory modality, sounds from digital devices seem to stand out in stories and incidents related from their everyday- and work-a-day lives. Hence, in order to unpack situations in which sounds shape or perform certain kinds of subjectivities and felt, embodied dispositions, we present three narratives derived from self-observation and iterative ethnographic writing (as a form of inquiry). In the paper, these stories are related from a position of autoethnographic (Ellis and Bochner, 2000) ‘everyday research’ (Brinkmann, 2012). This particular mode of research, so Brinkmann argues, compels the researcher to embrace ‘conceptual audacity’ and to use personal and mundane events in the development of new vocabularies and theories. Building on everyday self-observations, a key purpose for this paper is therefore to orbit new, if very partial, theoretical landscapes into the IS discipline.

Concurrently, we explore some initial methodological consequences and possibilities for this gradual turn. We do so by addressing the lack in current theoretical and empirical accounts of socio-material entanglements of ‘feeling’ (Stein et al., 2014). Subsequently, we provide a reflection on ‘affective entanglement’ as a possible materialistic ontology for conceptualizing feelings, moods, or atmospheres in relation to IS phenomena.

Using notions derived from affect theory to develop a style of working with the senses and IT that goes beyond ‘the emotional’, the paper investigates how a materiality of digital soundscapes can be understood as part of an intimate affective-sensory-technical entanglement. Such entanglement seems to be both pre-social (Massumi, 2002) and pre-cognitive (Merleau-Ponty, 1948; 2004), falling outside traditional forms of signification, classification, and meaning. We argue that a nascent appreciation of how sounds and incidental soundscapes created by digital machines perform different embodied dispositions furthers the understanding of what might be at stake in experiential computing. Sound, in this sense, could be replaced with numerous other sensory modalities through which we experience life with ubiquitous IT. However, in this paper, paying attention to sound provides a useful example of one possible way of working with the senses and feelings in IS.

Our approach departs from the ‘logic of practice’ that has dominated IS (including socio-material theorizing) to consider instead more transient and difficult-to-capture qualities and atmospheres of interacting (implicitly or explicitly) with computing technologies that do not relate directly to the viability or rationality of organizational work or leisure practices. We argue that felt qualities, independently of individual cognition and meaning making, structure a corporeal sense of living with IT. We thus also, in the paper, renounce the discourse of ‘emotions’ and emotionality in IS. In what follows, we motivate this departure, and we suggest how the (ontological) notion of affect, as well as any methodological corollaries, contributes to extending the understanding of – as well as the styles and approaches we might adopt in working with – IT as experiential.

We wish to pay attention to moods, ambiances, and other ephemeral aspects that give shape to how working with(in) IT *feels*. These are things that nevertheless typically live ‘below the radar’ of other approaches. The paper provides facets of a rather kaleidoscopic lens that allow us to see/feel how diminutive ‘ripples’ of sensation, too often glossed over in the search for more concrete narratives of ‘effect’ or ‘impact’ of digital technologies, might become included into a discourse of IS. In doing so, the paper aims to sharpen the sensibilities among IS researchers by suggesting them to ‘pay (more) attention’ to the various sensuous and fleetingly felt qualities of everyday IT phenomena. Our experimental approach aims to widen the range of viable inquiries possible under the experiential computing program laid out by Yoo (2010), as described next.

2 Experiential Perspectives on IS

Yoo (2010) has introduced the notion of ‘Experiential Computing’ into the IS research tradition. The notion that technologies have experiential qualities has previously attracted the interest of numerous disciplines including philosophy (Heidegger, 1977; Ihde, 1990) and sociology (e.g., Latour, 2004), but also the transdisciplinary fields of HCI and anthropology (McCarthy and Wright, 2004; Suchman, 1987; Dourish and Bell, 2007). Precursors to Yoo’s programmatic headlining of experiential aspects of IS research include Ciborra’s corrective engagement with the Heideggerian concept of ‘Befindlichkeit’ in IS (2006) and McGrath’s understanding of moods as a medium of ‘attunement’ in the development of an IT system (2001).

Theoretically, this paper emphasizes possible new ways of thinking about socio-material entanglement that can be described as a move from *entanglements in practice* (e.g. Styhre, 2011; Orlikowski, 2007) to *affective entanglements*. A standard account of socio-materiality emphasizes how “things”, i.e., artefacts, objects, or simply things, are imbricated in organizational *practices*. From this perspective, human actors and technological objects are understood to emerge in socio-material assemblages. This means that entities, human beings, and things exist only through their relations; i.e., they are continuously brought into being through their relationships. The focus, within this account, is on the performative nature of practices and the ways in which people and technologies, their properties, and

boundaries are enacted and re-enacted in practice (Cecez-Kecmanovic et al., 2014). We suggest that the socio-materiality of practices can usefully be complemented by a notion of affective entanglements; i.e., the embodied materiality of *feeling*. In this way, moods, feelings, and felt embodiment (similarly to practices) are relational performances of people and machines.

2.1 Affective entanglement, moods, and atmospheres

Retaining a materialistic ontology, affective entanglement suggests that body-subjects, and their affective dispositions, such as moods, felt-ness, (dis)comfort, stress, embodied dispositions, tensions, headaches, or desires are continuously transformed through material resonances or ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams, 1977) that pervade situations or contexts. This can emerge as very direct sensory impingements (such as getting a headache from reading in a badly lit place), but a felt shape of life and ‘being’ can be said to emerge out of atmospheres and more vaguely discernible “Stimmungen” by which dispositions and *moods* are performed. A ‘Stimmung’ literally means ‘a *tuning*’ (see Ciborra’s reading of Heidegger (2006)), and it follows that the material shape of soundscapes and noise from ubiquitous computers *tunes*, performs – and more generally *matters* – in emergent compositions of embodied being and subjectivity.

In the remainder of this section, we consider how our work is related to a particular body of research, namely affect theory, primarily developed within the humanities, cultural/human geography, and social philosophy.

2.1.1 Affect

Broadly, in a necessarily truncated fashion, we propose that affect theory is about forces, about ‘becoming’, and about ways in which bodies (be they human or non-human) are interacting. For example, Seigworth and Gregg (2010) suggest that affect theory denotes a set of diverse theoretical developments concerned with “those forces – visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally *other than* conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion – that can serve to drive us toward movement, toward thought and extension.” (2010, p. 1). Affect and emotion may seem related; yet, affect theory prefers to differentiate between the two. While Leys (2011) provides a critical reading of Massumi’s and related authors’ approach to affect, her summary of the ways in which affect is different from emotion is worth quoting. Leys (2011) argues that: “There is a gap between the subject’s affects and its cognition or appraisal of the affective situation or object, such that cognition or thinking comes “too late” for reasons, beliefs, intentions, and meanings to play the role in action and behaviour usually accorded to them. The result is that action and behaviour are held to be determined by affective dispositions that are independent of consciousness and the mind’s control” (Leys, 2011, p. 443).

Affect is here understood as a material, non-conscious ‘intensity’ or force while emotions are considered a more reflective and contextualized “sociolinguistic fixing of the quality of an experience which is from that point onward defined as personal. Emotion is *qualified* intensity, the conventional, consensual point of insertion of intensity into semantically and semiotically formed progressions, into narrativizable action-reaction circuits, into function and meaning. It is intensity owned and recognized” (Massumi, 2002, p. 38, italics added). Upon such a reading, the material world, and the various sensory modulations it provides, is a *force* that modulates the body’s ability to act, feel, think, and experience. Authors who subscribe to a similar version of affect include Thrift (2004), Stewart (2007), and Blackman (2012), who have provided studies of the ways in which forces may be “flighty and hardwired, shifty and unsteady but palpable too...” (Stewart, 2007, p. 4).

Trailing the affect theoretical impulse, our aim is to create a space for exploring representations and new analytical tactics when studying some of the more subtle potentialities at stake in living with IT. Affect theory prompt us to ask what we might be missing out on in our analysis of experiential computing if we fail to grapple with the ephemeral and hardly relatable ways IT make us feel. Ephemeral things such as moods and atmospheres contribute to the affective entanglements of experiential computing. In our rendering, this entanglement is played out as pressures or forces of

sound that emanate from an abundant array of digital devices. A challenge is then how to render such atmospheres and moods in ways that permit an analysis and ensuing understandings to emerge, however partial, idiosyncratic, or eccentric these may be. Before we continue exploring such representational tactics, we turn now to the ‘material’ aspect under scrutiny; i.e., the phenomenon of sound.

2.1.2 Sound

Sound is neither a material nor a phenomenon. We may put our scientific minds at ease by stating sounds to be nothing but waves propagating through the medium of air to then resonate with specific anatomical structures in the ear and, through the human sensory system, leading to the individual perception of ‘a sound’. However, we quickly realize that this definition leaves out any notion of experiential qualities. As Merleau-Ponty (1948; 2004) argues, by using the example of light, it would indeed be considered somewhat lacking, for instance, if we were to rely solely on a physicalist definition of light as either waves or particles emitted from a reflective surface of an object, hitting the retina. Light is *experienced*, or rather, things are experienced *in* light. As senses, light and *seeing* have qualities associated with what goes beyond the registration of light in the optical system. Ihde (2007) suggests that: “In the case of the sciences of sound this translation allows sound to be measured, and measurement is predominantly a matter of spatializing qualities into visible quantities. However, in ordinary experience, there is often thought to be a similar role for sound. Sounds are frequently thought of as anticipatory clues for ultimate visual fulfilments” (p. 54). This seems to confine a sound perception to an overall ‘lower’ role in the human sensorium, being merely ‘anticipatory’. However, sound perception does not only pertain to the differentiation of ‘shapes’ (or things) in the world (i.e., objects that *produce* sound such as a bird whom the birdwatcher listens to in order to be able to *see* it). It also concerns an experience of ‘space’ or an ‘auditory field’ that surrounds it, enrolling the subject and the body in an (involuntary) impression of a non-focal (spatial, diffuse) unfolding of an eventful environment.

Hence, sound and listening is not just the dispersal of waves (Ihde’s ‘visible quantity’ above) from a resonant object and the following displacement of air (or other viscous media) in the form of oscillating waves. Sound is also an *existential* structure that shapes experiences of being in a place. It gives form and impression to activities, and, like other sensory impressions, it may shape or modulate moods and feelings. Sound can also be seen as part of a broader cultural system (Feld, 1990). For example, Colin Turnbull’s (1957) seminal recordings of sounds and music among the Mbuti pygmies, and the subsequent publication of ‘The Forest People’ (Turnbull, 1961), show how life in a dense and sonorous forest shapes particular ways of listening and ways of attributing a vital importance and meaning to the acoustic sense. Sound is thus both a material structure or texture and a vital, embodied part of a felt reality.

2.1.3 Sound and affect

Concerning the way in which sound modulates the subject/body, LaBelle (2006) argues that “sound is intrinsically and unignorably relational: it emanates, propagates, communicates, vibrates and agitates; it leaves a body and enters others; it binds and unhinges, harmonizes and traumatizes; it sends the body moving, the mind dreaming, the air oscillating. It seemingly eludes definition, while having profound effect” (LaBelle, 2006, p. ix). Sounds are not merely ‘energy’ (in a physicalist sense) or ‘information’ (in a semiotic sense). Sounds furnish situations with certain ‘pressures’ and give shape to how people behave, relate, or feel. The mundane soundscapes at a work place or in the home, for example, may provide a sense of urgency, relaxation, animosity, hope, and so forth. Without being clear signifiers of discrete activities, sounds thus provide a dynamic, shifting backdrop in the form of a mood or an atmosphere.

In sum, what we argue here is the importance of affective entanglement, and hence the embodied materialities of feeling, when understanding the socio-materiality of practice. Sound plays an

important role as an existential structure that shapes the felt experience of work and leisure spaces. The question is how to study such phenomena. This we turn to next.

3 Everyday Research and Autoethnography

Following the affect theoretical agenda outlined above has methodological consequences. It is difficult, if not impossible, to talk about ambiguous and diffuse events such as atmospheres or ambiances without deferring to metaphorical language. It would seem that the rather gaseous nature of an affective “atmosphere” is somewhat impenetrable (or perhaps the opposite, too porous and vague) for scientific approaches.

With this in mind, we present accounts derived from self-observation and iterative ethnographic writing (as a form of inquiry, see Richardson, 1996) to help unpack situations in which sounds seem to subtly modulate or perform certain kinds of felt, embodied dispositions. We provide three vignettes in the style of autoethnography (Ellis and Bochner, 2000; O Riordan, 2014). Autoethnography is chosen as it foregrounds experience as part of a meaning-making process. Consequently, it is suitable as it allows us to explore the qualities of more subtle feelings, moods, and experiences. The felt experiences at stake in the paper would seem to be quite trivial and mundane, and they are often too flighty and slight to discuss properly in interviews or too elusive to capture in observations. We have chosen the vignette format to represent highly personal and experiential narratives of the role sounds may play in daily situations; at home, at work, and in the street. The vignettes serve as a means of exploring, through writing, a more generally felt sense of the role digital sounds play in everyday life that each of us have experienced. Thus, they aim to represent the context and the ‘feeling’ involved in very ordinary episodes that include digital technologies.

4 Vignettes: How Sounds Shape Subjectivities and Dispositions

4.1 At home

A family home in a pleasant ‘almost suburbia’, early morning. An alarm rings on a mobile phone, the family heads towards the kitchen. “*Alexa*, play my newsflash”. He struggles a bit with the English pronunciation in the morning. The pleasant female voice of the Amazon Echo voice controlled device starts reciting: “Playing your news briefing...” Somewhere, on someone’s phone, a calendar notification trills merrily. He stands at the kitchen table preparing a lunch bag for a teenage girl and an 11-year-old boy. One side of the table is a mess of phone chargers, kitchen utensils, and various condiments. He hears a phone buzz and instinctively picks up one of three mobile phones lying there. He rubs his eyes and stares at it. “Hey, stop checking my phone!” The teenager snatches the phone demonstratively from his hands and turns around, stooping over the phone to avoid him seeing the message that just came in. “What...?!” he blurts ... then stops, shrugs, and returns to sandwich making.

She puts it back in the charger and gives him a reproaching look before she goes to her room to find her school bag. A phone buzzes again. He twitches, then hears her voice from her room “DON’T touch it...!” “How do you know it’s your phone?” he calls back. No answer. “*Alexa*, what’s the time?” “It’s 7.15 AM”. “Hey”, his wife enters the kitchen, “can’t we hear some music rather than that annoying voice?” *Alexa* obediently accepts his “*Alexa*, stop” command and the kitchen is quiet again. Somewhere, perhaps hidden amongst clothes and blankets in the couch, a phone lies buzzing.

4.2 At work

An academic institution at noon. A calendar trill from his phone reminds him about the upcoming Tuesday lunch meeting. Colleagues gather to share news and general pleasantries around a large oval table. Chatter and the moving of chairs as the meeting participants settle around the table. Colleagues are catching up. Some are typing on laptop keyboards, others are getting seated. He is chewing his sandwich, idly observing his colleagues. Some are occupied, distractedly answering messages on their

phone, tap-tap-tapping on their smartphone keyboards. More talk is interspersed with short intervals of leafing through a handout. As they study the handout, a number of smartphones buzz and go ‘dingggg’ as a message or calendar event is sent to the whole group from an as of yet unknown source. He discreetly checks his own device with a glance under the table.

Early afternoon. He enters the auditorium and turns on the beamer. It sends out a short, discreet beep to indicate that it is on and getting ready to serve its purpose. Students seep in, turning on their laptops, which sings their start-up tune. Two students are watching a YouTube clip and start giggling. Others pay attention as he writes a message on the whiteboard. Almost silence. The beamer is humming in the background. “Today’s topic is...” he starts, then winces and stops upon hearing a loud message ping from a phone, a short laugh from somewhere in the auditorium. Then a mumbled apology as a student rushes to turn off the sound on her phone. “Ok...so, today’s topic is Internet of Things”.

Late afternoon. Finally, back in his office. Silence for a short moment. It is a sunny day so he opens the window to get some air. From the window, he watches and listens to the traffic on the street. Birds are chirping from the tree. He gets back to the desk and starts typing eagerly on his keyboard. He feels excited about this ECIS paper. He is interrupted by a sudden ping from his phone. A text from his son. Quick answer, back to work. Then another buzz. This time it is a WhatsApp message from his wife. Then quiet concentration. He hears a low noise from the neighbouring office, his colleague setting up a Skype conversation. A bubbling dingdingding...ding, ding, ding...but no one seems to answer. His mind slips away for a while, wondering idly who his colleague might be calling. A knock-knock sound from his smartwatch; “Time to stand”, it tells him. Ignoring his watch, he gets back to writing.

4.3 In the street

This is undeniably a public space, but wearing his in-ear headphones, he is sheltered from distractions of street noise and half-overheard conversations between strangers passing by. It is like a cocoon, pleasant music and talk radio playing at his discretion. An early winter dusk falls as he bikes on his way back from work. The crisp air seems to whisk away stressful thoughts and tensions in his body accumulated during the day, but these seem to resurface as he is reminded of pressing deadlines or things he needs to take care of by the sound of emails and messages coming in. It feels like the designers of his smartphone took care to design the sound so that it gently compresses the music or radio. Despite the slow fade in- and out, it feels slightly intrusive.

Outside again. He ties his laces as he gets ready for the weekly 10k run workout next to the lakes. He turns on the running app and it counts down from 3-2-1 “beginning workout!” He stops for a second. “Pausing workout!” He turns on his favourite playlist. Now he is ready! As the flood of music fills his ears, he takes the first steps “resuming workout!” He feels energetic, even after a long day at work. The music boosts his pace. The path is crowded with other runners, families walking their dog, and kids feeding the ducks. Wait, what was that? He stops, glances over his shoulder. He shudders briefly. Was that a sound ... maybe someone calling him? Picking out his headphone and standing absolutely still for a moment listening keenly, “pausing workout”, he looks around to locate the sound. Hmm, maybe the sound was merely imagined or part of the music...? Well, he resumes his workout with the slightest sense of shock lingering in his body. Very soon the music is interrupted once again by another running app notification; “Distance, one kilometer, time...” Still 9k to go! He should speed up.

5 Analysis

At home, sounds appear as both woven into a deliberate daily routine. The alarm as a device sets a number of activities in motion. The morning conversation with an artificial voice that shifts between being frustrating, pleasant, and annoying, as well as the incidental noise from machines that signal the start of the workday, such as calendar notifications or messages that provide subtle cues that other people are also beginning their day. His daughter is tuned into a flow, somehow, knowing instinctively that it is indeed *her* phone that just received a message. The mood is that of beginnings, of a gradual ‘tuning-in’ to coming activities. These digital ‘household items’ turn (or tune) the scene into one of

coordination and preparedness. Bodies react non-consciously (shock, instinctively picking up a phone) to various notifications and feedback sounds that seem to battle for attention and sometimes hide from view, disclosing their presence only teasingly with a buzz that resonates in the furniture.

At work, people and things come together at the lunch break. Getting together in the same physical space provides a sense of presence and belongingness. However, this feeling is somewhat disrupted by sounds and notifications from the digital devices that people bring along. Many activities are taking place at the same time, while people are shifting between ‘here and there’; i.e., being bodily present in the physical office space as well as virtually engaged with a digital world. Sounds provide a fleeting pressure to this vague and chaotic choreography of work. Sounds can be contagious and distracting such as when a colleague’s calendar notification pings and people are shaken out of a conversation to rush to check their own phone. At the same time, they can furnish spaces with a sense of reassuring and pleasing ‘activity’ noise or provide the impetus for a fleeting smile at the ‘perpetrator’ who forgot to turn down the sound, a frown, a raised eyebrow, or a curious attraction.

In the classroom, the humming of the beamer provides a subtle, hushed ‘bubble’ of togetherness while other devices cause jarring distractions that shatter your already tenuous presence in the room. There is a constant shift in attention in the room – one second, attention is on the teacher – and in the next, the body is alerted to another opportunity for interaction with a laptop, phone, or a smartwatch. In the office, the presence of digital devices interrupts the solitary researcher and may allow for short distracted daydreams. At the same time, the sound from the surrounding devices (in the neighbouring office and outdoors) confirms to the body that this is indeed a work-space, abuzz with activity. It pushes, reminds, forces the body into work mode, only to yank it out of that mode with an ‘incoming message’ sound.

In the street, the buzz of mails and calendar notifications become an intrusion to an off-work time and space. The sound from the devices (phone and smartwatch) provides a low-level, nagging reminder of responsibilities and tasks that need to be accomplished. It invades the cocoon built up by the isolation of the headphones. When exercising, however, some notifications from the running app are not experienced as an obtrusion, but rather as an encouraging trigger for the body’s ability to move. The female voice of the running app creates a feeling of having a faithful companion that helps keep track of distance, pace, and time, and the constant notifications encourage his workout (i.e., faster or slower pace). Similarly, the playlist of favourite music tunes the body, motivates, and propels it forward. The two apps work together effortlessly; the music app is silenced by the running app when important notifications arrive. Yet, his feeling of energetic isolation is temporary. The real world and a sudden rush of possibly imagined (threatening) sounds freezes his moving, energetic body. The sense of isolation becomes ominous and threatening for a while, until he shakes off the sudden confusion and gets back to moving.

What happens when we begin to pay attention to particular sensory details of everyday life and to relate these in the form of a narrative? In all three vignettes, sounds are emphasized and play a central role in shaping the mood of the narratives. Yet, these sounds from digital machines play widely different roles in the three stories. The vignettes show different events in which sounds from digital technology shape a body’s ability to act, feel, think, and experience. They show how vague ‘atmospheres’ afforded by digital devices tune and perform what Heidegger termed the ‘Befindlichkeit’ of bodies in everyday settings; a concept vastly more complex and holistic than the often-used notion of ‘context’ (Ciborra, 2006). Notably, the vignettes do not emphasize meaning-making or signification, but highlight with what sounds *do* as opposed to what they *mean*. Activities are performed in and through not simply a *backdrop* of meaning, but an *on-flow*, a pressure (Anderson, 2009), or an intensity (Massumi, 2002) of sensory modulation. The materiality of IT devices provides the potential for affective entanglements, where the body becomes tuned to perform or becomes idle, feels energetic and moves, or becomes irritated and tenses up. Such ‘moods’ or ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams, 1977) are arguably aspects of living or working with IT that are not available to typical studies on the socio-materiality of practices and knowing.

6 Discussion: Sounding Out IS?

There is a way in which the senses, perhaps excluding the visual sense which is frequently associated with the ability related to process information (i.e., decoding textual information as well as understanding thoughts represented as mental images or models), are often glossed over as incidental to knowing and experience. Quoting Feldman (1994), we suggest that this amounts to a ‘cultural anesthesia’ or; “[the] banishment of disconcerting, discordant and anarchic sensory presences and agents that undermine normalizing and often silent premises of everyday life” (Feldman, 1994, p. 89).

In the analysis, we have addressed our research aim of how to render atmospheres and moods, materialized through forces of sound, in ways that permit an analysis and an understanding to emerge, however partial, idiosyncratic, or eccentric. We have explored one way in which IS researchers can expand the repertoires for how to engage with sensory aspects of experiential computing. This will, in future work, enable us to take stock of a much wider repertoire of what can count as ‘knowing’ and feeling in everyday entanglements with ubiquitous IT.

Based on these initial insights, we urge IS researchers (such as ourselves) to simply ‘pay (more) attention’ to everyday phenomena that involve digital technologies, in particular how the senses are modulated in sensuous ways by technologies. The vignettes help us begin the unpacking of situations in which sounds shape or perform different felt and embodied dispositions. Based on these narratives, we have analysed different ways in which soundscapes from digital technology shape the body’s ability to act, feel, think, and experience. Presenting vignettes of everyday life situations (at home, at work, and in the street), is a first, explorative step into representing and understanding ways in which sounds of digital technologies are involved in giving shape to our lives. We can think of many other scenarios in which digital sounds shape the sense of work or everyday life (e.g., hospital settings, leisure- and tourism settings, or public spaces). Similarly, different types of technologies, e.g. embedded computers to wearables, or mobile devices, act differently and afford different kinds of moods.

The suggestion in this research in progress paper pushes for furthering an ‘experiential turn’ in the IS discipline. Foregrounding the potential and actual interactions that emanate from the vast range of digital machines around us, we have set the stage for new research opportunities in the IS discipline. First, we encourage IS researchers interested in the socio-materiality of practice to complement their studies with the embodied materiality of feeling outlined above. Sensing bodies and a sensory scholarship may become plausible means with which to explore a technological corporeality in ubiquitous, ordinary information systems. Second, we suggest that we build on affect theory and autoethnographic everyday research to single out the performative nature of practices and the ways in which people and technologies are enacted and re-enacted in practice. Third, we encourage IS researchers to simply invest themselves in attentive and sensuous investigations of situations in which soundscapes (or, indeed, smell-scapes, touch-scapes or other sensory-modal formations) involving digital technology, become entangled into moods or atmospheres of everyday life. We might think of how worlds of health care are increasingly inundated in shifting digital soundscapes or how subtle vibrations (or other ‘ambient’ cues) from devices and the tactile senses may play a role in the shaping of what it *feels* like to work and live in a world where computational things are everywhere.

References

- Anderson, B. (2009). "Affective atmospheres." *Emotion, Space and Society* 2, 77-81.
- Blackman, L. (2012). *Immaterial Bodies – Affect, Embodiment, Mediation*. London. Sage Publications.
- Brinkmann, S. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life; Working with Everyday Life Materials*. Sage Publications.
- Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., Galliers, R.D., Henfridsson, O., Newell, S., and Vidgen, R. (2014). "The sociomateriality of information systems: current status, future directions." *MIS Quarterly* 38(3), 809-830.
- Ciborra, C. (2006). "The mind or the heart? It depends on the (definition of) situation." *Journal of Information Technology* 21, 129–139.
- Dourish, P. and Bell, G. (2007). "The Infrastructure of Experience and the Experience of Infrastructure: Meaning and Structure in Everyday Encounters with Space." *Environment and Planning* 34, 414-430.
- Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. P. (2000). "Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject." In: N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. 2nd Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 733-68.
- Feld, S. (1990). "Wept Thoughts: The Voicing of Kaluli Memories." *Oral Tradition* 5(2-3), 241-266.
- Feldman, A. (1994). "From Desert Storm to Rodney King via ex-Yugoslavia: On Cultural Anesthesia." In: Seremtakis, C. N. (ed.). *The Senses Still: Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity*. Boulder Co: Westview Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). "The Question Concerning Technology." In: *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York and London. Garland Publishing, inc.
- Ihde, D. (1990) *Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, USA.
- Ihde, D. (2007). *Listening and Voice. Phenomenologies of Sound*. 2nd Edition. New York. State University of New York Press.
- Janlert, L-E. and Stolterman, E. (2014). "Faceless Interaction – A Conceptual Examination of the Notion of Interface: Past, Present, and Future." *Human-Computer Interaction* 30(6), 507-539.
- LaBelle, B. (2006). *Background Noise: Perspectives on Sound Art*. Continuum Books.
- Latour, B. (2004). "How to Talk About the Body? The Normative Dimension of Science Studies." *Body & Society* 10(2–3), 205–229.
- Leys (2011). "The Turn to Affect: A Critique". *Critical Inquiry* 37, 434-472.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the Virtual; Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Duke University Press.
- McCarthy, J. and Wright, P (2004). *Technology as Experience*. MIT Press.
- McGrath, K. (2001) "The golden circle: A case study of organizational change at the London Ambulance Service." In: *Proceedings of the 9th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS), Global Co-operation in the New Millennium*, ECIS 2001, Bled, Slovenia, June 27-29, 2001.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1948/2004). *The World of Perception* (Transl. Oliver Davis). Routledge.
- Orlikowski, W.J. (2007) "Sociomaterial practices: exploring technology at work." *Organization Studies* 28(9), 1435-1448.
- O Riordan, N. (2014). "Autoethnography: Proposing a new method for Information Systems research." In: *Proceedings of the European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS 2014)*. Tel Aviv.
- Richardson, L. (1996). "Writing as a method for inquiry: A Sociology of Responsibility." *Qualitative Sociology* 19(4), 519-524.

- Seigworth, G. J. and Gregg, M (eds.) (2010). *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stein, M. K., Newell, S., Wagner, E. L. and Galliers, R. D. (2014). "Felt quality of sociomaterial relations: Introducing emotions into sociomaterial theorizing." *Information and Organization* 24, 156-175.
- Stewart, K. (2007). *Ordinary Affects*. Duke University Press.
- Styhre, A. (2011). "Sociomaterial practice and the constitutive entanglement of social and material resources: The case of construction work", *VINE* 41(4), 384 – 400.
- Suchman, L. (1987). *Plans and situated actions: The Problem of Human-Machine Communication*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thrift, N. (2004). *Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect*. *Geografiska Annaler* 86.
- Turnbull, C. (1957). *Music of the Ituri forest*. LP. New York: Folkways.
- Turnbull, C. (1961). *The Forest People*. New York: Simon & Shuster.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Yoo, Y. (2010). "Computing in Everyday Life: A Call for Research on Experiential Computing." *MIS Quarterly* 34(2), 213-231.