

It's About Rhythms: Rethinking Our Experience of Time with Michel Alhadeff-Jones

Gislene Feiten Haubrich⁶

I always feel so privileged to have the opportunity to talk with fantastic scholars in our interviews for JOCO. This conversation with **Michel Alhadeff-Jones** invites us to think about our experience with time. From the moment we met for the interview to the transcription and the reviews of the text we created from the recording, each new interaction with Dr. Alhadeff-Jones' ideas added a new, inspiring layer to my reflections about the temporalities of processes, activities, institutions, and more. Beyond being inspiring, Michel was also very generous in the ideas he shared and in the rich, formative readings he suggested. Thus, I hope you also feel fortunate about the opportunity to engage with Michel's ideas. I recommend this interview to all who want to understand contemporary life and explore how we can reclaim our life-narratives to learn and become more critical of the events of our uncertain world.

Michel Alhadeff-Jones is a psychosociologist and philosopher of education based in Geneva. He is the Executive Director of the Sunkhronos Institute and the Program Director of the Certificate of Advanced Studies in Life Narrative and Biographical Coaching at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland. His work focuses on biographical coaching, transformative learning, rhythm analysis, and the temporalities of human experience. Formerly affiliated with Teachers College, Columbia University, he is a recipient of the Jack Mezirow Award for Transformative Learning (2016) and contributes to several international networks and editorial boards in adult education and human development. [Read Michel's full bio here.](#)

Enjoy the reading!

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Michel, thank you so much for your time and your openness to share your knowledge with us. I would like to start our conversation by learning a little more about your passion for education, in particular, adult education. How did you become passionate for education?

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: My passion for education started quite early in my life. I always liked to support and teach other kids at school. My interest for adult education started at the end of my studies in psychology. I was interested in teaching psychology and that oriented me toward the field of self-development and lifelong learning. It was my encounter with [Pierre Dominicé](#), who has been my mentor for many years at University of Geneva, that really made me enter into the field of adult

education. [Pierre Dominicé](#) has been a key figure who contributed to the development of that field in French speaking countries, but also worldwide. He was among those who introduced the use of life history and biographical approaches in the field of adult education, as a research and educational praxis.

When I started working with him as a teaching assistant in 2000, it triggered my interest in theories in adult education, such as transformative learning theory. I realized that what he was doing was really at the core of what I was looking for, which is helping adults reflecting on their own experience, exploring with them what and how they have learned throughout their life, not only in formal settings – like in school, at the university or in continuing education – but also informally. Most important learning experiences that influence our lives happen informally. So, that encounter triggered a shift toward the field of adult education. At that time, working on my PhD, I was interested in exploring how educational practices can foster critical reflection, critical self-reflection, and bring people to develop their critical capacity. It was in the field of adult education that I found theoretical resources to develop my research.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: I find the idea that we learn more informally than in formal settings fascinating. I think it is a topic we do not know enough yet, and we do not talk enough about it. Can you tell a little bit more about your research on informal learning spaces? How can we study them? Can you share a few examples of informal spaces of learning for adults?

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: I can say a few words about the practice that I have been developing and using mainly in higher and continuing education. Currently, I am responsible for a program where we are training professionals to use life narrative and life history in different settings, to bring people to reflect on their own experience. The idea is to ask people to talk about what they have learned throughout their life, where and with whom did they learn what they know or what they believe. Formal settings are, of course, important. But what is interesting is that people tend to remember from school experiences that are linked to informal aspects, such as people encountered, friends, or mentors' influences. Often what people remember from school is related to experiences of failure or, at the opposite, the reinforcement of their way of knowing and their self-confidence. Beyond school, what we see is that people tend to reappropriate for themselves learning that occurred at different stages of their life, in various formal

⁶ House of Innovation, Stockholm School of Economics.

and informal settings. Narratives that people share highlight how they developed themselves at the junction between the different spheres of their life. Thus, people learn from family members, from their experience with friends, or through social commitments or leisure activities, that go beyond formal settings such as work or study. Another aspect that emerges from life narratives has to do with health. Sometimes people encounter health issues, or living with people who have a health condition. Such experiences represent also significant learning opportunities that unfold informally. Such experiences emerge when you ask people to talk about their life and to share events that are meaningful to them. What is critical is what people learn from such experiences. The use of life narratives is very powerful because it is a way for people to rewrite their story. Literally, because they are asked to write a narrative, but also, more deeply, as they write their narrative, they have the opportunity to retell their stories and eventually to change the plot, according to a renewed perspective. The narrative they write is a way for them to reformulate how they understand their sense of identity, based on key experiences expressed in their narrative, associated with what they have learned throughout their life. Formulating such learning allow them to socialize how they perceive themselves, who they became, and how they make sense of their development at a specific time. Informal learning is actually at the core of such narratives.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: While listening to you, I was wondering: Is technology, in particular, generative AI influencing this practice? Are people relying in this type of tech to rewrite their narratives? Do you see already something happening or something changing in that sense?

Michel Alhadef-Jones: Well, I keep finger crossed because, so far, I have not seen any direct impact. I would assume that the main reason is that when people are willing to commit to the exercise of writing about themselves, it makes absolutely no sense to dedicate that task to a machine. As I conceive this approach, what is important is not the product; these texts are not meant to be published. What is paramount is the process: The process of reflecting on the way you select experiences that you consider worth being included in the narrative, how do you articulate such experiences through a plot that is meaningful to you, and who do you imagine writing for. Obviously, you can write prompt and ask GenAI tools to produce some kind of narrative, but that defeats the purpose. The exercise focuses on the process of elaboration, which is a relatively slow process of maturation, that also emerges from dialogue among participants. So far, AI has not been really an issue for me, but I do know that there are businesses emerging that

are using AI to provide people with resources to produce their life history. I am personally quite skeptical about such approaches, because AI puts the stress on the end product, and not the developmental processes you have to go through to elaborate your experience. Moreover, it is not your own words. It is just an articulation of elements pasted together that have not been reflected upon. I believe that AI for that purpose is meaningless. So far, based on my experience, people interested in writing and reflecting on their life histories understand such limitations.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Yes, I fully agree. We've been seeing so many uses of Gen AI, for example as a therapist or an advisor. There are many uses that, as you say, deviate the purpose. This point connects with my next question. While preparing for our conversation today, I was in your website where you present your research question or the question motivating your research. You wrote that your main question is: *how does one learn to develop critical capacity?* I think it speaks directly with what we were just discussing. For us to unpack this question a bit, I would like to know: what do you mean by this 'critical capacity'? Why does it matter? And why should we care for it?

Michel Alhadef-Jones: Why does it matter? Well, that's part of the reason why I was interested in studying psychology in the first place. For me, psychology provides people with knowledge and resources that contribute to introspection and self-reflection. I come from a family who suffered from World War II, and I always wondered how education, introspection, and self-understanding could serve the purpose of developing critical reflection, and people's capacity to be critical about what they do, what they do not do, and about the purpose of their actions, especially in times of crisis. *Critical capacity, for me, is at the core of taking informed decisions and behaving ethically.*

My background in psychology biased the way I was envisioning at first the meaning of a critical capacity. I was initially reducing the exercise of critique to a form of introspection. I eventually came to expand that conception. When I started my Ph.D., my goal was to explore more systematically the *concept of critique* in the context of educational sciences. Soon, I realized that there were a very broad and diverse set of theories and practices that could inform how we understand the development of critical reflection. They are often identified as 'critical pedagogies,' but they rely on different set of assumptions and theories.

What I was interested in when I did my research was to understand how we can articulate different conceptions and theories of critique, not to reduce the idea of critique to a single perspective or a single practice. I was strongly influenced by the thinking of the French philosopher

[Edgar Morin](#), who wrote extensively about the idea of complexity and what he called the ‘[paradigm of complexity](#).’ Morin’s critique denounces the fact that academic knowledge tends to be compartmentalized. Academic fragmentation and compartmentalization tend to reduce the way we understand and interpret the phenomena we are experiencing and observing. Therefore, Morin argues about the importance of connecting knowledge and the perspective produced in different academic fields. Thus, I was interested in thinking about the concept of critique from a transdisciplinary perspective, articulating psychological, anthropological, sociological, and political perspectives, as well as philosophical, literary or aesthetic contributions, too. Obviously, it became something huge, and I was not that well equipped at the beginning. What I wanted to establish was a conceptual framework to locate and question the heterogeneous meanings associated to the idea of critique and clarify the different kinds of learning involved, once we start considering it from a truly transdisciplinary perspective.

Now, to answer your second question regarding how I conceive the idea of critique and what does it mean to be critical, I would say the following. My thesis brought me to identify at least six dimensions of critique. They are not exhaustive, but they encapsulate what historically has been associated with the idea of critique.

The first one has to do with the *capacity to discriminate*. The term comes etymologically from the Ancient Greek *krinein*, which, at the origin in its medical use, refers to the capacity to distinguish how a critical health condition may evolve between life and death. When we exercise a critical capacity, we need to discriminate the world around us. I’m not using the word discrimination in a pejorative way. For me, this notion refers to the way we establish differences that allow us to perceive phenomena, for instance as we categorize people, places, activities, and so on. To be critical, we need first to be able to reflect on the way we discriminate what we perceive and the way we establish differences that help us give meaning to our experience.

The second dimension has to do with our *capacity to interpret*, that is to give meaning to what we discriminate. It is one thing to establish differences; it is another one to give meaning to them. Interpretation is a core capacity to develop. When I work using life history, what I bring people to do is to help them interpret, give meaning, as well as to revisit the meaning they give to their own experiences.

The third dimension of a critical capacity has to do with values. As we establish differences, give meaning to them, we also attribute values to what we observe or live, based on internalized norms and standards. It is therefore important to discuss and reflect on how and why we attribute specific values.

The fourth dimension has to do with *argumentation*. Critical thinking is often associated with, if not reduced to the capacity to argue. To be critical, we need to be able to discuss why and how we attribute meanings and value to what we are interested in. At the same time, we need to be able to reflect on the ways we construct or deconstruct argumentation to defend a point of view.

A fifth dimension has to do with *judgment*, which again goes to the etymological roots of the word critique, that is to establish a judgment. A judgment basically means ‘asserting’ meanings in a way that is performative and relatively irreversible, based on a set of justifications. Although you can always revise it, formulating a judgment produces effects that cannot be simply untold or undone. A judgment goes beyond the simple attribution of a value. It is about establishing that such a value is recognized and justified in a specific context, in order to establish or reestablish a sense of balance or even justice. In the everyday life, we are always producing judgments about what people do, what to buy, how to act, or how we behave. Formulating such judgments requires a critical capacity, but we also must be able to reflect on the way we exercise such judgments and justify them based on specific principles.

Finally, the last dimension of critique, which is for me the most important one, is the *ability to challenge*. Challenge our assumptions, challenge the way we judge, argue, evaluate, interpret and discriminate the world around us and ourselves. Challenge means sometimes putting into crisis what we observe or what we experience or dealing with existing crisis that challenge what we believe or what we do. So, these six dimensions are, for me, at the core of the exercise and the development of a critical capacity.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Well, we could also dive into each of them because they make a lot of sense. I could see them all working. Yet, the first thing that strikes me, is that doing this exercise seems to take *time*. And time is this ‘thing’ that we are always chasing. It seems like, especially in our world, everything we do is based on the time that we have or don’t have. We exist within this relationship with time explicitly: we have a career timespan, we have an educational timeline, we have a family timeline; we have all these social processes, all guided by temporal aspects that we established over time. So, I agree with you, critical capacity is more and more essential. Yet, considering the exercise you were just explaining, how can we make the relationship between time and the reflective work, work?

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: This question is central. For me, it was the point of departure for my interest in time studies and later rhythm theory. At the end of my Ph.D., which was almost 20 years ago, I was realizing that there was a strong connection between the exercise of critique and

the experience of time. When I started working on this relation, the connection between critique and time was not as prevalent as it is nowadays in academic circles. It was developed mainly by sociologists, but it was not as central as it is today. At that time, my own experience working in higher education led me to realize how the exercise of critical (self) reflection in the classroom is dependent on time. Being confronted to temporal pressures and the need to compress the work I was doing with students to accommodate the temporalities of the institution made me realize how the experience of time had to become in itself the locus of critical reflection. I was realizing that the practice of critical pedagogy and the development of a critical capacity required one to systematically question how time is experienced individually and collectively. That's why your question is crucial in my opinion.

At a more macro level, when you look at the history of the idea of critique, from Antiquity until today, it has evolved throughout different social and historical contexts, which means that the topics and the methods used to exercise critique have also evolved depending on the social and cultural contexts. I think that today this connection between time and critique is nodal for many people. The question is what to do with it and how do we understand and interpret the relation between time and critique. I think there are at least two aspects to consider.

The first one is the fact that the exercise of critical reflection requires time, and therefore there is something about protecting the time required for sound reflection. We all know that it may be quite challenging to do that. To be able to protect the time required for critical reflection suggests that we need first to acknowledge that such a temporality constitutes a locus of power dynamics which needs to be named and questioned. What I am saying here is not very original. Sociologists and philosophers have already written about that. This idea that the way we experience time as a locus of power dynamics is now becoming more prevalent, but it still needs to be developed. We need to think about how we can practice such an exercise.

The second aspect to consider has to do with the fact that critical reflection in itself is a process, that unfolds through time. We have to question how critique or critical self-reflection unfold through time, in the everyday life, and also throughout the life course. Nobody is (self-)critical 24/7. As any other processes, critical-reflection fluctuates through time. And that's also part of the work I'm interested in, when I work on life history, because I'm interested in how people develop throughout their life, their critical capacity and what kind of events or experiences trigger and feed such as capacity.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: If we could frame all this conversation within the context of work. We have been

discussing productivity and efficiency for a long time. Also, we know that learning and crafting our doing, our values, it demands time. When you think about the work context, how can we support workers and organizations? And I'm thinking about action or interventional research. How can we help workers to think about this and 'find time' or create the space for reflecting and developing this critical capacity in work environments?

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: To me, the very first step is to start deconstructing the idea of time. When you talk about time with people, usually the first thing they think about is the clock, the calendar, the schedule, which refer to specific – although not exclusive – ways to measure time. Such linear, uniform, and quantifiable expressions of time are dominant and even hegemonic in our collective imaginary, although there is potentially an infinity of alternative conceptions of time that could be envisioned. So, the first step is really to deconstruct the idea that time can be reduced to *chronometry*. In fact, anytime you can relate changes – lived or observed – with a symbolic way to represent them, you are potentially creating a new temporality. I can relate the digits on my watch to the course of the sun in the sky; that allows me to express a physical temporality. If I use my watch to measure the beats of my heart, I construct another form of temporality, a biological one. Now, if I think about changes that occurred in my life and choose to describe them with words, I construct another form of temporality, a biographical or historical one. Time refers to changes, to the way we experience changes and the way we represent them. This is absolutely critical to understand. So, wherever we observe and perceive changes that can be represented, we can identify or describe specific forms of temporalities.

Now, to be critical about time at work, the next step is to recognize that time is deeply intertwined with power. I believe that human beings had to invent the concept of time to deal with the power dynamics that are inherent to the experience of change. The ways people relate to time reveal how they impose a specific way to relate to changes, sometimes abusively, sometimes in a very useful way. For instance, the fact that clocks and calendars are used to synchronize people's activity is one of the key reasons for them to be so ubiquitous. The other reason is that they are instrumental in the imposition of a specific order that reduces human activity to what can be quantified, measured or computed, for the sake of efficiency. So, changes and power are inherent in the way I understand the meaning of time.

Now, to your question, I think what's important is to understand that as soon as we see time as plural and not something singular, and that's why I use the term *temporalities* rather than time, then we can start paying attention to the different temporalities that populate our

everyday life. If we are sensible to the fact that often they are conflicting, then we can interpret them as temporal constraints that have to be regulated or negotiated. I use this expression to stress the fact that any form of temporality is somehow constraining. For instance, the alternance between day and night is constraining. Although, with electricity, it's now less constraining than it used to be. The rhythms and the temporality that constitute the changes that we're experiencing within our bodies are constraining. These biological and psychological rhythms define our capacity to focus, or the evolution of our moods. They define our level of tiredness or exhaustion, what we can do or not do, a specific moment of the day. The same is true for social temporalities that manifest in the life of any communities: temporal norms, habits and routines are constraining what we do and how we think.

Now, considering the working environment, what is at stake has to do with the ways heterogeneous temporal constraints are regulated and organized... or fail to be. What is critical is how we conceive the relations, complementary, contradictory and antagonistic, between physical, biological, psychological and social temporalities. Let's take the example of burnout: being burned out means being confronted to the difficulty of articulating and regulating, on the one hand, the expectations from the working environment, and the organizational rhythms and temporal pressures that come with them, and on the other hand, the rhythms and temporalities of one's own body and mind, up to the point when the person feels overwhelmed by the pace of external demands and the incapacity to adapt one's own inner rhythms.

What is at stake today in working environment, I believe, is to train people so that they can discriminate, interpret, and evaluate the temporalities that are shaping their everyday life. The way priorities are set, and also the way some temporalities have become hegemonic. I think that is where the locus of attention should be. Obviously, it is not that original for anyone who has been studying power dynamics in working environments. Time appears, indeed, as a key medium through which power dynamics emerge and unfold. Nevertheless, I believe it is more crucial than ever to help people develop a specific capacity to reflect on the way they relate to time and the way they regulate the different temporalities in their life, beyond simplistic "time management" approaches. In my work, that is what I call *rhythmic intelligence*, because I privilege the idea of rhythm to refer to the ways people, individually and collectively, experience time.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Great response! I was also thinking about the concept of *temporal alienation* you bring in your book, and its relationship with emancipation. I tend to think about working contexts

because we spend much of our lives engaging with them. While we're working, we're learning and developing ourselves, understanding the world we belong and participate in. Although already have several notions scholarly elaborated, they are still hard to take shape in practice, and I think what you're saying is very key, in that sense.

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: The reason I moved, in my theoretical work, from the concept of time and temporalities to the concept of rhythm is because I was interested in the way we experience time. And rhythm is something that is very intuitive. We can all relate quite intuitively with this notion of rhythm. Rhythms refer to patterns, repetitions and variations that characterize the ways we experience and represent changes. In my work, I have found very useful to refer to the contributions of Gaston Bachelard and Henri Lefebvre, two French philosophers who have theorized and conceptualized the way we can reflect and use the concept of rhythm. Concretely, one way to think about this is to distinguish the temporal scale we are thinking and talking about. Bachelard envisions the rhythms of life at the scale of the lifespan. Lefebvre stresses the importance of considering the everyday rhythms that compose our daily life. Those are two different temporal scales to be considered critically when reflecting on our experience of time.

In the *everyday life*, what is at stake is the rhythmicity involved in each activity that we are committed to, and how such rhythms interact with each other. It is a matter of synchronization. One has to be able to nurture what Henri Lefebvre calls *polyrhythmia*, that is the coexistence of the plurality of rhythms that compose the processes and activities people experience throughout the day. Whenever people have to accomplish something, such rhythms need to be synchronized, to avoid what Lefebvre designates as *arrhythmia*, that is the situation when rhythms collide or conflict with each other. Complex tasks require some form of *eurhythmia*, that is the state when complementary and contradictory rhythms are organized with each other. Concretely, when I have a task to do, whether it involves processes of reflection, writing, dialoguing, or corresponding with someone else, each of those activities involve specific rhythms. People who are good at what they do have the critical capacity to identify what are the right rhythms for each activity and process they are involved in, and they know – often without being fully aware of it – how to organize them. Another aspect is to be able to protect these rhythms and eventually find a way to organize them with conflicting rhythms associated with competing processes and activities.

According to Bachelard, rhythms also compose the course of one's life. On the larger temporal scale, whether we consider the lifespan of individuals or collectivities, life is also fluctuating. Our lives are composed by a succession

of moments, ups and downs, characterized by the alternations of states and activities whose qualities and intensities vary. At that scale, there is also something about learning to regulate how the fluxes of our activities evolve through time. And that's another kind of critical capacity that has to do with rhythmic intelligence. It is about being able to discriminate, interpret, evaluate, and more broadly reflect on how changes occur and evolve throughout longer duration. From that perspective, everyone has to learn how to best regulate the rhythms that compose the different periods of one's life, so that we experience them as fulfilling, balanced, and meaningful.

To go back to the notions of alienation and emancipation you were referring to, I would borrow Lefebvre's ideas. For him, alienation has to do with the experience of being prisoner of a specific moment of one's life, understood as a specific category of experience that compose the everyday life and whose rhythms become hegemonic. From that perspective, the experience of work can be alienating if it locks people into rhythms that are experienced either as painful, stultifying or hegemonic, because they do not let any room for other rhythms to develop. The definition of alienation from a rhythmanalytical perspective has to do with repetition; the dry repetition of rhythms that are not experienced as fulfilling. On the other hand, emancipation has to do with the capacity to challenge and break through alienating rhythms. It refers to experiences or processes that expand our capacity and often involve diversified rhythms of activity. From that perspective, the question is how do people learn to extract themselves from experiences that are lived as alienating, because the rhythms that organize them are not appropriate for whom they are or what they want at a specific time in their life? And how do we learn to sustain this capacity to nurture the rhythms of the activities that fulfil us?

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Fantastic points. Well, our *time* is going away, so I have to start wrapping up, but I wanted to follow up with the Rhythmanalysis perspective. When we're thinking about our fieldwork as researchers; when we are planning how we're going to reach out the field and how we're going to approach the people, one of the questions that's often popping up is: how and what can we give people back for their contributions to our research? This is a core question for an organization to allow us to be there. So, if we think about Rhythmanalysis, how can we provide support or informed advice for organizations? And from the scholarly point of view, how can we learn with Rhythmanalysis and use it in our research? How can we learn more and incorporate it in our research?

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: First, I'd like to say that, in my opinion, Rhythmanalysis as an approach is actually still in

its infancy. I mean, there has been the contribution of Lefebvre, that is now used in many disciplines. Lefebvre had very strong intuitions, but there still a lot that has to be fleshed out from a theoretical and methodological perspective. Some colleagues have written extensively on that. I'm thinking, for example, about Dawn Lyon's contribution and her book '[What Is Rhythmanalysis?](#)' which, from a research perspective, I think is extremely useful.

What I am trying to develop is a bit different. In French, I would call my approach *une clinique rhythmanalytique*, that is a clinical perspective on Rhythmanalysis. What I am interested in developing is how we can bring people to reflect on their experience from a rhythmological perspective. It is 'clinical' not from a medical perspective, but because it requires one to remain close to the experience that people are living and expressing. What is critical is to pay attention to the lived or observed tensions that compose people's experiences of time and rhythms. I believe there is still more vocabulary that needs to be defined to interpret such phenomena. For instance, in my work, I use notions that colleagues have developed such as [Gaston Pineau's schizochrony](#). This notion expresses the experience of split or divided temporalities that people may live when they feel that the rhythms of different moments of their life, such as family, work or study, are disconnected from each other, becoming a source of suffering. I have also introduced the notion of *temporal double binds*, after [Gregory Bateson's](#) work on double binds. Temporal double binds refer to contradictory messages we receive and that can become sources of alienation whenever they are sustained over time and remain tacit. The typical example is to be formally required to accomplish something of high quality, but being simultaneously constrained to produce it under such temporal pressure that it is impossible to do it according to the high standards to which we are going to be evaluated. So, there is this contradiction that can be experienced as really alienating if what is at stake is considered as important, for instance because you may lose your job.

I think paying attention to the tensions that are inherent to the experience of time is the point of departure. Another idea I have been thinking about recently refers to the strategic importance of identifying people who can play the function of *temporal mediators* in organizations. Those are people who are trained to recognize processes, rhythms, and temporalities, associated with specific tasks or responsibilities that are meaningful and relevant for the organization. Their function would be to mediate and help organizing complementary, contradictory, and antagonistic rhythms within the organization. So, they pay attention to the way those processes and those rhythms are organized, so that tensions and conflicts are minimized, from a temporal and rhythmic perspective. I

really believe that there is more that can be done and envisioned to think about the conflicting experiences of time at work, in a way that takes into consideration the richness and the heterogeneity of temporalities and rhythms that compose life.

Another aspect I would like to add refers to our imagination of time. One of my colleagues, [Keri Facer](#), introduced the expression [temporal imagination](#) (which is also the title of a [podcast](#) we have produced together) to stress the importance of enriching our symbolic representations of time, including in the ways we relate, past, present and future. There are new languages, new words, new metaphors that must be developed and used, to envision and perpetuate new ways of dealing with time. I think that can also be part of the work we do in organizational theory.

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Fantastic. My last question is: what are additional readings we could have, any books, any newspapers, anything you think is important for us, to help us understanding and studying these experiences with time? If I understood correctly, there's still a lot of room for us to as academics to develop within the context you are explaining.

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: Yes, I really think this is an emerging field. So, in terms of references, well obviously I could do some self-promotion here!

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Please do it. Guide us through your work.

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: My book and my writings are mainly in open access, so that people can find them easily. My monograph '[Time and the Rhythms of Emancipatory Education](#)' is available in open access. It explores systematically the relations between time and power, rhythms and emancipation, from an educational perspective. There is also a fair amount of literature in the field of organizational studies around time. Writings on rhythms and rhythmanalysis are emerging, and I really invite readers to explore what has been written around theories of rhythm, including in other languages than English, because a lot of recent work has not necessarily been translated yet. Key authors such as *Gaston Bachelard* or *Henri Lefebvre* have been translated. Others, such as Pierre Sauvanet have not yet been translated from French. The work of [Pascal Michon](#) has also been really useful for me. He is probably one of the most knowledgeable scholars working on rhythm theories. He has a very broad understanding, including historically, of the use of that notion. His work has been published in English, so that may be a strategic point of departure too. People can also consult [rhuthmos.eu](#), the online platform he has

developed to gather transdisciplinary references around rhythm theories. These are a few names that come to my mind right now, but obviously there are so much more!

Gislene Feiten Haubrich: Fantastic. Thank you so much for your time, Michel.

Michel Alhadeff-Jones: It was a pleasure. Thank you, Gislene.