

A research program as series of thoughts in actions

NEW MOVEMENTS

NEW NORDIC WELFARE MANGEMENT

Ecologies of Sustainability and Societies

WELFARE AS OPEN PROCESSES, URBAN FLOWS OF WELFARE

WELFARE ENTREPRENEURSHIP,

EDUCATIONS AS INVESTMENTS IN THOUGHTS IN MOVEMENT

REAL PARTICIPATION, EXPERIMENTATIONS,

RESEARCH AS CREATION, EVENTS

– AND REFORMULATIONS OF BURNING MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS

Board of members: CEO of culture and children in Herlev Kommune, Flemming Olsen, Business Manager in Rambol Management, Heidi Graff Mortensen, Senior-consultant Peder Kjøgøx, Manager of children in Gentofte Kommune, Peter Ulholm, CEO of the social area in Ringkøbing Skjern Kommune, Anette Ørbæk Andersen and HRM-partner Karen Marie Johansen. Senior-consultant in COK Tim Struck, consultant Jacqueline Albers Thomsen, Ph.D. at CBS/CVL Eva Pallesen, PhD. Poula Helth, Research Ass. Inger Halleløv, Ph.D. in spe Thorbjørn Kristiansen and Dorte Mondrup, culture researcher Helle Laustsen, master in psychology Sanna Waagstein, PhD and Ass. Professor at CBS Christa Breum Amhøj.

Read about us at our experiments at: www.newmovements.org (under construction)

Enjoy the assemblages' of events and breathe in the ecologies of intensities at:

www.facebook.com/intensewelfare

The so called welfare crisis is central in the Danish debate about welfare management. There is a growing demand for economic frugality. 'More welfare for less' is a political slogan, that runs through the public organizations as a central discourse. This has pushed forward a new perspective on the citizen. The citizen is no longer just observed as an object for welfare service. The elderly, the students, the parents and the social fragile should also contribute to the welfare system as active citizens. The welfare crisis becomes an argument to observe the citizen as an infinite potential for the welfare state. This has consequences for public management too. It means that the welfare crisis

is not only an economic crisis. It is also a crisis of rationality. What we thought was rational might also turn out to be a barrier for sustainable welfare and economic growth.

Welfare Management is no longer just a matter of providing controllable, measurable and pre-defined care to the elder, teaching the students the curriculum and shaping programs and standards for the social fragile, which they blindly should follow. Welfare management also becomes a question of managing the potential and not yet possible welfare. In U.K. this is among other things also articulated as a question about, how to continually ‘unlock’ potential (Cooper & Starkey 2010).

In the Danish welfare debate this has been framed as a question of unfolding new resources by building not yet possible bridges between various professional silos, roles and organizations. E.g. the ‘New Nordic School Reform’ articulates parents as a hidden – but strong - resource in relation to the public school and contains various attempts to put them into play. In addition, there is an ongoing discussion about whether craftsmanship and volunteers is and can be a potential resource to shape active and physical learning processes in the school or whether that is undermining the pupil’s qualifications.

WELFARE AS A PROCESS

This problematization of problems and their possible solutions (Foucault 1999) seems to push forward a transformation of how welfare is articulated - from being primarily a simple and stable *output* to become an unstable and emerging *process* that overflows means and ends. Management of welfare is no longer just a matter of connecting in- and output. It becomes a question of being able to manage the potential and not yet possible welfare¹. The shift from welfare as ‘output’ to welfare as an ongoing, elusive and emerging process seems to transform the relationship between the public administration, the public employee and the citizen.

The public administration is no longer put into the world to discipline the minion citizen or to provide pre-given service for the citizen as a customer. If the public administration – and the employee – wants to see and thereby to manage - so called potentials and resources everywhere, it has to withdraw itself as an organization. New policy making – initiated e.g. by the Danish think tank MandagMorgen – increasingly articulates that public managers need to observe both the

¹ This is also a ‘diagnose’ that resonates the Canadian philosophers Massumi’s analysis of the Bush administration and the war on terror. In a paper (Massumi 2007) Massumi shows how the “Cold War” is replaced with a “Long War”: a preemptive war with the tendency to be newer ending.

municipality and the citizen as a part of a local community, where everyone is free to participate in the on-going process of contributing to unfold new potentials (www.ressourcedanmark.dk).

In other words a new pragmatic question seems to emerge: How to respond on welfare as emerging processes and how to re-think public organizations making them able to constantly respond to the shape-shifting and self-driven processes? And what does this turn managers and employees into? How and to what extend can they become the ‘masters’ of the co-creating processes of welfare? And what are the consequences of these so called creative processes: Do they turn welfare management into more democratic processes securing the weak or is the effect/affect that “we” create a competitive state (Pedersen 2011) that leaves no places for the Other?

This discursive shift can be illustrated this way:

The public organization...	A formal organization	An Organization	A local community
Object for management of welfare	Jura	Service	Life Processes
The Citizen...	A minion	A client asking for service	Active resources able to create welfare
The Politician...	Concerned about single cases	Govern the organization	To manage the local community
The Manager...	Knows the juridical discursive system	Manage other to manage themselves	Is able to withdraw the organization and invest in spaces of intensities
The employee...	Concerned with the single citizens juridical rights	Knows the clients’ needs	Working with how to mobilize resources and bring them together
Criteria for success	Justice	That the client gets the ‘right’ welfare service	To create passage to new possible and intense

			worlds/communities
--	--	--	--------------------

CRITIQUE FROM WITHIN THE PROCESS

One possible way to address the management of the potential and not yet possible welfare could be to deconstruct this diagnosis through foucaultian and critical reflexive management perspectives. This would highlight and address the transformation of discipline and power showing how bio-power – the source of the bare life – is becoming both the premise of and the object of management (Thrift 2007). This perspective would unfold how a new and even more radical neo-liberal discourse about public value is making management possible by claiming that 2 plus 2 always is 5²: There is always more potential to capitalize and to make manageable.

In this research program, we will carefully try to walk another path than the more classic foucaultian governmentality perspectives without forgetting the central meta-theoretical insights from the poststructuralistic perspectives on management. ‘Welfare’ is socially constructed and social constructions have constitutive consequences: They offer us certain forms of subjectification and make certain forms of becoming impossible. This also has the consequence that our research observations and techniques are never neutral.

From a processual philosophical approach (Aijt Nayak 2008, Hjorth 2008, Massumi 1998, 2002) we will try to deconstruct welfare management in the most positive connotation of the word. We will read *for* ‘more welfare for less’ - as the political parole states it - instead of reading *against* it (Hjorth 2008). What seems to be at stake is that even change changes as Murphies states it, through Massumi (Murphie 2008:2). When we observe welfare as a process we are also in search for the shape-shifting and self-driven aspects. This also means, that what we recognize as critical research, changes too. In other words we cannot take for granted that deconstruction, discourse - and governmentality analysis is the most adequate way to address welfare as a process and to open up new possible ways to work with welfare management. We cannot take for granted that ‘change’ is discursive or about self-discipline. Change can change.

² Thanks to Susanne Ekman for this formulation presented at the MPA education 2013

MOVEMENTS

The concept movement in the title *New Movements* is inspired by Brian Massumi's conceptualization of movements³. This is a concept we use to explore, how to grasp welfare as processes that overflows welfare as question of controlling the relationship between means and ends.

Massumi elaborates how walking is a controlled kind of falling. Every step we take works with gravity so we don't fall, we don't think about it, but it is the gravity as a constraint which makes it possible to take next step (Massumi in Zournazi 2002). You have to let go in every step – you have to let yourself be open to the possibility of falling in every single step. Every new step – or movement – is made possible through the constraints and at the same time it is about stretching the constraints. In that sense there is also an empowering possibility in every new step. There is openness in the movement, which is made possible by the constraints. So it is not about escaping the constraints. It is about flipping them over to new degrees of freedom (ibid).

From this perspective Massumi paves the way for a post-critique of the society (and its regulative constraints) addressing the question: How to make every new step more intense? He is talking about controlling next movement by intensifying it.

This is different from formulating new visions for the future. Expectation will always produce disappointments because everyday practices always will turn out differently from the abstract and distant visions (ibid). This doesn't mean that intensifying next movement is less risky. Intensifying the next movement is indeed a risky affair, because you refrain from waiting for a nice and neat vision of the future. By taking next step you risk falling. This means that every movement is about experimentation and about (qualitative) differentiation. It is never possible to predict how a movement could actually flip constraints over to new intense degrees of freedom and welfare. The only way we can find out, is by constant experimenting. Experimentation is a way to explore movements in action and thereby also thoughts in movement.

When we address welfare as a question of movements – stretching constraints - with the possibility of intensifying and multiplying every single movement through experimentations with movements - welfare becomes moving thoughts in a matter-meld process of affects, subjects and objects folded

³ The Canadian philosopher Brian Massumi studies of affect has a central role in the so called "affective turn", trying to rethink the relationship between the body and language.

and coming together in various ways (Thrift 2004). To paraphrase Manning and Massumi, we could say that this coming together of affects, subjects and objects “assumes no community in the sense of defining an identity that precedes and determines a collectivity coming together – but the eventful integration of collective invention in the singularity of an event” (Manning and Massumi p. 9). Put roughly ‘welfare’ as thoughts in movement does not become a community – like a unit - that define what the criteria for membership it. The community at stake here is not harmonic in its form. It collects every single movement in the same event just to unfold them. Because of this the community of welfare in movement is constantly shape-shifting and self-driven.

RESEARCH IN ‘LIVE’ WELFARE PROCESSES RUNNING LIKE WATER

The mission of the projects in New Movement research program is to create a research of creation that come together in the same event of unfolding welfare as movement. The mission is to create a research process that becomes alive and actualize Life. ‘Welfare’, ‘welfare management’ as well as ‘research in welfare’, is in other words coming into a common movement – in the creative search for how to produce different qualities of welfare: How to produce different thoughts in movement flipping over constraints to new degrees of freedoms? Rather than being small combinations of ‘welfare’ (as pre-given means and ends) and ‘research technics’ (as observations of these means and ends) that are mixed together, the ambition is to create a process that becomes like a waterfall running with real felt thoughts about welfare ‘de-freezing’ the dichotomies between research and practices. Research – as well as welfare - becomes a question about being able to actualize an event (Thrift 2007), that are able to actualize a new event. It is in that sense research in welfare as a process – as well as research in welfare – becomes a shape-shifting and self-driven process in the search for how to multiply and intensify these processes.

However, the processual philosophical approach to theorizing not only challenges the relationship between ‘research’ and the ‘object’ (in this case welfare). When welfare is turned into a process of autonomy – an event understood as sensation of movements - we don’t know at advance what kind of thoughts in movement about welfare it will actualize. We have to explore the on-going movements and we have to explore our movements in catalyzing this process and how (and to what extend) it feeds forward the capability to actually feed forward the process.

We have to start the experiments LIVE.

RESEARCH AS BECOMING-OTHER

When welfare is making itself worthy of being conceptualized as a process, we cannot simply stop our analysis saying, that it is a new discourse of management. This post-critical approach also challenges research and the evaluation of a good theory.

Inspired by the various contributions to post-critical studies (Thrift 2008, Hjorth 2008, Massumi 2002) and ‘research as creation’ (Murphie 2008, Manning and Massumi 2013), the projects in the research program will explore whether and how it is actually possible for us as researchers to “see”⁴ the potential and not yet possible welfare that overflows the means and ends that the explosions of management technologies produces. As Michael Hardt formulates it in the foreword to “The affective turn” (Clough 1999), we need to “see” the affects if we want to multiply and intensify them. Affect can be conceptualized as a double process of being affected and affecting others. The Spinozian argument is, that it is this double process that create agency. Massumi will argue, through the readings of Deleuze, that affects is the pathway to pure potentiality. The virtual and infinite field of possibilities. So, rather than *just* observing the parole ‘more welfare for less’ as a new discourse of change, that shape and fix the relationship between the municipality/the manager/the employee and the citizen in a specific powerful ‘process’ we aim to observe the new articulation of welfare as movements from *within* the process.

To do this, we try to observe ‘welfare’ and ‘the research in welfare’ without placing ourselves on one side and the studied welfare on the other (practice/theory). Through the readings of Massumi – and his readings of Whitehead, Simondon, Strengers, Deleuze and Guattari – we will understand research as a question about being able to actualize thoughts in movements - thoughts in action - able to create passages to new experimenting worlds. In other words we will understand research as research creation. Research becomes a way to potentialize the open virtual field and thereby to make new possibilities real.

Because of this we are not in search for how to make welfare management possible by minimizing the ‘world’ by observing management technologies – and welfare – as a question of evaluating the effects/affects of pre-given means and ends. We want to keep it open what ‘welfare’ and management technologies are and could be. More precise we are in search for, how research in

⁴ Here ‘to see’ is to be understood in a more broad sense than the word ‘observe’. It is not only about observing with the eyes, but about sensing the senses between us (perception of perception).

welfare as a process can potentialize the process of becoming-other together. What happens when “we” come together in the same event and are folded out in new intense processes?

The reframing of (research) technology

Latour use the example of a hammer to argue that it is exactly because the technology turns us in to someone else, that we have to re-invent the concept of technology as objective means and ends and instead begin to conceptualize technologies as intense modes of becoming-other:

“It is impossible here to proceed as if the hammer ‘fulfilled a function’, for it overflows the strict limits of this container on all sides. The claim that ‘the organ creates the function’ can be made about all tools (and of the hammer in particular). With it in hand, the possibilities are endless, providing whoever holds it with schemes of action that do not precede the moment it is grasped. [...]thanks to the hammer, I become literally another man, a man who has become ‘other’, since from that point in time I pass through alterity, the alteration of that folding (Gibson, 1986). This is why the theme of the tool as an ‘extension of the organ’ makes such little sense. Those who believe that tools are simple utensils have never held a hammer in their hand, have never allowed themselves to recognize the flux of possibilities that they are suddenly able to envisage” (Latour 2002)

We could also add that the process of becoming-other also goes for the object, that the hammer is actual hammering. Everybody is transformed in the process of acting and with Massumi and his readings of Deleuze, we could say, that it is exactly in this intense meeting between hammer, object and subject, that the thought is moving. The ‘hammering’ is exploding thoughts in movement, we could add with Massumi. They are the real felt thoughts that re-actualize what the hammer, the subject and the object is and could be. Therefore experimentations with ‘hammering’ are interesting. Hammering or – technics - increase the possibility for thoughts in action or as Latour would call it ‘the flux of possibilities’. They can explode the thoughts in action in this specific moment where intensity is invested. They can make subjects, objects, discourses and affects to become something ‘new’. Therefore we argue can the ‘hammering’ – or more in more general the technics – potentialize welfare (and welfare management) in new ways. There can create not just new things but also ‘newness’.

Through the readings of Deleuze and Massumi Andrew Murphie express this experimenting process of research as creation and participation as ‘worlding’:

“...subject and object integrate into a greater autonomy of participation, a matter-manner meld adding a new line of multiple-singular encounter to the world: that a *technic, an artifice between of any number of possible subjects and objects, autonomous of any given particular subject and object* (Massumi 1997:755)” (in Murphie 2008:2)

What both Latour and Murphie are trying to do is to refuse the concept of technology (as means and ends) and thereby to make the ‘the flux of possibilities’ and ‘worlding’ central. Andrew Murphie formulates the challenge like this: “Worlding with awareness is made possible by the refusal – a technically orchestrated refusal – of the world to be owned, by legal deed, by concept, or by experimental design” (Murphie 2008). In other words the processual philosophical perspective begins to take the ‘middle’ between means and ends seriously. There is more to the middle than a relation or a connection between two points. The middle is also an intense movement – enabling us to see our self and others in intense movement. Enabling us to become-other. To see the middle is to use, morph and experiment with technics – like hammering - to overflow both sides in the technology understood as connecting specific means and ends. It is to refuse technology to experiment with techniques to “see” newness.

The becoming-other

Massumi calls this process of subjectivation for movement-seing (Massumi 2004) and argue that this process-of-becoming makes it possible to orientate in new ways in the virtual field of possibilities. Latour calls it *pro*-position to emphasis, that the emerging participation is more than formal roles and discursive positions in a system of coordinates. There is a deeper or more profound connection. The *pro* underlines that what is at stake, when it comes to these processes and flux of possibilities, also is a matter of intensity.

With the help from Manning we could say that doing research in welfare as processes also implies that “we” are always more than one (Manning 2010). “We” – a project, a group, an organization, a research team - are also an abstract body and the question seems to be, how “we” - as participants – can open up this abstract body between us – in the middle - and create a window to new shape-shifting forms able to multiply and intensify expressions that are making themselves worthy to be

called welfare. “How can we actualize explosions of intense movements through ‘hammering’ – through the experimentations with technics?”

THEORY AS ‘OUTDOING ITSELF’

The experimentation with technics – as opposite to the use of technologies to produce a pre-given effect - is not only a way to ‘add more’ to welfare it is also a way to create new knowledge understood as feeding forward thoughts in movements. In the paper:”For a Pragmatics of the Useless” (Manning & Massumi 2013) Manning and Massumi argues that: *”A good philosophical concept is one that works itself out, unfolding outward from the limit of the thinkable, outdoing itself, as it settles I to go outside itself. It has to get out of its navel-gazing. It has to out itself”* (ibid). Because of this, the experimentation and the morphing of technics, which the projects initiate with politicians, employees, managers etc., is also a way to create new concepts about welfare by letting all the participants in the process ‘go out itself’ in the common search for the potential of creating new experimenting worlds and processes of becoming-others. The aim of the experimentations is to create and intensify thoughts in action. Thoughts in movement (Manning & Massumi 2013). Because of this, the evaluation of ‘the good theory’ becomes a question of being able to go to the edge of the already meaningful and grasp, what we here and now recognizes as the useless. The evaluation becomes a question about being able to conceptualize affects – in ways in which it becomes possible to create and add ‘even more’.

In other words we define experimentations in the most radical sense as the exploration of the ‘useless’ and as an exploration of how to add more ‘useless’. How to potentialize the useless? Inspired by Mannings and Massumis ”For a Pragmatics of the Useless” (Manning & Massumi 2013) we define an experiment as a context, that have not yet been imagined: “What is most experimental is most useless. If something is truly new, the context for its use will not yet exist. It will create its own context, giving rise to new uses, never before imagined” (Manning & Massumi 2013:1). But of course the uselessness is a strange animal, as Manning states it. Because the useless is both speculative but it is also pragmatic and in that sense useful. It is the ‘hammering’ – it is a verb - and not the instruction about how to hammer.

Because of this, experimentations with technics is understood as a process of becoming that are useless, in the sense that it overflows what we recognizes as an technology with means and ends. But it is also useful in the sense that it is one way to actualize the process of research creation

aiming at not only producing ‘the new’ or ‘new things’ but also to actually feed forward a shape-shifting and self-driven process of welfare. What we can call the ‘newness’. It is a process to explore how to hammer in various ways and to explore the multiple affects. The multiple thought in action.

According to Murphie research then becomes a question about how *participation occurs*” (Murphie 2008) and again this is a question of technics. “Technics address the partial, always incomplete attempt at what used to be thought of as agency” (Murphie 2008:2).

Therefore we need to re-formulate the ideal of a designed research processes as a pre-given process with specific technologies observing and evaluating means and ends of welfare. Instead the ambition becomes a question about ‘being prepared’ to experiment with and to morph various technics exploring how agency – or more precise *participation* occurs and likewise how the emerging of *real* participation make new so called technics occur. Be ready to become another! – That could be one creative constraint for research in welfare as processes.

REFORMULATION OF MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS

As researchers in welfare management we will also try to reformulate our role as reflexive critics and be bold enough to try to reformulate that ambition to what we will call an innovative management question. We find it interesting to reformulate the challenge from being a matter of designing activities to ‘remove’ old bureaucratic systems, old words and concepts (This is how the think-tank Mandag Morgen is trying to pave the way for new resources) – and to produce ‘less’ of the simple and instrumental management - to be a question of experimentations with techniques able to actually act on the emerging, elusive, ever-changing, potential and non-representative welfare here and now- and to keep the process being shape-shifting and self-driving.

This shift might be what Ajit Nayak, in the paper “On the Way to Theory: A Processual Approach” (Ajit 2008) calls a shift from “false” to “true” research questions. Whereas the ‘false’ science shapes dichotomies between for example the organization and management and between managers and employees the ‘true’ science observes the continuous process of thought. Murphie doesn’t use the distinction “true” and “false”, but claims that all research is about variation and is in that sense relative. The difference is that “...the *awareness that this is what we are doing* makes all the difference in world. All research is research-creation but not all research is the same” (Murphie 2008:2)

ECHOES of SUSTAINABILITY

From this point of perspective sustainability is not about implementing pre-given plans or programs for sustainable societies. Sustainability becomes a question about creating events that are ‘intense’ enough to create echoes of thoughts in movement. Sustainability becomes a question about how to keep the process of welfare as real felt thoughts – *thoughts in action* – moving across formal roles, professions, silos, organizations, geographical areas, cities, countries etc. A lot of research is about creation – and about processes – but they are not equally good. Given that this research project is engaged in the question of how to actualize ‘the abstract body’ (Manning) and the ‘flux of potentialities’ (Latour) between us – welfare and management of welfare also become a *sensed* welfare. The consequence is, that welfare is not only a question of ‘social constructions’ it also becomes a question of perceptions of the ‘bare’ perception. Sensing senses. It becomes an ontological project. But paradoxically also an epistemological question about: How to create the conditions for this ontological becoming?

New types of research questions

Seen from a management perspective “New Movement” is overall in the search for answers on:

How is it possible to think of leadership than more than a heroic figure going in front and with specific followers? How is it possible to work with leadership as self-driven and shape-shifting processes?

How is it possible to strategically manage all potential interactions between politicians, managers, front-line employees and citizens in ways where the becoming-of-subjectivation is open for the potential and not yet possible welfare?

How is it possible to actualize a curious and imaginative scholarship in welfare entrepreneurship as a movement that attracts investment of intensity and mobilizes the idiosyncrasies of the multiple? (Steyaert 2007).

How is it possible to work with educations as investments in thoughts in movement?

How is it possible to work with public schools as ‘open spaces of play’ investing in moving thoughts in action?

How is it possible to manage cities as ‘livable cities’ as moving thoughts in movement connecting and folding subjects, objects, affects and discourses in new ways?

In other words how is it possible to intensify every step in the “production” of welfare and to transform welfare from bare images, signs and numbers being distributed and coordinated to become a process of lived, imageless and real thoughts of welfare running through “us” and feeding forward new different felt thoughts of welfare?

These kinds of questions are one of the driving forces of our research initiative “New Movements – New responsive Welfare Management.” The title is an umbrella for different experimenting research projects. The starting point for all of them is, that they start with a question that are a burning and central management question ‘in’ the welfare organization and from there begins to reformulate it together with the participants. The participants are often from different organizations, silos and have different formal roles to secure that ‘all resources’ is put into play from the beginning of the project. The mission of the project is not only to ‘set up’ meetings but to actually transform ‘the formal meeting’ to an event able to make new forms of participation occur. As said, this is not a mission about harmony but a mission about being able to potentialize the open virtual field in ways in which new movements can occur.

All in all the projects work with various ways to shift focus from a strategic perspective on management – understood as new images, visions, expectations or reformulations of welfare management – to a strategic management of the *tactical* – understood as ways in which to see and manage the small on-going and intense everyday activities (Hjorth 2008).

RESEARCH PROJECTS

LEADERSHIP AS MOVEMENTS

What happens if we take public leadership to the edge and instead of conceptualizing the leader as one going in front – like a hero – with the employees as followers - we experiment with leadership as a process? How are we becoming-other? And what are the affects of this becoming-other for the ‘organization’? How to manage these processes of intense becoming? And how does it transform our organizations?

This is the central question for 4 experiments with public managers form 2012-2013. The project is financed by the Danish Ministry of Finance.

Participants DSR, FTF, DJØF, Århus Kommune, Frederiksberg Kommune, Magistrene, VIA College, METROPOL, Design Museum Danmark, CBS, Villa Venire (kan ikke huske de sidste kommuner).

You can read about the experiment with leadership in these articles:

LITTERATURE:

Amhøj, Breum Christa (2013): Fremtidsparat Lederskab, in Lederskabelse (red. Helth). Samfundslitteratur.

Amhøj, Christa & Struck, Tim (2013): ”At skabe en eksperimenterende og virtuel fremtid sammen” in Forstandig ledelse (ed.) Kim Gørtz and Mette Mejlhede. DJØF.

Amhøj, Christa, Kristiansen, Thorbjørn & Mondrup, Dorte (2013): “Embodying Leadership – as a capability to shake the habitual and to vision the potential welfare”, paper presented at Subtheme 41: Embodying Leadership with Ethics in Mind, (Convenors: Alison Pullen, Pasi Ahonen, Suzanne Gagnon) EGOS, Montreal, July.

LEARNING AS TRANSFORMATION (PhD. PROJECT, Poula Helth)

What happens if we reformulate learning and instead of thinking learning as predefined means and ends to be evaluated begins to think of learning as intense thoughts in movement – in action.

This project is working with experimenting technics – inspired by the above mentioned project on ‘leadership in movement’ and has initiated various technics in 6 public organizations.

LITTERATURE:

(INDSÆT POULAS TEKSTER)

FAIR WELFARING (PhD. PROJECTS/Eva Pallesen):

What happens if we reformulate welfare as a goal, effect or competence and instead begins to observe it as open processes?

This project explores four experiments about welfare as open processes in various public organizations and discusses the effects/affects for management.

LITTERATURE:

Amhøj, Christa & Pallesen, Eva (2013): “Collaboration as Alchemy”. Paper presented at Subtheme Sub-theme 12: (SWG) Processes of Organizational Creativity: Collective Entrepreneurship, Co-Creation and Collaborative Innovation (Conveyors: Chris Steyaert and Daniel Hjorth), EGOS, July.

Amhøj, Christa Breum & Pallesen, Eva (2014): “The Poly-rhythmic Organization as shape-shifting processes”, Paper to EGOS Rotterdam.

SUSTAINABILITY AS ECOLOGIES OF INTENSITY

STRATEGIES AS THE ART OF THE WEAK (PHD PROJECTS)

How to strategically manage welfare as tactic movement without fixtating the process in means and ends?

This project is mobilizing three experimenting hubs in Herlev-, Gentofte and Ringkøbing Skjern Kommune working with ‘welfare as digital/virtual events’, ‘welfare as co-creating events in the community’ and ‘welfare as moving affects in the city’. This project explores how experimenting hubs can manage small intense movement strategically and how it unfolds new forms of participation and new processes of welfare across organizational boarders.

One experimenting hub: Urbanizing

What happens is we observe the city as more than a geographical place and instead begins to observe it as moving fields of affects, bodies, subjects and objects? What happens if we reformulate strategically management of cities to a question about a tactical creation of ‘livable cities’ through the thoughts of welfare in movement? We follow one hub and how it collect subjects and objects and unfolds them in new ways... Thereby we explore animations as a research technic.

LITTERATURE:

Amhøj, Christa Breum, Struck, Tim and Kristiansen, Thorbjørn (2014):“Welfare as movements actualizing ‘the livable city’- Research as a creative practical jump-cut and move-animation”, paper EGOS, LAEMOS 2.-4. April.

Upcoming RESEARCH PROJECTS

Open School: Welfare creation as co-creational interstices of learning.

Cand.pæd.psyk.. PhD in spe: Dorte Mondrup

In continuation of the current school reforms and based on new co-creative relationships with society and local community, the project aim to develop new methods of re-locating and re-thinking learning. The mission of the project is to explore whether and how the future school management is about having the courage to move in new ways with students, parents, government, cultural organizations, local politicians, teachers, professional organizations and businesses? To create live events and activities, emanating from radically exceeded classrooms involving art installation, factory floors, the metro station and the town hall as co-creational interstices of potential learning?

Leadership as an abstract dance: Embodied Movements in Leadership

Jacqueline Albers Thomsen, cand.pæd.psyk. (Consultant MacMannberg, KL and The Social Ministry)

The story of how best to manage welfare continues to unfold and some voices (ex. NPG) are telling stories of the need for a shift in the mind-set in welfare management. How do we break away from tightness brought to organizational life by idea of the rational mind? The ideas from Neoliberal capitalism seem to be a poor framework for the practice of welfare. It seems technically advanced, but from a social perspective it is very primitive. How do we create a sensible management leading to welfare based on what makes sense in action – instead of bounded rationality? Creating a sensible welfare management making sense by sensing. The project aims to unfold how can we integrate the conscious mind with the wisdom of the body in welfare management. How does ancient knowledge from the yoga-tradition apply in modern leadership? And what happens if we approach Leadership as yoga? As a dance between control and surrender – between pushing and letting go – and as when to push and when to let go becomes part of the creative process, part of the open-ended exploration of the being in and the impact on organisational life. And as a way to develop body(commitment), heart(belongingness) and mind(awareness) and the capability to see reality as it is.

Working environment catalyzed through the lens of investments in moving affects.

Cand. Pæd. Psyk. Sanna Waagstein – with a twist from an education from a drama school

Trivsel og udvikling sættes på dagsorden på nye måder, ved at tage udgangspunkt i et affektiv set-up hvor der arbejdes med performativ intensitet og begivenheder på/mellem arbejdspladser. Formålet med projektet er at iværksætte en eksperimenterende affektiv setting for

processuel læring i aktion, hvor deltagerne selv registrer og sætter ord på effekter af stemninger i den undersøgende, affektive og refleksive proces. Projektet kredser om hvordan stemninger betoner vores interaktion med andre mennesker og afsøger muligheder for at anvende det affektive gear til at gentænke 'care for the other'. Men projektets mission er også at undersøge, hvorvidt og hvordan arbejdet med at potentialisere affekterne mellem os, åbner op for nye emergerende fællesskaber og dermed også muliggøre såkaldte innovative løsninger.

Januar 2014/Christa