Sustainability as an Ecology of Learning, Thinking and Acting
Using the World Health Organization's Six P's as an Action-research Intervention to Create Public Value with Multiple Bottom Lines
Amhøj, Christa Breum

Sustainability as an Ecology of Learning, Thinking and Acting: Using the World Health Organization's Six P's as an Action-research Intervention to Create Public Value with Multiple Bottom Lines

Christa Breum Amhøj

Journal article (Accepted manuscript*)

Sustainability as an ecology of learning, thinking and acting

Using the World Health Organization's six P's as an action-research intervention to create public value with multiple bottom lines

Background and idea

Today, the need for sustainability is recognised worldwide as a key issue facing the challenges of twenty-first century society (Komiyama & Takeuchi, 2006). In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development defined sustainability as the "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (1987). The sustainability aspiration has found its way to the Danish government. In 2016, the minister of development and the minister of finance presented a "Plan for the UN Goals" (2017). The aim was and still is to motivate public organisations to work on the UN goals in an even more focused manner.

One aspect involves the aim to implement and measure sustainable development goals (SDGs) in different areas (health, climate, education, etc.). This could create, what the Canadian philosopher Brian Massumi calls, a 'stop operation' (Massumi 2002). This is the moment where sustainability is reduced to a fixed classification of data which is no more perceived or sensed on an experiential level. The other and central aspect of sustainability involves the aim of paving the way for crafting a challenge and a problem constantly asking: What is next? (Massumi 2002, p 219 in McLure 2013 p. 229). This is a question of turning sustainability into an generative process where it becomes an active verb. *Sustainabilising* is something we do and learn in every "intra -action" (e.g., Barad, 2007), understood as the movements of desire and intensity that connect bodies— human and nonhuman, animate or inanimate, virtual and actual, including bodies of knowledge—in/as an assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004 in McLure 2013, p. 229).

Transforming the SDGs to a question of sustainabilising is still an area for exploration. Therefore, in this article, we ask, How can an action-research process pave the way for sustainability to become an ecology of thinking, learning and acting, desire and intensity that connect bodies intra-acting with human, non-human, animate, spaces and affective movements?

To understand the importance of turning the UN goals into an ecology of thinking, learning and acting, we need to focus on the implicit premises connected to the UN goals. One central idea, which the SDGs represent, is the need for a *planetarian* approach to our social systems, such as our countries, cities, municipalities and organisations. When the astronauts landed on the moon, the greatest experience has not been to see the moon but how all resources on Earth are related and interconnected (Hildebrandt, 2016). Understanding sustainability as an awareness about how everything is *interconnected* and *intra-acting* (eg. Barad 2007*)* is often opposed to the dominating knowledge created in both industrial and post-industrial eras*.*

The industrial era has created solutions but has simultaneously separated and isolated areas of knowledge. The back side of the industrial and instrumental way of addressing problems is creating new challenges, which it is unable to manage. When knowledge is addressed as separate and often isolated areas, it is unable to observe and thereby to manage how one solution in one area can generate new challenges in another area. To think and act in more sustainable ways, we need to understand that we are all connected, not separate from our planet and nature. We do not manage and control

Earth but *intra-act* with it. To think and act in sustainable ways is to understand that what we do in one area can affect other areas. We need to engage and participate, instead of being at an isolated distance.

Achieving the UN goals is not only about how to survive and use resources in more sustainable ways in different areas, such as climate, health and education. It does not just involve implementing and controlling the goals in specific areas and in practice. It is also about how to enable humans and other species to live healthily, safely and securely (Komiyama & Takeuchi, 2006), as well as lead fulfilled lives together across roles, silos and national and organisational borders. Thereby, attaining the UN goals is less about activating a discourse on fear – trying to scare people to act differently – but more about facilitating and enhancing a "safe space" where people, place(s) and the planet can interact in qualitatively better ways in every new movement. Understanding the UN goals as developing a "holistic" perspective from within our chaotic life practices does not entail finding one simple solution but sharing complexities and thinking, learning and acting together. The premise is our need to learn through participatory practices intensifying and multiplying intra-actions between unstable networks of human and nonhuman, animate or inanimate, virtual and actual, including bodies of knowledge—in/as an generative ecology of practices.

Another way to articulate the need for sharing complexities and uncertainties and connecting often isolated forms of knowledge is to emphasise that the UN SDGs draw on the ethic of open and inclusive societies. The World Health Organization (WHO) works on the practical application of this inclusive ethical approach. The aim is to build healthy cities. One way to do so is to understand the UN goals as the integration of six areas in the desire to develop healthy cities[1]. Focusing on these six areas paves the way for transgressing the idea of a city as a place with often isolated resources, roles, silos and organisations. Beyond managing infrastructures, it becomes the mere experience of belonging to and co-existing with the city. Using the UN goals to build healthy cities intensifies the geographical place as a *space* understood as the affective and in this sense, the emotional infrastructures between us (Beyers & Steyaert 2012; Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Thrift, 2008).

On an organisational level, the UN goals and the six P's challenge the rationality of new managerialism and new public management. New public management has succeeded because of its ability to invest knowledge in management technologies, such as routines, instructions, rules, control, surveillance and hierarchies. These social technologies aim to categorise and build systems and territories of knowledge. Value is understood as comprising predictable and performative outcomes of these systems. Andersen and Thygesen argues that these kinds of social technologies make an area manageable by creating a communicative difference between the expected (the generalised model) and the practice and then trying to minimise that difference (Andersen & Thygesen, 2004).

The UN goals entail addressing a range of challenges, calling for more flat and experiential embedded ways of organising our social systems, workplaces and higher educational institutions. This process is not about minimising actions in simple ways, aiming at managing pre-given effects. Rather, it involves an increased awareness of other potential ways to act and understand value and growth. Simple management and simple technologies are transformed into new kinds of open and explorative questions, aiming at understanding how to create 'programs for collective actions' (Latour 2006) having multiple bottom lines. The questions include how to create emerging ecologies of thinking,

---

[1] These areas are people, place, participation, peace, prosperity and planet (six P's).

learning and acting, where we do not know what the ecologies are turning into – and where value creation can be unexpected.

It is important to emphasise that such questions are not just relevant to citizens or non-governmental organisations (NGOs) but are also highly relevant to public organisations. They need to understand themselves as "vertical" organisations that are able to manage "horizontal" social movements (Hardt & Negri, 2017) or what Hjorth (2005) would call "spaces for play" to highlight the need for intensifying *desire* (Hjorth 2013). Another way to articulate this need to rethink about (public) management is to state that the UN goals make a plea for entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship management and education often focus on adopting predominantly economic and business perspectives and models. Often, the point is about following the entrepreneurial person. Nonetheless, we claim that the UN goals involve adopting a broader definition of entrepreneurship than the creation of start-ups. The UN goals entail returning entrepreneurship to the social process among people. Entrepreneurship and leadership become a collective process (Steyaert & Katz, 2004).

This is just a short presentation of some of the arguments about how sustainability is about rethinking rationality. The following discussion will be divided into two sections. First, we elaborate on how sustainabilising entails rethinking about areas that include rationality, organisations, knowledge, leadership and value and about *transforming* these areas into an ecological way of thinking, learning and acting. But one thing is to rethinking areas another thing is to work it into a craft of research. Therefore the second section will unfold a conceptualisation of a specific action-learning project, called "Sustainable and Healthy Cities through Urban Nature Relations". This project will transform the theoretically 'rethinking of sustainability' into a craft of research. Informed by the proposed theoretical lens, the action-learning process involves research based on the WHO's six P's. The Danish WHO network, Healthy City Network (SBN as the Danish acronym), has initiated the project, which is financed by the Danish Ministry of Health.

Theoretical perspective: affective turn

Although sustainability is a fussy concept with many different attempts to translate it, a growing number of studies tap into the affective turn, aiming at understanding sustainability as a transformative potential for our organisations and society. The starting point of these studies is that we cannot solve our problems with the same forms of knowledge that have created the problems in the first place. Therefore, these studies aim to go beyond this *problem maze* (Li & Lin, 2011), which our industrial society has created, by advocating for sustainability as a new kind of sensitive rationality.

Such approaches explore the gap between problems and solutions (and between input and output) and observe potential solutions other than the predicted outcome. The value is about the impact of the mere process itself. These approaches can be used to invest knowledge in new kinds of social technologies that are able to boost an inclusive society as an ethical practice of even more sensitive and experiential thinking, learning and acting.

Reviewing the cited literature on sustainability points out different areas, as we need to rethink through more sensitive, poetic, vague and practice-embedded approaches to knowledge if we want to build new pathways. Overall, these studies attempt to:

1) go beyond the idea of instrumental *rationality*, calling for an aesthetic and sensitive rationality (people);
2) transgress the formal *organisation*, calling for techniques to re-embed it with more experiential practices, urban nature and communities (place);
3) challenge the idea of *knowledge transfer between A to B*, calling for a sense- and practice-based knowing and exploring the gap between (participation);
4) transgress the individualistic and formal *leadership*, calling for a collective leadership (and a poetic self) (peace);
5) understand organisational structures and value as more than an output of a causal relation, paving the way for understanding structures and value as an ongoing and form-shifting process of assembling and re-assembling people, affects, materials, discourses and places ('assemblages') (prosperity); and
6) transform critical research (in broad terms, both academic and everyday research and inquiry) from observing practice at a distance to affirming life-enhancing potentials in every micro-movement. This critical awareness of creating a qualitative difference at every moment also entails the ability to empathise with all kind of lives (planet).

We unfold some of the specific ways to rethink about rationality, organisation, knowledge, leadership, value and critique through the sustainability lens. We aim to show how these theoretical approaches and concepts can inform the process of intervening with the WHO's six P's.

The ecology of thinking, learning and acting can be understood as a new kind of social technology. Some researchers would call it a social technology aiming to create an "environ-mentality" (e.g., Thain, 2008) because we need to move from the social production of individualised mentalities, controlling and disciplining their own "selves" in relation to the expected norms, to *mentalities* informed to intensify and multiply intra-actions between human and nonhuman, animate or inanimate, virtual and actual, including bodies of knowledge—in/as an generative ecology of practices. The environ-mentality informs the subjects to belong to and co-exist with a 'space' more than just a geographically place and to share, care and take responsibility for how to develop an emerging ecology of a qualitatively better practice together. In other words, an ecology can be understood as a social technology, assuming belonging, co-existence and co-becoming, but without knowing what the practices are turning into (Massumi, as cited in Stengers, 2013).

Rethinking about rationality, learning, leadership, organising and value

Zooming in on studies about understanding sustainability as a sensitive rationality clarifies that the approaches search for new forms of knowledge to formulate problems and potential solutions in more life-enhancing ways.

In the next section, we present some examples of how these studies can be used to rethink about several areas, such as *rationality, organisational learning, leadership* and *value*, and how these areas can be understood as ecological ways of thinking. Every area is in itself worthy of individual exploration, which many studies have already done. However, we aim to use the theoretical approaches to inform the WHO's six P's and transform them into action-learning processes aimed at intensifying an emerging ecology of thinking, learning and acting.

Need for aesthetic rationality (people)

P for people is not just about inviting more people across formal roles, silos and organisations to join the value-creation process in our cities. It also involves changing the mere rationality of how people think and act. Shrivastava, Schumacher, Wasieleski, and Tasic (2017) argue that a fuller understanding of organisational rationality that embraces a "'sensitivity' for the ecological well-being of the planet can transform existing business models to become more innovative and deploy more progressive business strategies" (p. 370). They advocate seeking new ways of thinking that respond to emerging economic and ecological crises, implying the necessity for a better understanding of emotional and cognitive approaches to sustainability-oriented solutions.

Shrivastava et al. (2017) argue that aesthetic rationality represents a possible form of Max Weber's "value-oriented rationality". The value-oriented rational social action "is not anchored in the successes of this action, but in the proper form of the action itself" (Shrivastava et al., 2017, p. 400). For example, this means that managers need to be convinced that strict agency relationships between principals and agents must be more relaxed. Managers must have the mandate to not only focus on short-term goals but also on long term goals (Shrivastava et al., 2017, p. 400).

Art and aesthetics are pointed out as techniques that can enhance collective conversations about "value-oriented rationality" that focuses on the "beauty" of the social action, not only its goal. Aesthetic rationality is "where reasoned objectives are not only pursued with reasoned means but with emotional means" (Shrivastava et al., 2017 p. 394). Sustainability involves developing a sensitive and aesthetic rationality that loosens the tight relations between "principals and agents", as well as enhancing collective conversations about the "beauty" of such relations. P for people is a way to understand "rational social action" as an extraordinary quality of the relations among people. Beauty is the passage to sustainability as a sensitive ecology of thinking, learning and acting. It is an intelligent detour to new solutions.

Need for interactions with animals and places (place)

Cato and Meyer (2010) argue that sustainability is not just about our practices in organisations but involves the need to expand our perceptions. Inspired by Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology and social constructionism, they advocate for interpersonal relationships to consider our connection with other species and inanimate aspects of the planet. They explore how knowledge derived through a community of walking or song, such as that of the Aboriginals, intensifies intellectualising processes in opposition to new (public) managerialism where 'intellect' is something possessed by someone (Cato & Meyer, 2011). Rather than relying on theories and abstractions, walking and interacting with nature and with community practices make us open to new emotions and thoughts and new opportunities for sense making and meaning making (Cato & Meyer, 2011, p. 55).

In line with this argument, Guthey, Whiteman, and Elmes (2014) contend that focusing on a place has the potential to transform our understanding of sustainability and narrow notions of input and output. Informed by Worthy (Worthy 2008, cited in Guthey et. al 2014), they argue that it has empirically been shown "how the lack of immediate sensual engagement with the material consequences of everyday life—what he calls 'phenomenal dissociation'—leads to global environmental disasters because people are distanced from the consequences of their actions by

extensive material and informational networks. In effect, people lack a very deep sense of place" (Guthey et al., 2014, p. 8). In contrast, "people who live in a place, often strongly identify with the built environment and local ecology. In some places, we have found [that] people develop so-called 'real relationships' with the land, what Livingston called the 'sense of being-a-place'" (Guthey et al., 2014, p. 5).

Guthey et al. (2014) call for more emphasis on organisations as not just specific geographical places but also as multidimensional phenomena and spaces created through affects, materials, non-yet things and so on. They point out that the existing literature (citing Hernes) on organisations as spaces neglects to theorise how organisations are related to places. Place and nature are external to an organisation although fundamental for its existence (Guthey et al., 2014). This raises new types of research questions, which have yet to be answered, about how decision makers understand their relationship with human-organisation-nature. P for place is therefore about intensifying the interconnectedness between human organisations and urban nature.

Need for collective leadership aiming at a common good (peace)

Raelin (2018) advocates for collective leadership in a complex and network-based society that needs more sustainable decisions, with the aim of "lowering the risk of suboptimal decisions" (p. 61). We should set aside our fear of collective leadership. Raelin's point is that the collective negotiation is more than an exchange between individuals. "It is often an in-the-moment intra-action – not inter, but intra-action – out of which a dynamic unfolding may emerge through some form of leadership agency that reorients the flow of practice" (Raelin, 2018 p. 61). To make this happen, the participants need to trust one another and have a common good as an aim.

This requires another understanding of a relationship that is not an "I-it" relation. The "I-it" relation is a functional and instrumental approach based on "what I can do for you". In contrast, the "I-thou" relationship is based on a shared sense of caring, commitment and mutual responsibility (Raelin, 2018 p. 62). Another way to make this relationship occur is on a system level that creates small circles or groups without placing anyone in a hierarchical position (Raelin, 2018 p. 63). Training in collective problem solving and in methods of ongoing dialogues is also a way to build up the capacity for collective leadership. Raelin emphasises the need for action learning, whether initiated through action research, action science or appreciative inquiry, and how it is done because "action modes" can make collective learning emerge from a more natural experience (p. 63). Overall, P for peace can be understood as not only the absence of war in an local area but also the potential for enhancing collective leadership, caring and sharing complexity because shared responsibility is able to actualise new actions.

Need for transformative and real-life learning (participation)

Citing Steven and Fallows (2010), Cato and Meyer write about sustainability and learning that 'curricula are developed around students' ability to demonstrate employability skills, usually with an emphasis on information retrieval and handling; communication and presentation; planning and problem solving; and social development and interaction (2011, p. 3). From the sustainability perspective, they argue for the need to "be a room for basic 'good pedagogy and it need not be linked

to the workplace to be considered important. There is more to real life than what goes on in the workplace'" (Cato & Meyer, 2011, p. 3).

The growing literature on collaborative governance and co-creation (Hartley, Sørensen & Torfing, 2013; Emerson, Nabatchi & Balough; 2011; Ansell & Torfing, 2014, Plotnikov 2015) is another way to think about and to involve "real-life learning" outside educational institutions. Inviting students, researchers, employees and citizens to participate in political events, local actions in/through urban nature or the city makes it possible to include other real-life ideas and experiences in the process. This can also be a way to work with lifelong education. Instead of universities designing courses for the growing number of seniors, it becomes possible to intensify local actions (e.g., in urban nature) in an open and inclusive lifelong learning space. P for participation addresses the potential for formal and informal learning not only in the classroom but everywhere and with even more different people. This kind of participation outside the classroom and operating on an experiential and felt level has the potential to create more 'deep' relations. This is animating the process of participation to become an on-going and form-shifting process.

Need for understanding public value as organising emerging and generative actions on a felt level (prosperity)

The cited studies try to use the agenda about the UN goals and/or sustainability as a way to rethink rationality. This way of rethinking about public management and education has some consequences for the way we think about organising. First, we move from the organisation as a more or less stable and closed system to *organising*. It becomes a verb, something that we do. Second, we can begin to understand how organising is not only about decision making, structures and routines. Organising becomes a matter of intensifying and multiplying an ecology of events.

Massumi's (2002a, 2002b) and Manning and Massumi's (2014) studies on art, practice and research can provide sensitivity towards organising, understood as an ongoing, form-shifting and self-generative process where *affect* is a central concept. Affect refers to the mere quality of the relation, which can never become fully represented in one performative expression (a sign, a person, a model, a number, etc.). Affect is the relationality of the relation and is the experience on a felt level. Because it cannot be represented and thereby "fixed" in the relation, it always "spills over" and creates new landing fields for new events. Affect is movement. To use the vocabulary of these studies, *affects affect affects*.

Massumi (2002a, 2002b) is inspired by Spinoza's conceptualisation of affect. Affect is always a double movement: *to affect and to be affected*. In the same movement, someone affects "the other" or other things on a felt and often unarticulated level and is also affected. Intervention always moves (at least) in two ways. The affective co-motions also emphasise that affect is never about the inclusion of the citizen or about the citizen including the municipality or the private company. Affective co-motions involve being mutually included in the event, where the parties become slightly different (Hjorth 2013).

The more someone is affected by experiences on a felt level, the more one also knows how to affect and respond to other affects. A person's ability to be affected is about one's ability to see, sense, feel and actualise new microworlds between one and the other. This is enables new ways of acting but it also intensifies the capability of being a life force (Spinoza calls it *conatus* cited in Massumi 2008, p.

38). Thereby, affect is not just about personal feelings. Affect – or what Massumi defines as "the thinking feeling of what happens" (2008, p. 5) – exactly refers to these affective co-motions among persons, things, sounds, smells and places. When organisations become increasingly non-hierarchical and flat, these hybrid networks and assemblages of things, subjects, affects and tendencies can be used for orientation.

Affect is not a reflexion about a practice at a distance. To underline the point about reflexivity, Massumi (2002a) uses the concept of "a thinking feeling of what happens" to define affect. The "thinking feeling of what happens" is about inflexion. It is a reflexion on a felt level that generates the same actions, thoughts or experiences from "within" the experiences but always with a qualitative difference. People can hold hands repeatedly, but the mere quality of this relation on a felt level always differs, and how they hold hands at a specific moment paves the way for the next moment and movement. The felt experience ("more qualitative") always flips over and creates new affective landing fields.

From the affective approach, knowledge is not just transferred from one human to another or from one technology to a human. Knowledge is generated through the vague, loose and not yet articulated gap between people, things, places, tendencies and so on. Knowledge is created through these more wild and non-disciplinary affective co-motions *moving* between the entities involved. This makes it possible to understand how knowledge can be transmitted across fields of experiences. A scientist can affect a student – not only by the amount of information given but by the use of materials, places and narratives that transmit the experience of knowledge on a felt level. In other words, this process can inspire the student to think, learn and act in qualitative better ways. Organising – and creating value – becomes the specific moment when the parties involved are able to intensify knowledge on a felt level. This is creating a passage to the ecology of thoughts in the act (affective co-motions). And then we are back to the point of 'rationality of beauty'.

Critique (planet)

Sustainablising, understood as intensifying an ecology of thinking, learning and acting, means revisiting Deleuze, Latour, Barad and other studies in 'new materialism', because they in different ways are focusing on intra-actions between human, non-human, affects. This also paves the way for rethinking critical agency. In the paper "Critical agency" Rebughini states that we live in *'a society where there is no longer a central conflict federating subaltern and oppressed actors. The focus always returns to experience, to the present, and to the transformation that actors are able to produce here and now'* (Rebughini 2018, p. 11). Thereby critique can become an affirmative practice. It can be an attitude to 'problem-solving'. This can become a form of critical agency motivated by what is perceived as a 'critical' situation that must be resolved (Holmwood, 2011 in *Rebughini 2018, p. 11)* or it can be an attitude to intensify and multiply affects with are enhancing Life. Critique becomes possible on what Isabelle Stengers calls a meso-level it becomes a matter of either inventing macro- or microchanges but about the technical in-between: *How?* Thereby critique becomes a technical matter of: *How* to craft a qualitative better ecology of practice without having an ideal in the horizontal of the field. This critical awareness of creating a qualitative difference in every micro-moment entails the awareness of empathising with all kind of lives (the planet).

Using the WHO's six P's to create an ecological action-learning process

We elaborate on how every P can become a part of an action-learning process, aiming to transform the six P's into sensitive and ecological processes of thinking, learning and acting.

Conceptual process

Eight Danish municipalities have participated in the action-research project based on the WHO's six P's. One criterion for participation is that every municipality should be organised around cross-professional teams. Another criterion is the need to involve a specific local area of urban nature[2].

Overall, the one-year process in which the municipalities have been invited to participate can be conceptualised, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

1) People
The action-research project is organised as cross-professional collaborations (addressing P for people). We have asked the participating municipalities to invite architects/urban planners, healthcare professionals, citizens and HR consultants. The aim is to use these cross-professional teams to create and develop new communities in and through the local urban nature. Thus, it also involves P for place.

2) Place
We have invited the cross-professional groups to experience the local urban nature in different ways and through various aesthetic techniques. They need to connect to the place on a felt level to move from "planning and controlling the place" to experience all the potential microworlds, actualise these potentials and perhaps connect them.

3) Participation
The theoretical assumption is that these aesthetic techniques can intensify the felt experience of urban nature and the city, addressing P for participation. This kind of participation also aims to intensify the experiential feeling of being part of an urban community.

4) Peace
Peace is not only defined as "the absence of war" in internationally warzones. It can also be understood as the aim of intensifying a collective and life-enhancing leadership. Then leadership

---

[2] This way of addressing sustainability also transforms the conceptualisation of health. The project idea and the reason why the Danish Healthy Cities work with it are that health is not just defined as the absence of sickness among the citizens. Through this craft of action research, healthy cities become a matter of developing qualitatively better pathways through interactions with people, urban nature and public organisations. Health becomes a verb, something that we do together at every moment across roles, silos and organisational borders to enhance the experiential quality of life. Specifically, it can involve exploring how citizens want to use their local area: Do they want to walk, grow gardens, meditate, bike, or do some artistic activities and so on?

becomes the collective ability to create "a ship" and lead it together. Thereby "peace" entails the practice of intensifying and multiplying the assembling and the re-assembling of people, places, materials and affects without having any horizon or dominating concept. Rather, leader-ship is about intensifying a qualitative difference in every micro-action knowing, that this practice will create a qualitative better field of actions, a middle ground ('milieu') (Stengers 2005, p 187)

5) Prosperity

The expected outcome of this process is not just improving the participants' mental health by using and sensing nature. There are multiple outcomes when people, a place and participation are involved, addressing P for prosperity. More than an economic output, growth entails multiple ways of creating qualitatively better *impacts*: people sharing resources in/through urban nature, enhancing more flat ways of organising and collaborating, improving and creating a specific place to interact with urban nature and turning the place into an attractive area that can draw more resources (e.g., new families, etc.).

6) Planet

We understand critical research as affirming life-enhancing potentials in every micro-movement. This critical awareness of creating a qualitative difference at every moment without having an ideal of in the horizon also entails the ability to empathise with all kind of lives (planet).

Techniques to enhance an ecology of thinking, learning and acting

One aspect is to design this process of the six P's. Another is to turn it into a craft of an action-learning process, using various non-functional techniques during the first year to intensify the vague and loose knowledge between often isolated roles and areas. The aim is develop an ecological way of thinking, learning and acting. Non-functional techniques or art-based methods constitute "the technique of living life in – experiencing the virtuality of it more fully, living it more intensely" (Massumi, 2011, p. 45). It is not possible to elaborate on all the non-functional techniques used in the action-learning process. Instead, we focus on the techniques that could be observed as having the most intense affect at the workshops and to which the participants refer repeatedly.

Intensifying the ecology of practices by walking and mapping experiences on a felt level

At the first workshop (People and Place), the leading question is "how to invite (even more) citizens to participate in the exploration of the local urban nature and to enhance life together and across roles, silos and organisations".

To move the point of observation from the idea of a pre-given, specific and isolated "target group" and to move away from the idea of one end product (e.g., the target group needs to be less stressed, sick, disabled, unemployed, lonely, etc.), we ask the cross-professional groups from every municipality to walk together in the local area (urban nature) before the workshop. When they join us at the workshop, we ask them to map the resources that they have experienced. By inviting them to walk and map the resources together, we first want to boost an aesthetic rationality. Our purpose is to invite them to begin to observe, feel and experience the extraordinary potentials of all people, things, materials and affects related to the area. From this point of departure, it becomes possible to combine the resources in new ways and thereby mix the more instrumental ideas of "target groups", "specific needs" and "outputs".

There are many approaches to cultural mapping (Duxbury, Garrett-Petts, & MacLennan, 2015; Evans et al., 2008). Whether art or digital data is used, the technique is designed to observe and create emergent community practices. To begin the process of engaging the cross-professional teams in observing and creating the emergent practices in and around urban nature, we use a picture of a city with metro lines and different resources (culture, nature, science, history, spaces, transport). We invite the participants to use the metro-map metaphor to observe the resources in and around their local area. Asking them to jointly draw a metro map of the resources underlines the resources as not just pre-given. Just as the pen is used to draw the lines on paper, the resources are in-the-making and something that we create together. They are in movement as well as the map is in movement. When the participants are walking around in the urban area drawing the lines they also intensifies the resources. It becomes possible to create a relation to them on a felt level and it becomes possible to see how different resources, objects, bodies and spaces are or could be intra-acting.

The resources on the map (the metro lines) can be specific. Where are people gathering? Where do they eat, have a picnic, play, sleep, work and walk? Where can empty places be observed? The resources can also be called "loose" knowledge (McCormack, 2012 citing Hin- chliffe et al., 2005: 648), understood as the experiences with the area on a felt level: What kinds of atmosphere can the teams register and where? Where do they experience the beauty of this particular local area? This can lead to more questions, such as where and how we can create more of this beauty in other areas of the city. What is the potential of this area of nature or this bench? Drawing and combing all these 'loose' expressions of resources can help the participants observe and draw new connections and talk about what kinds of combinations of materials, nature, affects and people they would like to intensify and how. To intensify the experience of this "loose" knowledge we inspire the participants to walk in silence for up to 30 minutes. Thereby the collective body can become even more sensitive towards the 'loose' and not yet articulated knowledge.

To pave the way for a shared responsibility for the area – and their map of resources – the next task is an invitation to reformulate their "problem" in a way that can transgress dichotomies, such as the municipality (the urban nature owner) versus the citizen (the consumer). One reformulation could be as follows. We present the problem: *We have unemployed people (who are stressed) as a target group, and we need to offer them an anti-stress activity in nature*. Inspired by the mapping of the resources, the cross-professional groups reformulate the challenge: *We want to create a safe place for "using urban nature as an opportunity to create healthy communities in every step"*. Thereby, health becomes less of an individual question (someone in poor health) in specific places and more of sharing the responsibility to intensify every action in/through the local urban nature. It intensifies belonging to a place by exploring interactions among nature, the place, people, politicians, materials, affects and so on.

A central point is that the process of mapping resources never ends. We urge the cross-professional groups to invite even more citizens to map the resources in the area, and we encourage them to do the mapping combined with actually walking in the area. Through these connections among mapping, walking together and talking about potential resources and activities, we emphasise their joint development of emerging practices by simply exploring and experimenting with how to create relations among people, materials, places, affects and potentialities in qualitatively better ways. To put it another way the mapping of resources is not about moving together in a maze from point A to B but about getting lost in the Labyrinth (Ingold 2013) and to experiencing the 'useless-ness' together. Massumi (2002) claims that there is an open potentiality in useless- ness: "Need and utility lead to self-same reproduction. Uselessness, on the other hand, lends itself to invention"

[emphasis added] (2002, p. 96) (in McLure 2013 p. 230). The useless-ness is about interventions affecting the body.

When we interview the participants about the experiences of the 'useless' walks in the urban nature, we observe how this is an intervention which intensify management of 'mental health' as emerging practices. It becomes a collective awareness of qualitatively difference of the smallest of the smallest micro-activity. One affect of this is that some of the cross-professional teams from the municipalities are beginning to meet in the local urban nature instead of the town hall. They are transforming formal meetings into informal meetings and events in nature.. When interviewed, they explain that this qualitatively difference facilitates new kinds of "soft" relations where ideas flow more freely. In nature, they forget their formal roles and begin to share and care for the urban nature area. They also plan less for future activities. Instead, they invite (more) citizens to their meetings and do activities together (e.g., preparing the fireplace and the hammocks, practising and improving the healthcare programme, etc.). Planning health programmes for the future is transformed into experiments with the mere quality of the activities. Learning emerges from "within" these actions and practices in/through the urban nature.

Local action

Before the cross-professional teams attend our second workshop (Participation and Peace), they had been asked to perform a local action in their municipality. It involved inviting citizens to walk in the urban nature area, experience the resources and map their experiences on a felt level. At this second workshop, the cross-professional groups share their experiences about this local action and often share narratives about how this creates deeper and unexpected knowledge about the place.

For example, one professional has invited both local politicians and unemployed people experiencing stress to walk around and explore a specific urban area. A local politician talks about all the grand plans for the area (e.g., a large site for eagles), aiming to attract more families and eventually make them want to live there. This conversation leads to an unexpected action. A citizen slowly takes the politician's arm and shows him a spot in that area, where she would like a bench placed away from the open space. She unfolds her story about needing a quiet place to feel the silence and feel more grounded. This walk – and this experience of the quiet place – is the first passage for them to share and care for the felt experiences of the place, the people and the activities. Politics becomes life politics, a thought in the act (Manning & Massumi, 2014). It also calls for a reflexion about the importance of not just walking and mapping the resources on a felt level at one time. The process needs to continue, and the cross-professional groups should constantly be aware of how to invite different kinds of people and create safe places, making it possible for "weaker voices" to participate.

Smallest tango dance

After sharing this kind of conversation about the local actions at the workshop, we invite the cross-professional groups to explore the word *participation* as an emerging, ongoing and self-generative process. It offers them an experience that illustrates the theoretical point about affective co-motions. We want them to experience how the mere quality of the relation (the affect) is able to generate new qualitative and better affects. We want to do an activity that emphasises participation as not just an exchange of ideas and dreams or to ask the citizens to vote for a specific plan or an idea on how to

design the urban area. Participation is less about transferring information and more about transmitting a quality of the relation. Informed by the affective studies, this can create potential new actions.

To illustrate this point, we invite all participants to the floor to experience "the world's smallest tango dance". In pairs, they are instructed to put their fingertips together, close their eyes or look at one spot in the room. One person in each pair is asked to control the fingers, while the other follows. After two minutes, they switch roles. Sometimes, we invite them to switch partners and do it again to feel the difference in the quality of the movements. We issue the last creative constraint: "Now we don't know who is in control and who follows. You need to feel the smallest of the smallest movement in the moment and explore how to impact the movement". Next, we ask them questions, such as "Do you know that kind of experience when you work together in the group and with the citizens? How is that experience? What is the effect? How can you see it?"

Some of them experience that if they are really present in the moment, the movements between them emerge as an intense dance, where it is difficult to determine who is in control. The collective body moves and looks for qualitatively better movements. The participants never know when the process begins or ends. It is an endless dance or rather, the emergence of an ecology, not knowing what it can become.

When we interview the cross-professional teams, weeks after the end of the project, one outcome of this process is their increased awareness of how the smallest of the smallest movements in the moment creates a difference for participation and commitment. A citizen expresses it as follows:

> *Before, I was very engaged in the health programme, moving from one planned activity and goal to the next when we were walking in the local woods. Now, I have another kind of awareness. I am curious about the small poetic moments. What kind of activity can help me to get Torben to come back again next Tuesday. How to prevent him to drive home in his garage and stay there: Is it the fireplace, the coffee – or is it us walking side by side or maybe us chopping wood?*

What seems intensified is the awareness of how the quality of the relation can pave the way for an emerging ecology of thinking, learning and acting. The citizen observes himself as responsible for co-existing with the other citizens in this specific place. He is aware that the smallest of the smallest moment of the experiences with e.g. the wood, the mud, the other participants and the food can be an opportunity to think, learn and act in a qualitatively different way.

Concluding reflexions

There are many potential bottom lines in this way of engaging people to intensify and multiply an emerging ecology of thinking, learning and acting, including the following:
1) People begin to share resources on a felt level in/through urban nature (e.g., walking, drinking coffee, chopping wood, making fire, growing gardens, etc.).
2) It enhances more flat ways of organising and collaborating (e.g., informal meeting in nature).

3) It creates a specific urban place through collaborative practices (e.g., wild woods become a place for senior men).
4) Interacting with urban nature creates climate awareness (e.g., How can I do more of these green activities?).
5) It turns the place into an attractive 'space' that can draw even more resources (e.g., empty spaces emerging as common places creating space for gardens, pausing, walking together).

What seems more interesting is the way that the WHO's six P's can be worked into a craft of action-learning research that enhances an ecology of thinking, learning and acting where people, places, nature and materials co-exist in qualitatively better ways. Using the six P's as a way to understand sustainability as public value/entrepreneurship can be interpreted as the capability to critically re-assemblage our intra-actions between between bodies, non-human, nature and affects through craftwork.

The craftwork is made possible by a hybrid network of components (the Ps). The craftsperson uses the technique (e.g., hammering), the material (e.g., wood) and his/her profession (e.g., theoretical and institutionalised knowledge and experience) in a value-creation process where these components and their potentials and tendencies meet and their interactions and connections are explored. How can the hammer affect the wood? What extraordinary potential of the wood affects the hammering? How does/is the theoretical knowledge affect/affected by the process? Every action in the craftwork process moves between what is (the actual) and could be (the potential) a new action. Thereby, every action creates a new action and a new landing field for more actions. If the craftwork process has a high and professional quality, the ecological process of thinking, learning and acting will not stop when the 'product' is created. People will use the chair or the house, and the ecology of thinking, learning and acting will continue.

The action research process of sustainabilising can be understood as this kind of process moving between the known and the unknown potentials of the components' interactions. The six P's and thereby the cross-professional groups, the place, the participation and the value of the process constantly interact, with the aim of creating an emerging ecology of practices and of belonging and co-existing lives. It creates a field of actions, what Strengers would call a 'milieu' without an horizon.

Critical reflexions

We also need to mention some critical reflexions. If the managers are not part of the cross-professional groups, this kind of work seems to create a "hyper-responsibility" (Andersen & Knudsen, 2016). The employees participating in the process constantly need to deliver performance indicators to the formal organisation, showing how this kind of work produces public value (understood as output of a more linear process), while trying to facilitate an ecology of emerging practices. This is experienced as "very difficult" and "stressful". Another barrier in the process can be the quality of urban nature. For example, in one municipality, the wild woods are too harsh to intra-act with, and the citizens (primarily senior men) have not returned to meet again in that area. Finally, some of the cross-professional groups think that it is too difficult to let go of their own idea. They need to "plan and control" the workshop's "specific output" in the local nature, which works as a "stop operation". The citizens are neither invited to experience a sense of belonging and co-existence nor take responsibility for further actions in the area. Intensifying an ecology of thinking, learning and acting entails an awareness of the interactions among these kinds of components. It is

about the ability to become a 'crafts-humanship' constantly being sensitive to not only the different components such as people and places, and to how to combine them but also sensitive towards the affective, useless, vague and loose knowledge: The real felt rationality of beauty.

References

Andersen, N. Å., & Thygesen, N. T. (2004). Styringsteknologier i den selvudsatte organisation. *Tidsskriftet Grus*, *25*(73), 8–29.

Ansell, C. & Torfing, J. (2014): Public Innovation Through Collaboration and Design. Routledge. New York.

Barad, K. (2007). Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. duke university Press.

Beyes, T., & Steyaert, C. (2012). Spacing organization: Non-representational theory and performing organizational space. *Organization*, *19*(1), 45–61.

Duxbury, N., Garrett-Petts, W. F., & MacLennan, D. (2015). Cultural mapping as cultural inquiry: Introduction to an emerging field of practice. In *Cultural mapping as cultural inquiry* (pp. 19–60). Routledge.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balough, S. (2011). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22(1): 1-29.

Evans, G., & Foord, J. (2008). Cultural mapping and sustainable communities: Planning for the arts revisited. Cultural Trends, 17(2), 65–96.

Cato, M. S., & Myers, J. (2010). Education as re-embedding: Stroud communiversity, walking the land and the enduring spell of the sensuous. Sustainability, 3(1), 51-68.

Guthey, G. T., Whiteman, G., & Elmes, M. (2014). Place and sense of place: Implications for organizational studies of sustainability. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *23*(3), 254–265.

Hardt, M. &Negri, A. (2017): *Assembly*. Oxford University Press. United States of America.

Hartley, J. Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2013): Collaborative Innovation: A Viable Alternative to Market Competition and Organizational Entrepreneurship. Public Administration Review. 73(6): 821-830.

Handlingsplan for FN's verdensmål – Danmarks opfølgning på FN's verdensmål for bæredygtig udvikling (2017). Udenrigsministeriet.

Hildebrandt, Steen. (2016). *Bæredygtig Global Udvikling*. Jurist- og Økonomiforbundetsforlag. København

Hjorth, D. (2005). Organizational entrepreneurship: With de Certeau on creating heterotopias (or spaces for play). *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *14*(4), 386–398.

Hjorth, D. (2013). Public entrepreneurship: Desiring social change, creating sociality. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *25*(1–2), 34–51.

Komiyama, H., & Takeuchi, K. (2006). Sustainability science: Building a new discipline.

Li, M., & Lin, K. (2011). A new paradigm of organizational transformation: Enacting wholeness praxis in the oneness of problem and possibility. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, *24*(2), 107–132.

Manning, E., & Massumi, B. (2014). *Thought in the act: Passages in the ecology of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.

Massumi, B. (2002a). Movement, affect, sensation.

Massumi, B. (2002b). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Duke University Press.

Massumi, B (2008): "The Thinking-Feeling of What Happens" 3 Inflexions 1.1 "How is Research-Creation?" www.inflexions.org

Massumi, B (2011): " Semblance and Event: Activist Philosophy and the Occurrent Arts". MIT Press

McCormack, D. (2012). Geography and abstraction: Towards an affirmative critique. *Progress in Human Geography*, *36*(6), 715–734.

MacLure, M. (2013). The wonder of data. Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies, 13(4), 228-232.

Plotnikof, M (2015): Challenges of Collaborative Governance, An Organizational Discourse Study of Public Managers' Struggles with Collaboration across the Daycare Area. 1st edition 2015 PhD Series 26.2015

Raelin, J. A. (2018). What are you afraid of: Collective leadership and its learning implications. *Management Learning*, *49*(1), 59–66.

Shrivastava, P., Schumacher, G., Wasieleski, D. M., & Tasic, M. (2017). Aesthetic rationality in organizations: Toward developing a sensitivity for sustainability. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *53*(3), 369–411.

Stengers, I. (2005). Introductory notes on an ecology of practices. *Cultural Studies Review*, *11*(1), 183–196.

Steyaert, C., & Katz, J. (2004). Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *16*(3), 179–196.

Thain, A. (2008). Affective commotion. *Inflexions: A Journal of Research-Creation*, *1*

Thrift, N. (2008): *Non-representational theory: Space, politics, affect.* Routledge.

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). Our common future. Oxford: Oxford University Press.