

# Postdisciplinary Knowledge

*Postdisciplinary Knowledge* is the first book to articulate postdisciplinarity in philosophical, theoretical and methodological terms, helping to establish it as an important intellectual movement of the twenty-first century. It formulates what postdisciplinarity is, and how it can be implemented in research practice.

The diverse chapters present a rich collection of highly creative thought-provoking essays and methodological insights. Written by a number of pioneering intellectuals with a range of backgrounds and research foci, these chapters cover a broad spectrum of areas demonstrating alternative ways of producing knowledge. Essays are interspersed with dialogue, encouraging a comprehensive and engaging discussion on this emerging movement.

Not limited to a specific field or discipline, this will be of great interest to upper-level students and researchers in a wide range of subject areas, including: tourism, sociology, education, psychology, physiotherapy, fine arts, architecture and design, as well as those with a general interest in epistemology and methodology.

**Tomas Pernecky** is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Culture and Society at the Auckland University of Technology (AUT), New Zealand. He is mainly interested in the way social realities are constructed, and the implication and possibilities this denotes for different peoples. His research is broad and multifaceted, ranging from the philosophy of science to specific areas of phenomenology, social constructionism, post-existentialism, sustainable leadership and a host of conceptual, theoretical and methodological issues examined in the context of events, tourism and leisure. Tomas has been officially recognised by receiving the 2014 Vice Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching, and the subsequent nomination by AUT for the 2015 Tertiary Teaching Excellence Award (TTEA). He is the author of *Epistemology and Metaphysics for Qualitative Research* (2016).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# Postdisciplinary Knowledge

Edited by Tomas Pernecky

First published 2020  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge  
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2020 selection and editorial matter, Tomas Pernecky; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Tomas Pernecky to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-0-367-17941-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-05856-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman  
by codeMantra

# Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xv
<b>An unintroduction to postdisciplinarity</b>	<b>1</b>
TOMAS PERNECKY	
<b>PART I</b>	
<b>Being. Thinking. Doing.</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>1 At the periphery lies the centre: women artists and the legacy of surrealism – the case of Ithell Colquhoun and Camille Billops</b>	<b>25</b>
BARBARA LEKATSAS	
<b>2 Undisciplined thinking: disobedience and the nature of design</b>	<b>48</b>
WELBY INGS	
<b>3 Transscape theory for designing the invisible</b>	<b>66</b>
CHIKAHIRO HANAMURA	
<b>4 Desire as a way of knowing</b>	<b>84</b>
ANA MARÍA MUNAR AND LONNI HALL	
<b>5 White leaves in front of my window</b>	<b>97</b>
NINETTE ROTHMÜLLER AND FRASER STABLES	
<b>6 Knowledge as play: centring on what matters</b>	<b>115</b>
TOMAS PERNECKY AND LOIS HOLZMAN	

**PART II**

**Doing. Thinking. Being.** 135

**7 Do, learn, do** 137

FRITH WALKER

**8 DiY (do-it-yourself) postdisciplinary knowledge** 149

EMIT SNAKE-BEINGS AND ANDREW GIBBONS

**9 Q Methodology, William Stephenson and postdisciplinarity** 165

CLAIRE GAUZENTE AND JAMES M. M. GOOD

**PART III**

**Thinking. Being. Doing.** 183

**10 On walls and webs: contemplating postdisciplinarity** 185

KELLEE CATON AND DAVID J. HILL

**11 The university as a maquila: whose voices, whose ideas,  
whose knowledges?** 200

MARLENE M. FERRERAS, DUANE R. BIDWELL  
AND TOMAS PERNECKY

**12 After the love has gone: generalists, specialists and  
post-professional healthcare** 215

DAVID A. NICHOLLS

**13 Postdisciplinarity: imagine the future, think the unthinkable** 235

FRÉDÉRIC DARBELLAY

*Index* 251

# Illustrations

## Figures

1.1	<i>Dervish</i> by Ithell Colquhoun, c. 1952	33
1.2	<i>Winter Tree</i> by Ithell Colquhoun, 1977	34
1.3	<i>The Pine Family</i> by Ithell Colquhoun, 1940	35
1.4	Camille Billops from <i>The Story of Mom</i> , 1986	38
1.5	<i>Smoke and Blue</i> by Camille Billops, 1988	39
1.6	<i>For Japanese with Mirrors</i> by Camille Billops, 1975	39
1.7	Camille Billops from <i>The Story of Mom</i> (Ceramic sculpture, 1981)	41
1.8	Production still from the documentary film <i>Suzanne, Suzanne</i> directed by Camille Billops and James Hatch, 1982	43
2.1	Comparative relationships between disciplinary and nondisciplinary models	51
2.2	Interactive page from Tatiana Tavares' illustrated augmented reality (AR) picture book, <i>Saints of Paradox</i>	54
2.3	The Mother of Compassion, The Father of Orthodoxy and the Father of Realism	55
2.4	Image in potentia and three interpretations	55
2.5	Ross Brannigan performing <i>Foolish Prating Knave</i> in Auckland New Zealand (July 2018)	57
2.6	The intermedial play <i>Foolish Prating Knave</i>	58
2.7	Frame grabs from the <i>Heart of Spring</i>	60
3.1	The relationship that creates a landscape	67
3.2	The effect of transscaping on the subject-object (viewer-place) relationship	68
3.3	A manhole cover	69
3.4	A manhole cover after transscaping with the addition of small figures	70
3.5	' <i>San-zon-seki</i> : three holy stones' in a Japanese garden	71
3.6	Recycling bin ghost	72
3.7	<i>A Sheep's Pride</i>	73
3.8	<i>A Witches' Meeting</i>	73

viii *Illustrations*

3.9	Installation on <i>The Fourth Nature</i> walking path	75
3.10	Fake flowers installed on <i>The Fourth Nature</i> walking path	75
3.11	Combining target (subject or object) with approach (physical or psychological) to produce four methods for transscape design	76
3.12	<i>Shining Spring after Clearing Fog</i> – bubbles released from the ceiling of the hospital atrium	79
3.13	<i>Shining Spring after Clearing Fog</i> – artificial fog rising up from the floor of the hospital atrium	79
3.14	Children watching the exhibition at Osaka City University Hospital	80
3.15	Patients watching the exhibition at Osaka City University Hospital	80
3.16	Staff and patients watching the exhibition at Osaka City University Hospital	81
5.1	<i>Reality Fighting, Mohegan Sun (audience)</i> , 2015	100
5.2	<i>El Salvador Gangs</i> , 2013	103
5.3	<i>Reality Fighting, Mohegan Sun (fighter)</i> , 2015	104
5.4	<i>Must be Autumn Now</i> , 2018	105
5.5	<i>Boardwalk, Taj Mahal, Atlantic City</i> , 2017	112
7.1	Movie goers in Silo Park, Auckland, New Zealand	144
7.2	Local residents enjoying food from food trucks at Silo Park, Auckland	144
8.1	DiY electronics	152
8.2	DiY stool	154
8.3	DiY footwear	156
8.4	DiY repurposed plastic drink bottle	156
8.5	DiY repurposed plastic drink bottle at a fruit market in Kathmandu	157
13.1	Graduated progression	238
13.2	Circle of knowledge production	239
13.3	Scenarios	242

**Tables**

I.1	Open vocabulary for postdisciplinary research	15
9.1	Table of aesthetic orientations	176

# Contributors

**Duane R. Bidwell**, PhD, a member of the Taos Institute board of directors, serves as professor of practical theology, spiritual care and counselling at Claremont School of Theology, where he also serves as accreditation liaison officer. Duane is a clinical Fellow of the American Association of Pastoral Counsellors and a senior staff clinician and supervisor at The Clinebell Institute for Pastoral Counselling and Psychotherapy in California. His teaching, advising and research reflect narrative, constructionist and competency-based approaches to relationships. His most recent book is *When One Religion Isn't Enough: The Lives of Spiritually Fluid People* (Beacon, 2018).

**Kellee Caton** is a sociocultural theorist and applied philosopher in the Faculty of Adventure, Culinary Arts, and Tourism at Thompson Rivers University (TRU), in British Columbia, Canada. Together with Ana María Munar, she coordinates the Critical Tourism Studies (CTS) network, an international group of scholars working for social change in and through tourism research, education and practice. She is also co-founder of CTS' young North American regional chapter. Kellee sits on the editorial board of several journals in tourism studies, including the *Annals of Tourism Research*, and serves as part of the executive team of the Tourism Education Futures Initiative. Her research focusses on how we come to know tourism as a sociocultural phenomenon, and also on how we come to know and reshape the world through tourism – in particular, she is interested in the moral dimensions of these two interrelated epistemic processes. Her recent projects include work on the role of tourism in ideological production in educational and religious tourism contexts, conceptual analyses of knowledge advancement processes, philosophical projects on the value of humanism for tourism, and advocacy projects for the inclusion of humanities content in tourism curricula. She is also passionate about teaching research and social theory courses to TRU's wonderful undergraduate students.

**Frédéric Darbellay** is an associate professor at the University of Geneva (Valais Campus) and Head of Inter- and Transdisciplinarity Unit in the

Centre for Children's Rights Studies. His research focusses on the study of interdisciplinarity as a creative process of knowledge production between and beyond disciplines. He is the author of several publications on the theory and practice of inter- and transdisciplinarity through multiple scientific fields in higher education. Among his main (authored and co-edited) books are *Interdisciplinarité et Transdisciplinarité en Analyse des Discours*, Slatkine, 2005; *Le Défi de l'Inter- et Transdisciplinarité*, PPUR, 2008; *A Vision of Transdisciplinarity. Laying Foundations for a World Knowledge Dialogue*, EPFL Press/CRC Press, 2008; *Repenser l'Interdisciplinarité*, Slatkine, 2010; *Common Knowledge: The Challenge of Transdisciplinarity*, EPFL Press/CRC Press, 2011; *La Circulation des Savoirs: Interdisciplinarité, Concepts Nomades, Analogies, Métaphores*, Peter Lang, 2012; *L'interdisciplinarité racontée. Chercher hors frontières, vivre l'interculturalité*, Peter Lang, 2014; *La recherche interdisciplinaire sous la loupe. Paroles de chercheurs*, Peter Lang, 2016 and *Creativity, Design Thinking and Interdisciplinarity*, Springer, 2017.

**Marlene M. Ferreras**, PhD, is a graduate of Claremont School of Theology in practical theology, spiritual care and counselling. She is an associate member of the Taos Institute and assistant professor of practical theology at La Sierra University.

**Claire Gauzente** is a professor of Management Science at the University of Nantes (France). Her research interests include the methodological underpinnings of human subjectivity study as well as the intertwining between social sciences and artistic research. She is the principal investigator of Q-Connect, a research programme that focuses on the added-value of digital traces for the study of subjectivity. Academic contributions have been published in reference journals such as *Operant Subjectivity*, *Nouvelles de l'Estampe*, *International Journal of Arts Management* and *Journal of Artists' Books*.

**Andrew Gibbons** is an early childhood teacher educator and Associate Professor at the School of Education. He has worked in journalism, in the social services in England and in early childhood education in Auckland. He has published widely on topics including the early childhood teaching profession, Aotearoa New Zealand early childhood education policy, approaches to early childhood curriculum, the educational implications of the work of Albert Camus, the philosophy of education and the philosophy of technology in education.

**James M. M. Good** is an Honorary Fellow in the Department of Psychology, Durham University, UK. His research interests include the impact of American pragmatist philosophy on the development of mutualist thought in the human sciences, the dual disciplinary heritage of social psychology, ecological approaches to cognition and the history, theory and practice of Q Methodology. He has co-edited *The Recovery of*

*Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences* (with Richard H. Roberts, Classical Press, 1993) and *The Politics of Post-modernity* (with Irving Velody, Cambridge University Press, 1998), and is the author of numerous articles on a variety of aspects of the history and theory of psychology, Q Methodology, social affordances and the psychology of music. He was Editor of *History of the Human Sciences* (2000–2014) and currently edits *Operant Subjectivity: The International Journal of Q Methodology*.

**Lonni Hall** is an associate professor, PhD in the Center of Leadership and Leisure Management at University College Absalon, Denmark. Her work focusses on public leadership. Lonni is especially interested in affective leadership and in how desire has a performative impact on the leadership that emerges in specific events. Lonni holds a MA in Philosophy from Copenhagen University. She is philosophical advisor at the University of Oslo/Norwegian Society for Philosophical Practice and an established painter. She has published several books and articles on leadership, as well as contributed to different anthologies with chapters on Gilles Deleuze, affectivity, leadership and philosophy.

**Chikahiro Hanamura** is an associate professor of the Graduate School of Economics at Osaka Prefecture University. Chikahiro completed his PhD in environmental science and worked at landscape design office as a designer from 2002 to 2005. From 2005 to 2010, he was a researcher at the Center for Study of Communication Design (CSCD) at Osaka University. His initial focus on landscape architecture and environmental science has expanded, through communication with philosophy and contemporary art, to cultural studies in the fields of tourism and religion studies. His work focusses mainly on the design between human perception and environment. He is a landscape artist, a design scientist and sometimes an actor in films and on stage. He is also the CEO of Bricolage Foundation – an organisation dedicated to social innovation in contemporary art. His recent book *Design of Perspective* introduces his ideas about transscape theory.

**David J. Hill** is an associate professor in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Thompson Rivers University. He received his MS and PhD in Environmental Engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2001 and 2007, respectively. His research interests centre on the integration of natural resource management, computer science and sensing technology to solve problems that impact public health, safety and well-being. Recent projects have explored cyberinfrastructure to enable adaptive management of environmental resource systems, real-time quality control of streams of heterogeneous environmental sensor data, crowd-sourced and ubiquitous sensing of the environment, and applications of the Internet of things

(IoT) and unpiloted aerial vehicle (UAV)-based remote sensing for environmental resource management. He serves on the editorial board of the *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* as an expert in emerging technology and is the proud founder of the GeoX Lab at TRU, where he mentors his creative band of inventors and technophiles – his graduate students – as they work collectively to apply technology to environmental science and management problems.

**Lois Holzman** received her PhD in developmental psychology and psycholinguistics from Columbia University. Lois founded the East Side Institute for Group and Short Term Psychotherapy in the 1980s with philosopher, therapist and activist Fred Newman. She is its current director. With Newman, she developed Social Therapeutics as a methodology in which human development and community development are inseparable, and linked to play, performance and practical philosophy. Lois is also a founder and the chair of the biennial Performing the World conferences, which support the emerging social change approach known as performance activism. As a leading proponent of postmodern, activity-theoretic, cultural approaches to human learning and development, she has brought the ideas of Lev Vygotsky to the fields of psychotherapy, organisational and community development, in addition to their traditional location with education. Among her books are *Vygotsky at Work and Play* and *The Overweight Brain: How Our Obsession with Knowing Keeps Us from Getting Smart Enough to Make a Better World*. For more information, visit <http://loisholzman.org/>.

**Welby Ings** is a professor in Design at AUT University. He holds a PhD in applied narratology and is an elected Fellow of the British Royal Society of Arts. In 1997, he established New Zealand's first postdisciplinary Master's Degree in Art & Design and his current research navigates trajectories across linguistics, typography, public policy, education and visual communication design. Welby is also a multi-award-winning illustrator, filmmaker and author. In 2002, he received the New Zealand Prime Minister's award for Tertiary Teaching Excellence and, in 2013, the inaugural AUT University medal for his research and teaching. He has in publication over 50 books, book chapters or research articles that are accessible here: <https://www.aut.ac.nz/profiles/welby-ings>.

**Barbara Lekatsas** is a professor of Comparative Literature at Hofstra University (New York), where she was also curator for many years of the Weingrow Collection of Avant-Garde Art and Literature. She teaches in the Department of Comparative Literature, Languages and Linguistics and specialises in literary and art movements. She has also been affiliated with the Hatch-Billops Collection of African-American Culture (now housed at Emory University). Her recent publications include: *Will Barnet and Bob Blackburn: An Artistic Friendship in Relief* (reprint),

*South Writ Large: Stories, Arts and Ideas for the Global South (No. 25)* (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Winter 2018); ‘Freud and Aristotle Read Sophocles’ *Oedipus: The Dramatic and Philosophical Roots of Psychoanalysis*, *An Anthology of Philosophical Studies, Vol. 11* (Athens, Greece: ATINER, 2017); ‘André Breton’, *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, 2nd Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014); *La pensée de midi: Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism in the Work of Camus, Cavafy, and Chahine, Alif 34: World Literature: Perspectives and Debates* (American University in Cairo, 2014). Her current research is focussed on the work of American Surrealist artist, David Hare.

**Ana María Munar** is an associate professor and Director of the Center for Leisure and Culture Services at Copenhagen Business School (CBS), Denmark. With research interests in epistemology, higher education, gender and digital technologies, her latest publications focus on postdisciplinarity, social media and gender in academia. Over the years, Ana has served on several national and international boards and networks such as the Diversity and Inclusion Council and the Diversity and Difference Platform at CBS, the Critical Tourism Studies Network, Women Academics in Tourism and several academic journals.

**David A. Nicholls** is an associate professor in the School of Clinical Sciences, AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand. He is a physiotherapist, lecturer, researcher and writer, with a passion for critical thinking in and around the physical therapies. David is the founder of the Critical Physiotherapy Network, an organisation that promotes the use of cultural studies, education, history, philosophy, sociology and a range of other disciplines in the study of the profession’s past, present and future. David’s own research work focusses on the critical history of physiotherapy and considers how physiotherapy might need to adapt to the changing economy of health care in the twenty-first century. He has published more than 35 peer-reviewed articles and 17 book chapters, many as first author. He is also very active on social media, writing more than 600 blog posts for [criticalphysio.net](http://criticalphysio.net) in the last four years. David has taught in physiotherapy programmes in the UK and New Zealand for over 25 years and has presented his work all around the world. *The End of Physiotherapy* – the first book-length critical history of physiotherapy, and written by David – was published by Routledge in 2017.

**Tomas Pernecky** is an associate professor in the Faculty of Culture and Society at the AUT, New Zealand. He is mainly interested the way social realities are constructed, and the implication and possibilities this denotes for different peoples. His research is broad and multifaceted, ranging from the philosophy of science to specific areas of phenomenology, social constructionism, post-existentialism, sustainable leadership and a host of conceptual, theoretical and methodological issues examined in

the context of events, tourism and leisure. Tomas has been officially recognised by receiving the 2014 Vice Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching, and the subsequent nomination by AUT for the 2015 TTEA. He is the author of *Epistemology and Metaphysics for Qualitative Research*, published by SAGE in 2016.

**Ninette Rothmüller** is currently a visiting scholar at the Department of Dance at Smith College in the USA. Operating between various languages and socio-political landscapes, during recent years she has worked and collaborated in Iceland, France, Czech Republic, USA and Germany. Rothmüller is interested in investigating the permeability between academic and artistic practices with the aim of establishing a dynamic conversation between both, which is inclusive to diverse voices. Her practice-led research is informed by philosophical contemplations by, for example, Hannah Arendt, Albert Camus, or Giorgio Agamben. Rothmüller's artistic practice is concerned with social justice and is participatory as well as site-sensitive, oftentimes investigating the borderlands of joint human existence through embodied knowledge-production processes. Rothmüller's forthcoming publication *Turfing, Desire Pathing and Modes of Remembrance and Creative Citizenship under Surveillance* examines the world-making potential of vernacular dances, cross reading these with philosophical thought.

**Emit Snake-Beings** is an educator and researcher in ethnographic film, journalism and interactive media. He works in a variety of practice-led research modalities and actively engaged learning pedagogies. His PhD was awarded through the examination of creative strategies and workshop processes of DiY (do-it-yourself) ArtScience practitioners. His other research areas – experimental sound, techno-animism and collaborative art practice – are documented at [www.snakebeings.org](http://www.snakebeings.org).

**Fraser Stables** is a Scottish artist, currently living and working in the USA where he is a professor of Art at Smith College. Stables works in photography and video, using conventions of documentary and performance to explore the construction of narrative and identity. Stables has exhibited in museums and galleries in the USA, Canada and Europe, and he was an artist in residence at the Core Program (Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, TX). He is a co-director of Atopia Projects, an independent curatorial and publishing organisation based in Iceland and the USA. Stables' work is represented by Georgia Scherman Projects in Toronto, Canada.

**Frith Walker** is the manager of Place Making, Panuku Development Auckland, New Zealand. She works within the Design & Place Directorate on the creation of successful public space networks, supporting the programming and activation of our public spaces, and championing the difference a healthy public realm can make in terms of creating liveable cities.

# Acknowledgements

I wish to thank, first and foremost, all the contributors to this edited volume for finding the time to share their thoughts on, and express passion for, postdisciplinarity. I would also like to acknowledge the growing community of creative, innovative and disobedient thinkers who have supported this project and other events and publications over the past years. My gratitude goes equally to Trish Brothers, who assisted with copy editing parts of this text in the initial stages, and to Emma Travis and Lydia Kessell at Routledge for their help and commitment to the book. Finally, I thank the reader for picking up *Postdisciplinary Knowledge* and exploring what it has to offer.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# **An unintroduction to postdisciplinarity**

*Tomas Pernecky*

It seemed inevitable to commence this edited collection of creative thought by un-introducing postdisciplinarity; doing otherwise would undermine the entire project from the outset. The conundrum presented itself as a nudging question: how does one write an introduction to something that, in its diverse expression, is open, unbounded and unrestricted? Introductory chapters, especially in edited texts, tend to be the authoritative springboards. Their function is to launch the reader into a pool of knowledge carefully filled with words and ideas by thinkers whose hope, in turn, is that a few make it to their waters and become invigorated, provoked and perhaps even shaken into action. Academic writing, therefore, aside from performing a solely rational function, is an expressive act of voicing, choosing, caring, sharing and reaching out. It stems from an intricate blend of the writer's resonance with certain viewpoints, philosophies, lived experiences, values and dilemmas – all of which contribute to making the pool – or this book – a 'space' in which one can buoyantly extend oneself.

In the attempt to get around the issue of providing only one point of entry, it became essential to free the reader from a prescribed mode of comprehension. However, starting with an un-introduction does not mean that the chapter has to be devoid of discussions of the ways in which postdisciplinarity can be approached and understood; it is more appropriately envisaged as a deliberate, symbolic gesture that says that postdisciplinarity does not belong to any single person or an elite group. It advances, invites, transforms and expands through the work of those who contribute to it. Thus, there can never be an accurate, exact or complete primer to postdisciplinarity. The proposition being made here is to resist the urge to rely on any single one definition and to continue with a sense of openness.

The term 'postdisciplinarity', despite making a more frequent appearance in academic scholarship, is often accompanied with hesitation and uncertainty about what exactly it entails. The present chapter, and the text at large, strives to lessen this burden by advancing and further developing the understandings of postdisciplinarity. But the book does not seek to provide finite answers. This is due to several positive predicaments: (1) the scope and commitment of postdisciplinary-minded thinkers is too wide and varied;

(2) there are no clear criteria for membership; and (3) there is no structure or official body to do the kind of ‘policing’ common in disciplinary settings. The overarching goal of this chapter is to examine the developments and influences that have shaped postdisciplinarity, and to loosely organise these thematically to make the foray into postdisciplinarity less daunting. The chapter is divided into five sections: the first maps the beginnings that have led to this project; the second situates postdisciplinarity in a paradigmatic discourse and explains why it is not a paradigm; the third, and also the largest, suggests four strains of emerging postdisciplinary scholarship; the fourth offers a selection of terms for postdisciplinary research; and the fifth is an outline of the contributions that make up this book.

### **Multiple beginnings**

A story of postdisciplinarity can be aligned with different figures, movements and problems, and it can also be told through a technical, philosophical, methodological, political or artistic narrative. Where it begins depends on whether we trace postdisciplinarity to the word itself; to articulations of what it ought to do or not do; to concepts such as ‘freedom’ and ‘openness’; to ideals about learning; or, more broadly, to the creative and imaginative capacity of the human being. Accordingly, one can adopt a structured approach and search databases for the first time the term was mentioned, or trace certain ideas to thinkers and revolutionaries of the past, or look for commonalities in the journeys of those who have sought to make contributions through painting, sculpture, poetry, performance and literary works. The story of postdisciplinarity thus becomes many, with each adding a layer of richness and complexity.

To situate this text, it is imperative to note that there have been several gatherings connected with this project. The first conference, named ‘Welcoming Encounters: Tourism Research in a Postdisciplinary Era’, was chaired by William Feighery and hosted at the Institute of Ethnology, University of Neuchatel, Switzerland (19–22 June 2013). It was the first of its kind in the field of tourism studies, and possibly the first in the world to focus on this topic – providing an opportunity to discuss the implications and possibilities of emerging postdisciplinary thought in the context of tourism (e.g. Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2016; Hollinshead, 2010, 2012). The second conference was hosted by the Copenhagen Business School in Denmark (22–24 June 2015) and sought contributions that addressed postdisciplinarity in relation to the topics of freedom, art and power. Subsequently, the 3rd International Conference on Postdisciplinary Approaches was held at the Auckland University of Technology in New Zealand (2–5 February 2018). This event centred around the notion that knowledge can be a disobedient, heuristic and creative endeavour, and manifests in multiple ways – extending to Indigenous perspectives vis-à-vis oral literature, art and performance.<sup>1</sup>

The discussions and themes of the first conference were gathered in a special issue of *Tourism Analysis* (Munar, Pernecky, & Feighery, 2016). Among the key areas of interest were: (1) the critique of traditional universities failing to prepare students to become critical and literary global citizens; (2) the acknowledgement of postdisciplinarity as a deeper, critical concern about knowledge production and dissemination; (3) the widespread misconception of postdisciplinarity as motivated by the utter demise of disciplinary knowledge; and (4) the endorsement of epistemological, semantic and methodological flexibility, which can manifest not only through pluralist and constructionist approaches, but also through the use of reflexive methodologies, visual methods and emic approaches (for a summary, see Pernecky, Munar, & Feighery, 2016). Overall, the ongoing efforts of these initiatives were to create a space within which disciplines and fields of study could exercise intellectual freedom without the restrictions imposed by disciplines.

Before we go any further, a caveat shall be put in place: a common approach to delineating postdisciplinarity has been to differentiate it from disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, trans-disciplinary, anti-disciplinary, and other systems of organising knowledge. This inclination is resisted here, for it has been accomplished elsewhere (including in some of the chapters in this book), and there is now a growing body of literature dedicated to these strands (e.g. Akcesme, Baktir, & Steele, 2016; Bruce, Lyall, Tait, & Williams, 2004; Coles et al., 2006; Frodeman, 2017; Menand, 2001; Mourad, 1997; Ostreng, 2010; Pernecky, 2016; Ramadier, 2004; Rosenfield, 1992; Stember, 1991), as well as works that have examined progress and achievements in different fields (Coles et al., 2016; Lawrence, 2015) and suggestions for overcoming some of the methodological pitfalls. In what follows, we shall be motivated less by normative incentives and more by further advancing and developing postdisciplinary scholarship.

## **Making sense of postdisciplinarity**

### *Let's dance!*

The task of rendering postdisciplinarity in its moments of unfolding – as it takes hold of thinkers, researchers and practitioners, some of whom may have outgrown or perhaps never felt like they belonged to a neatly organised field of study or a discipline, but also those who are still working within a disciplinary setting – is as challenging as putting into words the movement of dancers taking the stage to perform somewhat atypical choreographies. It becomes instantly obvious that the performance is not a prescribed set of movements but a form of expression underpinned by what each perpetrator considers important, relevant, useful, previously unexplored and necessary.

Drawing on the metaphor of dance is helpful also in understanding that postdisciplinarity may question given conceptions, rules and expectations that tend to standardise and hegemonise. Put in academic terms, it is an

invitation to ontological, epistemological and methodological probing. As articulated by Pernecky, Munar, and Wheeler (2016),

it extends to questioning conventional norms and processes of knowledge production, dissemination, and communication; it is an invitation to a debate about the genres that have received a privileged position in scholarly activities; and it challenges the established views about the scope and limits of what is possible, relevant, desirable, and even credible in academic terms.

(p. 390)

Through a postdisciplinary lens then, the stage, the dancers and the dance itself can be re-imagined and reconfigured in novel ways.

In the summer of 2017, I was fortunate to attend a workshop at an arts-themed conference in Paris. The workshop organisers, Barbara Allegra Verleza and Sabatino Verleza,<sup>2</sup> were established dancers who had worked with prestigious dance companies before deciding to use dance as a tool for empowering individuals and communities with disabilities in the United States. The session commenced with all participants being asked to sit down on chairs and form a circle. We were told that we had different kinds of disabilities: some of us were on wheelchairs, others were only able to move their upper body parts, and yet others were paralysed entirely from head to toe. The challenge we faced was apparent: according to some set of standards, and due to our new predisposition as a group not able to move freely (as dancers typically do), the possibility of dancing or even borrowing the word ‘dancer’ for ourselves, was inaccessible. The following questions thus arose: how can we dance while embracing the limited mobility of our bodies? Is it possible for us to re-imagine and challenge the notion of dancing? Can we create a form of dance that is more inclusive and in which we can all participate? The result was nothing short of a transformational experience: subtle movements became grand and unexpected performances; simple arrangements of people’s heads, hands, arms and legs started to turn into elegant flows; and those assigned a complete body paralysis were expressing emotions more powerfully through their eyes than people with perfectly functioning bodies. What happened in the room was equivalent to a troupe of fully mobile dancers. We were all dancing because we had broken free from a conventional paradigm of dance.

### *On paradigms*

Postdisciplinarity is not a paradigm. Paradigms guide scientific activities, research decisions and views within a science, discipline or field of study. They also represent the norms, values and traditions in accordance with which researchers make contributions to distinct bodies of knowledge. These extend to assumptions about what is permitted and what

falls out of disciplinary – and thus methodological, epistemological and ontological – scope. Kuhn's (1962/2012) seminal text, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, not only made the word 'paradigm' one of the most widely used research terms, it established a new view of the development of science. Kuhn argued that when scientists address problems according to agreed standards and familiar methods, their science is in a 'normal' phase. In contrast, 'scientific revolutions' occur when there are significant departures from previously accepted views and scientific practices (see also Bird, 2018).

If we take paradigms to constitute the building blocks of disciplines, or more generally, that they fix the way we 'see' the world, then postdisciplinarity would be erroneously classified using the term 'paradigm', the chief reason being that there are no axioms, key concepts or logical and theoretical guidelines in postdisciplinary scholarship. Paradigms can also obstruct one's capacity to think creatively. The theoretical physicists David Bohm and F. David Peat (2011) have argued that not only do paradigms 'interfere with that free play of the mind that is essential for creativity' (p. 42), but also they 'clearly involve, in a key way, the process of taking ideas and concepts for granted, without realizing that this is in fact going on' (p. 41). In this regard, paradigms can operate subtly in that the fixed assumptions, or what Bohm and Peat (2011) call the 'subliminal infrastructure of [the mind's] tacit ideas' (p. 27), are not always available to the 'disciplined' thinker already trained to 'see' in a certain way. To paraphrase, our thinking is predisposed by the practices and agreements within a social system. And it is due to this social dimension of knowledge that Kuhn's epistemology of science has been labelled by some as *social epistemology* (see, e.g. Wray, 2011; and also Goldman, 2010, 2015).

But postdisciplinarity is not entirely devoid of paradigmatic discourse: it addresses a range of ontological, epistemological and methods-related issues, and also the processes of knowledge acquisition, production and dissemination. Namely, it is concerned with matters of legitimacy and the belief that noteworthy knowledge must be guided by strict conceptual and methodological canons. Postdisciplinarity thus brings into question the notion that epistemic advances and valuable contributions to knowledge have to conform to established scholarly practices. For these reasons, certain varieties of postdisciplinary scholarship can be understood as post-paradigmatic. Adopting a post-paradigmatic stance is to recognise that the uncritical acceptance of paradigms as the 'givens' leads to habituated knowledge in which the paradigms grow into 'hegemonic systems of organization' (Pernecky, 2016, p. 194). The level of required vigilance by the postdisciplinary practitioner is eloquently described by Morin (2001) who notes that 'the paradigm is both underground and sovereign in all theories, doctrines and ideologies. The paradigm is unconscious but irrigates and controls conscious thought, making it also super-conscious' (p. 23).

Paradigms – the ways in which the world and its social and physical phenomena are comprehended – are not something we are born with. Rather,

one's capacity to grasp the world grows and develops through exposure to people, lived experiences, ideas, textbooks, education, institutional culture and so forth. The implications for the producer of knowledge are that our attitude towards studying the world develops beyond one's rational capacity and in conjunction with a plethora of social, cultural, political and personal signifiers. In other words, we are not only beings of intellect but also humans in a fuller sense of the term: beings who grapple with questions of the ethical, moral, existential and psychic variety. What postdisciplinarity has to say about knowledge, then, is that we 'encounter ourselves' through research and as makers of knowledge. This shift is a recognition that all knowledge operates in social systems (i.e. social epistemology), and that any attempt to detach knowledge from the social is problematic. Consequently, postdisciplinarity is more fruitfully understood through what we may call here 'surges of understanding' that rise to the fore of one's scholarly activity. It may then present itself, albeit not exclusively, as:

- a tendency to break disciplinary habitus (Bourdieu, 2004): when framed by a discipline, or across a number of disciplines, research is shaped by cultural practices which are always 'at work', so to speak, arranging objects, people and research problems in distinct ways; and hence also as:
- a recognition that there are different ways in which we meaningfully make sense of our worlds (i.e. ontological, epistemological, methodological and semantic pluralism); therefore, arming the enquirer with:
- a mandate to communicate numerous, and at times varying, viewpoints, experiences, inter-subjectivities, methods, models and frameworks, that may stem from but are not limited to:
- an anti-conformist effort that views the questions of validity and legitimacy not as something to be determined institutionally or through disciplinary agreement but by recognising the researcher as a valued knowledge maker, capable of academic fluency and intellectual insight.

Postdisciplinarity can further arise as:

- a *worldmaking* force<sup>3</sup> that is proficient in making, re-making and de-making social realities;
- an anti-reductionist undertaking that renders problematic any attempt to reduce human experience to a set of generalisable, descriptive facts;
- a fluid process as opposed to a completed activity, due to the dynamic character of social and global problems;
- a liberated mode of imagination and curiosity that advances academic freedom and flexibility to *see, do* and *be* anew or
- a critico-probing activity that examines the processes of reification of social and institutional facts (e.g. what is socially constructed by whom and for what reasons).

Following the appeal at the start of this chapter to resist overt prescriptivism, we have to be mindful that these points come with a caveat and a reminder that there is no unanimous agreement on how to *do* postdisciplinary research. Any attempt to neatly reduce or classify postdisciplinary contributions through a common vision or a programme will lead to failure due to the heterogeneity of postdisciplinary scholarship. It is possible, nevertheless, for ease of comprehension, to cluster some of the emerging varieties into broader strains. These can be loosely described as follows:

*STRAIN 1:* Complexity-driven approaches fuelled by transforming existing knowledges through establishing new links and connections in order to find solutions to contemporary challenges facing different communities around the world.

*STRAIN 2:* Critical, emancipatory, equitable and transformatory *knowledge acts* that aim to unleash/unveil/disrupt the ways in which knowledge can be both oppressive and libertarian.

*STRAIN 3:* A form of post-existentialism whereby knowledge is understood fundamentally as an existential problem – a predicament from which there is no escape for the average human being.

*STRAIN 4:* Departures from the *what*, *why* and *how* of knowledge that seek to challenge and reconfigure fixed assumptions at the levels of ontology, epistemology and methodology.

At this juncture, it is important to emphasise that not all postdisciplinary approaches are critical or existential in character; some may be interested in synthesising and extending already existent knowledge, or inspired by disobedient and radically exploratory acts. Moreover, some academics situated in a disciplinary setting may diverge on the issue of placing validity and legitimacy with the researcher because they find value in the criteria established in their respective fields (or a number of fields). And so, to assert that postdisciplinary approaches to knowledge are not unanimous means that, although there is a general drive to break free from disciplinary expectations, the way one may go about it differs. For example, Coles et al. (2009) explain that, for them, postdisciplinarity is not ‘an intellectual free-for all’ but the need to research ‘issues and questions to their logical conclusion’ and without predetermined end points (p. 95). Others, however, may experiment and deviate utterly from the established knowns to break into new territories of understanding. The following sections further unpack each of the four strains.

## **Strains of postdisciplinary research**

### ***Strain 1: Complexity-driven approaches***

The first strain builds upon the critique of disciplinary knowledge and the calls for holistic and integrative approaches. One of the chief concerns in this

region is that many of the problems societies face today are rarely discipline specific, and therefore, disciplines provide only a partial picture. Seidman (2017) is among those voices to have emphasised that to talk of social inequality, power and racial injustice, for instance, demands that one is skilled enough to be able to draw on a variety of theoretical perspectives, which may range from classical sociology and poststructuralism to feminism and cultural studies. In his view, the ‘old-style grand theorizing’ (p. 306) we saw in Comte, Marx or Habermas has become suspicious particularly to post-modern scholars, who understand knowledge to be situated, political and enormously complex socio-historically. What is needed, Seidman proposes, are integrative postfoundational *general theories*, but also *domain-oriented theories*, which centre on specific issues (e.g. sexual fluidity or ‘postcolonial nationalism’).

Complexity, however, is not simply a matter of integrating and synthesising a number of different perspectives, and neither is it a renewed form of reductionism. On this subject, the work of the French philosopher and sociologist, Edgar Morin, is notably informative. Morin’s call for complex thought (e.g. Morin, 1992b, 2001) – or what he has termed elsewhere *a new paradigm of complexity* (Morin, 1992a) – is not an alertness to the fact that diverse units make up larger systems or wholes. In his opinion, holistic explanations at the level of totality are equally problematic to those of reductionism, because both reductionism and holism progress in a similar manner: whereas one reduces systems to elementary parts, the other reduces for the sake of totality (i.e. holism simplifies and reduces upwards to the whole). Underpinning his critique of General System Theory, Morin (1992a) further argues that systems theory has failed to articulate the concept of system and falls ‘repeatedly into the reductive, simplifactory, mutilating, and manipulative ruts from which it was supposed to have freed itself (and us along with it)’ (p. 372). For Morin (1992a) then, the paradigm of complexity is not about correctly understanding either the parts or the whole but integrating these into an ‘active loop’ that works in a circulatory fashion: ... *diversity organises unity which organises ... diversity organises unity which organises ... diversity organises unity which organises ...* (p. 374).

The complexity paradigm poses a challenge to both reductionism and holism mainly because the latter two are incapable of explaining ‘emergent phenomena’. Therefore, our focus, we are urged by Morin, ought to lie on grasping their complex character and ‘emergent qualities’. In his view, complexity is inscribed into the fabric of relations between the parts and the whole in a very intricate way – so much so that all of the following may apply:

- The whole is greater than the sum of the parts.
- The whole is less than the sum of the parts.
- The whole is greater than the whole.
- The parts are at once less and greater than the parts.

- The parts are sometimes greater than the whole.
- The whole is less than the whole.
- The whole is insufficient.
- The whole contains uncertainty.
- The whole contains conflict.

(Morin, 1992a, pp. 374–375)

Although it is beyond this chapter to delve any deeper into Morin's ideas on complexity, we shall have sufficient grounds to appreciate why disciplinary approaches alone fall short of addressing emergent, complex phenomena and vice versa, why holistic approaches are limited due to their tendency to simplify individual components for the sake of the whole. In this regard, Morin maintains piquantly that 'the paradigm of holistic simplification leads to neo-totalitarian functionalism and accommodates itself as easily to all of the modern forms of totalitarianism' (p. 375). In the name of the whole, individual parts can be manipulated, and with it, also their personal characteristics and qualities that are suppressed and inhibited under the reign of the whole. This analogy applies also to social structures and systems of ordering.

Overall, postdisciplinary research within this strain views reductionism in both forms – to the individual components and to the whole – as failing to see the crux of complexity. The implications for the different sciences, which have worked to maintain autonomy, are that the insistence on division and fragmentation poses a barrier to 'serious knowledge'. As to what serious knowledge denotes for Morin (1992a), we find some pointers in the following words: '... [it is] a praxis that is at once responsible, liberal, libertarian, and communitarian (each of these terms being transformed through its interaction with the others)' (p. 383). With such a resolve, we can segue with ease to the second strain.

### ***Strain 2: Critical, emancipatory, equitable and transformatory knowledge***

The second strain comprises a broad range of enquiries marked by the propensity to bring about change vis-à-vis knowledge and learning. Knowledge, understood as a social phenomenon, invites the investigator to examine the conditions, influences and impacts of ensuing knowledges to different members of society. Taking gender as an example, Seidman (2017) argues that 'men's very social positioning in the public world has also meant that their ideas have been seriously flawed and partial', and more importantly, that 'men's social perspectives have basically written women out of the story of society and history' (p. 343). His argument is accentuated by highlighting that neither Comte nor Marx nor Durkheim delved into the analysis of emotions, caring for children, reproduction, sexuality or gender – activities historically assigned to women and absent from male-dominated social

thought. And so, Seidman rightly points out that it is only recently that matters of gendered identities or using gender as a lens have gained prominence in social thought.

At the core of such critiques is an emancipatory, equitable, transformative and critical aptitude nested in a deeper recognition: that in any society, the voices with an authoritative privilege are the product of socio-cultural matrices, which not only influence policies, norms and practices but also knowledge and learning. We can therefore propose that this strain of post-disciplinary scholarship labours towards erasing inequalities, and champions more inclusive environments.

Consequently, postdisciplinary contributions may extend to investigating themes that have been omitted or deemed unfitting due to being perceived as jeopardising rigour, robustness and validity in the name of objective knowledge. As part of the efforts to ground knowledge within the human condition, topics such as desire (see Munar & Hall in this volume) are brought to the fore, because knowledge is seldom free from the need to influence, from promotion, from power, from wanting to be recognised, from prestige, from seeking greater autonomy – all expressions of desire. Moreover, the aspiration to make knowledge more equitable in the areas of production, dissemination and participation requires a much-needed scrutiny of the institutional predicaments that continue to act as barriers to dehegemonising the university. In this regard, what is urgently needed, Ferreras, Bidwell and Pernecky argue (this volume), are more candid conversations about how universities are viewed and experienced through a non-Western lens. Or as Caton and Hill (this volume) propose, we need to dismantle the ancient disciplinary walls and build new webs.

Postdisciplinary research can emerge as a critical and decolonising project in that it values Indigenous and non-Western ways of knowing – including oral traditions, art and performance. Importantly, it recognises the degree to which such knowledges have been suppressed. In this regard, Hollinshead (2016) has maintained that a postdisciplinary acumen and appreciation for *plural knowability* is ‘especially appropriate where external assumptions or imposed truths have squashed or denied (intentionally or unintentionally) other/local/Indigenous mandates of knowing’ (p. 350). This has been underscored with great potency by Linda Tuhiway Smith (2018) at the Third International Conference on Postdisciplinary Approaches, who argued that native populations have been ‘disciplined’ through Western knowledge, and that Māori have been labelled as ‘disobedient’ and ‘defiant’ until they learned the rules and applied them internally. The notion of disobedience in the context of Western, colonising knowledge thus becomes a decolonising stance – what Smith (2018) calls ‘the refusal to engage in disciplines’, whereby disciplines are not only systems for organising knowledge but also ways of ‘organising people or bodies’ (Smith, 1999, p. 68).

Last but not least, within the confines of (disciplinary) critiques of education and learning, it is important to stress that the aforementioned call

for complexity (Strain 1) comes with a critical undertone. It says that disciplinarity (and also some versions of inter-disciplinarity, cross-disciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity) is not sufficient to grapple with certain problems, such as global warming, terrorism, religious conflict and other challenges facing societies around the world. This inherently raises questions about the weaknesses of the systems and structures that build, maintain and disseminate knowledge. In this domain of critical postdisciplinary scholarship, the chief apprehension is thus the failure to prepare knowledge citizens who are at once also global citizens capable of navigating complexity. Hessel and Morin (2012), especially, have lamented the shortcomings ‘of an educational system that fences off bodies of knowledge in such a way that it becomes impossible to deal with fundamental and global challenges of our lives as individuals and as citizens in any organic manner’ (p. 16). The average citizen, despite being ‘well’ educated – tempted with the promise of (short-lived) expertise and specialisation – has lost her ability to manoeuvre uncertain, changing and complex social realities. The question we must ask is whether a focus on preparing experts armed with vast amounts of technical knowledge fails them as fluid knowledge citizens and global citizens. Morin expresses this sentiment poignantly by commenting that a student has ‘a right to acquire specialized knowledge through ad hoc studies but is dispossessed as a citizen from a comprehensive pertinent viewpoint’ (Morin, 2001, p. 92).

An additional question arising from such debates put here to educators, schools, universities and governments is whether the current measurements and metrics, which produce immense anxiety and institutional angst (i.e. to be in the top 10, top 100 or top 400 universities;<sup>4</sup> citation indexes; journal rankings; etc.), are appropriate means for evaluating ‘good’ and socially responsible education. The global marketing schemes and grading machineries are divisive and elitist systems that place a numerical value on what teachers and students do, but fail to account for the important and the not so easily quantified achievements. Deciles and scores are incapable of measuring the processes of growth, flourishing and development between teachers and students in the classroom, between academics and practitioners at conferences, and through projects and publications invisible to the new arithmetic of quality. When the value of education is less centred on specialisation and more balanced with complex thinking, it is possible to conceive of alternative definitions of success. A postdisciplinary alternative of successful and desirable graduates, socially responsible learning institutions, and flourishing societies may then have in common the vision to nurture pluralistic mindsets skilled in weaving solutions in respectful, relational and reciprocal ways, and by means of sensibly attuned global, moral and ethical campuses.

### ***Strain 3: Postdisciplinarity as a form of post-existentialism***

Twenty-first-century human existence is undivorceable from knowledge, and, in turn, knowledge is not easily detached from humans’ being – the

two are interwoven. Despite the objectivist efforts to deny this bond so as to not contaminate scientific truths, all knowledge is derived from, comprehended by, shared with and intended for humans. Similar to death, anxiety or freedom – topics frequently explored by existentialist figures – knowledge, then, must have a stable place in the existential basket of problems. The justification is glaring: one can neither reject knowledge and throw it away, so to speak, because it has already impregnated the way we ‘are’ in the world, nor can one avoid the external grips knowledge has on human existence. Knowledge organises our being: it structures what we do and how we do it; what we eat and in what quantities; where we live; how we live; how we spend our working time and non-working time; how we communicate; what we are permitted to do as citizens, as parents and as workers. Hence, whether we like it or not, decisions about all aspects of human life are built on specialised pockets of knowledge. Yet underneath this existential awareness lurks a far grimmer quandary for the Self. It surges up as the following intuition: *the knowledge held by another can have a profound influence on my life, and there is nothing I can do about it.* It is to this extent that knowledge determines all being – from actions and interactions, to communication and specialised vocabularies, to norms, to regulations, to policies and laws.

From a postdisciplinary, post-existential point of view, to recognise that we live in knowledge societies (Bindé, 2005) is not a mere acknowledgement of knowledge as a vehicle for change; it is a deep-seated apprehension that one’s existence is inexorably governed by different knowledges always competing for legitimacy and power, and that this *competing* is not an objective affair but an inherently human occurrence. Knowledge is a post-existential problem because it is no longer a matter for the specialist philosopher or the disciplinary expert, who are viewed through a postdisciplinary lens as limited by their disciplinary habitus. Knowledge is a postdisciplinary and post-existential problem, because nothing is neat and stable in what have been described as *post-postmodern* (Nealon, 2012), *metamodern* (Vermeulen & van den Akker, 2010) and *digimodern* (Kirby, 2009) landscapes in which knowledge (and thus action) is at once ecological, environmental, gendered, political, economic and multi-spiritual.

The personal ramifications for the individual human being are that knowledge anticipates our grand entrance into this world (from fertility testing to blood and urine testing, to genetic screening and ultrasound monitoring), and it stays until our final days, when more decisions have to be made about how to discard the human body. To live in a world-of-knowledge society is to have our birth, life and death guided by knowledge: it means that we have the choice to turn our bodies into trees, and by so doing, make a personal, knowledge-based contribution to reducing our carbon footprint.<sup>5</sup> The post-disciplinarians working in this domain recognise that it is knowledge that guides us into this world and to the grave, and in between shapes our lives on a daily basis.

***Strain 4: Departures from the What, Why and How of knowledge***

By challenging the *what*, *why* and *how* of knowledge, postdisciplinarity is not only critical but resolutely democratic: it supports multiplicity of thought, approaches and outlooks. According to Morin (2001), ‘democracy expects and nurtures diversity of interests and diversity of ideas’ (p. 89). Democracy, viewed here as a dialogical culture of open legitimation, means – in the context of learning and knowing about the world – that there are no demands on the thinker to align their enquiry with a dominant paradigm or disciplinary parameters. The terms ‘disciplinary imperialism’ and ‘disciplinary parochialism’ used by Sayer (1999) underscore the pitfalls of disciplines as guarding mechanisms, which, in his view, eventually hinder progress towards understanding the social world. Morin’s words further encapsulate the creative-political mindset of some postdisciplinary intellectuals, and assist in explaining what is at stake for those fighting disciplinary rigidity:

respect for diversity means that democracy cannot be confused with dictatorship of the majority over minorities; it must include the rights of minorities and protesters to exist and express themselves; it must allow the expression of heretical and deviant ideas.

(Morin, 2001, p. 89)

The invitation to deviance, heresy and disobedience, and therefore also to creativity, imagination and play, is considered as a valid path to development and progress. The role of disobedient thought is immensely important in re-inventing and re-examining the ways we grasp, attend to and meet the challenges in this world. From teachers and scientists to organisations, disobedience is a process of creative engagement that may lead to profound insights, innovation and improved practices. In this regard, Welby Ings (2017, p. 24) notes that ‘historically, philosophers, inventors, economists and social reformers have questioned the limitations of what exists’, making disobedient thinking a desirable quality possessed by the ‘shapers of our world’ (p. 23). But these shapers are also average citizens who think creatively – as shown by Snake-Beings and Gibbons (this volume), who employ the term ‘technological disobedience’ to describe the practice of giving objects (that are no longer useful for the roles they were once designed to perform) new functions and meanings.

In a postdisciplinarity project, deviation and disobedience do not have the negative connotations once attached to the undesired biases of the scientific method. Deviation is recognised and revered for its disorganising/reorganising propensity, the potential to revitalise knowledge and, in some instances, even a complete metamorphosis (see Morin, 1992a, 2001). Deviation and disobedience are displays of creativity. They are as much part of knowledge as their methodical and orderly counterparts. The importance of creativity has been emphasised by a number of thinkers, including Bauman, Rescher, Baum and Peat, and Ings:

To create (and so also to discover) always means breaking a rule; following a rule is mere routine, more of the same – not an act of creation.  
(Bauman, 2000, p. 208)

Virtually every step in the history of human innovation and invention has come about in the wake of someone's asking about imaginary possibilities, speculating about what would happen if, and reflecting on yet-unrealized and often unrealizable possibilities.  
(Rescher, 2005, p. 162)

If science always insists that a new order must be immediately fruitful, or that it has some new predictive power, then creativity will be blocked. New thoughts generally arise with a play of the mind, and the failure to appreciate this is actually one of the major blocks to creativity.  
(Bohm & Peat, 2011, p. 37)

Disobedient thinkers who can look into the heart of what exists and conceive effective alternatives increasingly have the capacity to realise new social, economic, technological and political reforms that better meet ordinary people's needs.  
(Ings, 2017, p. 24)

Here, we arrive at understanding postdisciplinarity as a creative, imaginary and somewhat ethereal space in which the mind can be liberated of dogmas, expectations and measurements. As we approach the end of our unintroductory voyage, it seems appropriate to reflect on a phenomenon observed at the postdisciplinary events in recent years. Despite most attendees having doctoral degrees, and many holding senior academic roles, there has always been a sense of joy and passion that comes with sharing, collaborating and experiencing creativity together. This quality may be described by using the word 'playfulness' – playfulness in the sense of light-heartedness and curiosity about our world which upsurges through knowledge. The feminist scholar Maria Lugones (1996) puts it eloquently, as follows:

Playfulness is, in part, an openness to being a fool, which is a combination of not worrying about competence, not being self-important, not taking norms as sacred and finding ambiguity and double edges a source of wisdom and delight. So, positively, the playful attitude involves openness to surprise, openness to being a fool, openness to self-construction or reconstruction and to construction or reconstruction of the 'worlds' we inhabit playfully. Negatively, playfulness is characterized by uncertainty, lack of self-importance, absence of rules or a not taking rules as sacred, a not worrying about competence, and a lack of abandonment to a particular construction of oneself, others and one's relation to them.  
(p. 431)

In sum, postdisciplinary scholarship, in addition to complex thought; critical, emancipatory, equitable and transformatory knowledge acts; post-existential examinations; and deviant and disobedient approaches can also be immensely creative and playful.

## New vocabularies for postdisciplinary thought and practice

Finally, novel approaches require new language and vocabulary to overcome the intellectual and methodological regularities that keep research within bounds. As a way of concluding this chapter, and before introducing the contributions to this volume, Table I.1 lists a selection of terms that may be useful in contemplating postdisciplinarity. It is offered as an invitation to considering alternative approaches to the progressively

Table I.1 Open vocabulary for postdisciplinary research

- 
- A postdisciplinary approach.** An open, non-prescriptive, inquisitive, creative and democratic relationship with knowledge.
- Horizontal knowledge.** An expansive view of knowledge that lays before the researcher. It is an invitation to articulating, framing, path-setting and exploring. In contrast to a tiered, structured and vertical organisation of knowledge, horizontal knowledge has multiple entry points and ways of assembling.
- Acts of declarations.** An acknowledgement that scholars and practitioners are motivated by different issues and problems, and that the diverse displays of postdisciplinary thought are more aptly understood as deliberate acts of declaration: declarations about ethics and moral imperatives; declarations about global citizenry; declarations about freedom; declarations about power; declarations about passion and desire and so forth.
- Intellectual freedom.** The pursuit of knowledge without any obligation to produce and reproduce the familiar, expected and disciplinarily preordained.
- Knowledge-as-play.** An intellectual activity and expressive capacity in which the mind is deliberately undisciplined. The opposite of methodological and conceptual tunnel vision.
- Disobedience.** A quality of a thinker/scholar/practitioner motivated by finding alternatives (see Ings, 2017). Taken as a critical and political term, it characterises resistance to dominating and/or oppressive cultures, processes and practices (see Smith, 1999).
- 'Impossible marriages'.** A technique suggested by Welby Ings (2017) for exploring the relationships between ideas that may appear to have nothing in common – what he calls 'the creative potential of an impossible marriage' (p. 41).
- 'Method assemblage'.** A performative view of method proposed by Law (2004), whose function is to produce realities as opposed to accurately describing them. Method assemblage is described as: 'the crafting, bundling, or gathering of relations in three parts: (a) whatever is in here or *present* (for instance a representation or an object); (b) whatever is absent but also *manifest* (it can be seen, is described, is manifestly relevant to presence); and (c) whatever is absent but is *Other* because, while necessary to presence, it is also hidden, repressed or uninteresting' (p. 144).

*For more terminology, see the following chapters.*

---

ordered ways of framing research, such as having to claim one's allegiance to a given paradigm. The word 'open' signifies the ongoing, creative efforts of postdisciplinary thinkers, whose future contributions are likely to yield additional concepts and terminology and add to the postdisciplinary lexicon.

### **About this book and its contributions**

There are many ways to read this book. Whether one delves into the chapters *ad hoc*, or follows the order provided here, is a matter of preference and personal curiosity about the topics covered. The authors represent a diverse group of thinkers, designers, artists and practitioners, with varied expertise and interests and also nationalities – united in their support for postdisciplinarity. To overcome the challenge of differences and similarities across the manuscripts when ordering these for the reader, the chapters were arranged subtly but perceptibly into three parts: Part 1: *Being. Thinking. Doing*; Part 2: *Doing. Thinking. Being* and Part 3: *Thinking. Being. Doing*. Each thematic section reflects the emphasis of what is accentuated in the contribution but without denying its reach into the other domains. Whereas in some chapters we may be asked to consider the theoretical and conceptual possibilities of postdisciplinarity, we find that they also speak to the lived experience and one's practice. Other manuscripts put a stronger weight on the human and the personal, yet are not entirely detached from the cognitive and the philosophical. Hence, thinking, doing and being are bound together – they are the tune to which the performers, who have taken the stage at the start of this chapter, dance.

#### ***Part 1 Being. Thinking. Doing.***

The first chapter in Part 1 was selected because it presents Barbara Lekatsas' persuasive argument that it is 'the artist, in a general sense, who best embodies the qualities of postdisciplinarity' (p. tbc). If we take all scholarly work as a form of art, then we can propose that a postdisciplinary potential lies within the intellectual who cherishes, through their work and scholarship, the fringe – always ready to leave the safety of the centre to explore new possibilities. Hence the maxim evoked by Lekatsas: 'at the periphery lies the centre'. We are reminded of movements such as Dada and Surrealism, and told of the challenges of two female artists, Ithell Colquhoun and Camille Billops, who had to face the consequences of working across different genres.

The following chapter by Welby Ings examines practice-led research design and the relationship between professional and postdisciplinary practices. Ings reflects on the enormous heterogeneity of the work of his master's and doctoral students (over 80 supervised projects), and centres on three case studies to demonstrate how each navigates beyond disciplines.

Next, Chikkahiro Hanamura (Chapter 3) highlights the way in which landscapes can be altered by changing the relationship between our physical perception and the environment. He introduces the notion of ‘transscape theory’ and shows through his work and exhibitions how places such as hospitals can be transformed.

From here we move to Ana María Munar and Lonni Hall’s meditations on desire (Chapter 4). Their work, titled ‘Desire as a Way of Knowing’, gives much needed prominence to the relationship between desire and knowledge. The authors draw on the ideas of Esther Perel, Helen Fisher, Martha Nussbaum and Giles Deleuze, and invite us to contemplate the extent to which desire manifests in our world but also through our beings as makers of knowledge.

Desire is also conveyed in the literary and poetic rendering of movements and cages by Ninette Rothmüller and Fraser Stables in Chapter 5. It is at the end that we find the term ‘desire-pathing a text’, explained by Rothmüller as follows: ‘I am taking shortcuts, where I desire to. Cutting off lines, dropping words here and there, as I please. It doesn’t matter if others follow or not. I am alone here, anyways’ (p. 113). Desire in this chapter thus becomes a methodological and creative right.

The last contribution in Part 1 is a dialogue between Tomas Pernecky and Lois Holzman (Chapter 6) about academia, learning, education, Lev Vygotsky and the spaces in which we live and work as researchers, students, professionals and intellectuals. The notion of knowledge-as-play emerges as a recognition that the quest to know is intimately human and therefore inseparable from our interaction with other humans and the world.

## ***Part 2 Doing. Thinking. Being.***

The second part commences with insights by Frith Walker, who is a place-making manager at Panuku Development Auckland, and was one of the keynote speakers at the Third International Conference on Postdisciplinary Approaches, held in Auckland, New Zealand.<sup>6</sup> Her chapter called ‘Do, Learn, Do’ reflects the working philosophy and approach she developed in her vision to transform cities into ‘liveable, lovable spaces’. The chapter is an account of an Auckland/Tāmaki Makaurau way of ‘placemaking’ as lived by a postdisciplinary practitioner working with postdisciplinary knowledge-in-action.

Andrew Gibbons and Emit Snake-Beings stay on the subject of ‘doing’ and introduce do-it-yourself (DiY) postdisciplinary knowledge through a series of projects framed in the context of the maker movement. In examining the notions of the DiY ethos, making and citizenship, they view DiY as a critical and political movement, and a phenomenon from which academics can learn about ‘escaping’ disciplinary and institutional constraints.

The third contribution in this cluster is Claire Gauzente and James M.M. Good’s Chapter 9 on Q-methodology, which takes us to the year 1935 and

the work of William Stephenson, a British physicist and psychologist, whom the authors situate as a postdisciplinary thinker. It offers Q-methodology as a more flexible approach that is capable of bridging the qualitative–quantitative divide, and as a suitable alternative for those researchers interested in objectivity but with flexibility, creativity and inventiveness.

### ***Part 3 Thinking. Being. Doing.***

We begin the third part with an essay titled ‘On Walls and Webs: Contemplating Postdisciplinarity’. Kellee Caton and David Hill question the autochthony and inevitability of disciplines, and contest a number of key epistemic assumptions that have assisted with firmly cementing disciplinary modes of knowledge production. Concentrating on three epistemic creeds, they discuss the superiority of depth over breadth, the equivalence of expertise and specialisation, and whether knowledge production must always amount to discovery and originality. In their call for dismantling disciplinary walls, Caton and Hill reassign the task of individual scholars from being disciplinary guards and brick layers to weavers of webs, arachnophiles and web watchers.

The discussion maintains this critical and liberatory tone in Chapter 11. Here, Marlene Ferreras, Duane Bidwell and Tomas Pernecky explore, through conversation, how Marlene and her academic advisor Duane sought to subvert the dominant system of knowledge production by incorporating wisdom she had learned by doing field research with Maya women working at a *maquila* in the Yucatan. The women recognise that to support their families they need to participate in the neoliberal policies that birthed the factory; at the same time, they develop strategies to resist the dehumanisation and oppression at the heart of multinational neoliberal capitalism. Through an open dialogue, the authors look at the similarities between the *maquila* and the contemporary university: the assembly-line process of doctoral education; low wages; high expectations and encouragement to hit ‘industry standards’ with no promise of ongoing employment in the future.

We then move from webs and *maquilas* to technology in Chapter 12, and are encouraged to think about the future of certain fields and vocations. The changes brought by technology have already had widespread ramifications across all aspects of human life and are likely to impact professions such as medicine, nursing, midwifery, physiotherapy and occupational therapy. In this chapter, David A. Nicholls argues that we may be entering an era of post-professional healthcare that could restructure and re-order the concurrent practices of Western healthcare systems. He looks at both the possible grounds for resistance to postdisciplinary approaches by orthodox health professions, and the arguments in support of postdisciplinary generalism, pondering whether post-professional healthcare may be necessary amid a ‘more ecologically and socially just form of healthcare in the future’ (p. tbc).

The volume's concluding Chapter 13, headlined 'Postdisciplinarity: Imagine the Future, Think the Unthinkable' by Frédéric Darbellay, reaffirms postdisciplinarity as 'a dynamic of openness and transgression between disciplinary walls' (p. tbc). Darbellay proposes different degrees of postdisciplinarity – ranging from strong to moderate to its weaker varieties – and suggests that many academics move across one or more of these at different points in time. The chapter farewells the reader with a flexible schema and alternative ways to reimagine the university.

## Notes

- 1 This event was hosted in partnership with Te Ara Poutama – the Faculty of Māori & Indigenous Development at the Auckland University of Technology.
  - 2 For further information about the work of Barbara Verleza and her husband, Sabatino Verleza, see: <https://www.kent.edu/advancement/news/barbara-allegro-verleza-associate-professor-dance>.
  - 3 The term was introduced originally by Nelson Goodman (1978), and adopted as a critical and conceptual tool particularly in tourism and events studies (e.g. Hollinshead, 2009; Hollinshead & Suleman, 2016; Pernecky, 2014).
  - 4 There are now elaborate ranking schemes, such as <https://www.topuniversities.com/subject-rankings/2019> or <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/>.
  - 5 See, for example, a CNN article on biodegradable burial pods: <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/05/03/world/eco-solutions-capsula-mundi/index.html>.
  - 6 For more information, see <http://postdisciplinary.net/>.
- 
- 1 For example, the concept of Zhe Jiang proposes that knowledge may impact on the spirit or essence of the researcher. Xu (2016) suggests that this occurs through a distinctive process where tenacity may lead to reverence, reverence to expertise, expertise to vision and vision to Zhe Jiang. In such a process, the researcher not only increases in ability, but also becomes a more refined being.
  - 2 This was particularly challenging when the candidate needed to discuss phenomena like the complex Xiang system [象系统]. This is a layered philosophical and aesthetic classification adapted from Chinese poetry that consists of three equally complex, hierarchically tiered concepts: Xiang [象], Yi Xiang [意象], and Yi Jing [意境].
  - 3 However, the word university does not originally refer to a universality of knowledge but rather, to 'the totality of a group, whether of barbers, carpenters, or students' (Haskins, 1957, p. 9). The word draws its reference from an early *universitas* of students who organised themselves as a group and were able to make demands of their teachers who were beholden to the fees they paid per lecture (Hearn, 2003).
  - 1 Stephenson provides a valuable and revealing account of the impact of this event on his subsequent life and work in his posthumously published 'Tribute to Melanie Klein' (Stephenson, 2006).
  - 2 In his *Festschrift* tribute to Stephenson, Oliver Zangwill recollects: 'The 1946–1947 post-graduate Diploma course in Psychology was by all considerations exceptional. Although no doubt each of us contributed his share, the inspiration throughout was William Stephenson himself' (Zangwill, Kohlberg & Brenner, 1972, p. x).
  - 3 A more detailed account of Stephenson's life and work can be found in Good (2010).
  - 4 *Operant Subjectivity: The International journal of Q Methodology*, the house journal of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity (ISSSS),

has for the past 40 years published Q methodological research by scholars with very diverse backgrounds across the natural sciences, social science and the humanities.

- 5 Stephenson's (1953) publication *The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and its Methodology* is his most systematic presentation of his approach. Steven Brown's (1980) *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science* is a more accessible introduction, especially clear on the technical aspects of the analytic procedures. Simon Watts and Paul Stenner's (2012) *Doing Q-methodological research, Theory, method and interpretation* offers a British view and helpfully provides the novice Q researcher with a step-by-step guide to the theory and practice of Q methodology. Bruce McKeown and Dan Thomas' (2013) *Q Methodology* is a short authoritative introduction, now in its second edition.
- 6 See Brown and Rhoads (2017) for a comprehensive bibliography of single-case studies.
- 7 Some 15 years later, Stephenson revisited this article in his posthumously published essay on 'Old age research' (Stephenson, 2005). Following his own retirement, Dan Thomas carried out a recent replication of this kind of study (Thomas, 2017).
- 8 As Steven Brown notes (Brown, 2002), Stephenson had himself acknowledged the possibility of such studies. One of Stephenson's Iowa doctoral students, Albert Talbott, pioneered the procedure. It is currently attracting increasing attention, especially among health researchers. A special issue of *Operant Subjectivity* was devoted to the Q-Block method (Vol 34/1), October 2010. This includes Talbott's initial (1963) conference paper on the method as well as a pioneering article on the application of the method to views about health care by Baker, van Exel, Mason and Stricklin (2010). Also see Danielson (2009); Franz, Worrell, and Vögele (2013).
- 9 Space restrictions only allow the provision of one image per AO. A more detailed presentation of each AO and its internal dynamics will be available in the coming months (Gauzente & Doré, 2018).
- 10 Although not specifically addressed to issues concerning postdisciplinarity, Abbott's previous book *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the social sciences* (Abbott, 2004) underscores the central role of methods in knowledge production.
  - 1 English translation: 'Voyager there are no bridges, one builds them as one walks'.
  - 1 Physiotherapy was first professionalised in 1894 in England, and the English 'model' of practice has influenced professional programmes in more than 100 countries since then. Although this model is strongest in the Commonwealth countries, its core disciplinary structure can be seen in all physiotherapy and physical therapy programmes around the world (Nicholls, 2017).
  - 2 Here again it is necessary to clarify the confusion that exists around inter-disciplinary and inter-professional practice in healthcare, because much of the literature conflates disciplines with professions. In this chapter, I am referring to the inter-professional collaboration between orthodox health professions like doctors, nurses and physiotherapists, rather than the interposition of the various disciplines that constitute their professional identity (such as anatomy, physiology and pathology), which might be thought of as inter-disciplinarity.

## References

- Akcesme, B., Baktir, H., & Steele, E. (2016). *Interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinarity in humanities*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bindé, J. (2005). *Towards knowledge societies: UNESCO world report*. Retrieved February 10, 2019, from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000141843>
- Bird, A. (2018). Thomas Kuhn. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Winter, 2018 ed.). Retrieved 15 December, 2018, from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/thomas-kuhn/>
- Bohm, D., & Peat, F. D. (2011). *Science, order, and creativity*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge Classics.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity* (R. Nice, Trans.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. p. 42.
- Bruce, A., Lyall, C., Tait, J., & Williams, R. (2004). Interdisciplinary integration in Europe: The case of the Fifth Framework programme. *Futures*, 36(4), 457–470. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2003.10.003
- Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2005). Mobilizing tourism: A post-disciplinary critique. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2), 31–41. doi:10.1080/02508281.2005.11081471
- Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(4&5), 293–319. doi:10.2167/cit327.0
- Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2009). Post-disciplinary tourism. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 80–100). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Coles, T. E., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2016). Tourism and postdisciplinarity: Back to the future? *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 373–387. doi:10.3727/108354216X14679788636113
- Frodeman, R. (Ed.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Goldman, A. (2010). Why social epistemology is real epistemology. In A. Haddock, A. Millar, & D. Pritchard (Eds.), *Social epistemology* (pp. 1–28). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goldman, A. (2015). Social epistemology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Summer, 2015 ed.). Retrieved December 15, 2018, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-social/>
- Hessel, S., & Morin, E. (2012). *The path to hope*. New York, NY: Other Press.
- Hollinshead, K. (2009). The “worldmaking” prodigy of tourism: The reach and power of tourism in the dynamics of change and transformation. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(1), 139–152. doi:10.3727/108354209788970162
- Hollinshead, K. (2010). Tourism studies and confined understanding: The call for a ‘new sense’ postdisciplinary imaginary. *Tourism Analysis*, 15(4), 499–512. doi:10.3727/108354210X12864727693669
- Hollinshead, K. (2012). The under-conceptualisations of tourism studies: The case for postdisciplinary knowing. In I. Ateljevic, N. Morgan, & A. Pritchard (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (pp. 55–72). Abingdon, UK: Taylor & Francis.

- Hollinshead, K. (2016). Postdisciplinarity and the rise of intellectual openness: The necessity for “plural knowability” in Tourism Studies. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 349–361. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851613
- Hollinshead, K., & Suleman, R. (2016). Tourism and new collective effervescence: The encoding of ‘Aboriginality’ – A worldmaking critique of special events and special places. In T. Pernecky (Ed.), *Approaches and methods in event studies* (pp. 120–146). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ings, W. (2017). *Disobedient teaching: Surviving and creating a change in education*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Kirby, A. (2009). *Digimodernism: How new technologies dismantle the postmodern and reconfigure our culture*. London, UK: The Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Kuhn, T. S. (2012). *The structure of scientific revolutions: 50th anniversary edition; with an introductory essay by Ian Hacking*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (Original work published 1962).
- Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Lawrence, R. J. (2015). Advances in transdisciplinarity: Epistemologies, methodologies and processes. *Futures*, 65, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2014.11.007
- Lugones, M. (1996). Playfulness, “world”-travelling, and loving perception. In A. Garry & M. Pearsall (Eds.), *Women, knowledge, and reality: Explorations in feminist philosophy* (2nd ed., pp. 419–434). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Menand, L. (2001). Undisciplined. *The Wilson Quarterly*, 25(4) (Autumn), 51–59.
- Morin, E. (1992a). From the concept of system to the paradigm of complexity. *Journal of Social and Evolutionary Systems*, 15(4), 371–385. doi:10.1016/1061-7361(92)90024-8
- Morin, E. (1992b). *Method: Towards a study of humankind, Vol. 1: The nature of nature* (J. L. R. Belanger, Trans.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Morin, E. (2001). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future* (N. Poller, Trans.). Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing.
- Mourad, R. P., Jr. (1997). *Postmodern philosophical critique and the pursuit of knowledge in higher education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Munar, A. M., Pernecky, T., & Feighery, W. (2016). An introduction to tourism postdisciplinarity. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 313–347. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851578
- Nealon, J. T. (2012). *Post-postmodernism: Or, the cultural logic of just-in-time capitalism*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ostreng, W. (2010). *Science without boundaries: Interdisciplinarity in research, society, and politics*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Pernecky, T. (2014). The making of societies through events: On ideology, power and consent. In O. Moufakkir & T. Pernecky (Eds.), *Ideological, social and cultural aspects of events* (pp. 28–46). Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Pernecky, T. (2016). The epistemic foundations of event studies. In T. Pernecky (Ed.), *Approaches and methods in event studies* (pp. 3–21). London, UK: Routledge.
- Pernecky, T., Munar, A. M., & Feighery, W. (2016). Tourism in a postdisciplinary milieu: Final demarcation points. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 431–434. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851857
- Pernecky, T., Munar, A. M., & Wheeler, B. (2016). Existential postdisciplinarity: Personal journeys into tourism, art and freedom. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 389–402. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851730
- Ramadier, T. (2004). Transdisciplinarity and its challenges: The case of urban studies. *Futures*, 36(4), 423–439. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2003.10.009

- Rescher, N. (2005). *What if?: Thought experimentation in philosophy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Rosenfield, P. L. (1992). The potential of transdisciplinary research for sustaining and extending linkages between the health and social sciences. *Social Science and Medicine*, 35(11), 1343–1357. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(92)90038-R
- Sayer, A. (1999). Long live postdisciplinary studies! Sociology and the curse of disciplinaryparochialism/imperialism. Retrieved February 13, 2019, from <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/resources/sociology-online-papers/papers/sayer-long-live-postdisciplinary-studies.pdf>
- Seidman, S. (2017). *Contested knowledge: Social theory today* (6th ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2018, February). *Postdisciplinarity and the disciplining of Indigenous peoples*. Keynote address presented at the Third International Conference on Postdisciplinary Approaches, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Stember, M. (1991). Advancing the social sciences through the interdisciplinary enterprise. *The Social Science Journal*, 27(1), 1–14. doi:10.1016/0362-3319(91)90040-B
- Vermeulen, T., & van den Akker, R. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 2(1), 5677. doi:10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677
- Wray, K. B. (2011). *Kuhn's evolutionary social epistemology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Baudelaire, C. (1955). *Flowers of evil* (M. and J. Mathews, Eds.). New York, NY: New Directions.
- Billops, C., & Hatch, J. (1982). *Suzanne, Suzanne*. New York, NY: Hatch-Billops Production.
- Billops, C., & Hatch, J. (1987). *Older women and love*. New York, NY: Hatch-Billops Collection, Inc.
- Billops, C., & Hatch, J. (1991). *Finding Christa*. New York, NY: Hatch-Billops Production.
- Billops, C., & Hatch, J. (1994). *The KKK boutique ain't just rednecks*. New York, NY: Mom & Pop Productions.
- Billops, C., & Hatch, J. (2002). *A string of pearls*. New York, NY: Mom & Pop Productions.
- Borradori, G. (1994). *The American philosopher: Conversations with Quine, Davidson, Putnam, Nozick, Danto, Rorty, Cavell, MacIntyre, Kuhn*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Breton, A. (1960). *Nadja* (R. Howard, Trans.). New York, NY: Grove Press (Original work published 1928).
- Breton, A. (2004). *Arcanum 17* (Z. Rogow, Trans.). Los Angeles, CA: Green Integer Books (Original work published in 1945).
- Breton, A. (2010a). Manifesto of surrealism. In *Manifestoes of surrealism* (R. Seaver & H. R. Lane, Trans., pp. 2–47). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (Original work published 1924).
- Breton, A. (2010b). Prolegomena to a third manifesto or not. In *Manifestoes of surrealism* (R. Seaver & H. R. Lane, Trans., pp. 281–294). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (Original work published 1942).
- Breton, A. (2010c). Second manifesto. In *Manifestoes of surrealism* (R. Seaver & H. R. Lane, Trans., pp. 119–194). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (Original work published 1929).

- Breton, A. (2010d). Surrealism and its living works. In *Manifestoes of surrealism* (R. Seaver & H. R. Lane, Trans., pp. 297–304). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (Original work published 1953).
- Butler, J. (2009). Critique, dissent, disciplinarity. *Critical Inquiry*, 35(4), 773–795. doi:10.1086/599590
- Colquhoun, I. (1961). *The goose of Hermogenes*. London, UK: Peter Owen Press.
- Colquhoun, I. (1966). *The blue Anubis*. Unpublished manuscript (The typescript is at Tate Gallery Archive 929/2/1/6/8).
- Colquhoun, I. (1975). *Sword of wisdom: MacGregor Mathers and the Golden Dawn*. London, UK: Spearman.
- Colquhoun, I. (2016a). *The crying of the wind: Ireland*. London, UK: Peter Owen Press (Original work published 1955).
- Colquhoun, I. (2016b). *The living stones: Cornwall*. London, UK: Peter Owen Press. (Original work published 1957).
- Derrida, J., & Ronell, A. (1980). The law of genre. *Critical Inquiry*, 7(1), 55–81.
- Ellmann, R. (Ed.). (1969). *The artist as critic: Critical writings of Oscar Wilde*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Farrington, L. (2005). *Creating their own image: The history of African-American women artists*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Faubion, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Michael Foucault: Aesthetics, method, and epistemology* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Ferentinou, V. (2013). Surrealism, occulture and gender: Women artists, power and occultism. *Aries*, 13(1), 103–130.
- Hatch, J. V. (1973). Interview with Camille Billops [Camille Billops and James V. Hatch archives, 1954–2011]. Atlanta, GA: Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University (Series 6, Oral History, 26.1, Camille Billops interviewed by James Hatch, July 26, 1973).
- Hatch, J. V., & Hamalian, L. (1981–2011). (Eds.). *Artists and influence*. New York, NY: Hatch-Billops Collection, Inc.
- hooks, b. (2006). *Outlaw culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lekatsas, B. (1991). Encounters: The film odyssey of Camille Billops. *Black-American Literature Forum*, 25(2), 395–408.
- Lekatsas, B. (2014). André Breton. In M. Kelly (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of aesthetics* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 310–315). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lekatsas, B. (2015, December 7). Personal interview with Camille Billops [discussion]. New York, NY: Hatch-Billops Collection.
- Lepetit, P. (2014). *The esoteric secrets of surrealism: Origins, magic, and secret societies* (J. E. Graham, Trans.). Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions (Original work published in 2012).
- Levy, S. (Ed.). (1987). *Journal inedit de Ricardo Viñes: Odilon Redon et le milieu occultiste (1897–1915)*. Paris, France: Aux Amateurs de Livres.
- Lippard, L. (Ed.). (1971). *Dadas on art: Tzara, Arp, Duchamp and others*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Morrison, M. (2014). Ithell Colquhoun and occult surrealism in mid-twentieth century Britain and Ireland. *Modernism/Modernity*, 21(3), 587–616.
- Patai, R. (1982). Maria the Jewess: Founding mother of alchemy. *Ambix*, 29(3), 177–197. doi:10.1179/amb.1982.29.3.177

- Pernecky, T. (2016). The epistemic foundations of event studies. In T. Pernecky (Ed.), *Approaches and methods in event studies* (pp. 1–2). London, UK: Routledge.
- Poggioli, R. (1968). *The theory of the avant-garde* (G. Fitzgerald, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press (Original work published in 1963).
- Quine, W. V., & Ullian, J. S. (1978). *The web of belief*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Reilly, M. (2015, May 26). Taking the measure of sexism. Retrieved from <http://www.artnews.com/2015/05/26/taking-the-measure-of-sexism-facts-figures-and-fixes/>
- Ross, A. (2016). Encrypted. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/04/11/stephane-mallarme-prophet-of-modernism>
- Sheets, H. M. (2014, March 7). Study finds a gender gap at the top museums. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Shillitoe, R. (2010). *Ithell Colquhoun: Magician born of nature* (2nd ed.). Morrisville, NC: Lulu Publishing.
- Tzara, T. (1922). Some memoirs of dadaism. *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved from <http://www.oldmagazinearticles.com>
- Waite, A. E. (2015). *Lives of alchemical philosophers based on materials collected in 1815*. London, UK: Forgotten Books.
- Basgier, C. (2014). Extra-disciplinary writing in the disciplines: Towards a metagenetic pedagogy. *Across the Disciplines*, 11(2), 1–19.
- Brannigan, R. (2018). *How then to act? A performance as research investigation into the potentials of expanding an actor's agency* (Doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/12298>
- Candy, L. (2006). Practice based research: A guide. Retrieved from <http://research.it.uts.edu.au/creative/eae/intart/pdfs/PBR%20Guide-1.1-2006.pdf>
- Chen, C. (2018). *Bright on the grey sea: Utilizing the Xiang system to creatively consider the potentials of menglong in film poetry* (Doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/11737>
- Darbellay, F. (2016). From disciplinarity to postdisciplinarity: Tourism studies dedisciplined. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 363–372. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851659
- Gusdorf, G. (1983). Passé, présent, avenir de la recherche interdisciplinaire. In L. Apostel, J. M. Benoist, T. B. Bottomore, K. E. Boulding, M. Dufrenne, M. Eliade, ... J. Ui (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarite et sciences humaines* (pp. 31–51). Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Haskins, C. H. (1957). *The rise of the universities*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hearn, A. (2003). Interdisciplinarity / extradisciplinarity: On the university and the active pursuit of community. *History of Intellectual Culture*, 3(1), 1–13.
- History of Education. (1977). *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Vol. 6). Chicago, IL: Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Keats, J. (1958). *The letters of John Keats 1814–1821*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Little, S. (2011). Practice and performance as research in the arts. In D. Bendrup & G. Downes (Eds.), *Dunedin soundings: Place and performance* (pp. 19–28). Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- McElreavy, C., Tobin, V., Martin, T., Bea Damon, M., Crate, N., Godinez, A., & Bennett, K. (2016). The history of the academy and the disciplines. Retrieved from <https://press.rebus.community/idsconnect/chapter/the-history-of-the-academy-and-the-disciplines/>

- Merriam Webster Dictionary. (2018). Radical. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/radical>
- Nelson, R. (2013). *Practice as research in the arts: Principles, protocols, pedagogies, resistances*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1957). *The revolt of the masses*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Outline of Academic Disciplines. (n.d.). In Wikipedia. Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outline\\_of\\_academic\\_disciplines](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outline_of_academic_disciplines)
- Post, R. (2009). Debating disciplinarity. *Critical Inquiry*, 35(4), 749–770.
- Radical [Def. 1]. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster online*. In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved September 19, 2018, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/radical>
- Sayer, A. (2003). Long live postdisciplinary studies! Sociology and the curse of disciplinary parochialism/imperialism. Retrieved from <http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/resources/sociology-online-papers/papers/sayer-long-live-postdisciplinary-studies.pdf>
- Schlanger, J. (1992). Fondation, nouveaute, limites, memoire. *Communications*, 54, 289–298.
- Schön, D. (1985). *The design studio*. London, UK: RIBA Publications Ltd.
- Shumway, D. R., & Messer-Davidow, E. (1991). Disciplinarity: An introduction. *Poetics Today*, 12(2), 201–225.
- Tavares, T. (2019). *Magical realities: A creative consideration of the narrative and illustrative potentials of realism maravilhosos* (Doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand). Retrieved from <https://designassembly.org.nz/2018/10/01/postgraduate-design-research-tatiana-tavares-aut/>
- Wright, J. T., Embrick, D. G., & Henke, K. (2015). Interdisciplinarity, postdisciplinarity, and anomic specialization: Where do we locate sociology? *Humanity & Society*, 39(3), 267–273.
- Xu, J. (2016). The poetics of Wang Jing: A report on the 2016 orientation ceremony. Retrieved from <http://gaokao.chsi.com.cn/gkxx/yzzs/201609/20160929/1557693554.html>
- Badiou, A. (2012). *In praise of love*. London, UK: Serpent's Tail.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2013). *Anti-Oedipus*. London, UK: Bloomsbury (Original work published 1984).
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2014). *A thousand plateaus*. London, UK: Bloomsbury (Original work published 1987).
- Fisher, H. (1992). *Anatomy of love: A natural history of mating, marriage, and why we stray*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Fisher, H., Brown, L., Aron, A., Strong, G., & Mashek, D. (2010). Reward, addiction, and emotion regulation systems associated with rejection in love. *The Journal of Neurophysiology*, 104, 51–60.
- Goodchild, P. (1996). *Deleuze & Guattari: An introduction to the politics of desire*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hall, L. (2017). *Ledelse på læringsudbytte, en analytisk begrebsættelse af ledelse på læringsudbytte tæt på livet ledelsesliv* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Århus Universitet/DPU, Århus, Denmark).
- Holland, E. (2010). Desire + social-production. In A. Parr (Ed.), *The Deleuze dictionary: Revised edition* (pp. 67–69). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kleinherenbrink, A. (2016). Closed vessels and signs: Jealousy as a passion for reality. In C. Meiborg & S. van Tuinen (Eds.), *Deleuze and the passions* (pp. 59–79). Santa Barbara, CA: Punctum books.
- Massumi, B. (1995). The autonomy of affect. *Cultural Critique*, 31, 83–109.

- Meiborg, C., & van Tuinen S. (2016). *Deleuze and the passions*. Santa Barbara, CA: Punctum books.
- Nussbaum, M. (1994). *The therapy of desire: Theory and practice in Hellenistic ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Perel, E. (2006). *Mating in captivity: Unlocking erotic intelligence*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Perel, E. (2017). *The state of affairs: Rethinking infidelity*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Pernecky, T., Munar, A. M., & Feighery, W. (2016). Tourism in a postdisciplinary milieu: Final demarcation points. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 431–434.
- Pernecky, T., Munar, A. M., & Wheeler, B. (2016). Existential postdisciplinarity: Personal journeys into tourism, art, and freedom. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 389–401.
- Bohm, D., & Peat, F. D. (2011). *Science, Order, and Creativity*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Daskal, L. (2018, January 3). 8 ways improvisation can make you into a better leader. *Inc*. Retrieved from <https://www.inc.com/lolly-daskal/how-improv-can-make-you-a-better-leader.html>
- East Side Institute. (2019). *The international class*. Retrieved March 19, 2019, from <http://eastsideinstitute.org/study/international-class/>
- Holzman, L. (1997). *Schools for growth: Radical alternatives to current educational models*. Edison, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Holzman, L. (2017). *Vygotsky at work and play* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Holzman, L. (2018). *The overweight brain: How our obsession with knowing keeps us from getting smart enough to make a better world*. New York, NY: East Side Institute for Group & Short Term Psychotherapy.
- Mitra, S. (2013). *Build a school in the cloud* [Video file]. Retrieved from [https://www.ted.com/talks/sugata\\_mitra\\_build\\_a\\_school\\_in\\_the\\_cloud/transcript](https://www.ted.com/talks/sugata_mitra_build_a_school_in_the_cloud/transcript)
- Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (1997). *The end of knowing: A new developmental way of learning*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Pernecky, T. (2016). *Epistemology and metaphysics for qualitative research*. London, UK: SAGE Publishing.
- Pernecky, T., Abdat, S., Brostroem, B., Mikaere, D., & Paovale, H. (2019). Sexual harassment and violence at events and festivals: A student perspective. *Event Management*, 23(6), (in press). doi: 10.3727/152599518X15403853721277
- Salit, C. (2016). *Performance breakthrough*. New York, NY: Hachette Books.
- Tertiary Education Commission. (2017). *Performance-based research fund: A guide for staff members participating in the 2018 quality evaluation*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Weinberger, D. (2011). *Too big to know*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Colless, I. R. T. (2018, November 1–4). *Panel 1: First Nations artists: Responding to place*. Panel discussion at Artstate Bathurst 2018, Bathurst, Australia. Retrieved January 16, 2019, from <http://www.artstate.com.au/>
- Edwards, B. (2012). *Drawing on the right side of the brain: The definitive* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Penguin.
- Kidder, R. M. (1994). *Shared values for a troubled world: Conversations with men and women of conscience*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Panuku Development Auckland: An Auckland Council organisation (2019). Retrieved January 16, 2019, from <http://www.panuku.co.nz>
- Panuku Development Auckland: An Auckland Council organisation (2018). Retrieved October 8, 2018, from <http://www.panuku.co.nz>

- Autodesk. (2018). *Instructables: Make anything*. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <https://www.instructables.com/>
- Ball, S. J. (2016). Neoliberal education? Confronting the slouching beast. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(8), 1046–1059.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs*, 28(3), 801–831.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Cassidy, D. (2018). Go make something! The growth of the maker movement. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/guide/go-make-something-growth-maker-movement/>
- Clark, A. (2011). *Supersizing the mind: Embodiment, action, and cognitive extension*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis*, 58(1), 7–19.
- Crossan, J., Cumbers, A., McMaster, R., & Shaw, D. (2016). Contesting neoliberal urbanism in Glasgow's community gardens: The practice of DIY Citizenship. *Antipode*, 48(4), 937–955.
- Dick, P. K. (2007). The variable man. In P. K. Dick (Ed.), *Human is* (pp. 103–169). London, UK: Gollancz.
- Dougherty, D. (2018). *Make*. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <https://makezine.com/>
- Dunne, A., & Raby, F. (2013). *Speculative everything: Design, fiction, and social dreaming*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Ellul, J. (1964). *The technological society* (J. Wilkinson, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Gibbons, A. (2018). Neoliberalism education policy and the life of the academic: A poetics of pedagogical resistance. *Policy Futures in Education*, 16(7), 918–930.
- Gil, A. (2018). *Interview with Ernesto Oroza*. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/67>
- Goodwin, I. (2014). Power to the people? Web 2.0, Facebook, and DIY cultural citizenship in Aotearoa New Zealand. *MEDIANZ: Media Studies Journal of Aotearoa New Zealand*, 12(2), 110–134.
- Gordon, C. (1991). Government rationality: An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 1–51). London, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Guerrini, A. (2016). The material turn in the history of life science. *Literature Compass*, 13(7), 469–480.
- Hartley, J. (2016). A problem of knowledge solved. In I. Hargreaves & J. Hartley (Eds.), *The creative citizen unbound: How social media and DiY culture contribute to democracy, communities and the creative economy* (pp. 25–48). Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Hertz, G. (2012). *Critical making*. Retrieved June 13, 2018, from <http://conceptlab.com/criticalmaking/>
- Hertz, G. (2018). *We need something better than the maker movement*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Humes, E. (2012). *Garbology: Our dirty love affair with trash*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Liboiron, M. (2014). *Why discard Studies?* Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <https://discardstudies.com/2014/05/07/why-discard-studies/>
- Malafouris, L. (2013). *How things shape the world: A theory of material engagement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Novoa, G. (2016). *Welding machine (criolla)*. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <http://www.technologicaldisobedience.com/2016/05/06/welding-machin-criolla/>
- Onion, R. (2008). Reclaiming the machine: An introductory look at steampunk in everyday practice. *Neo-victorian Studies*, 1(1), 138–163.
- Oroza, E. (2018). *Technological disobedience: From the revolution to revolico.com*. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <http://www.technologicaldisobedience.com/category/notes/>
- Peters, M.A., & Heraud, R. (2015). Toward a political theory of social innovation: Collective intelligence and the co-creation of social goods. *Journal of Self-Governance and Management Economics Volume*, 3(3), 7–23.
- Peters M.A., Marshall J.D., & Fitzsimons, P. (2000). Managerialism and educational policy in a global context: Neoliberalism, Foucault and the doctrine of self-management. In N. Burbules & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalisation and educational policy* (pp. 109–132). London, UK: Routledge.
- Pickering, A. (2010). *The mangle of practice time, agency, and science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ratto, M. (2011). Critical making: Conceptual and material studies in technology and social life. *The Information Society*, 27(4), 252–260.
- Scanlan, J. (2005). *On garbage*. London, UK: Reaktion Books.
- Snake-Beings, E. (2016). *The DiY ['Do it yourself'] Ethos: A participatory culture of material engagement* (Doctoral thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/9973>
- Snake-Beings, E. (2018a). Animism and artefact: The entangled agencies of a DIY [Do-It-Yourself] maker. *Visual Ethnography*, 7(2), 80–98.
- Snake-Beings, E. (2018b). Maker culture and DiY technologies: Re-functioning as a techno-animist practice. *Continuum*, 32(2), 121–136.
- Tight, M. (2019). The neoliberal turn in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1111/hequ.12197h
- Abbott, A. (2004). *Methods of discovery: Heuristics for the social sciences*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Abbott, A. (2006). Le chaos des disciplines, in *Qu'est-ce qu'une discipline?* (French translation of chapter one of the book *The Chaos of Disciplines*, 2001).
- Baker, R., van Exel, J., Mason, H., & Stricklin, M. (2010). Connecting Q and surveys: Three methods to explore factor membership in large samples. *Operant Subjectivity*, 34(1), 38–58.
- Biagioli, M. (2009). Postdisciplinary liaisons: Science studies and the humanities. *Critical Inquiry*, 35, 816–835.
- Blanckaert, C. (2006). La discipline en perspective, le système des sciences à l'heure du spécialisme (XIXe – XXe siècle). In J. Boutier, J.-C. Passeron, & J. Revel (Eds.), *Qu'est-ce qu'une discipline?* (pp. 117–148). Paris, France: Editions de l'EHESS.
- Boutier, J., Jean-Claude, P., & Jacques, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Qu'est-ce qu'une discipline?* Paris, France: Editions de l'EHESS.
- Bonness, A. (1989). *The conditions of success: How the modern artist rises to fame*. London, UK: Thames and Hudson.
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Brown, S. R. (1993). A Q methodological tutorial. *Operant Subjectivity*, 16, 91–138. Retrieved October 3, 2005, from [www.qmethod.org](http://www.qmethod.org)

- Brown, S. R. (1996). Q Methodology and qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6(4), 561–567.
- Brown, S. R. (2002). Q technique and questionnaires. *Operant Subjectivity*, 25(2), 117–126.
- Brown, S. R. (2003). *Empowerment as subjective operant*. Paper presented at the Workshop on ‘Measuring Empowerment: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives’ held at the World Bank in Washington, DC, February 4 and 5, 2003.
- Brown, S. R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality and Quantity*, 40(3), 361–382.
- Brown, S. R., & Rhoads, J. C. (2017). Bibliography of intensive single-case studies. *Operant Subjectivity*, 39(1–2), 98–100. doi:10.15133/j.os.2017.007
- Brown, S. R., Wolf, A., & Rhoads, J. (2017). *An abductory examination of abduction*. Paper presented at the 33rd ISSSS Conference, Glasgow.
- Callard, F., & Fitzgerald, D. (2015). *Rethinking interdisciplinarity across the social sciences and neurosciences*. Palgrave. Retrieved from <http://www.oopen.org/search?identifier=588620>
- Cuppen, E., Breker, S., Hisschemoller, M., & Bergsma, E. (2010). Q methodology to select participants for a stakeholder dialogue on energy options from biomass in the Netherlands. *Ecological Economics*, 69(3), 579–591.
- Danielson, S. (2009). Q method and surveys: Three ways to combine Q and R. *Field Studies*, 21(3), 219–237.
- Darbellay, F. (2016). From disciplinarity to postdisciplinarity: Tourism studies de-disciplined. *Tourism Analysis*, 21, 363–372.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty: A study of the relation of knowledge and action*. New York, NY: Putnam’s.
- Dewey, J., & Bentley, A. (1949). *Knowing and the known*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Dryzek, J.S., & Braithwaite, V. (2000). On the prospects for democratic deliberation: Values analysis applied to Australian politics. *Political Psychology*, 21(2), 241–266.
- Dryzek, J.S., & Kanra, B. (2014). Muslims and the mainstream in Australia: Polarisation or engagement? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(8), 1236–1253.
- Durning, D. (2006). Using Q-methodology to resolve conflicts and find solutions to contentious policy issues. In R. Ahmad (Ed.), *The role of public administration in building a harmonious society* (pp. 601–620). Beijing, China: China National School of Administration and the Network of Asia-Pacific Schools and Institute of Public Administration and Governance.
- Fabiani, J. L (2012). Du chaos des disciplines à la fin de l’ordre disciplinaire? Pratiques, Linguistique, Litterature, Didactique, 153–154. Retrieved from <http://pratiques.revues.org/1969>, 129–140.
- Franz, A., Worrell, M., & Vögele, C. (2013). Integrating mixed-method data in psychological research: Combining Q methodology and questionnaires in a study investigating cultural and psychological influences on adolescent sexual behavior. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(4), 370–389.
- Fuller, S. (2003). Interdisciplinarity. The Loss of a Heroic Vision in the Market place of Ideas in *Rethinking interdisciplinarity*, site d’échanges. Retrieved from <http://www.interdisciplines.org> (texte déposé le 1 octobre 2003), cited in Fabiani, 2012).
- Gauttier S., & Gauzente C. (2018). Exploring the similarities between users and non-users of consumer mobile internet services: Towards a porosity model of technology acceptance. *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction*, 14/3, 71–87.

- Gauttier, S., Gauzente, C., & Aikala, M. (2016). Are AR shopping services valued the same way throughout Europe? A four country Q-investigation. *Système d'Information et Management*, 21(1), article 4. Retrieved from <http://aisel.aisnet.org/sim/vol21/iss1/4>
- Gauzente, C. (2014). Digging into the subjectivity of mobile apps 'non-users' – A single-case study approach. *Operant Subjectivity*, 37(4), 41–55.
- Gauzente, C. (2017). *Subjectivity and more in art appreciation – A pilot Q-study of contemporary prints*. 33rd ISSSS Conference, Glasgow, UK, 7–9 September.
- Gauzente, C., & Doré, S. (2018). *General public's taste for contemporary prints – A French experimental exhibition*. 10th IMPACT Conference, Santander.
- Good, J. M. M. (2000). Disciplining social psychology: A case study of boundary relations in the history of the human sciences. *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, 36(4), 383–403.
- Good, J. M. M. (2007). The affordances for social psychology of the ecological approach to social knowing. *Theory and Psychology*, 17(2), 265–295.
- Good, J. M. M. (2010). An introduction to the life and work of William Stephenson. *Psychoanalysis and History*, 12(2), 211–243.
- Grosswiler, P. (1997). A Q methodology study of media and ideology orientations: Exploring medium theory, critical theory and cultural studies. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 22(2). Retrieved from <https://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/996/902>
- Harvey, H., Good, J. M. M., Mason, J., & Reissland, N. (2015). A Q-methodology study of parental understandings of infant immunisation: Implications for health-care advice. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 20(11), 1451–1462.
- Heilbron, J., & Gingras, Y. (2015). « La résilience des disciplines », Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales 2015/5 (N° 210), pp. 4–9. doi:10.3917/arss.210.0004
- Heinich, N. (2012). Mapping intermediaries in contemporary art according to pragmatic sociology. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(6), 695–702.
- James, W. (1984/1912). *Essays in radical empiricism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jessop, B., & Sum, N-L. (2001). Pre-disciplinary and postdisciplinary perspectives. *New Political Economy*, 6(1), 89–101.
- Kantor, J. R. (1959). *Interbehavioral psychology: A sample of scientific construction*. Granville, OH: Principia Press.
- Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory and practice*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. B. (2013). *Q methodology* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Messer-Davidow, E., Shumway, D.R., & Sylvan, D.J. (1993). *Knowledges: Historical and critical studies of disciplinarity*. Charlottesville and London, UK: University Press of Virginia.
- Mutuku, C. M. (2011). *Youth perspectives on their empowerment in sub-Saharan Africa: The case of Kenya*. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Newman, I., & Ramlo, S. (2010). Using Q methodology and Q factor analysis in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (2nd ed., pp. 505–530). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Ockwell, D.G. (2008). 'Opening up' policy to reflexive appraisal: A role for Q methodology? A case study of fire management in Cape York, Australia. *Policy Sciences*, 41, 263–292.
- Pernecky, T., Munar, A. M., & Fieghery, W. (2016). Tourism in a postdisciplinary milieu: Final demarcation points. *Tourism Analysis*, 21, 431–434.
- Pronko, N. H., & Herman, D. T. (1982). From Dewey's reflex arc concept to transactionalism and beyond. *Behaviorism*, 10, 229–254.
- Putnam, H. (2001). *The threefold cord: Mind, body, world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Ramlo, S. (2016). Mixed method lessons learned From 80 years of Q methodology. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(1), 28–45.
- Ramlo, S. E., & Newman, I. (2011). Q methodology and its position in the mixed-methods continuum. *Operant Subjectivity*, 34(3), 171–192.
- Reed, E. S. (1996). *The necessity of experience*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rhoads, J. C. (Ed.). (2017). Special issue: Q methodology and the single case. *Operant Subjectivity*, 39(1–2), 1–100.
- Roberts, R. H., & Good, J. M. M. (1993). *The recovery of rhetoric: Persuasive discourse and disciplinarity in the human sciences*. Bristol, UK: The Bristol Press; Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1935a). Technique of factor analysis. *Nature*, 136, 297.
- Stephenson, W. (1935b). Correlating persons instead of tests. *Character and Personality*, 4, 17–24.
- Stephenson, W. (1953). *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1961). Scientific creed -1961: Philosophical credo. *The Psychological Record*, 11, 1–8.
- Stephenson, W. (1967). *The play theory of mass communication*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1969). Foundations of communication theory. *Psychological Record*, 19, 65–82.
- Stephenson, W. (1970/1980). *Quiddity College: Thomas Jefferson's legacy*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Stephenson, W. (1978). Concourse theory of communication. *Communication*, 3, 21–40.
- Stephenson, W. (1980). Consciring: A general theory for subjective communicability. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 4* (pp. 7–36). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Stephenson, W. (1982a). Q-methodology, interbehavioral psychology and quantum theory. *The Psychological Record*, 32, 235–248.
- Stephenson, W. (1982b). Newton's fifth rule and Q methodology: Application to self psychology. *Operant Subjectivity*, 5(2), 37–57.
- Stephenson, W. (1986a). *Quantum theory of advertising*. Columbia, MO: School of Journalism Missouri-Columbia.
- Stephenson, W. (1986b). William James, Niels Bohr, and complementarity: I – Concepts. *The Psychological Record*, 36, 519–527.
- Stephenson, W. (1988). 'Quantum theory of subjectivity'. *Integrative Psychiatry*, 6, 180–187.

- Stephenson, W. (1988/1989). The quantumization of psychological events. *Operant Subjectivity*, 2(1/2): 1–23.
- Stephenson, W. (1992). Self in everyday life. *Operant Subjectivity*, 15(2), 29–55.
- Stephenson, W. (1994). *Quantum theory of advertising*. Columbia, MO: School of Journalism Missouri-Columbia.
- Stephenson, W. (2004). Theory and methodology for esthetics. *Operant Subjectivity*, 28(1/2), 13–32. doi:10.15133/j.os.2004.012
- Stephenson, W. (2005). Old age research. *Operant Subjectivity*, 34, 217–233.
- Stephenson, W. (2006). Tribute to Melanie Klein. *Operant Subjectivity*, 29(3/4), 95–121.
- Still, A. W., & Good, J. M. M. (1992) Mutualism in the human sciences: Toward the implementation of a theory. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 22, 105–128.
- Still, A. W., & Good, J. M. M. (1998). The ontology of mutualism. *Ecological Psychology*, 10, 39–63.
- Thomas, D. B. (2017). The presentation and remembrance of self in everyday academic life: Building the case for single-case studies in a science of subjectivity. *Operant Subjectivity*, 39(1–2), 21–36. doi:10.15133/j.os.2017.003
- Trentini, B. (2018). Expérience esthétique et subjectivité - Aux origines de l'autoréférence, Talk at SAMI Workshop (Subjectivity As Matter and Instrument), Maison des Sciences de l'Homme Ange Guépin, Nantes.
- Trudel, M. (2005). *La Méthode Q*, Teaching Material. University of Sherbrooke.
- Trudel, M. (2018). Q-method and unconventional uses – The case of MIRA, among others. Presentation at SAMI (Subjectivity As Matter and Instrument) International Workshop, September 2018, MSH Ange Guépin, Nantes.
- Unger, R. M. (1998). *Democracy realized: The progressive alternative*. London, UK: Verso.
- Wallerstein, I. (1996). *Open the social sciences. Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the restructuring of the social sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Watts S., & P. Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q-methodological research, Theory, method and interpretation*. London, UK: Sage.
- Zabala, A., Sandbrook, C., & Mukherjee (2018). When and how to use Q methodology to understand perspectives in conservation research. *Conservation Biology*, 32(5), 1185–1194.
- Zangwill, O. L., Kohlberg, L., & Brenner, D. J. (1972). 'Introduction: William Stephenson'. In S.R. Brown & D.J. Brenner (Eds.), *Science, Psychology, and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson* (pp. ix–xxv). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Zanoli, R., Carlesi, L., Danovaro, R., Mandolesi, S., & Naspetti, S. (2015). Valuing, unfamiliar Mediterranean deep-sea ecosystems using visual Q-methodology. *Marine Policy*, 61, 227–236.
- Airey, D., Tribe, J., Benckendorf, P., & Xiao, H. (2015). The managerial gaze: The long tail of tourism education and research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(2), 139–151.
- Alcoff, L. M. (2002). Does the public intellectual have intellectual intelligence. *Metaphilosophy*, 33(5), 521–534.
- Anderson, P. W. (1972). More is different. *Science*, 177(4047), 393–396.

- Barone, T. (1995). The purposes of arts-based educational research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(2), 169–180. doi:10.1016/0883-0355(95)91500-G
- Benjamin, S., & Kline, C. (2019). How to yes-and: Using improvisational games to improv(e) communication, listening, and collaboration techniques in tourism and hospitality education. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism Education*, 24(June), 130–142.
- Benson, T. C. (1982). Five arguments against interdisciplinary studies. *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 1, 38–48.
- Berg, M., & Seeber, K. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Bonney, R., Shirk, J., Phillips, T., Wiggins, A., Ballard, H., Miller-Rushing, A., & Parrish, J. K. (2014). Next steps for citizen science. *Science*, 343, 1436–1437. doi:10.1126/science.1251554
- Briggle, A., & Frodeman, R. (2016). The institution of philosophy: Escaping disciplinary capture. *Metaphilosophy*, 47(1), 26–38.
- Campbell, E. G., Clarridge, B. R., Gokhale, M., Birenbaum, L., Hilgartner, S., Holtzman, N. A., ... Blumenthal, D. (2002). Data withholding in academic genetics: Evidence from a national survey. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 287(4), 473. doi:10.1001/jama.287.4.473
- Cohn, J. (2008). Citizen science: Can volunteers do real research? *Bioscience*, 58(3), 192–197. doi:10.1641/B580303
- Corning, P. (2002). The re-emergence of “emergence”: A venerable concept in search of a theory. *Complexity*, 7(6), 18–30.
- David P. A. (2004). Understanding the emergence of “open science” institutions: functionalist economics in historical context. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 13(4): 571–589. doi:10.1093/icc/dth023
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542–575.
- Eagleton, T. (2007). *The meaning of life: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Elkaim-Sartre, A. (2007). Preface. In J. Sartre (Ed.), *Existentialism is a humanism* (pp. vii–xiv). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fecher, B., & Friesike S. (2014). Open science: One term, five schools of thought. In S. Bartling & S. Friesike (Eds.), *Opening science: The evolving guide on how the Internet is changing research, collaboration and scholarly publishing* (pp. 17–47). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8\_2
- Flint, C. G., Jones, A. S., & Horsburgh, J. S. (2017). Data management dimensions of social water science: The iUtah experience. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 53(5), 988–996. doi:10.1111/1752-1688.12568
- Frodeman, R. (2010). Introduction. In R. Frodeman, J. Thompson Klein, & C. Mitcham (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (pp. xxix–xxxix). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Frost, R. (1914). *Mending wall*. North of Boston. Strand, UK: David Nutt.
- Haeussler, C. (2011). Information-sharing in academia and the industry: A comparative study. *Research Policy*, 40(1), 105–122. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2010.08.007
- Harari, Y. N. (2011). *Sapiens: A brief history of humankind*. London, UK: Vintage Books.
- Heidorn, P. B. (2008). Shedding light on the dark data in the long tail of science. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 280–299. doi:10.1353/lib.0.0036
- Hvistendahl, M. (2019). Land of giants. *MIT Technology Review*, 122(1), 8–13.

- Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lincoln, Y., & Denzin, N. (2018). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Liu, J., Dietz, T., Carpenter, S. R., Alberti, M., Folke, C., Moran, E., ... Taylor, W. W. (2007). Complexity of coupled human and natural systems. *Science*, *317*, 1513–1516.
- Molloy, J. C. (2011). The Open Knowledge Foundation: Open data means better science. *PLoS Biology*, *9*(12), e1001195. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001195
- Munar, A. M. (2016). The house of tourism studies and the systemic paradigm. In A. M. Munar & T. Jamal (Eds.), *Tourism research paradigms: Critical and emergent knowledge* (pp. 131–153). Bingley, UK: Emerald. doi:10.1108/S1571-504320150000022014
- Pollan, M. (2006). *The omnivore's dilemma: A natural history of four meals*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Sartre, J. (2007). *Existentialism is a humanism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Soranno, P. A., Bissell, E. G., Cheruvilil, K. S., Christel, S. T., Collins, S. M., Fergus, C. E., ... Webster, K. E. (2015). Building a multi-scaled geospatial temporal ecology database from disparate data sources: Fostering open science and data reuse. *GigaScience*, *4*(1), s13742-015-0067-4. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0067-4
- Summers, J., Smith, L., Case, J., & Linthurst, R. (2012). A review of the elements of human well-being with an emphasis on the contribution of ecosystem services. *Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*, *41*, 327–340.
- Stengers, I. (2018). *Another science is possible: A manifesto for slow science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Taberlet, N., Morris, S., & McElwaine, J. (2007). Washboard road: The dynamics of granular ripples formed by rolling wheels. *Physical Review Letters*, *99*, 068003.
- Turner, B., Hill, D. J., and Caton, K. (In press). Cracking “open” technology in ecohydrology. In D. F. Levia, D. Carlyle-Moses, S. Iida, B. Michalzik, K. Nanko, & A. Tischer (Eds.), *Forest water interactions*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Weingart P. (2010). A short history of knowledge formations. In R. Frodeman, J. Thompson Klein, & C. Mitcham (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (pp. 3–14). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why greater equality makes society stronger*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, G., & Moraga, C. (Eds.). (2015). *This bridge called my back: Writing by radical women of color* (4th ed.). New York, NY: State University of New York Press (Original work published 1983).
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gordon, L. R. (2019). *Existentialism from a global perspective*. Retrieved February 11, 2019, from <http://www.lewisrgordon.com/sketches/existentialism-from-a-global.html>
- Manufacturing in Mexico. (n.d.). *What is a maquiladora in Mexico?* Retrieved June 24, 2019, from <https://manufacturinginmexico.org/maquiladora-in-mexico/>

- Abbott, A. (1981). Status and status strain in the professions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(4), 819–835.
- Allsop, J., & Saks, M. (2002). *Regulating the health professions*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Barnett, T., Sellick, K., Cross, M., Walker, L., James, A., & Henderson, S. (2012). Preparing student nurses for healthcare reform. *Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-disciplinary Journal*, 14(1), 23.
- Baum, F., Freeman, T., Sanders, D., Labonté, R., Lawless, A., & Javanparast, S. (2016). Comprehensive primary health care under neo-liberalism in Australia. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 168, 43–52. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.09.005
- Belling, C. (2013). Begin with a text: Teaching the poetics of medicine. *Journal of Medical Humanities*, 34(4), 481–491. doi:10.1007/s10912-013-9246-4
- Bertilsson, M. (1990). The welfare state, the professions and citizens. In M. Burrage & R. Torstendahl (Eds.), *The formation of professions* (pp. 114–133). London, UK: Sage.
- Bleakley, A. (2015). *Medical humanities and medical education: How the medical humanities can shape better doctors*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Boulton, A., Tamehana, J., & Brannelly, T. (2013). Whānau-centred health and social service delivery in New Zealand. *Mai Journal*, 2(1), 18–32.
- Brandt, B., Lutfiyya, M. N., King, J. A., & Chioreso, C. (2014). A scoping review of interprofessional collaborative practice and education using the lens of the triple aim. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 28(5), 393–399. doi:10.3109/13561820.2014.906391
- Bremner, C., & Rodgers, P. (2013). Design without discipline. *DesignIssues*, 29(3), 4–13. doi:10.1162/DESI\_a\_00217
- Brownie, S., Thomas, J., McAllister, L., & Groves, M. (2014). Australian health reforms: Enhancing interprofessional practice and competency within the health workforce. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 28(3), 252–253. doi:10.3109/13561820.2014.881790
- Carr-Sanders, A. P., & Wilson, P. A. (1933). *The professions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cherry, B., & Jacob, S. R. (2017). *Contemporary nursing: Issues, trends, & management*. St. Louis, MO: Elsevier.
- Chiavaroli, N., & Ellwood, C. (2012). The medical humanities and the perils of curricular integration. *Journal of Medical Humanities*, 33(4), 245–254. doi:10.1007/s10912-012-9183-7
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus – Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Drake, D. B. (2014). Three windows of development: A postprofessional perspective on supervision. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 9(1), 38–48.
- Einhorn, E. S., & Logue, J. (2003). *Modern welfare states: Scandinavian politics and policy in the global age*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fitzsimons, P. (2000). *Neo-liberalism, welfare and education: 'The New Zealand experiment': Critique and critical transformations*. In AREA conference, New Orleans.
- Flood, C. (2003). *International health care reform: A legal, economic and political analysis*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1984). The order of discourse. In M. Shapiro (Ed.), *Language and politics* (pp. 108–138). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Freidson, E. (1970). *Profession of medicine: A study of the sociology of applied knowledge*. New York, NY: Dodd Mead.
- Gabe, J., Harley, K., & Calnan, M. (2015). Healthcare choice: Discourses, perceptions, experiences and practices. *Current Sociology*, 63(5), 623–635. doi:10.1177/0011392115590061

- Goodson, I., & Norrie, C. (2005). A literature review of welfare state restructuring in education and health care in European contexts: Implications for the teaching and nursing professions and their professional knowledge. The ProfKnow Consortium. EU SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME PRIORITY. University of Brighton, Brighton, UK.
- Gottlieb, K. (2013). The Nuka System of Care: Improving health through ownership and relationships. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 72. doi:10.3402/ijch.v72i0.21118
- Holmes, C. A. (2001). Postdisciplinarity in mental health-care: An Australian viewpoint. *Nursing Inquiry*, 8(4), 230–239. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1800.2001.00117.x
- Hurley, C., Baum, F., & Eyk, H. (2004). Designing better health care in the south: A case study of unsuccessful transformational change in public sector health service reform. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 63(2), 31–41.
- Hyde, P., Granter, E., Hassard, J., & McCann, L. (2016). *Deconstructing the welfare state: Managing healthcare in the age of reform*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy. (2012). Health reform and the health care workforce. *Baker Institute Policy Report*, 51, 1–23.
- James, K., & Quirk, A. (2017). The rationale for shared decision making in mental health care: A systematic review of academic discourse. *Mental Health Review*, 22(3), 152–165. doi:10.1108/MHRJ-01-2017-0009
- Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Johnson, T. (1995). Governmentality and the institutionalization of expertise. In G. Larkin & M. Saks (Eds.), *Health professions and the state in Europe* (pp. 7–24). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Johnson, S. A. (2011). *Challenges in health and development from global to community perspectives*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Jones, L. J. (1994). Power and control in health work. In *The social context of health and health work* (pp. 411–459). Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Jones, L., & Green, J. (2006). Shifting discourses of professionalism: A case study of general practitioners in the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 28(7), 927–950. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.2006.00513.x
- Köppen, J., Maier, C. B., Busse, R., & MUNROS Team. (2018). What are the motivating and hindering factors for health professionals to undertake new roles in hospitals? A study among physicians, nurses and managers looking at breast cancer and acute myocardial infarction care in nine countries. *Health Policy*, 122(10), 1118–1125. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2018.07.018
- Lakoff, A. (2015). Real-time biopolitics: The actuary and the sentinel in global public health. *Economy and Society*, 44(1), 40–59. doi:10.1080/03085147.2014.983833
- Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lupton, D. (2012). *Medicine as culture: Illness, disease and the body in western society*. London, UK: Sage.
- Max-Neef, M. A. (2005). Foundations of transdisciplinarity. *Ecological Economics*, 53, 5–16.
- McDonald, R. (2014). ‘Bourdieu’, medical elites and ‘social class’: A qualitative study of ‘desert island’ doctors. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 36(6), 902–916. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12121
- McNeil, K., Mitchell, R., & Parker, V. (2015). The paradoxical effects of workforce shortages on rural interprofessional practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 29(1), 73–82. doi:10.1111/scs.12129

- Meads, G., Ashcroft, J., Barr, H., Scott, R., & Wild, A. (2008). *The case for inter-professional collaboration in health and social care*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mingardi, A. (2015). Healthcare and the slippery slope of state growth: Lessons from the past. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy, 40*(2), 169–189. doi:10.1093/jmp/jhu074
- Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Nancarrow, S. A., & Borthwick, A. M. (2005). Dynamic professional boundaries in the healthcare workforce. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 27*(7), 897–919. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.2005.00463.x
- Nicholls, D. A., Atkinson, K., Bjorbækmo, W. S., Gibson, B. E., Latchem, J., Olesen, J., ... Setchell, J. (2016). Connectivity: An emerging concept for physiotherapy practice. *Physiotherapy Theory & Practice, 32*(3), 159–170. doi:10.3109/09593985.2015.1137665
- Nicholls, D. A. (2017). *The end of physiotherapy*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Nicholls, D. A. (2018). New materialism and physiotherapy. In B. Gibson, D. Nicholls, K. Synne-Groven & J. Setchell (Eds.), *Manipulating practices: A critical physiotherapy reader* (pp. 101–122). Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Damm Forlag.
- Nordgren, L. (2010). Mostly empty words – what the discourse of ‘choice’ in health care does. *Journal of Health Organisation & Management, 24*(2), 109–126. doi:10.1108/14777261011047309
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Pernecky, T. (2016). The epistemic foundations of event studies. In T. Pernecky (Ed.), *Approaches and methods in event studies* (pp. 3–21). London, UK: Routledge.
- Petersen, A., Bleakley, A., Brömer, R., & Marshall, R. (2008). The medical humanities today: Humane health care or tool of governance? *Journal of Medical Humanities, 29*(1), 1–4.
- Petrakaki, D., Barber, N., & Waring, J. (2012). The possibilities of technology in shaping healthcare professionals: (Re/de-)professionalisation of pharmacists in England. *Social Science & Medicine (1982), 75*(2), 429–437. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.033
- Pickard, S. (2010). The role of governmentality in the establishment, maintenance and demise of professional jurisdictions: The case of geriatric medicine. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 32*(7), 1072–1086.
- Pierson, C. (1991). *Beyond the welfare state*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Pollitt, C. (1995). Justification by works or by faith? Evaluating the new public management. *Evaluation, 1*(2), 133–154.
- Rose, N. (1994). Medicine, history and the present. In C. Jones & R. Porter (Eds.), *Reassessing Foucault: Power, medicine and the body* (pp. 48–72). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Ryan, A., Carryer, J., & Patterson, L. (2003). Health workers and the struggle for professional dominance. In *Health concerns: Sociology for New Zealand nursing and midwifery students* (pp. 133–147). Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson.
- Saks, M. (1995). *Professions and the public interest*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Sales, C. S., & Schlaff, A. L. (2010). Reforming medical education: A review and synthesis of five critiques of medical practice. *Social Science & Medicine, 70*(11), 1665–1668. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.018
- Somerville, L., Davis, A., Elliott, A. L., Terrill, D., Austin, N., & Philip, K. (2015). Building allied health workforce capacity: A strategic approach to workforce innovation. *Australian Health Review: A Publication of the Australian Hospital Association, 39*(3), 264–270. doi:10.1071/AH14211

- Sommers, B. D., & Rosenbaum, S. (2011). Issues in health reform: How changes in eligibility may move millions back and forth between Medicaid and insurance exchanges. *Health Affairs*, 30(2), 228–236. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2010.1000
- Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2015). *The future of the professions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, L. (2008). The role of nursing in governmentality, biopower and population health: Family health nursing. *Health & Place*, 14(1), 76–84.
- Wahlberg, A., & Rose, N. (2015). The governmentalization of living: Calculating global health. *Economy & Society*, 44(1), 60–90.
- Waring, J., & Bishop, S. (2011). Healthcare identities at the crossroads of service modernisation: The transfer of NHS clinicians to the independent sector? *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 33(5), 661–676.
- Weiss, D., Tilin, F. J., & Morgan, M. J. (2018). *The interprofessional health care team: Leadership and development*. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett.
- Williams, L., & Lawlis, T. (2014). Jostling for position: A sociology of allied health. In J. Germov (Ed.), *Second opinion: An introduction to health sociology* (5th ed., pp. 439–463). South Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Darbellay, F. (2005). *Interdisciplinarité et transdisciplinarité en Analyse des Discours. Complexité des textes, intertextualité et transtextualité*. Genève, Switzerland: Éditions Slatkine.
- Darbellay, F. (2014a). Où vont les Studies? Interdisciplinarité, transformation disciplinaire et pensée dialogique. *Questions de communication*, 25, 173–186. doi:10.4000/questionsdecommunication.9012
- Darbellay, F. (2014b). La recherche interdisciplinaire: Disparition ou métamorphose des disciplines? In J. P. Leresche & A. Gorga (Eds.), *Transformations des disciplines académiques: entre innovation et résistance* (pp. 135–148). Paris, France: Éditions des archives contemporaines.
- Darbellay, F. (2015). Rethinking inter- and transdisciplinarity: Undisciplined knowledge and the emergence of a new thought style. *Advances in transdisciplinarity 2004–2014. Futures*, 65, 163–174. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2014.10.009
- Darbellay, F. (2016). From disciplinarity to postdisciplinarity: Tourism studies de-disciplined. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 363–372.
- Darbellay, F., Cockell, M., Billotte, J., & Waldvogel, F. (Eds.) (2008). *A vision of transdisciplinarity. Laying foundations for a world knowledge dialogue*. Lausanne, Switzerland: EPFL Press and CRC Press.
- Davidson, C. N. (2017). *The new education: How to revolutionise the university to prepare students for a world in flux*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Frodeman, R., Klein, J. T., & Pacheco, R. C. S (Eds.) (2017). *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Funtowicz, S., & Ravetz, J. (1993). Science for the post-normal age. *Futures*, 25(7), 739–755. doi:10.1016/0016-3287(93)90022-L
- Godet, M. (2004). *Manuel de prospective stratégique (tome 1). Une indisciplin intellectuelle: L'art et la méthode (tome 2)*. Paris, France: Dunod.

- Graff, H. (2015). *Undisciplining knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the twentieth century*. Baltimore, MA: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hirsch Hadorn, G., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Biber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., & Pohl, C. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Hollinshead, K. (2016). Postdisciplinarity and the rise of intellectual openness: The necessity for “plural knowability” in tourism studies. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 349–361.
- Huutoniemi, K., Thompson Klein, J., Bruunc, H., & Hukkinena, J. (2010). Analyzing interdisciplinarity: Typology and indicators. *Research Policy*, 39(1), 79–88. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2009.09.011
- Ings, W. (2017). *Disobedient teaching: Surviving and creating change in education*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (2013). *In defense of disciplines: Interdisciplinarity and specialisation in the research university*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Klein, J. T. (2010). *Creating interdisciplinary campus cultures: A model for strength and sustainability*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass and Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lévy, J. (2008). Sortir du pavillon disciplinaire. In F. Darbellay & T. Paulsen, *Le défi de l’inter- et transdisciplinarité : concepts, méthodes et pratiques innovantes dans l’enseignement et la recherche* (pp. 194–217). Lausanne, Switzerland: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes,
- Munar, A. M., Pernecky, T., & Feighery, W. (2016). An introduction to tourism postdisciplinarity. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(4), 313–347. doi:10.3727/108354216X14600320851578
- Nicolescu, B. (1996). *La transdisciplinarité. Manifeste*. Monaco: Éditions du Rocher.
- Paveau, M. A. (2012). Présentation. Pour une épistémologie critique. In M. A. Paveau (Ed.), *Texte, discours, interactions. Nouvelles épistémologies*. Semen 34. *Revue de sémio-linguistique des textes et discours*, 7–16. Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/semen/9720>
- Piaget, J. (1972). Épistémologie des relations interdisciplinaire. In L. Apostel, G. Berger, A. Briggs, & G. Michaud (Eds.), *L’interdisciplinarité: problèmes d’enseignement et de recherche dans les universités* (pp. 131–144). Paris, France: OCDE.
- Popper, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and refutations: The growth of scientific knowledge*. New York and Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Repko, A., Szostak, R., & Buchberger, M. (2017). *Introduction to interdisciplinary studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosenfield, P. L. (1992). The potential of transdisciplinary research for sustaining and extending linkages between the health and social sciences. *Social Science & Medicine*, 35(11), 1343–1357. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(92)90038-R
- Sayer, A. (2001). For postdisciplinary studies: Sociology and the curse of disciplinary parochialism/imperialism. In J. Eldridge, J. MacInnes, S. Scott, C. Warhurst, & A. Witz (Eds.), *For sociology: Legacies and prospects* (pp. 83–91). Durham, NC: Sociology Press.
- Stokols, D., Hall, K. L., Taylor, B. K., & Moser, R. P. (2008). The science of team science: Overview of the field and introduction to the supplement. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(2), 77–89. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2008.05.002
- Szostak, R. (2017, November 7). Why we should not ignore interdisciplinarity’s critics [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://i2insights.org/2017/11/07/interdisciplinarity-and-critics/>
- Walklate, J., & Richards, A. (2012). The symbiotic academy: On specialisation and interdisciplinarity. *Science Progress*, 95(4), 447–465. doi:10.3184/003685012X13445364922174

- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J. H., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Załęska, M. (2012). Ordre et chaos dans les disciplines. L'exemple de la rhétorique. In M. A. Paveau (Ed.), *Texte, discours, interactions. Nouvelles épistémologies*. Semen 34. Revue de sémio-linguistique des textes et discours, 35–50. Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/semen/9731>

## Bibliography

- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality (transformations)*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Anonymous poet incarcerated at the Clinton Correctional Facility in New York State. (n.d.). *Point of inflection*. Retrieved from <https://thepisonartscoalition.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/bittersweet-dreams-docx.pdf>
- Barthes, R. (2015). *Fragmente einer Sprache der Liebe*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Branigin, A. (2018, June 21). The hell after: New report uncovers years of negligence and physical, sexual abuse in shelters for migrant youths. *The Root*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cage>
- Butler, J. (2015). *Senses of the subject*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- cage. (2018). In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved July 17, 2018, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cage>
- cage. (2018). In *Worldcentral.com*. Retrieved July 17, 2018, from <http://wordcentral.com/cgi-bin/student?book=Student&va=cage>
- Davidson, B. (2013). *Bestiarum vocabulum*. Accompanying essay for Fraser Stables' exhibition *A Bestiary* at Georgia Scherman Projects, Toronto, Canada.
- Davie, G. (1986). *The crisis of the democratic intellect*. Edinburgh, UK: Polygon.
- Davis Halifax, N. (2004). Imagination, walking. In A. L. Cole (Ed.), *Provoked by art: Theorizing arts-informed inquiry* (pp. 175–187). Halifax, Canada: Backalong Books.
- Karwowska, B. (2010). Metaphors of dancing and the human body in Nazi concentration camps. In M. Hallensleben (Ed.), *Performative body spaces, corporeal topographies in literature, theatre, dance, and the visual arts* (pp. 31–42). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Mandela, N. (2013). *Long walk to freedom*. Hachette, UK: Black Bay Books.
- Mangaoang, A. (2014). Performing the postcolonial: Philippine prison spectacles after web 2.0. *Postcolonial Text*, 9(4), 1–18.
- Mohegan Sun Arena. (n.d.). Retrieved October 10, 2018, from <https://mohegansun.com/poi/venues/mohegan-sun-arena.html>
- Paz, O. *Envoi* as cited as epigraph to H. Lefebvre. (1991). *The production of space*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shepherd, P. (2016). *Buildings: Between living time and rocky space*. London, UK: Circa.
- Stenius, M. (2011). Actors of violence: Staging the arena in Mixed Martial Arts. *Nordic Theatre Studies*, 23, 86–97.
- The Home Depot. (n.d.). Retrieved October 8, 2018, from [https://www.homedepot.com/c/fencing\\_how\\_to\\_install\\_posts\\_rails\\_chain\\_link\\_fence\\_HT\\_PG\\_BM](https://www.homedepot.com/c/fencing_how_to_install_posts_rails_chain_link_fence_HT_PG_BM)

- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.). *Topf and sons: An "Ordinary Company"*. Retrieved October 11, 2018, from <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/topf-and-sons-an-ordinary-company>
- WalaLight. (n.d.). Retrieved October 10, 2018, from <https://www.walalight.com/applications/correctional-facilities/>
- Young Lee, P. (2010). Still life, after death. *Log, No. 20 (Fall), Curating Architecture*, 133–140.