The Affordances of Arts and Humanities in Multidisciplinary Projects
Contributions to Sensemaking Processes

Falk Heinrich

PhD, Associate Professor, Aalborg University, Denmark, Head of Studies (School of Communication, Art and Technology). Teaching and research areas: Art theory and aesthetics, interactive dramaturgy, and artistic methodology. Formerly, he worked as a theatre actor and -director and installation artist. Published books: Interaktiv digital installationkunst (2008) and Performing Beauty in Participatory Art and Culture (2014).

Abstract

The theme of this article is the role of aesthetics in providing one affordance of the arts and humanities in multidisciplinary research projects. The premise is that sense and sensemaking processes (as described by Weick (1995) and Luhmann (1984)) are at the core of multidisciplinary projects. This article discusses the potential of fiction and fictionalisation in multidisciplinary sensemaking processes and does so on two levels: the procedural level of the research project, and the level of a project's subject matter. On the process level, aesthetic contributions to sensemaking serve the multilayered and creative interaction between the meaning-producing participants. On the level of the subject field, aesthetic competences generate spaces of potentiality by means of observational participation that restrains applications of existing concepts and creates intermediary spaces of *non-sense*. These spaces are inevitable for the emergence of novel solutions to complex social challenges. The article illustrates its assertions through discussion of a research project.

Keywords multidisciplinary, sensemaking, non-sense, critical thinking, aesthetics

Introduction

In 2011 the British Research Council implemented one of its multidisciplinary sandpit initiatives.[1] The sandpit theme was 'Reducing CO2 emission by changing travel behaviour'. My colleague Prof. Mark Grimshaw, a researcher of music and sound, participated in this sandpit together with people from a range of academic disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, computer science, mathematicians, road engineers, fine and sound artists. A sandpit has to deal with a set social challenges and provides scientists with the opportunity to develop a complete research proposal within five days. During these five days, ideas are presented, discussed, altered, and rejected, and working groups are formed and reformed. The process is supported by facilitators and inspired by expert presentations. I asked my colleague how he saw his role as a humanities scholar and how he would describe his contribution? His answer was that from the outset he engaged in the embodied experience of the singular human being and in the question of how this embodied experience can be traced and measured. The resulting data was supposed to be one element in an electronic incentive system intended to alter human travel behaviour. 'We develop an experience sampling system via a smartphone platform for the collection and delivery of real-time information on subjective travel experience. In a series of small controlled trials we feedback information to individuals about their own experiences, and those of others, and we explore whether and how these interventions change behaviour.' (Research Councils GB 2015) The idea was to bring the individuals' emotionality and aesthetic sensibility into play.

Human experience is a complex affair and contains heterogeneous elements that are difficult to capture. Yet heterogeneity is also of key importance in multidisciplinary projects that aim to transcend scientific reductionism. My question here is thus, how can researchers from the arts and humanities facilitate this transcendence and pave the way to find solutions to complex challenges?

Premise and Thesis

This article reflects on one affordance[2] of the arts and humanities in multidisciplinary projects[3], the aim of which is to create understandings of and solutions to complex societal challenges. My definition of a project here includes research, educational, or business

development projects; I do not distinguish between these different domains because I want to focus on one affordance of the arts and humanities that is applicable to various types and contexts of multidisciplinary projects. This affordance can take many forms, ranging from the very concrete (e.g., a specific design solution) to a more abstract description of a problem field and its implications in terms of definitions, challenges, possibilities, etc. (e.g., a report).

Evidently, such multidisciplinary projects are developed on the basis of sensemaking (I will return to the notion of sensemaking). My contention is that humanistic methods and knowledge can facilitate and contribute to sensemaking processes in multidisciplinary projects by adding a critical and constructive perspective facilitated by the human capacity of constructing *as-if* scenarios (potential scenarios). This necessitates a human observer who takes into account the various dimensions of observation: first, personal experiences (the phenomenological aspect); second, an explanatory case (induction); and third, salient literature on the topic (deduction). As such, my contention has affinities with Luhmann's functional method (1990, 421f) that is oriented towards the examination of potentiality in the light of the difference between problem statements and solution finding. *As-if* scenarios are always prospective in their aim and might uncover potentiality by means of *non-sense* and purposelessness.

Sensemaking as a Conceptual and Practical Domain

Multidisciplinary projects mostly deal with complex issues that require various perspectives on the same subject matter in order to scrutinise the issue and find possible solutions. In these processes all participants are evidently engaged in sensemaking processes. Furthermore, given that this is an almost too quotidian term—used by everyone in expressions such as 'does this make sense?' or 'that makes sense to me'—sensemaking is also an academic concept with its own theoretical bearings and domains. The notion of sensemaking has, for example, been developed within organisation theory and in artificial intelligence systems.[4] The main proponents are Weick and Klein. I will shortly return to Weick's notion.

Sense is also one key element in Luhmann's system theory (1984). He declares that sense is the medium of decision making for both psychic and social systems. Luhmann defines sense as the differ-

ence between potentiality and actuality (Luhmann 1984, 93). Thus, sense acts as the emergence of the actual within potential instantiation and, vice versa, as the emergence of potentiality from the actual. Sense establishes an operational relationship between a psychic or social system and its environment. Of sole importance for my investigation is the fact that sense emerges in and as acts (systemic operations). Sense is not the same as meaning, interpretation, or knowledge, however, it is a process that might elicit meaning and can be extrapolated as knowledge. Multidisciplinary projects are comparable to 'interaction systems (Luhmann 1984) because interacting people drive every multidisciplinary project. Interaction systems operate as the basis of both communication (being a system of its own) and perception. Sensemaking is an operation of interaction systems (as it is for all social and cognitive systems) that seeks to fulfil the objective of this specific interaction system, namely to scrutinise selected issues and to find appropriate solutions. Sense emerges and manifests itself as, for example, premises and findings that lead to decisions such as those pertaining to new orientations and application methods. Sense is therefore something that happens outside of or between – but evidently not independent of – the individual participants.

Weick's theory is more domain specific because his theory scrutinises sensemaking in organisations. He asserts that sensemaking is a process in a more or less hierarchical structure that differentiates between decision makers and other members of an organisation. Sensemaking occurs when members have to implement decisions in the form of novel procedures or when they are confronted with situations that the organization has not accounted for. It is important to note that for Weick, sensemaking is also an act or an initiated decision that allows the subject, post factum, to find meaning in an altered situation. Sensemaking is an intrinsic part of the 'making' of a situation. The event activates the senses of the subject involved (ranging from mere sense perception to sensibility), either factually or imaginatively. Weick differentiates between sense and interpretation. 'Sensemaking is clearly about an activity or a process, whereas interpretation can be a process but is just as likely to describe a product' (Weick 1995, 13). Interpretation and meaning are used retroactively to understand and argue for the already created event/situation. Weick identifies seven main characteristics of sensemak-

ing, 'the enactment of sensible environment being one of them' (Weick 1995, 17). All seven characteristics are interesting for my discussion, but instead of presenting them upfront I want to refer to some of them in the course of my elaboration.

The approaches of Luhmann and Weick differ in that Weick links sense to an acting (and then interpreting) subject within an organisational (historical, cultural, administrative, etc.) context, whereas Luhmann understands sense as a medium of action that, firstly, drives systemic operations, and secondly, secures the interpenetration of communicational and psychic systems. Both approaches emphasise action as the primary characteristic of sense. However, both approaches seem to neglect the human body as the material-neurological basis for the 'interplay between action and interpretation' (Weick et al. 2005, 409).

Now, how can the arts and humanities participate in the sense-making of multidisciplinary projects?

Since Dilthey, the majority of the arts and humanities have outspokenly been engaged in hermeneutics (although in different forms and with different aims) and thus with meaning ascription through interpretation.[5] Nietzsche claims that interpretation is the only path to understanding (e.g., Schacht, 1984). Academic interpretation is dependent on an interpreter (observer) and a subject matter (which in most human sciences is a kind of cultural product). Nonetheless, meaning is not a private opinion, but is the result of a rigorous process of inference, critical, dialectical and causal argumentation, comparison, abduction, etc., which is aimed at the extraction of significance that is general, abstract, and valid not only for the academic interpreter. Dilthey's distinction between the explanatory discourse of the natural sciences (*Erklärung*) and the humanities' discourse of understanding (*Verstehen*) through interpretation is still reflected in the self-understanding of many humanities researcher because the human sciences emphasise and investigate the human as an individual cultural being within a social, material, political, and religious context. This has determined both the methodologies and subject fields of the arts and humanities (for a detailed and nationally differentiated description, see Holm et al. 2015).

The epistemological distinction between the sciences has become increasingly fuzzy and obsolete. The role of the academic researcher of all disciplines has undergone a transformation from

being an extractor of stable, external (objective) truth (especially in the natural sciences) to that of an observer who is part of the observed subjects matter. Furthermore, natural scientists engage in interpretation by means of theorems and axioms (which are often only valid in their own conceptual field). Faye (2008, 73) contends that both natural and human sciences work with understanding (*Verstehen)* and explanation (*Erklärung*) alike, because today these concepts cannot be separated.

This development is furthered by an increasing social demand stipulating that all sciences should participate in solution finding concerning existing and emerging challenges (national and European research calls reflect this very clearly). Hence, the deployment of theorems and axioms to solution finding processes is changing the academic discourse – including the research discourses of the humanities. This change can be described as a shift of focus from the discovery of truth(s) to the development of theories and axioms that are entangled with practical solution finding. Latour (1999) convincingly explains that the scientist is an actor in a heterogeneous network that might yield novel objects and materials. This and similar views echo Vico's old dictum: *Verum ipsum factum.* My point here is that academic research today is increasingly seen as a creative endeavour: academic research constructs or produces something (for example, solutions). In my view, creative research includes theory production[6]; and theory, in a recursive movement, is today also seen as a means of creation and emergence.

How can humanistic theories and methods be means of emergence of novel understandings and solutions in multidisciplinary sensemaking processes?

The Dimension of Fiction in Sensemaking Processes

This article does not allow for a thorough account of all possible roles and affordances of the human sciences, not least because of the complexity and multitude of the various disciplines within the arts and humanities. Here, I will propose and discuss fiction as a part of critical, theoretical thinking.

Critical thinking is one the trademarks of the arts and humanities (see, for example, Holm et al. (2015)). 'Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skilfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating informa-

tion gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.' (Scriven and Paul, 1987) Critical thinking is a means to thoroughly untangle the premises, components, discourses, and implications of human descriptions of a whole array of phenomena and subject fields, ranging from texts as cultural artefacts to anthropological observations and interviews. Critical thinking seeks to uncover hidden conditions and their consequences by means of, for example, comparative analysis, deconstruction, or deduction.

Critical thinking can also be used to unfold a field of potentiality that is necessary for novel solution finding. Potentiality is based on the simultaneity and heterogeneity of discrete elements. The very result of critical thinking is (or, more modestly, can be) discrete elements. Among many others, the elements can be technical conditions, social and political structures, documented discourses, or consequences for users (experiences, procedures, knowledge).

The sandpit workshop mentioned in the beginning is organized in such a way that researchers from different academic and artistic disciplines form momentary working teams. In the beginning of the workshop, the researchers can form, join and leave the teams contributing with analyses, opinions and early ideas. Many different elements and aspects are up in the air, not yet ordered and categorised, but all somehow related to the theme of the sandpit workshop.

The question is now: How can the analytical fields of uncoupled elements be recombined into novel solutions? Clearly, multidisciplinary teams cannot simply deploy this opened field of uncoupled abstract elements without re-transforming them into concrete images not yet seen. But how could that be done? My short answer is, by means of aesthetics. The remainder of the article attempts to explain why this is the case.

In *Truth and Method,* Gadamer writes about the aesthetic etymology of theory by returning to the Greek concept of *theoria*. *Theoria* described the ancient man's participation in festivals for honouring the gods (Davey 2006, 32), that is, the ability to purely contemplate the universe. Gadamer (2004, 122) re-interprets *theoria* as personal engagement being the very foundation of any cognitive activity. *Theoria* is a meeting or practice where the observer is a participant that opens and gives him/herself to the presented event. This meet-

ing (*theoria*) 'is a true participation, not something active, but something passive (pathos), namely being totally involved in and carried away by what one sees' (Gadamer 2004, 122) In contrast to Gadamer, Davey claims that *theoria* is not a 'disinterested detachment, but an intensive involvement … an enabling act' (Davey 2006, 32) that brings forth the subject of contemplation (see also Polanyi's similar notion of *indwelling*). In this sense, theoretical contemplation is always dependent on the observer, yet also transcends the observer because s/he is carried away by and carried into the observed object. Theoretical perception (if I may use this apparent oxymoron) unfolds as an undetermined space, where the propensity for categorization of the observed object is counteracted by the object's appearance entailing polysemantism on the basis of perceptual manifold. 'The importance of *theoria* as aesthetic contemplation is that it creates a perceptual space in which the difference between how such a subject matter appears in an artwork and what is beyond its initial appearance in that work, begins itself to emerge'[7] (Davey 2006, 33). Thus, *theoria* is a continuous process of comprehension (on the basis of existing concepts) and the decomposition of existing concepts. The *theoria* dimension in the sandpit project example is the idea to represent commuting experiences as sound files that contain complex, mostly aesthetic, information and to allow for different individual interpretations and feelings. Experience represented as sampled sound files does not convey defined messages but contains a multiplicity of information not yet conceptualized. The listener – as well as the researcher – can vicariously and sensuously partake in the experience of other commuters.

The multifarious relationship between the human observer and the observed phenomena (in the arts and humanities, typically human actions and expressions) emphasises the aesthetic dimensions of academic investigations within fields as diverse as language, media studies, and anthropology. The aesthetic facet of theory does not aim at determining, defining, or otherwise categorising an observed phenomenon, but at creating a field of possible interpretations and comprehensions. Furthermore, an act of *theoria* cannot be solely understood in terms of subjectivity, in as much as *theoria* is an act of transcendence that, at best, pushes the observer out of his or her preconditions. In other words, the aesthetic part of *theoria* simultaneously relies on and defies already existing internalised

structures and concepts of interpretation. This is resonant with Kant's notion of the aesthetic that accentuates free play between imagination and the laws of understanding.[8] Rundell (1994, 93) explains that one category of imagination, namely productive imagination, is constitutive of the interaction between sensibility and understanding, it is 'the transcendental function of the imagination' (Kant cited in Rundell 1994, 93). Rundell identifies the transformative capacity of the imagination as creativity that is able to not only synthesise sensibility into intelligible (*a posteriori*) forms, but is also able to transform these forms.[9]

The aesthetic dimension of theory and theorisation finds one of its most full-blown forms in Vaihinger's, *The Philosophy of As-if* (1925/2009). Grounding his philosophy in Kant's axiom that phenomena cannot be apprehended objectively but remain a mental construct, Vaihinger claims that some scientific explanations are overt fictions— mental constructs with no claim to truth. This does not diminish their scientific function, on the contrary, because their value is expediency. Unlike hypotheses, which need to be verified, scientific fictions need justification, for example, the search for applicable explanations and solutions to set problems. 'If a fictional construct is formed, its excuse and justification must be that it is of service to discursive thought' (Vaihinger 1925/2009, 89). Vaihinger claims that scientific fiction is a function of our logical mind. Scientific fictions are artful speculations on the basis of sense perception that are used to find applicable solutions by imagining a field of possibilities that need not be realistic. He claims that aesthetic fiction (especially poetry and drama) and scientific fiction gradually be transformed into each other. Furthermore, aesthetic and scientific fictions have an indispensable practical function (Vaihinger 1925/2009, 84): fictions enact possible scenarios by concretising ideas. Imaginations are fictitious enactments that are indispensable for sensemaking processes.

Today, the concept of fiction is much broader, not solely referring to an artistic form (e.g., literature, film, and theatre). The human capacity to fictionalise, to create possible future narratives and scenarios around a defined problem, has, for example, become a design method (design fiction, e.g., Bleecker 2009; Hales 2013;). From the outset, Vaihinger's logical function is first of all an intrinsic part of analysis proper, and as a corollary, a heuristic means in applied

research. Kant has already observed that analysis is not possible without synthesis, without a hypothesis, a hunch that can be proven by analysis (decomposition) (Kant 1997, A716–7). As-if scenarios belong to this category.

The indissolubility of synthesis (e.g., as-if strategies) and analysis, found in the arts and humanities, plays an important part for emergence and solution finding in multidisciplinary projects. The aesthetic dimension of *as-if* theory (fictionalisation) allows for the transcendence of causal-logical solutions that are not able to account for the complexity of multidisciplinary projects. Bredsdorff and Thyssen's book, *Til Glæden. Om Humanisme og Humaniora* (1980), defines the capacity to think of alternatives within a field of potentiality as the aesthetic dimension entailing a distinct motivation and phenomenological-hermeneutic relation that plays with imagination and understanding, as specified by Kant, Rundell, Gadamer, and Davey. Gumbrecht refers to this simply as 'risky thinking' (Gumbrecht 2011).

The aforementioned sandpit project serves again as an example: the conveyance of commuting experiences by recorded sound files constructs fictitious realms for the user of the system—even though the sounds are real. These *as-if* realms constitute imagined alternatives to the user's current commuting situation. In order to come up with, and believe in, such ideas, the multidisciplinary group of researchers must have the will to leave rigid scientific causal logic (for example, the trust that having only knowledge about the quantity of emission is a sufficient means of persuasion and behavioural change) and take seriously the power of projected imagined alternatives that address individuals' aesthetic dimensions.

Fictionalisation is one example of the methods found in the arts that might be employed to create heterogenic potentiality fields made up of discrete, abstract and concrete elements such as feelings and sense perceptions, phenomenal objects, parts of structures and imagined solutions ideas. Of course, I do not claim that only the arts and humanities are proficient in creating these potentiality fields; nonetheless, I want to claim that the arts and humanities can introduce heterogeneity into these fields due to their aesthetic and critical focus on the singular human, prominent in both their research methods and subject fields.

The focus on solution finding (creation) also brings the arts onto the (academic) stage, because they see synthesis as an analytical means. The arts create (e.g., tangible and representational objects, performances, events —actual or fictive) and make sense *a posteriori*, so to speak. Not surprisingly, Weick's words fit very well: art as sensemaking 'enacts sensible environments' (Weick, 1995). Research projects increasingly integrate artistic approaches, not with the objective of creating works of art, but to widen the field of potentiality. The arts' ability to create objects and situations not subservient to specific solution finding, opens up alternative perspectives that just might include novel dimensions that are not readily associated with the subject field at hand.

The Application of Sensemaking to a Multidisciplinary Project

In this closing section I want to concretise my reflections in regard to the sensemaking processes. In my field, sensemaking processes have a dual target: first, internal multidisciplinary group work needs to be based on sensemaking, and second, the proposed solution needs to take into account the sensemaking processes of the targeted group of people. Evidently, both sensemaking processes can be dealt with separately, however, my point would be that the arts and humanities have the methodological and epistemological means to build bridges between these two sides by including the researcher's phenomenological qualities into the analytical and solution finding process. A researcher, who is able to making him or herself as sensuously partaking being an intrinsic methodological part, might transcend existing conceptual limitations. Likewise, historical, and still existing, academic disciplines' conceptual confines hinder multidisciplinary collaborations and thus the finding of solutions that incorporate a variety of discourses and perspectives. An increased focus on researchers' emotional and aesthetic (imaginative) dimensions could contribute to overcoming these divides and thus enable a fruitful dialogue.

Let me be more specific by returning to the sandpit example presented at the beginning of this article. The resulting sandpit, in which my colleague participated, states: 'We develop an experience sampling system via a smartphone platform for the collection and delivery of real-time information on subjective travel experience. In

a series of small controlled trials, we feedback information to individuals about their own experiences, and those of others, and we explore whether and how these interventions change behaviour. The idea is one of user-informed behavioural interventions to encourage self-motivated change […]" (Research Councils GB, 2015).[10] Thus, the method is that subjective travel experiences are partially conveyed as sound files. The experience is an aesthetic experience that primarily addresses the affective and perceptual capacities of the human being and not exclusively the rational-ethical capabilities. This idea surpasses academic-analytical thinking in that it is not exclusively based on reasonability, but includes aesthetics. In an academic solution-bound context aesthetic experience might become a field of *non-sense* because it does not pertain to rational logic, where intelligible reasons for the necessity of changed travel behaviour are far too often taken as the very motivation for the targeted persons' actual decision making processes. The generation of ideas for the solution to complex problems must intend to push boundaries and transcend the conceptual limits of the subject fields by allowing *nonsensical* elements (defined in contrast to the subject field's conceptual structures and discourses). Sense is always a construct that structures and categorises a heterogeneous and fluctuating (and thus, in principle, nonsensical) space with various possible realisations. Contemplating the targeted users' embodied situation (for example, by means of *theoria* or indwelling (Polanyi 2009, 17) allows for the recognition of the users' pre-determined actuality. The sensory manifold of immediacy in aesthetic perception transcends conceptual categorisation. This is the realm of *non-sense* or *not-yet-sense*.

Weick lists seven characteristics of sensemaking; one of them has already been mentioned: 'enacting sensible environments'. For the user of the intended travel experience system, sense is encapsulated in experiences already lived by others. The intended system (smart phone app) would provide the user with a sensorial relation to the experiences of others. This is another of Weick's dimensions of sensemaking processes: the social – the interactive or intersubjective – dimension. According to Weick, sense is constructed between people (Weick 1995, 39), and this is true of any kind of sense: rational, feeling, or aesthetic-imaginative. Sensemaking for users of the intended travel experience app is also retrospective, which, according to Weick, is yet another feature of sensemaking. The user

compares his/her own traffic practices with the experiences of others, which in one way or another resonate with their own sensorial experiences. To change behaviour here also means inducing *non-sensemaking*, which in this case means to remove existing behaviour patterns and opening a momentary field of *non-sense,* because new behaviours are not yet in place. For example, using the private car for commuting to a big city means long queues and waiting times of uncertain length, pollution, etc., eventually bringing about emotional distress. On the other hand, a private car provides independence, flexibility, and membership of a higher social level (one that can afford cars and time). These pros and cons make it quite clear that rational arguments are a poor weapon against the feelings of independence and pride (social status).

Sociality and retrospection are not only sensemaking features in regard to the subject field of a specific project, but they are also features of the research project group proper because its members' sensemaking processes must reflect and scrutinise the preliminary solutions. Multidisciplinarity calls for and makes possible solutions that might engage the targeted person's multidimensional, dynamic being and agency, comprised of rational, emotional, socio-dynamic, and aesthetic features. This is why sensemaking is an ongoing process without a final conclusion. Weick uses Heidegger's metaphor of always being thrown into new situations. This 'thrownness' also necessitates intuition based on aesthetics and imagination rather than only documented data and confirmed knowledge, as the exact sciences predescribe. Intuition is an immediate (re-)action based on personal experiences. In concrete terms, it is futile to believe that users will change their travel behaviour once and for all as a result of reasoned arguments. There must be a transference of aesthetic sensibility and knowledge from the project member to the project's target group and vice versa. This includes gaps that are spaces of non-sense.

References

Biilmann, Magnus, Simo Køppe and Claus Emmeche. 2015. "Humaniora og 'de Nye Videnskaber'." In *Kampen om Disciplinerne*, edited by David B. Pedersen, et al., 365-396, København: Hans Reitzel Forlag.

Bleecker, Julian. 2009. "Design Fiction – A Short Essay on Design, Science, Fact and Fiction". http://www.nearfuturelaboratory. com (accessed Maj 19, 2016).

Bredsdorff, Thomas, Mihail Larsen and Ole Thyssen. 1980. *Til Glæden. Om Humanisme og Humaniora*. København: Gyldendal.

Davey, Nicolas. 2006. "Art and Theoria." In *Thinking through Art*, edited by Kathy Macleod and Lin Holdrigde, 20-39. London: Routledge.

Faye, Jan. 2008. "Fra Åndsvidenskab til Humanvidenskab." In *Ideer vi Lever På: Humanistisk Viden i Vidensamfundet*, edited by Finn Collin and Jan Faye. København: Akademisk Forlag: 58-75.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*. London, New York: Continuum.

Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. 2011. *"Misere der Meisterdenker."* In *Der Freitag.* January 2011.

Hales, Derek. 2013. "Design Fictions an Introduction and Provisional Taxonomy." *Digital Creativity* 24, 1: 1-10.

Harper, Douglas. 2001-2016. *Online Etymology Dictionary.* (accessed Maj 19, 2016). http://etymonline.com/index.php

Holm, Poul, Ame Jarrick, and Dominic Scott. 2015. *Humanities World Report 2015.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kant, Immanuel. *1997. Critique of Pure Reason, 1st edn. 1781, 2nd edn. 1787*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latour, Buno. 1999. *Pandora's Hope.* Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1984. *Soziale Systeme*. Frankfurt a. M: Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, Niklas. 1990. *Die Wissenschaft der Gesellschaft.* Frankfurt a. M: Suhrkamp.

Polanyi, Michael. 2009. *The Tacit Dimension.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Rundell, John. 1994. "Creativity and Judgment: Kant on Reason and Imagination." In *Culture and Creativity*, edited by Robinson, Gillian and John Rundell, chapter 5, London, New York: Routledge.

Schacht, Richard. 1984. "Nietzsche on Philosophy, Interpretation and Truth." *Noûs* 18, 1: 75-85.

Scriven, Michael and Richard. Paul. 1987. Statement presented at the 8th Annual International Conference on Critical Thinking

and Education Reform, (accessed Maj 19, 2016). http://www.
criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/766

Vaihinger, Hans. 1925. *The Philosopgy of "As-if" – A System of Theoretical, Practical and Religious Fictions of Mankind.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Weick, Karl, Kathleen Sutcliffe and David Obstfeld. 2005. "Organizing and the process of Sensemaking." *Organization Science*, 16, 4: 401–421.

Notes

1 For a thorough description of the sandpit format, see: https://www.
epsrc.ac.uk/funding/howtoapply/routes/network/ideas/whati-
sasandpit/. This sandpit example is but one of various other mobility studies that take into account human perception and experience. As such it is not a new approach. I chose the sandpit project as an example because of its focus on multidisciplinarity and because it includes aesthetic and artistic aspects.

2 The notion of *affordance* was introduced by Gibson to signify an object's or environment's inherent "action possibilities" that are readily recognizable and usable by an external agent. Norman has applied the term to the field of design theory. Even though it is not a familiar concept in humanities scholarship, I choose it because of its double scope: the arts and humanities' inherent possibilities that have to be realized and operationalized in multidisciplinary projects.

3 That does not mean that the so-called classic humanistic disciplines are obsolete. On the contrary, humanistic roles and functions in multidisciplinary projects needs to be grounded in and nourished by mono-disciplines with well-established humanist subject fields and methodologies. Monodisciplinary approaches and subject fields can be seen as focalisation boxes that protect and develop humanist conceptualisations.

4 Klein spells the notion with a hyphen: sense-making. I could not find an academic reason for this distinction.

5 Since Dilthey, the scope and subject field of hermeneutics has broadened considerably to include visual expressions, events, and media phenom-

ena, and also to include phenomenological aspect of the meaning making process.

6 The notion of theory covers a diverse field of abstractions and generalisations on the basis of extracted and compiled data from particular incidences or objects. Theories are models of explanation that in a recursive movement can be concretised and applied to singular cases. Theories might yield both explanation and understanding: understanding has a phenomenological-reflective tenor, whereas explanation has a functional and agential one.

7 Davey writes about *theoria* in relation to art. However, there is only one etymology for the concept of theory –participating, contemplation, and speculation (Harper 2015) – and this can thus be applied to all theories and subject fields.

8 One might object and claim also that the humanities must acquiesce to academic rigor as a means of validating methods. The resulting data will provide a trustworthy basis for more or less unequivocal analysis. One forgets though that the selection of method is founded on a primary contemplation of the phenomenon in question, which, already at this early stage, synthesises perceptual data into proto-meaningful data-clusters.

9 The difference is that Kant seeks the transcendental function of imagination as mental capacities of the subject, whereas Gadamer/Davey postulate a transcendence of subjectivity be means of participatory observation.

10 (http://gtr.rcuk.ac.uk/projects?ref=EP/J004715/1, 2015)