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Abstract
The paper accounts for the process of becoming of a changed practice within the area of disability care in the Municipality of Aalborg in Denmark.

Across a period of a few months in the fall of 2015 a group of employees across the organization and an action researcher from Aalborg University (the author) met and formed a research group and across this period a revised model for cooperation emerged that – upon realization – would reconfigure the intra-play of all relevant areas of the organization involved in disability care. The model included the grasping of disability as dis/ability and thereby the model opened the possibility for reworking the binary.

The offset of the becoming of the revised model for cooperation was taken from a quantum approach to organizational development and change coined as ‘Organizational scenography’ as part of the methodology of Material Storytelling (Strand 2012). Here Organizational practices of any kind are understood as material-discursive practices (Barad 2007). A take that widens the range of complexity to be handled but also includes the tools for this handling.

A conceptual apparatus of the various significant constituent ‘voices’ of the organizational scenography of dis/ability care were developed over the course of the project and as a result a renewed material-discursive practice emerged as the recommended ‘modus operandi’ of dis/ability care. A recommendation entailing a ‘village-based-community of practice’ which would extend the organizational borders to embrace other dis/ability care facilities and dis/ability care workers/professionals nearby as well as the neighborhood of the village of citizens surrounding these facilities. Thus reworking previously upheld cuts between areas of responsibility of the Municipality/relatives and of Municipality/citizens in general and widening the area – or field of possibility of becoming dis/able. Thus a change of previously upheld relationalities that were no longer beneficial, substantial or sustainable neither economically nor pedagogically. The conclusion was: Dis/ability is to become with many. It is to reconfigure the organizational scenography as one that supports entangled becomings rather than singular, separate beings of citizens and organizational silos with clear cut boundaries.

Related to this conclusion another equally recommended practice was the continuation of the material-discursive practice of ‘lighthouse dialogues’ that had grown out of the project. With the extension that they should be materially supported by a community-based in-house laboratory or ‘light-house’ closely linked to Aalborg University. A recommendation that in turn – upon realization - would manifest the of relationalities of Municipality and University and of dis/ability
care practices and research practices which had emerged during the project. A recommendation that widened the range of possibility for handling the complexity of dis/ability in a competent and relevant manner.

Both recommendations were founded on empowerment and dreams as drivers for the process of becoming (dis)able.

These recommendations are outcomes which - upon their realization - will change the organizational scenography and in doing so reconfigure ‘the field of possible becoming’ for not only the disabled citizens in the Municipality of Aalborg but also for the employees and thereby support the bringing about of a cultural transformation. A changed relationality indeed brought about though reworking the binary dis/able.

From the standpoint of a diffractive methodology (Barad 2007) the paper accounts for this project by being organized in four parts that together depicts the background and methods for the project, its findings and the conclusions and recommendations in greater detail. The four parts are brought about as gatherings (Haraway, 2008) through fragments grasped from the workgroup sessions, the final report on the project, the writing process and from the body of research on a quantum approach to storytelling coined as Material Storytelling (Strand, 2012). Fragments that are then read through one-another and thereby themselves becoming entangled becomings with no independent existence. Co-shapes as part of the intra-activity of the process.

**Dreams as Drivers of Change (The background part)**

Welcome to the research project: ‘Learning while doing’.

Across a period of three months in the fall of 2015, an action-research based group emerged among a cross-disciplinary and cross-organizational group of employees and me, as action-researcher and facilitator.

“Welcome to the Laboratory. You are now going on a journey into the details of the machinery of the Organization – the place where everything happens. Imagine that you are a detective and that your task is - together with your competent detective colleagues (each having a different view and specialty) to research all traces of the complicated and sometimes tortuous courses, which the life of a disabled citizen consists of.

We are to explore what constitutes the organizational scenography that we have for the meeting and the cooperation related to the disabled citizen and each other. Can we identify a scenography that will make our inter-play even better? And that could support that we can work intensely with dreams as drivers? When do we succeed in the intra-play and when are there different kinds of obstacles?”

(Text piece from the introduction-letter send to employees inviting them to partake in the project)

Below, (in slides from the final report on the project) the framework for the process is depicted as a structuring device (apparatus, see further below) that ensures that the storytelling taking place in the research group would have an offset in the practical matters of the world of the organization.
Figure 1: Copies of slides depicting the framework for the process (Final Report Dec. 2015)
Being part of a bigger picture

The pink illustration below depicts the area of concern for the research project and the relation to a grand change project called ‘Development and Re-orientation’ that was happening throughout the Organization in the period from 2014-2017 (and thereby forms a backdrop for the present research group’s work). A project that was build on a dream of succeeding in handling the paradox of strengthening the organizational effort towards the disabled citizen while at the same time decreasing the resources allocated to the area.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2: A slide with the model depicting the Organizational Change project ‘Project Development and Re-orientation of the Disability-area’** (in Final Report Dec. 2015)

The initiatory constituent for the large change project was the need to do a yearly 50 million (Danish kroner) cutback on expenses on the area of disability-care. Instead of using the usual method of cutting a certain percentage of every budget post, the Municipality of Aalborg decided for a complete change of approach which used ‘dreams as the drivers’ for succeeding with the necessary changes.

A strategy that involved a significant cultural change in terms of the entire approach to disability, and how disability-care, etc. were to be conducted on an everyday basis.

---

1 In Danish: 'Projekt Udvikling og Omstilling af handicapområdet'.
2 In Danish: 'Drømmen som drivkraft'.
‘Empowerment of the disabled’ became a mantra which also meant a change in the definition of the core-task that went from setting ‘the disabled citizen as the center’ to setting ‘the empowerment of the disabled citizen together with others’ as central. This basically meant that the smallest unit of reference were no longer the disabled citizen in herself, but a relation of citizen/Other. Other is here understood more widely than previously as relatives, care-taking personnel, neighbors, other disabled people, etc. In short; opening the possibility of delegating the care-taking and relational aspects to the hands of others than the professional (employed) personnel, and opening the field of possibility for the (presently) disabled to experience themselves as (dis)able in regard to Others.

One of the strategies for realizing the dream was from the offshoot to enhance the cooperation between Authority (left blue circle) and Performer (right blue circle) as these are the main constituents of organizing and conducting the care-taking effort.

Halfway into this large change project (spring 2015) I came in contact with the Department of Disability and an action research-based intra-play (Heron & Reason, 2006) concerning the mint-green area of the model in figure 2 ‘Strengthened co-work between Citizen, Performer and Authority’ emerged. The project ‘Learning while doing’ was initiated based on the assumption that what was required was the reconfiguration of the existing cooperative-relations.

The centering on the co-work-relations rested on two hypotheses:

1) That the cooperative relations - and thereby the dialogue between Citizen, Performer and Authority - is a central parameter for succeeding in lifting the core-task.
2) The task of setting up the right goals and following them is an equally central parameter for success in lifting the core-task of ‘Empowering the (dis)abled citizen together with Others’.

The two hypothesis drew attention to the dark blue area or backdrop on which this ‘strengthened cooperation’ were to rest. It is noticeable in the illustration (see Figure 2 above) that it ties it altogether and yet it is un-identified in terms of its constituents. It is indeterminate. This ‘base of resonance’ for the strengthened co-operative became the area of interest and the research project was founded on identifying an overall, favorable ‘base of resonance’ for the circumstances for such a co-operation by asking these initiatory questions:

• Which kinds of inter-plays is the organizational scenography presently inviting the central actors to partake in?
• Which outer circumstances are playing a role in the processes of becoming concerning the citizen?
• Which norms, logics and spirits are playing a role?
• Which voices are being heard in the interplay concerning the becoming of the citizen?

Drawing on the Apparatus of Material Storytelling such a ‘base of resonance’ is grasped as the Organizational Scenography (Strand et.al. forthcoming) and the entailed take on organizational becoming as a manifold of many constituents, a complex between, (Jørgensen & Strand, 2014). A productive machinery (Juelskjær, 2009) that enacts practices in a specific - and not some other – manner. The dark-blue ‘base of resonance’ in figure 2 constitutes such a spacetimematter manifold. The questions above intended to grasp the productive machinery of this manifold and possibly reconfigure it towards the enactment of manifolds around ‘dreams as drivers’ of becoming (dis)able.

3 Direct translation from the text in the mint-green circle of the illustration in Figure 2.
In employing this take on ‘becoming (dis)able through dreams as drivers’ the action-research project succeeded in enfolding a model for strong cooperation with a set of tools to support the strengthening of the co operative among relevant parties, constituents and multiple voices in realizing the (dis)able’s ‘Dreams as drivers’ for the organizational effort. A model for a different productive organizational machinery emerged that allowed for different ‘fields of possible becoming’ for both disabled citizens and employees.

In the following section of the paper vital aspects of the methodological framework - or apparatus - through which this was accomplished are depicted.

**Apparatuses of Becoming (the Methodological part)**

**The phenomenon-producing apparatus’ of the Laboratory of analysis**

Analysis were conducted, as stated, of five different cases of disabled citizens in their moving through the productive machinery of the Organizational scenography of the Municipality. In conducting this research and producing knowledge based on these analysis’ a ‘laboratory’ was enacted:

![Laboratory as a place of learning](image)

“Ethymologically laboratory means ‘a place, where work is being done’. But not in any manner of working and the laboratory is not any kind of place. On the contrary it is one - for the specific occasion - organized room arranged with a specific apparatus, where one withdraws to in a reality-referential and yet experiential and systematic practice. It is a momentary closing of to the world, established in regard to a subsequent more qualified engagement in that same world”. (Staunæs et al. 2014).

*Figure 3: Copy of slide from research project summery presentation September 18th 2015.*

There was such a specifically organized room with an arrangement of a specific – and not some other – apparatus for every session. This enabled the withdrawal of the established research group to systematically experiment in a practice-reality-referential manner with reconfiguring the organizational scenography of dis/ability. A ‘light-house’ metaphor emerged as knick-name for this laboratory-practice. (See recommendations below).
Central to such a quantum approach to such knowledgemaking-/worldmaking-practices is the notion of apparatus.

Apparatuses are about mattering in both senses of the word. They are simultaneously the conditions of the possibility of meaning making and causally productive forces of the materialization of phenomena, (Barad, 2011:8). Apparatus’ are by no means neutral, on the contrary. They are therefore always, already material-discursively productive practices and laborers:

“apparatuses are laborers that help constitute and are integral part of the phenomena being investigated. Furthermore, apparatuses do not merely detect differences that are already in place; rather they contribute to the production and reconfiguring of difference. The failure to take proper account of the role apparatuses play in the production of phenomena seriously compromises the objectivity of the investigation. Accounting for apparatuses means attending to specific practices of differentiating and the marks on bodies they make.” (Barad, 2007: 232).

This section therefore pays attention to the specific material-discursive practices of differentiating integral to the employed Apparatus of Material Storytelling and the marks on bodies it makes.

Apparatus of Material Storytelling

From a standpoint of a quantum approach to change (inspired by Barad, 2007, 2010), the requested ‘development and re-orientation’ that formed the backdrop for the research project was met with an Apparatus of Material Storytelling (Strand, 2012) where spacetime matter enfoldings constitutes the attempts on grasping both the disabled citizen and the employees and the organizational practices to come. Thus comprehend the iterative reenactment through which the becoming of any (re)new(ed) practice enfolds, (Sørensen & Strand, 2014).

The model below depicts the manner by which the Apparatus of Material Storytelling differentiates the iterative and multimodal becoming of phenomena as doings of spacetime matter enfoldings:

---

4 Note that ‘bodies’, are not just human bodies, but units or entities being cut out in the process of differentiating.
Figure 4: Model of the spacetimematter manifold in Material Storytelling (Strand 2014)

The apparatus depicts (differentiates) the process of becoming as emerging from a complex between of entangled agencies – coined as ‘affective sites of engagements’. Thus, sites through which agencies are both influenced and influential as entangled becomings.

A complex site of enfoldings across place-specific, time-specific and materiality-specific agencies which constitutes the field of possibility for becoming. Thereby the spacetimematter manifold constitutes an entangled genealogy of constituents across a plurality of spacetimescale enfoldings. In other words – a processual historicity.

“The historicity of phenomena⁵ is written into their materialization, their bodily materiality holds the memories of the traces of its enfoldings; space and time (like matter) are phenomenal, that is, they are intra-actively produced in the making of phenomena, neither space nor time exists as determinate givens outside of phenomena”. (Barad, 2007: 383).

The research project – in sum – depicted the phenomena that we were dealing with; the processes through which disabled citizens moved through (organizational) life – as such ‘gathered becomings’, where the history of the various spacetime enfoldings that they’ve been part of was written into their materialization. A materiality that held the memories of the traces of these enfoldings. In the findings below this is very evident.

---

⁵ The processual historicity of the slides with the traces of sand in the margin next to the quotes is deliberate as this layout materializes the entanglement of Agential Realism (Barad) and Sandplay and my PhD that founded Material Storytelling and therefore figures as a vital as part of the signature of the Apparatus of Material Storytelling. When these slides appear here they materialize the entangled genealogy of that apparatus and the research project on disability and the paper (this one) accounting for it. Within AR such traces are to be accounted for rather than erased.
By analyzing the apparatus of meaning-making and causally productive forces for disability care in the Municipality (the blue base of resonance in Figure 2 from within the entangled between of constituents of the research-laboratory apparatus, the material-discursive practices of disability care were differentiated differently and thereby reworked. Other agencies were included as mattering bodies (agencies that matters). Spatial, material and temporal agency were acknowledged and therefore included in the analytical ‘measurements’ of what matters for the constitution of a ‘strong cooperation’, of ‘dis/ability and of ‘Dreams as drivers’.

From a quantum methodological stand-point it is important to note that Bohr insisted (Barad, 2007: 294) that it was meaningless to comprehend a preexisting real world whose observables already possessed real values. On the contrary what we need to pay attention to is that a theory (of for example disability) and conceptual frameworks (for aspects of disability) can make statements only about those variables for which the employed material-discursive apparatus is currently configured.

“The Apparatus of Material Storytelling is configured to a wider range of constituents; space-specific, time-specific and material-specific influential aspects of the present between of any moment of becoming.

Thus, by enacting this apparatus through a different Laboratory arrangement of different experiential and systematic practices for meaning-making and different causally productive forces of intra-active materialization, disability care emerged differently and called out a different organizational scenography as the recommended ‘modus operandi’.

Discontinuous becoming of spacetime enfoldings of people, organizations and practices

“To be entangled is not simply to be intertwined with another, as in the joining of separate entities, but to lack an independent, self-contained existence. Existence is not an individual affair. Individuals do not pre-exist their interactions; rather, individuals emerge through and as part of
their entangled intra-relating. Which is not to say that emergence happens once and for all, as an event or as a process that takes place according to some external measure of space and of time, but rather that time and space, like matter and meaning, come into existence, are iteratively re-configured through each intra-action, thereby making it impossible to differentiate in any absolute sense between creation and renewal, beginning and returning, continuity and discontinuity, here and there, past and future.” (Karen Barad, 2007, Preface)

Apparatuses are open-ended phenomena that are themselves becoming through the constitutive entanglement of apparatus/phenomena. Never closed, always moving in the dance of the dynamic contingent multiplicity of the between intra-act.

As an example the apparatus of the enacted laboratory-sessions developed too as the various models/illustrations shaped and reshaped, or configured and reconfigured as part of the materialization of the research process. Insights from the analyzes kept changing the insights already accomplished; insights from the first analysis of the first citizen-case re-configured as it was read through (seen in the light of) the next. Constitutive entanglement of phenomena through differentiation. The second was inevitable read through and/or differentiated through the first, etc. etc. A qualitative multiplicity of phenomena rather than merely a quantitative multiplicity (Strand, 2012).

Below is a concrete example of a model that emerged during the 2nd analytical sessions:

An emerging model

There are huge differences among the five center-units in regard to what the citizens encounter, as different cultures and fields of possibilities are present.

A model has emerged of a continuum related to the different conceptual frameworks for what “rehabilitation” means, as a backdrop for considering when it is fair to work from such an approach:

Need for care (employee is responsible) Autonomy/motivation (cap)able (citizen is responsible) neglect/manipulation

Figure 5: Copy of a slide from the intro presentation on the 3rd session.
Over the course of the different sessions (aka scenes) a qualitative pattern formation of a higher order emerged. A configuration of ‘founding differences’ of the ‘base of resonance’ aka the organizational scenography (apparatus) and the real-life cases of disability care (phenomenon) emerged, (see Figure 1 for the shift of windows from retrospective insights to retrospective overview).

Closely related to this open-ended take on becoming as nonlinear iterative, intra-active enfoldings of spacetimematter manifolds is a take on time/timing as a dynamic three-folded enactment of:

![Figure 6: Model of the timed intra-action in Apparatus of Material Storytelling (Strand, 2012)](image)

This also means ‘Retrospective’ is a configuration of the past that never was, just as prospective is a configuration of anticipations of a future that will never simply be. Both however, become constituted, and constitutive part of the meaning making apparatus.

---

6 And vise versa one-turn-over when the organizational scenography became the phenomenon and the cases of disability care became part of the phenomenon-producing apparatus.
When read through this apparatus the disabled citizens were on the offset understood in a particular manner (and not some other) that constituted the field of possibility for becoming different as the dynamic threefold is closely related to dis/continuity of the appeal of the present intra-action:

Disabled citizens understood as

Dis/continuous processes of becoming – with 5 fields of possibilities of becoming dependent on which professional/disciplinary Organizational unit they were attached to.

This means:
• Focus on shifts, turns, transformation, etc. in the empowerment-process together with others
• Focus on the constitutive ‘spirit’ or ‘gaze’
• Focus on specifically factors that mattered

Figure 7: Copy of slide from research project summery presentation September 18th 2015.

The realization that it mattered which professional gaze/area of the organization depicted the dis/ability affected the configuration of the field of possible becoming for the specific citizen, just as it mattered which congealing of gazes (agencies) had been enacted in the writings in the various documents and journals that were past over from one area to the next or one organizational unit to the next. As we shall see in the findings below, it matters which of the five fields of possibility for becoming a citizen became through.

“The point is that it is the intra-play of continuity and discontinuity, determinacy and indeterminacy, possibility and impossibility that constitutes the differential spacetimematterings of the world. Or to put it another way, if the indeterminate nature of existence by its nature teeters on the cusp of stability and instability, of determinacy and indeterminacy, of possibility and impossibility, then the dynamic relationality between continuity and discontinuity is crucial to the open-ended becoming of the world which resists a causality as much as determinism.”
(Barad, 2007: 182)

Within the methodology of the Apparatus of Material Storytelling this complexity is the center of attention in the analytical take on practices of becoming. The following model depicts how the complexity of the field of spacetimemattering of the between is differentiated as a three-folded enactment – each depicting agencies of time/timed intra-play, space/spatially congealed discourses (unit-specific pedagogical or systematic approaches) and the apparent matter/mattering bodies (journal records, care-taker, motivations, etc.):
Figure 8: Depictions of the Analytical model of Apparatus of Material Storytelling (Strand, 2012) as it appears in general and in practical use as part of the research apparatus.

This model was employed as the analytical apparatus of the laboratory research-meetings during the five sessions of analyzing dis/abled citizen cases from each of the five units of the Organization that divided the professional (disciplinary) approaches to the phenomenon of disability. Various colors of post-It’s materialized the various constituents along the three spirals.

The analytical framework is constitutive part of the depicted three areas of focus in figure 7 above. This is a clear example of how the gaze of the organizational members of the research group reconfigured through the enacted laboratory apparatus. Next, we turn to take a closer look at the findings aka the themes aka the founding differences for the recommendation of a different ‘modus operandi’ of dis/ability care.

The research group was partly constituted by a steady group of members of the organizational units across the field of Authority and Performers and the various organizational levels therein. Every scene or session of analysis were also constituted by so-called ‘jump-on’s’; one or two persons with specifically close ‘hands-on’ experiences with the disabled citizen case in question. Finally, three master students within the Master program of Learning and Organizational Change at Aalborg University partook as a ‘reflective team’. As stated, I as researcher, were the facilitator of the laboratory sessions, which in turn was a role that was a constitutive part of enacting the Apparatus of Material Storytelling as the analytical framework.

Each session had a time-range of four hours, with a half an hour introduction and closing and the scene of action shifted between Material Story Lab at Aalborg University and a large cellar-room at the Municipality’s Department of Disability in Hammer Bakker outside Aalborg.

As a consequence of the whole of this larger arrangement of the Laboratory, the data archive (Rapley 2007) for each analysis consisted of both already existing documents (sample of written journal documents produced regularly across the various units and intra-play of Authority and

---

7 The three spirals are traces of the processual historicity or entangled genealogy of the Apparatus of Material Storytelling with Bojean living storytelling (Boje 2008).
Performer and Citizen, and self-generated data (tacit knowing/ experiences and realizations materialized as models, etc.).

Founding differences and Findings

The emerged themes and models
The emerged themes throughout the 5 rounds of analysis were ‘Language and Discourses’, ‘Dreams as Drivers are often close by’, ‘The Approach to the Disabled Citizen’, ‘Earlier Dialogue across the Organization’. (Final Report, Dec. 2015).

Below each of them are depicted by central quote(s) and photos from the analytical process as well as meta-theoretical quotes that the reader is invited to diffract in light of the above, the models and recommendations as well as what ever background and errand with the world he or she may ‘see in the light of’ to enact his own ‘findings’:

Theme 1: Language and discourse

“The project group has as the offset for the analysis worked with a large part of the written material for each of the citizen-cases. When one reads this material the significance of the discourse and the language stands out. There have been several instances of reflection on the power of the language, for example the power of repetition: when a claim or an interpretation regarding the actions of a citizen is repeated several times in the material that the matching of citizen and performer and service-level package is based upon, it becomes the truth, even though it might rely on one employee’s interpretation in a specific incidence or time in the citizen’s life. This becomes very obvious when the daily journals form the residences often accounts for completely different aspects of the citizen. The project group found several instances where the same aspect of a citizen’s behavior was interpreted very different depending on who is doing the writing. Especially since we are talking about humans that cannot speak their own ‘voice’ directly into the writings, the expectations formed in the writer’s end becomes the writing.”
(Quote from Final report, Dec. 2015)

“It was very clear, that the language use means a lot for which image one gets of the citizen. The responsibility is (discursively) to a large degree placed on M herself, and is that right given the present level of function? There is a schism here between the cognitively reduced level of function and that M in several instances in the text is described as dominant, lazy and stubborn. The image of M in constituted through the visitation is very different to the image that M’s pedagogue has of her. Also here the written language shows its powers, since the pedagogue expresses being very surprised to learn to what extend M can be motivated to take action in contrary to the expectation that has been build in the description from Authority.

Figure 9: Quote from the 1st analytical session
Theme 2: Dreams as drivers are often close by

“In going through the citizen-cases the project group has been reflecting on if and how to be able to see the motivation of the citizen both in the goals, that are posed for each of them but also in the daily work and approach to the citizen. It hasn’t been difficult to sense which dreams and motivations the citizens have expressed. The citizens have a clear language – both verbally and non-verbally – for what motivates them. The physical surroundings - both indoor and in the nearby areas plays an important role therein since the citizen in his and hers going toward or away from certain rooms and facilities by his or her actions are showing what they want and doesn’t want. Conflicts often play out in regard to this. The places they seek hold a field of possibility in close relation to what they want at to what brings them peace, dignity and life-quality. This has resulted in exciting discussions as to why we do not always catch these motivations in the goals and activities posed got the citizen, and often not in either in the daily approach to the citizen. The group points out how important it is to on an early stage in the visitation-process to include the persons that know the citizen well”. (Quote from Final report, Dec. 2015)

“Clearly expressed body language and actions by A (and other citizens) should be acknowledged. A is very sensitive to sound and reacts very frustrated – especially to one particular sound from another resident. On the other side A is clearly happy to go into the woods and out to the animals. Her e the sounds are different just lie the senses are stimulated differently than indoor. A also obviously enjoys music, as something that can both calm hi down and entertain and enlivening him. The motivation, that A has in regard to these factors can be used to create life-quality and joy for A. But A’s dreams/wishes/motivations are not clearly part of the goals that have been stated for the effort concerning A. The motivational-factors above would be usable in posing goals and activities for goals.

“Practices of knowing and being are not isolatable, but rather they are mutually implicated. We do not obtain knowledge by standing outside the world; we know because “we” are of the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming. The separation of epistemology from ontology is a reverberation of a metaphysics that assumes an inherent difference between human and nonhuman, subject and object, mind and body, matter and discourse” (Barad 2003: 829).
Figure 10: Quotes from the 2nd and the 3rd analytical session

“Possibly there is a blockage in our approach to the citizens in our tendency to focus on problems and what should be avoided for each one of them. This could mean that we sometimes do not give the motivation and the dream the necessary space”. (Quote from Final report, Dec. 2015)

“One of the things, that S still manages on his own, is to go down to the village to by his beers. Here he has the opportunity to do something on his own without pedagogical interference and this is probably supporting his sense of dignity.

“signifies the mutual constitution of entangled agencies. That is, in contrast to the usual “interaction,” which assumes that there are separate individual agencies that precede their interaction, the notion of intra-action recognizes that distinct agencies do not precede, but rather emerge through, their intra-action. It is important to note that the “distinct” agencies are only distinct in a relational, not an absolute, sense, that is, agencies are only distinct in relation to their mutual entanglement; they don’t exist as individual elements.” (Barad, 2007: 33).
Theme 3: The Approach to the Citizen

“S has no recognition of his illness and he doesn’t feel, that he has something in common with the other disabled residents, which is correct as the other residents are developmentally challenged. You can say that S contrary to the other residents whose disabilities has been with them from birth, has an “acquired developmental challenge”. S knows, that the area of Hammer Bakker is for “the under-developed”, and he doesn’t see himself in that context. S’s diagnosis means, that his prognosis is spiraling downward. How do we work with the developmental potential of a person who’s competences are declining rather than developing?

Meta-reflection that spurred from this: “even though it isn’t possible to develop the competences of a person, it is to a highly possible to develop on the approach to this human being and thereby increase the life-quality of the person and his sense of dignity. We must know the life-story of everyone and address the person that he himself believe he is”.

Figure 11: Quote from the 3rd analytical session

“Throughout the analyses of the the citizen-cases it has been made clear, how important the person’s life-history is. If we are to develop a person towards best possible independence or best possible quality of life it is necessary to know the person’s history; what joyful events, which let-downs, which important relations, which values, which interests, etc. has had/has significance for this person’s life?

Without this insight we cannot succeed in creating a dignified life. For the citizens which for example due to progressive diagnoses cannot work with development of specific skills, we can work with the approach to the human; how to give this person the ability to preserve and/or develop dignity.” (Final report, Dec. 2015)
Theme 4: Earlier dialogue across the organization

Objectivity

“Objectivity is not preexistence (in the ontological sense) or the preexistent made manifest to the cognitive mind (in the epistemological sense)” (Barad, 2007: 361). To be objective is “a matter of accountability for what materializes, for what comes to be. It matters which cuts are enacted: different cuts enact different materialized becomings.” (Barad, 2007: 361).

“S has no recognition of his illness and he doesn’t feel, that he has something in common with the other disabled residents, which is correct as the other residents are developmentally challenged. You can say that S contrary to the other residents, whose disabilities has been with them from birth, has an “acquired developmental challenge”. S knows, that the area of Hammer Bakker is for the “under-developed”, and he doesn’t see himself in that context. S’s diagnosis means, that his prognosis is spiraling downward. How do we work with the developmental potential of a person who’s competences are declining rather than developing?

Meta-reflection that spurred from this: “even though it isn’t possible to develop the competences

Figure 12: Quote from the 3rd analytical session

“Through-out the analyses of the the citizen-cases it has been made clear, how important the person’s life-history is. If we are to develop a person towards best possible independence or best possible quality of life it is necessary to know the person’s history; what joyful events, which let-downs, which important relations, which values, which interests, etc. has had/has significance for this person’s life?

Without this insight we cannot succeed in creating a dignified life. For the citizens which for example due to progressive diagnoses cannot work with development of specific skills, we can work with the approach to the human; how to give this person the ability to preserve and/or develop dignity”. (Final report, Dec. 2015)
Figure 13: Photo of Citizens and Employees of the Organization as ‘separated islands’ in final session Nov. 5th 2015
As the configuration in the photo depicts the current state of affairs of the organization was one of ongoing battles for resources, where the organizational scenography with five different centers and a large group of performers of disability care were competing.

A pattern of co-operation that defeated the object. A pattern that had been part of the organizational scenography for enough years to create a history of battles and feelings of ‘let-downs’ among various parties across authority and performers.

The following model emerged during the process as a manner of depicting the changed relationality of Performer and Authority in a manner that did entail the ‘hauntological relations’ (Barad 2010). Relations where the past experiences materialize themselves as patterns of communications in the now but in a manner where a conscious articulation in that now is made possible (by being included in the enacted model as part of the recommended toolbox) of what is happening might enable a restorying and letting go of inherited blame, fear and recent.
The following model emerged as well as part of the discussions on how to balance – on the one hand – the empathic approach to both the citizen and one's own professional take on it and - on the other hand – the analytical distance to the organizational reality of the Department of Disability. Both as vital parts of maintaining the partnership relation (see figure 15) across the organization.

Figure 15: Copy of slide depicting the idea of Partnerships
The two models encapsulate the spirit behind the project and forms a backdrop for the two recommendations as needed qualities for realizing the recommendations as part of the everyday co-operative practices.
Changed relationalities to come (the Concluding part)

The Ethics of Mattering

Figure 17: Copy of a slide from the introduction to the research project September 16th 2015

An ethical demand that goes beyond the citizen and the care-takers to encapsulate the relations across the Organization as a whole.

“A different material-discursive apparatus of bodily production materializes a different configuration of the world, not merely a different description of a fixed and independent reality. We are responsible for the world of which we are part, not because it is an arbitrary construction of our choosing but because reality is sedimented out of particular practices that we have a role in shaping and through which we are shaped”, (Barad, 2007: 390).

Central to the project has been to apply action to the fine words, breaking down silos and barriers and opening the possibility for working across professional divisions of approaches to disability, and across organizational levels of Authority and everyday Performers of disability-care-practices. With a dialogical approach to processes of disability-care8 where we closely investigated various documents from the everyday disability-care practices across the range of the department and the kinds of disabilities – not only did the project succeed in gaining an increased understanding and

8 In Danish: Borgerforløb
getting ideas for improvement, it succeeded in developing concrete methods for how a strong cooperation can be secured and realized forwardly.

**Ethics of mattering**

“(...) what we need is something like an ethico-onto-epistemology (e.g. in news practice) – an appreciation of the intertwining of ethics, knowing, and being - since each intra-action matters, since the possibilities for what the world may become call out in the pause that precedes each breath before a moment comes into being and the world is remade again, because the becoming of the world is a deeply ethical matter” (Barad 2007: 185).

**Recommendations**

As stated, a conceptual apparatus of the various significant constituent ‘voices’ of the organizational scenography of dis/ability care were developed over the course of the project and as a result a renewed material-discursive practice emerged as the recommended ‘modus operandi’ of dis/ability care. A recommendation entailing a ‘village-based-community of practice’ which would extend the organizational borders to embrace other dis/ability care facilities and dis/ability care workers/professionals nearby as well as the neighborhood of the village of citizens surrounding these facilities. Thus reworking previously upheld cuts between areas of responsibility of the Municipality/relatives and of Municipality/citizens in general and widening the area – or field of possibility of becoming dis/able. Thus a change of previously upheld relationalities that were no longer beneficial, substantial or sustainable neither economically nor pedagogically. The conclusion was: Dis/ability is to become with many. It is to reconfigure the organizational scenography as one that supports entangled becomings rather than singular, separate beings of citizens and organizational silos with clear cut boundaries.
Related to this conclusion another equally recommended practice was the continuation of the material-discursive practice of ‘lighthouse dialogues’ that had grown out of the project. With the extension that they should be materially supported by a community-based in-house laboratory or ‘light-house’ closely linked to Aalborg University. A recommendation that in turn – upon realization - would manifest the relationalities of Municipality and University and of dis/ability care practices and research practices which had emerged during the project. A recommendation that widened the range of possibility for handling the complexity of dis/ability in a competent and relevant manner.
Figure 20: Photo of Object Theatre enactment of ‘light-house laboratory dialogues’ in final session Nov. 5\textsuperscript{th} 2015

Notice that the troll in the middle/back is flipping his finger. A materialization, perhaps, of the relaxed attitude of these light-house dialogues in regard to respecting presently established limitations and boundaries? Notice also the variety of participants around the lighthouse – both in sorts and in temperament. The food items refer to the lunch and fruits served throughout the sessions as a vital part of establishing a friendly atmosphere.
Both recommendations were founded on empowerment and dreams as drivers for the process of becoming (dis)able.

These recommendations are outcomes which - upon their realization - will change the organizational scenography and in doing so reconfigure ‘the field of possible becoming’ for not only the disabled citizens in the Municipality of Aalborg but also for the employees and thereby support the bringing about of a cultural transformation. A changed relationality indeed.
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