

Please cite the Published Version

Duggan, James (2021) The co-productive imagination: a creative, speculative and eventful approach to co-producing research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24 (3). pp. 355-367. ISSN 1364-5579

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1799638>

Publisher: Informa UK Limited

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626280/>

Usage rights: © In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of a paper accepted for publication in *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, published by and copyright Taylor & Francis.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

1 **The co-productive imagination: A creative, speculative and eventful approach to co-**
2 **producing research**

3 **Abstract**

4 This article explores the co-production of research as creative,
5 speculative, and eventful rather than as research processes determined
6 by equality, empowerment and social justice. There are persuasive
7 critiques of participatory and co-produced methods. In response, the case
8 is made for focusing instead on the complex processes through which
9 ideas, affects and relational capacities emerge, are nurtured or obscured,
10 and circulate as part of the complex processes of co-producing research.
11 The argument is developed with reference to a recent research project
12 on youth loneliness. Through process philosophy and speculative
13 approaches, the co-productive imagination illuminates the necessary
14 imaginative work of conceiving propositions, techniques of relation and
15 methodological tactics that move us through creative advance to eventful
16 realisations that something in our research *matters!* Through an ethics of
17 the event the aim of research becomes collaboratively creating new
18 potentials in a world in process.

19

20 **Keywords:** Co-production, Whitehead, event, speculative, youth loneliness

21 **Introduction**

22 The co-productive imagination attempts to rethink the co-production of research as
23 creative, speculative, and eventful rather than as processes determined by equality,
24 empowerment and social justice. Ostrom (1996) coined ‘co-production’ to illuminate
25 the reciprocal exchanges between public services and communities in the delivery of
26 public goods, such as law and order. Co-production has since come to occupy a
27 prominent position in global policy and practice imaginaries (Bevir, 2019). The co-
28 productive trend in research is indicative of demands on academia to become more
29 relevant, and produce greater value for society (British Academy, 2010). The Arts and
30 Humanities Research Council’s *Connected Communities* programme was a significant
31 and illustrative response, funding over 300 projects, with genuine commitments for
32 community-university partnerships and co-production (Facer & Pahl, 2017). Co-
33 production is now a popular and plural repertoire of research practices for the
34 collaborative production of knowledge between professional researchers (e.g.

35 academics) and those traditionally thought of as participants and/or the objects of
36 study (e.g. young people) (Facer & Enright, 2016).

37 This article contributes to the field of co-producing research by re-imagining it as
38 creative and eventful. Co-producing research is often defined through terms such as
39 equality, empowerment, emancipation, democracy, and social justice approaches (e.g.
40 Beebeejaun, Durose, Rees, Richardson & Richardson, 2015). In addition to a
41 persuasive critique of the laudable rhetoric of participatory and co-produced practice
42 (e.g., Cooke and Kothari, 2001, Ersoy, 2017), it is not always clear what *equality* or
43 *empowerment* mean in the singularities of practice. The article emerges from the
44 *Loneliness Connects Us* project (2016-2019) (Batsleer & Duggan, 2020), which aimed
45 to work with young people to produce new ways of navigating loneliness, and
46 including youth voices in a national conversation on loneliness. We began the project
47 committing to youth ‘co-research’ as *co-producing* research felt too restrictive
48 (Bradbury-Jones & Taylor, 2015). This decision was challenged after an eventful
49 realisation that one of the youth co-researchers – Patience (anonymised name) – was
50 practising an expansive form of care that was crucial to co-producing the project’s aim
51 of young people collectively exploring loneliness. Following the trajectory of this
52 emerging finding questions leading accounts of co-production as equality or
53 empowerment. It warrants developing new approaches to the co-production of
54 research. This article, therefore, speculatively re-imagines *Loneliness Connects Us* as
55 illustrative of eventful co-production. The case is developed through sections on: co-
56 production as creativity under constraint, a speculative and eventful account of co-
57 production, an overview of the project, a description of the carousel of moving
58 methods that represent the methodology, three sections following the trajectory of
59 an emerging finding through three empirical moments (relationship, workshop, email),
60 and a conclusion scoping the potential of eventful practices for co-producing research.

61 **Co-production as creativity under constraint**

62 Co-producing research works to decentre, unsettle and disrupt spaces, relations of
63 power and authority across the production of knowledge between academia and the
64 communities beyond. Whether orientated ‘within, against or beyond the university’
65 (Bell & Pahl, 2018), co-production provides a necessary space for academics and

66 communities to challenge elitist and exclusionary knowledge production cultures. It
67 invites us to unlearn the inheritances of academia as a society of letters. It is the space
68 to explore research practices that venture ‘beyond text’ and academia’s logocentrism
69 (Beebeejaun, Durose, Rees, Richardson, & Richardson, 2014), work ‘beyond critique’
70 and construct just alternatives in and with communities (Perry & Atherton, 2017), and
71 rethink theory building in relation to *living* knowledges (Facer & Enright, 2016). The
72 reconceptualization of knowledge and knowledge production demands we re-think
73 and re-value the legacies of research (Pahl & Facer, 2016), and the practices and media
74 for knowledge production and dissemination beyond academic books and articles,
75 including ‘podcasts, zines, artworks, films, exhibitions, posters, apps, guided walks,
76 pamphlets and soundwalks’ (Bell & Pahl, 2018, p.110).

77 As necessary as the co-productive turn is, a recurrent concern is that co-production is
78 a worldly concept that must travel from theory and rhetoric to contested and complex
79 application (Innes, Davies & McDermot, 2019). A long-established critique of the
80 claims of participatory and co-produced modes of working defines participation as a
81 form of tyranny (Cooke & Kothari, 2001). Young people are conceptualised in deficit;
82 to be trained, socialised and made subject to practices that serve society’s needs
83 (Foucault, 1997, Vromen & Collin, 2010). The institutional context of academia
84 entrenches young peoples contrived participation in research (Dentith, Measor &
85 O’Malley 2009, Fox, 2013). Within the neoliberalising and performative structures of
86 accelerating academia (Vostal, 2016), temporal pressures constrain researchers’
87 capacities to sufficiently nurture the relationships required for genuine co-production
88 (Enright, Facer & Lerner, 2016). Academics therefore must protect against modes of
89 research that extract the value and capitals of the rich social and cultural
90 achievements of communities beyond academia (Autonomous Geographies Collective,
91 2010). Howsoever significant the challenges, co-production is a necessary process for
92 re-negotiating and re-imagining the relationships between academia, the public, and
93 knowledge production. The contexts in which research is co-produced are inherently
94 contested, constrained and messy (Thomas-Hughes, 2018b). If co-production is
95 implicated in governmentality strategies and the ‘conduct of conduct’ (Ersoy, 2017)

96 the question is, how we engage, ‘the art of not being governed quite so much’
97 (Foucault, 2007, p. 45) as we co-produce and through co-production?

98 A useful departure point is the common orientation for co-production to develop
99 equal relationships *throughout* the research process. Equality in co-production is
100 problematized, theorised and enacted in diverse ways including commitments to
101 empower or equalise power relations (Beebeejaun, et al., 2014), enact democracy or
102 democratise research (Kara, 2017), emancipate participants (Liddiard et al., 2019) or
103 realise social justice through social change (Banks, Hart, Pahl & Ward, 2018, Perry &
104 Atherton, 2017). Although not universal (e.g. Perry & Atherton, 2017), co-production
105 as equality involves including community co-producers in the research, from agenda
106 setting and planning to data analysis and the dissemination of findings (e.g. Hickey,
107 Richards, & Sheehy 2018, Liddiard et al. 2019). The justification for continuous
108 participation is found in the intersecting influences of: rights-based discourses and the
109 right of the child to be included in decisions that affect them (United Nations, 1989);
110 the claimed epistemological benefits of developing more relevant and useful
111 knowledge *with* communities (Durose, Beebeejaun, Rees, Richardson & Richardson,
112 2011); emancipatory and activist orientations (Liddiard, et al., 2019); and providing
113 young people with agency within a project, control over and ownership of the data
114 and outputs (Banks et al., 2013).

115 Do the emphases on co-production as equality and empowerment through
116 continuous participation, however, create forms of unnecessary exclusion? One, co-
117 produced projects are often complex, constituted of multiple types of people and
118 groups (e.g. academics, practitioners, artists, young people, funders, participants)
119 performing various roles (e.g. catalyzer, scholar, broker and project manager) at
120 different stages of a project (Facer & Enright, 2016). The orientation towards equality
121 in navigating this terrain is crucial but what does it mean to empower, enact
122 democratic or socially just research across diverse domains and extended timescales?
123 Are young people without the resources or stability to make sustained commitments
124 excluded from participating? Two, equality as continuous participation is a focus in co-
125 production in public service contexts (e.g. Pemberton & Mason, 2009) which typically
126 relate to transforming the relationships between groups that rely on services and

127 public or clinical services (e.g. Nesta, 2012). Despite similarities there are significant
128 differences between knowledge co-production through research and co-production
129 as innovation in public service delivery. Three, the assumption that including young
130 people in research tasks is necessarily meaningful and empowering is troubled by the
131 post-qualitative turn which identifies the social construction of, ‘conventional
132 humanist qualitative methodology... invented to respond to the [qualitative–
133 quantitative] paradigm wars’ (St. Pierre, 2019). Why, for example, is planning and
134 conducting an interview empowering?

135 Rather than defining and justifying co-production as equality or empowerment a more
136 productive approach is to explore what ways of theorising and practising research are
137 adequate to understanding the complexity of the world, and attending carefully to the
138 processes (Perry & Atherton, 2017) and micro-socialities of co-producing research
139 (Rogaly, 2016). Process and speculative approaches are foundationally committed to
140 thinking amidst a world in process. Thus, we can reconfigure co-production as
141 creativity under conditions of constraint with attention to eventful processes of
142 imagination and creativity. This rationale justifies this speculative adventure thinking
143 the *Loneliness Connects Us* as illustrative of a more expansive form of co-producing
144 research.

145 **Processes for eventful co-production**

146 The co-productive imagination builds on A.N. Whitehead’s (1967, 1978) process
147 philosophy and its descendants: speculative realism (Shaviro, 2009), activist
148 philosophy (Massumi, 2011) and constructivist philosophy (Stengers, 2011, 2019).
149 Whitehead in some senses prefigured the co-productive turn. He cautioned that our
150 prized academic training, disciplines and theorising prevents us from engaging
151 productively with a world in process. If we maintain abstract academic categories then
152 our mind resides in a ‘groove’, our intellectual adventures explore the same territories,
153 and ‘the remainder of life is treated superficially’ (Whitehead, 1967, p. 197). This
154 *remainder* is what oftentimes makes lives meaningful and co-produced research vital.
155 Categories such as production/co-production, service-producer/service-user,
156 academic/young person, co-produced research/ethnography focus our thinking on
157 particular ideas, rationalities and spaces – but what *remainders* do they obscure?

158 Whitehead illuminates our fraught relationship with ideas and concepts that we
159 cannot think without yet are ‘not a human creation... [but] powerful and demanding
160 “other-than-humans”’ (Stengers, 2019, p.14). We are moved to wonder: what does
161 *co-production* demand of us, make us feel, enable us to do?

162 This shift requires thinking in terms of the dynamic processes of ‘events’ rather than
163 understanding the world through a humanistic perspective of *knowing* humans (e.g.,
164 *I know*) and *known* objects (e.g., the *ball* is round). To understand what events are,
165 how they emerge and are realized, for the purpose of this article, imagine a sea where
166 each drop of water is a drop of experience (Whitehead, 1978). These drops of
167 experience are called actual entities or actual occasions and they are the primary form
168 of experience. Rather than *we* humans, *they* feel or ‘prehend’ and are felt or
169 ‘prehended’ through ‘prehensive exchange[s] of affective data’ (Rousell, 2017, p. 16).
170 Each of these actual entities is the singular outcome from a previous event. The
171 singularity of each means there is huge diversity amongst them. It is this diversity that
172 represents the potential and possibility for new things to emerge through eventful
173 realisation (Whitehead, 1978, Massumi, 2011). Events are pulsing and overlapping
174 waves of creation, novelty and invention where diversity becomes singularity and the
175 emergence of a new drop of experience, or actual entity. They are onto-genetic to
176 experience, meaning they define the world’s becoming and bringing into being
177 (Massumi, 2011). Events can be profound, relating to the ‘collective thinking of
178 something that sets something new into motion.’ (Stengers in Manning and Massumi,
179 2014, p.90) Events can be microscopic, relating to the change through time of non-
180 human structures such as Cleopatra’s Needle in London from one second to the next
181 (Whitehead, 1964).

182 Thinking co-production as eventful realisations orientates us to singularity, creativity
183 and the continual processes of bringing creative potentials together, attuning and
184 attending to the emerging potentials. Co-production becomes centrally focused on
185 imaginative work and the necessary task of developing our vigilance and our,

186 [C]apacity to answer the cry “*It Matters*” ... a transformation of the way
187 a situation – always *this* situation – may challenge our modes of
188 abstraction. (Stengers, 2019, p.15)

189 Stengers (2019) writes that answering the cry *It Matters* involves the ‘cultivation’ and
190 ‘awakening of the imagination’ (pp. 16-17). This imagination relates to the
191 ‘questioning of situations’ (Souriau, 2015 cited in Stengers 2019), and the ability to
192 artfully attend to the challenges in a particular sensible situation and nurture ‘new
193 ways of making sense in common – experimenting with the very “ontology of
194 ourselves”’ (Stengers, 2019, p.4). This experimentation occurs amongst the flux and
195 fluidity of a world in process and so our task is not to make definite statements on
196 what the world *is* as it will have already changed but rather,

197 For Whitehead ‘philosophy is akin to poetry’: its descriptions are carefully
198 constructed utterances (poesis) ‘requiring a leap of the imagination’—
199 [creating] lures for feeling, and by extension for thought and action...
200 (Gaskill and Nocek, 2014, p.8).

201 The rhythm of the co-productive imagination is found in the expansive adventures of
202 thinking and feeling, cohered through the creative advance towards the verification
203 that *It Matters!* The following sections describe the application the co-productive
204 imagination through the *Loneliness Connects Us* inquiry, the ethics of the event, and
205 the techniques of relation and appetition that created the conditions for the eventful
206 realisation that Patience was practising an expansive politics of care.

207 ***Loneliness Connects Us***

208 *Loneliness Connects Us* aimed to work with a group of young people to research youth
209 loneliness and amplify the findings into an emerging national conversation about
210 loneliness, providing *useful* knowledge to help young people navigate loneliness.
211 Realising these aims required creating spaces in which individual young people felt
212 able to have conversations and encounters that *matter* about the sensitive subject of
213 loneliness. In addition, we wanted to broaden the inquiry: First, geographically by
214 developing the research in different places across the UK. Second, by locating the
215 dialogue in the context of neoliberalising discourses and pedagogies in which issues
216 such as loneliness are individualised and pathologised, with young people made
217 responsible for being resilient to adversity (Fisher, 2009, Kelly, 2001). The project
218 therefore was complex, running from November 2016 to July 2019 and included 22
219 adults working with and for a group of 14 core youth co-researchers and engaging

220 over 200 young people. The challenge was how to reconcile co-production understood
221 as enacting equal and empowering relationships if through the project there were so
222 many diverse forms of encounters with young people. Was it enough to empower
223 some young people at some points, while having less empowering or equal
224 interactions with others? What about potentially powerful ideas that emerged in the
225 cracks and liminal spaces of temporary and peripheral interactions with young
226 people?

227 Thinking co-production as event provides a route for reconciling the challenge
228 between working with specific individual young people in relation to producing
229 interesting thoughts and feelings. Instead of an orientation towards what is equal and
230 common, the ethics of the event is, 'to what is irreducibly singular' (Manning and
231 Massumi, 2014, p.108). There is an emphasis on the differentials and diversity of those
232 forces present, which contribute to the realisation of an event. Rather than a personal
233 ethics, 'a collective practice of care' is a more aligned to a political virtue wherein
234 caring for individuals is folded into an overall concern for the processes of nurturing
235 and realising events (Manning and Massumi, 2014, p. 108). For Stengers this includes,
236 'allowing ourselves to be touched, and artfully giving to what touches us the power to
237 make us imagine, think, and learn' (p.18).

238 In terms of mobilising Whitehead's process philosophy, research creation represents
239 the most influential practice closest to the ambitions of this project. Research creation
240 engages with art as theory and research, rather than art as means of knowledge
241 dissemination (Truman & Springgay, 2015). *Loneliness Connects Us* was instead
242 grounded in practices from youth work and creative, arts-based and co-produced
243 methods that are foundationally committed to openness and developing authentic
244 and equal relationships with young people (de St Croix, 2016). Although arguably not
245 as theoretically ambitious and pioneering as research creation, the commitment to
246 youth work was essential for our ethical and productive engagement with the young
247 people.

248 The research ethics progressed beyond standard guidelines to engage with spatialities
249 of care for the youth co-researchers and events. The research followed standard
250 university and professional ethics guidelines, including, for example, securing and

251 protecting voluntary informed consent from young people and from the parents of
252 children under-16 (BERA, 2011). We invested in a project infrastructure that attended
253 to a politics of space, and the necessary conditions of conviviality and care required to
254 co-produce research (Bell & Pahl, 2018). Locating the research in a youth mental
255 health organisation was significant as engagements with loneliness are potentially
256 traumatic. As an ethical commitment we wanted the young people to be able to access
257 pastoral and counselling support within the project infrastructure and not signpost
258 them to mental health services where there might be a significant wait for referral and
259 service delivery.

260 **A carousel of moving methods**

261 We initiated the research through a carousel of moving methods, an iterative and
262 expansive series of encounters and conversations that matter with youth co-
263 researchers. Loneliness is a universal experience but profoundly social, complex,
264 relational and granular in its manifestations. Loneliness might be too painful to
265 confront and articulate in words; but dance, movement and improvisation might help
266 embody and encounter emotions otherwise inexpressible (Levy, 2005). Whereas film
267 or music could act as a familiar and safe set of cultural practices to consider loneliness
268 in one's life or in the apparent safety of imagined characters. We believed plural and
269 expansive research methodologies and approaches would afford diverse
270 vantagepoints of the singularities and diversities of loneliness.

271 The carousel involved the imaginative work of creating a series of 'lures for feeling' for
272 encountering loneliness, in the form of various propositions or techniques of relation.
273 Propositions can be speculative and conceptual, like Haraway's (1985) cyborg in the
274 Cyborg Manifesto. Or, they can take the form of 'techniques of relation,' which are
275 immanent and processual devices or practices for initiating creative and eventful
276 encounters (Manning and Massumi, 2014). These techniques are iterative, expansive
277 and mobile, creating ways of interacting in research contexts and whose potential can
278 be explored and developed. 'They are springboards... they activate a practice from
279 within. They set in motion.' (Manning and Massumi, 2014, p. ix)

280 An important feature of the carousel was that we did not seek to perfect a singular
281 method, proposition or lure for feeling but rather engage with loneliness expansively

282 and diversely, inspired by the notion of ‘appetition.’ Appetition describes the restless
283 appetite towards difference, differentials and the diverse data that create novelty and
284 transformation (Shaviro, 2009, pp. 90-91). Determined by the eventful movement of
285 diversity into singularity and the challenge of knowing in a world in process, we are
286 moved to encounter ever more diverse dimensions of experience and put our
287 propositions and ideas to work there. The carousel developed through a deep concern
288 with how ideas, people and an array of affective and material forces come together in
289 creative research processes.

290 One form of appetite was the movement through different techniques of relation in
291 the research, and ways of relating to one another and feelings of loneliness. There is
292 not space to describe the entire process of weekly meetings. In the beginning the
293 academic team took a greater role in conceiving the techniques of relation and
294 workshop design. The carousel began with a session on interviewing practice and
295 practical research ethics. A second session focused on community philosophy (Tiffany,
296 2009), which encourages talking, listening, and thinking together. We ran subsequent
297 sessions that drew together ‘patterned contrasts’ in the rough and ready arrangement
298 of differentials and diversity to create the eventful conditions for creativity (Shaviro,
299 2009, p.69). There were sessions that explored loneliness together through
300 discussions about music and film or playful methods that moved the research out of
301 the workshop space and into the street. In one session, a physical-technology
302 practitioner joined the group and we made DIY robots out of cardboard, pens and a
303 small vibrating motor for propulsion. The diversity of ideas, materials, affects,
304 relations, the arrangement of bodies – side-by-side and eyes following hands occupied
305 twisting and fixing cardboard, rather than face-to-face conversations – were
306 imaginative propositions providing lures for prehending new ways of thinking-feeling
307 loneliness. Some ideas and practices gained greater power and persisted or
308 disappeared, the motivating orientation being whether they set something in motion,
309 whether something mattered. Throughout the carousel, the academic researchers
310 encouraged the youth co-researchers to take a greater role in conceiving the
311 constitutive techniques of relation and propositions to define their and our
312 encounters with loneliness.

313 A second form of movement through the carousel was that of the young people. A
314 core team of 14 young people were central to the project's development. However,
315 apart from a paid youth co-researcher, none participated throughout. Another
316 approximately 186 young people joined for various reasons and lengths of time, for
317 example, as an activity for a university assignment, to 'hang out', or as *participants* in
318 interviews and workshops led by the academic and/or youth co-researchers. Some
319 young people engaged and continued to participate whereas others disengaged or
320 chose not to participate. We aimed to value temporary and peripheral encounters
321 with the project as much as those by young people unable to spend more time
322 participating.

323 Amongst the appetitive and expansive drive of the research to incorporate more and
324 diverse techniques of relation, encounters with loneliness, and young people's life
325 experience – the research was focused by an overall concern for verification. The co-
326 productive imagination is focused on a lure's or a proposition's capacity to, 'transform
327 our modes of thought, the habits of attention and interest that shape our
328 engagements with the world.' (Gaskill and Noceck, 2014, p.11) The following sections
329 present the empirical content following the trajectory of one emerging finding in the
330 growing importance of the relationship between Patience and Mark, and the tactics
331 and happenings that enabled my eventful realisation of Patience's expansive
332 capacities of care during the project.

333 **Relationship**

334 In the carousel's early phase, it was apparent in many ways that 'somethings-doing'
335 (Massumi, 2011, p.5) but not whether or if any of *It Matters!* There were changing
336 configurations of academic researchers and youth co-researchers attending the
337 weekly meetings. All of us were present in the space with undisclosed histories of
338 mental health issues and loneliness, attuning and attending to one another across
339 difference. We were learning how to relate to one another, and how to talk about
340 loneliness and vulnerability. Amongst this Patience and Mark represented an unusual
341 and increasingly interesting relationship.

342 Patience joined the project before Mark. She was a somewhat enigmatic presence,
343 seemingly aloof and bemused by the project but also clearly committed to helping

344 young people with mental health issues. She regularly attended meetings and
345 volunteered for the community partner's youth ambassador programme. Patience
346 was quiet and reserved in the sessions, appreciating others' contributions but not
347 volunteering her thoughts. When she spoke, it was obvious she had thought deeply
348 about loneliness. The academic team wanted to provide diverse opportunities for the
349 youth co-producers to develop the research in line with their interests. Patience
350 played the piano. As part of the evolving and imaginative work of the project we
351 conceived an 'enabling constraint' (Manning & Massumi, 2014, p.93). We invited the
352 young people to play music that evoked feelings about loneliness, and we would listen
353 and discuss it. Patience played a song from the movie score to the 1986 film *The*
354 *Mission*. The music was from a scene after the Guaraní warriors attached a missionary
355 to a cross and sent him over the waterfall to his death. A Jesuit Priest climbs to the top
356 of the waterfall to play his oboe to the Guaraní to plead for his life. The oboe was set
357 apart from the rest of the orchestra, Patience explained. It sounded lonely.

358 Mark joined several months later. After eight carousel sessions we hosted
359 participatory data analysis workshop to articulate the research agenda and associated
360 methods. Mark arrived late and was anxious that he had somehow annoyed the other
361 young people and was not welcome. Mark's anxieties were a continual concern for
362 me. At times I consulted the community partner's mental health practitioners to
363 ascertain if he was a risk to himself. Yet at other times we would laugh hysterically
364 while, for example, we walked to buy falafel wraps for the group and Mark did
365 impressions of 1990's Jungle MCs played on poor-quality tapes.

366 Much more could be written about Mark and Patience's relationship but in
367 Whitehead's scheme, we are thinking in a world in process, so, 'it is more important
368 that a proposition be interesting than that it be true' (1967, p. 259). Mark and
369 Patience's relationship *was* interesting. They tended towards opposites of various
370 personal characteristics, such as sociability and conflict resolution. At the time it could
371 not be anticipated that the relationship of support, care and friendship between
372 Patience and Mark would become something that mattered to the research. Indeed,
373 the appetite and drive to make more diverse encounters meant that no one could
374 be sure where the research was going but that more diverse encounters would with

375 imagination work towards an eventful realisation. Yet through the unfolding of the
376 research, and the complex relations beyond the project, Patience and Mark were busy,
377 doing things – turning up together, laughing at jokes, caring for one another –
378 producing data, and the growing inheritances of potentials that would create
379 tendencies for the research to eventually realise.

380 **Workshop**

381 During one session seven months into the project, a group of six co-researchers were
382 planning a radio show on youth loneliness. Patience and Mark arrived late, as they
383 were working on another arts project held on the same night. The lead youth co-
384 researcher asked the group, what should be in the programme? Mark immediately
385 launched into a series of comments, which were received in an uneasy silence,

386 Can we do a show about how trans parents are having kids and not calling
387 the kids a boy or a girl but making them trans kids? I'm all for adults being
388 trans and whatever but they shouldn't impose that on kids. Leave them
389 out of it... Could we look at political correctness? I want to know why if
390 I'm talking to a woman, I'm 'mansplaining'. It's fucking annoying. I'm just
391 talking... What about why there's no men's group here? There's 3 LGBT
392 groups but none (just) for men. Why's that?

393 These outbursts were a regular feature of the group. However, where before we had
394 engaged or challenged Mark, this time the response of the group was muted and non-
395 committal.

396 Mark was present with experiences of loneliness, depression and pain. Lonely people
397 tend to exaggerate the level of social threat they are encountering – the psychological
398 effect 'hypervigilance' – and can be anxious and awkward (Qualter et al., 2013). We
399 do not, therefore, encounter loneliness as an abstract category but rather we
400 experience the singularity of a young man sitting amongst others, his loud and
401 potentially transphobic outbursts during sessions when we are trying to conduct
402 research. A swirling sea of words, affects and desires.

403 I was unsure how to react: Protect Mark, challenge his views, or observe? As I
404 understand them, his outbursts challenged the *inclusive* project space. The
405 prerogative to self-define pronouns and gender identity are embraced in the
406 organisation. It is a microcosm of the societal trends that he feels alienate him. He is,

407 however, young and attends the project to receive support for mental health issues.
408 Under austerity politics there has been a massive disinvestment in youth mental
409 health services (Youdell and McGimpsey, 2015), creating fewer opportunities for
410 young people to meet in safe spaces that fit their preferences. Research projects are
411 one way of funding youth provision, keeping ‘the doors open.’ I was careful not to
412 occupy this space of youth sociality and peer-support, not positioning myself to
413 empower or manage the young people. Sometimes the young people’s motivation in
414 the space was seemingly dedication to conduct research to better understand
415 loneliness. At other times the project was more diversion, where the young people
416 wanted to socialise and have fun. So, I sat and observed. Looking around the group I
417 noticed Patience seemingly uncomfortable but also looking around to the other co-
418 researchers. Her glances and appeals to the other co-researchers seemed to me to be
419 actively including Mark in the space, intoning: This is not all he is. He needs to be here.
420 We are here for each other.

421 The significance of this event – its potential to transform our modes of thought –
422 would be born out yet in that moment my capacities to be open and to attune to this
423 sensible moment were closed. I was preparing a conference presentation on
424 masculinity and loneliness. I felt Mark’s ‘banter’, an aggressive and transgressive form
425 of humour, and the way it often alienated him from the support and connection he
426 seemingly desired would be a fascinating focus for the presentation. I noticed Patience,
427 but did not comprehend the potential of this event. Again, *this*, which is to say what
428 would come to *matter* at least here in this article, I did not at that time feel *It Matters!*
429 Yet, events are ‘full of oneness and manyness’ (James 1996, pp. 93–94 cited in
430 Massumi 2011, p.5) Patience’s silent looks and appeals created data that added to the
431 diversity of creative potentials that would be realised through subsequent events as
432 new possibilities, of modes and ways of being in the world.

433 **The Email**

434 The rhythm of the co-productive imagination is found in the expansive adventures of
435 thinking and feeling, cohered through the creative advance towards the verification
436 that *It Matters!* The concern for verification focuses on a lure’s or a proposition’s
437 capacity to, ‘transform our modes of thought, the habits of attention and interest that

438 shape our engagements with the world.’ (Gaskill & Noceck, 2014, p.11) The movement
439 towards verification occurs through our experience of the world and out prehension
440 or feeling, which has specific implications for co-producing research.

441 According to Whitehead, there is nothing beyond or outside of experience, and our
442 feeling or *prehension* of it (Shaviro, 2009). We experience the world through an
443 endless series of eventful moments: Mark’s outburst. Patience’s silent interventions
444 to include Mark. My moments of inaction during the session, and *now* as I write this
445 sentence – choosing from a diverse range of words tending towards the next word
446 and the next with each one committed to the page. You, at your desk, reading this
447 text. These are all events. Events become and perish, amidst a sea of pulsing waves
448 moving from diversity to eventful singularity and the creation of something new, an
449 actual entity, which creates the potential for yet more eventful realisations. The
450 emotional basis of experience, in Whitehead’s scheme, means the realisation or
451 culmination of events is described as ‘satisfaction’ (Whitehead, 1978). The task of
452 research therefore is in deepening and intensifying this emotional experience through
453 the creative advance, ‘an intensive, qualitative, and aesthetic drive for ‘depth of
454 satisfaction’ (Shaviro, 2009, p.70).

455 In Loneliness Connects Us project the culmination of the processes of creative advance
456 culminated in an eventful moment while I was sitting in my office, at my laptop
457 answering emails after the sessions with the youth co-researchers had finished. The
458 academic team had written the *Loneliness Connects Us* research report (Batsleer &
459 Duggan, 2018). We were developing strategies for sharing the findings in ways that
460 would help young people navigate experiences of loneliness, including a list of
461 recommendations. One recommendation was to increase capacities for ‘friendship,
462 mutuality, association and co-operation’ (p.50). This concern to be with one another
463 in difference and vulnerability, discussing feelings of loneliness, was central to the
464 research. It was not clear how these concepts ought to be translated and enacted, and
465 whether I realized them in specific encounters especially when working with Mark.
466 Following Whitehead, I wondered whether these abstractions – ‘friendship’ as with
467 ‘empower’ and ‘co-production’ – were mere grooves for my mind. Were these ideas

468 and practices non-human others, with powerful potentials to illuminate or obscure
469 my openness to imaginatively and expansively engage with a world in process?

470 I received an email from the research funder. It asked if they could use one of the co-
471 researcher's quotes for the title of an up-coming report. The quote was excerpted
472 from an interview I conducted with Patience. She said,

473 Loneliness means something different to everyone because everyone
474 experiences things differently. But I don't think people should be afraid
475 of loneliness. All *your* emotions are important ... if you're lonely it
476 means you're missing out on something. You need that social
477 connection.

478 The fund representative asked if they could change the quote as the tone, and
479 specifically '*your* emotions', was too didactic for a report written by adults for young
480 people. I agreed to the change, and the report was titled, *All Our Emotions are*
481 *Important* (Co-op Foundation, 2018). Thinking co-production as equality and by
482 ownership of data (Banks et al., 2013) my consent arguably infringed Patience's
483 ownership of *her* data. I was and continue to be, however, more concerned with the
484 easy acceptance of Patience's quote.

485 The quote's tone reflects neoliberalising discourses and pedagogies inculcating youth
486 resilience, character and grit in the face of life's adversity. We can read into it an
487 understanding of loneliness as an adaptive drive towards social connection, as hunger
488 is a drive to eat (Cacioppo & Patrick, 2009). Furthermore, indicative of the self-help
489 genre, the statement voices the thinking and wise 'I' demystifying the world for the
490 unaware 'you.' Young people are positioned to include themselves in the social
491 connection they desire. Youth loneliness becomes yet another aspect of human
492 experience and conduct interpolated within neoliberalising governmentality
493 strategies. Janet Batsleer – the principal investigator – was always clear that self-help
494 is okay but not if lonely young people cannot help themselves. Patience's quote
495 abstracted and amplified as the words became text, and as evidence might become a
496 resource for the subsequent imaginative work of denying capacities to act through
497 policy making in austerity contexts.

498 Sitting in my chair I initiated in an adventure of thought, departing from the
499 proposition: Patience's ways of relating to other members of the group went beyond
500 mere neoliberalising social relations. Patience was evidently versed in dominant
501 discourses – psychology and self-help – relating to loneliness. Yet the research's
502 commitment to appetite and expansively exploring loneliness through plurality had
503 produced diverse encounters of singularity and difference: Mark in the project space
504 and outside. Patience's art exhibition in another project. Eating together in a
505 restaurant. Listening to music together. Arguing and making space for one another.
506 And, finally, translating these events into text for funders and policy makers. It was
507 these shifts and translating and re-proposing the research to the policy domain that
508 worked to intensify the happening of the event towards its satisfaction. In
509 Whitehead's scheme difference is fundamental to creativity, as lightening's
510 "appearance is conditioned by an electro-magnetic differential" between positive and
511 negative charges (Massumi, 2012, p21). Here we can indicate the research developing
512 towards an eventful culmination through forms of creative advance, as,

513 Emotions are intensified, and experiences made richer, when
514 incompatibilities, instead of being excluded (negatively prehended), are
515 transformed into contrasts that can be positively integrated within a
516 greater "complexity of order" ... (Shaviro, 2009, p.69)

517 I came to resist the abstraction of co-producing research to particular contexts and
518 spaces where young people were present; instead in my research practice remained
519 open and sought to search for diversity and difference while nurturing the unfolding
520 potentials of the research through an ethics of the event. Rather than equality or
521 empowerment, co-production becomes responding to the insistence of the cry 'It
522 matters!'... intensifying it... [and] giving to it the power to problematize what we ask
523 our reasons to do and what they do to us, how they matter for us and how they make
524 things matter. (Stengers, 2019, p. 16)

525 The event was realising Patience's profound contributions to the project that the
526 quote failed to capture and that I had previously failed to appreciate. In the
527 multiplicity of the eventful unfolding of the research, as I struggled over whether I was
528 researching or being with another human next to a potentially lonely young man,

529 Patience was patient and open to the moment. Her relationship with Mark affirmed a
530 genuine embodiment of a more expansive relationship of care, friendship and the
531 capacity to relate to people experiencing loneliness and the accompanying anxiety.
532 Significantly, this suggests a more challenging relational politics of friendship and
533 obligation under the social and emotional conditions of neoliberalism (May, 2012).
534 We may propose to young people, if you are feeling lonely then you need to take
535 action to increase your social connection but we need to be there for you even if you
536 are awkward and anxious, or we are trying to do research.

537 **Conclusion**

538 This article was an adventure of thought: Suspending notions of co-production as
539 enacting equality, instead re-imagining it as creative and eventful through speculative
540 and process approaches. The work's originality is justified as the first application of
541 process and speculative approaches to the field of research co-production. The
542 significance of the shift is that it provides a clearer account of what it is we do when
543 we co-produce research, and why. Although grounded in empowering youth work
544 practices, research is not predicated on or justified by empowering participants or
545 enacting equality, practising social justice or democracy (e.g., Beebeejaun, et al., 2014,
546 Kara, 2017, Liddiard et al., 2019). This step mutes the extensive critique of
547 participatory and co-produced methods failure to realise the laudable aspirations (e.g.
548 Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Furthermore, following the post-qualitative turn, eventful
549 co-production unsettles abstract categories and settled research practices that are
550 definitional of co-producing research (e.g. co-researchers participating in 'planning'),
551 which *might* prevent us from accessing the many *remainders* of a world in process. In
552 some senses more ambitious in others more modest, eventful co-production
553 orientates the research to the practices and processes related to the realisation of
554 events: co-producing new thoughts and feelings that create new possibilities in the
555 world. Following speculative and process approaches, we understand co-producing
556 research as thinking and feeling in a world in process. We turn to the careful and
557 imaginative work of creating propositions and techniques of relation, developing our
558 capacities to attune to the potentials that emerge and determine whether what we
559 research *Matters!* Through Whitehead we can identify principles and practices that

560 augment and intensify creativity. The appetitive drive determines a restless search for
561 difference and diversity in, for example, the backgrounds and experiences of the
562 young people we work with, and the in thoughts and feelings, experiences and
563 encounters, media and modalities, and regimes of practice we explore. We are not
564 triangulating findings nor applying tested methods but endlessly experimenting,
565 adapting and following emerging findings wherever they go.

566 It is important in this shift from the qualities of the relationship with specific young
567 people to a broader engagement with the potential in ideas, propositions and enabling
568 constraints that 'theory' or the necessity to be creative and think *new* ideas does not
569 become an additional set of pressures that work to marginalise, disempower and deny
570 the agency of young people in co-produced research. It was, however, these processes
571 of speculation, imagination and remaining open to and following the emergence of
572 new ideas and feelings whether they follow the *grooves* of co-production or not that
573 created my eventful realisation of Patience's contribution to the project. Patience's
574 expansive politics of care in supporting her fellow youth co-researcher co-produced a
575 significant dimension of the project but this was not a trajectory related to
576 empowerment, social justice or equality. Rather the eventful realisation hinged on my
577 actions that might be seen to disempower Patience. Yet something more powerful
578 emerged. The aim therefore is not to *lose* young people but rather to fold
579 commitments for young people with an ethics of the event, finding and tracing
580 multiple and eventful contributions, collaboratively creating new propositions and
581 possibilities to re-imagine a world in process.

582

583

584 **References**

- 585 Autonomous Geographies Collective (2010). Beyond Scholar Activism: Making
586 strategic interventions inside and outside the Neoliberal University. *ACME: An*
587 *International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 9(2), 245-275.
- 588 Bradbury-Jones, C. and Taylor, J. (2015). Engaging with children as co-researchers:
589 challenges, counter-challenges and solutions. *International Journal of Social Research*
590 *Methodology*. 18(2), 161–173.
- 591 Banks, S., Hart, A., Pahl, K., & Ward, P. (2018) Co-producing research: A community
592 development approach. In S. Banks, A. Hart, K. Pahl & P. Ward (Eds.) Co-producing
593 Research: A Community Development Approach. (pp. 1-18) Bristol: Policy Press.
- 594 Banks, S., Armstrong, A., Carter, K., Graham, H., Hayward, P., Henry, A., Holland, T.,
595 Holmes, C., Lee, A., McNulty, A., Moore, N., Nayling, N., Stokoe, A., & Strachan, A.
596 (2013). Everyday ethics in community-based participatory research. *Contemporary*
597 *Social Science*, 8(3), 263-277.
- 598 Batsleer, J. & Duggan, J.R. (2018) *Loneliness Connects Us: Young people exploring and*
599 *experiencing loneliness and friendship*, Project Report, ISBN: 'Loneliness Connects Us':
600 978-1-010029-36-7
- 601 Batsleer, J. & Duggan, J.R. (2020) *Young and Lonely: The social conditions of loneliness*,
602 Bristol: Policy Press.
- 603 Beebeejaun, Y., Durose, C., Rees, J., Richardson, J., & Richardson, L. (2014). 'Beyond
604 text': Exploring ethos and method in co-producing research with communities.
605 *Community Development Journal*, 49, 37–53.
- 606 Beebeejaun, Y., Durose, C., Rees, J., Richardson, J., & Richardson, L. (2015). Public
607 harm or public value? Towards coproduction in research with, communities.
608 *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 33, 552–565.
- 609 Bell, D.M. & Pahl, K. (2018). Co-production: towards a utopian approach.
610 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(1), 105–117
- 611 British Education Research Association (BERA) (2011). Ethical Guidelines for
612 Educational Research. London: British Education Research Association.
- 613 Bevir, M. (2019). Inside co-production: Ruling, resistance, and practice. *Social Policy &*
614 *Administration*, 53, 197-202.
- 615 British Academy (2010). *Past, Present and Future: The Public Value of the Humanities*
616 *and Social Sciences*. British Academy: London.

617 Cacioppo, J.T. and Patrick, W. (2009) *Loneliness: Human Nature and the Need for Social*
618 *Connection*, New York; London: W.W. Norton and Company.

619 Cooke B. and Kothari U. (Eds). (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* Zed Books:
620 London.

621 Co-op Foundation (2018) All Our Emotions are Important, Retrieved from:
622 <https://www.coopfoundation.org.uk/youth/all-our-emotions-research/>

623 de St Croix, (2016). *Grassroots youth work: Policy, passion and resistance in practice.*
624 Bristol: Policy Press.

625 Dentith, A., Measor, L., & O'Malley, M.P. (2009). *Stirring Dangerous Waters:*
626 *Dilemmas for Critical Participatory Research with Young People. Sociology, 43(1), 158-*
627 *168.*

628 Durose, C., Beebeejaun, Y., Rees, J., Richardson, L. (2011). *Towards Co-Production in*
629 *Research with Communities.* Arts and Humanities Research Council Connected
630 Communities Scoping Report, Retrieved from:
631 [https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/project-reports-and-reviews/connected-](https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/project-reports-and-reviews/connected-communities/towards-co-production-in-research-with-communities/)
632 [communities/towards-co-production-in-research-with-communities/](https://ahrc.ukri.org/documents/project-reports-and-reviews/connected-communities/towards-co-production-in-research-with-communities/)

633 Enright, B., Facer, K., & Larner, W. (2016). Reframing co-production: Gender,
634 relational academic labour and the university. In E. Jupp, J. Pykett, F.M. Smith (Eds.)
635 *Emotional States: Sites and Spaces of Affective Governance*, (pp. 36-51). London:
636 Taylor & Francis Group.

637 Ersoy, A. (2017). Introduction in A. Ersoy (Ed.) *The Impact of Co-production: From*
638 *Community Engagement to Social Justice.* (pp. 1-8) Bristol: Policy Press.

639 Facer, K. & Enright, B. (2016). *Creating Living Knowledge: The Connected Communities*
640 *Programme, community university relationships and the participatory turn in the*
641 *production of knowledge.* Bristol: University of Bristol/AHRC Connected Communities.

642 Facer, K. & Pahl, K. (2017). Introduction. In K. Facer and K. Pahl, *Valuing*
643 *interdisciplinary collaborative research: Beyond impact.* (pp. 1-21) Bristol: Policy
644 Press.

645 Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist Realism. Is there no alternative?* London: Zed Books.

646 Foucault, M. (2007) *Qu'est-ce que la critique? [What is Critique?]* in *The Politics of*
647 *Truth* ed S. Lotringer /translated by L. Hochroth & C. Porter, Camb. MA., London:
648 Semiotext(e)/MIT Press.

649 Fox, R. (2013). Resisting participation: critiquing participatory research
650 methodologies with young people. *Journal of Youth Studies, 16(8), 986-999.*

651 Gaskill, N. and Nocek, A.J. (2014) An Adventure of Thought. In N. Gaskill and A.J.
652 Nocek (Eds.) *The Lure of Whitehead*. (pp. 1-41) Minneapolis; London: University of
653 Minnesota Press.

654 Haraway, D.J. (1985) A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-
655 Feminism in the Late 20th Century, *Socialist Review*, 80, pp. 65-108.

656 Hickey, G. Richards, T. and Sheehy, J. (2018). Co-production from proposal to paper.
657 *Nature*, 562(7725), 29-31.

658 Innes, M., Davies, B. and McDermot, M. (2019). How co-production regulates. *Social
659 & Legal Studies*, 28(3), 370-391.

660 James, W. (1996a). *Essays in Radical Empiricism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska
661 Press.

662 Kara, H. (2017). *Identity and power in co-produced activist research*. *Qualitative
663 Research*, 17(3), 289–301.

664 Kelly, P. (2001). Youth at Risk: Processes of individualisation and responsabilisation in
665 the risk society, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 22(1), 23-33.

666 Levy, F. J. (2005). *Dance movement therapy: A healing art* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA:
667 National Dance Association: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education,
668 Recreation, and Dance.

669 Liddiard, K., Runswick-Cole, K., Goodley, D., Whitney, S., Vogelmann, E. & Watts, L.
670 (2019). “I was Excited by the Idea of a Project that Focuses on those Unmasked
671 Questions” Co-Producing Disability Research with Disabled Young People. *Children
672 and Society*, 33, 154-167.

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

675 Massumi, B. (2011). *Semblance and Event: Activist Philosophy and the Occurrent Arts*.
676 Cambridge, MA.; London: The MIT Press.

677 May, T. (2012). *Friendship in an Age of Economics: Resisting the Forces of
678 Neoliberalism*. New York: Lexington Books.

679 Nesta (2012). *People Powered Health Co-production Catalogue*. London: NESTA.

680 Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the Great Divide Coproduction, Synergy, and
681 Development. *World Development*, 24, 1073-1087.

682 St. Pierre, E. (2019). Post Qualitative Inquiry in an Ontology of Immanence,
683 *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(1), 3-16.

684 Pemberton, S. & Mason, J. (2009). Co-production and Sure Start Children's Centres:
685 Reflecting upon Users', Perspectives and Implications for Service Delivery, Planning
686 and Evaluation. *Social policy and society*, 8(1), 13–24.

687 Perry, B. & Atherton, M. (2017). Beyond critique: the value of co-production in
688 realising just cities? *Local Environment*, 22(1), 36-51.

689 Qualter, P., Brown, S.L., Rotenberg, K.J., Vanhalst, J., Harris, R.A., Goossens, L.,
690 Bangee, M., Munn, P. (2013) Trajectories of loneliness during childhood and
691 adolescence: Predictors and health outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36, 1283–
692 1293.

693 Rogaly, B. (2016). ‘Don’t show the play at the football ground, nobody will come’: the
694 micro-sociality of co-produced research in an English provincial city. *The Sociological
695 Review*, 64, 657–680

696 Rousell, D. (2017). Mapping the Data Event: A posthumanist approach to
697 art|education|research in a regional university. In L. Knight & A. Cutcher, *Arts,
698 Research, Education: Connections and directions* (pp. 203-220). New York: Springer
699 International Publishing.

700 Shaviro, S. (2009). *Without Criteria: Kant, Whitehead, Deleuze, and Aesthetics*.
701 Cambridge, MA, London: MIT Press.

702 Stengers, I. (2011). Penser avec Whitehead [*Thinking with Whitehead: a free and wild
703 creation of concepts*]. Harvard, London: Harvard University Press.

704 Stengers, I. (2019). Putting Problematization to the Test of Our Present. *Theory,
705 Culture & Society*, OnlineFirst.

706 Thomas-Hughes, H. (2018a). Critical Conversations with Community Researchers –
707 Making Co-Production Happen? Bristol: University of Bristol and AHRC Connected
708 Communities. Retrieved from: [https://connected-
709 communities.org/index.php/project_resources/connected-communities-catalyst-
710 fund-reports-2016-18/](https://connected-communities.org/index.php/project_resources/connected-communities-catalyst-fund-reports-2016-18/)

711 Thomas-Hughes, H. (2018b) Ethical ‘mess’ in co-produced research: reflections from a
712 U.K.-based case study, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(2),
713 231-242.

714 Tiffany, G.A. (2009). *Community Philosophy: A project report*. York: Joseph Rowntree
715 Foundation (JRF).

716 Truman, S.E., & Springgay, S. (2015). The primacy of movement in research-creation:
717 New materialist approaches to art research and pedagogy. In M. Lavery & T. Lewis
718 (Eds.), *Art’s teachings, teaching’s art: Philosophical, critical, and educational musings*.
719 Springer. pp. 151–162.

- 720 United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. HMSO: London.
- 721 Vostal, F. (2016). *Accelerating Academia: The Changing Structure of Academic Time*.
722 London; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 723 Vromen, A. & Collin, P. (2010). Everyday youth participation? Contrasting views from
724 Australian policymakers and young people. *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research*,
725 18(1), 97–112.
- 726 Whitehead, A.N. (1964) *The Concept of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
727 Press.
- 728 Whitehead, A.N. (1967) *Science and the Modern World*. New York: The Free Press.
- 729 Whitehead, A.N. (1978) *Process and Reality: Corrected Edition*, (Eds.) D.R. Griffin and
730 D.W. Sherburne. New York: The Free Press.
- 731 Youdell, D., & McGimpsey, I. (2015). Assembling, disassembling and reassembling
732 ‘youth services’ in Austerity Britain. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 116-130.