

## ***Hanging-out-knowing: The potential of dwelling with our affective landscapes of research-creation***

Noora Pyyry, University of Helsinki: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9689-3901>,  
[noora.pyyry@helsinki.fi](mailto:noora.pyyry@helsinki.fi)

### **Abstract**

In this paper, I approach knowing as a spatial practice of dwelling with one's affective landscapes of inquiry to think with Erin Manning's idea of research-creation as immanent critique. 'Landscape' is re-defined in a nonrepresentational frame to include the various materialities with which we sense and see. To approach research-creation as a joint-action with the landscape, I turn to my native language, Finnish, in which being is referred to as pre-individual with the passive form of 'to be': *ollaan*. I build the argument by discussing my research with young people on their hanging out practices. Movement without destination, attuning to the landscape, can be taken as an energizing technique of relation: an encouragement to follow the call of the unfolding world. In this experimental way of being together, new worlds and selves emerge in encounters. 'Hanging-out-knowing' arises from moments of hesitation that challenge what is known.

**Keywords:** affective landscape, encounter, hanging-out-knowing, hesitation, research-creation

### **Introduction: dwelling *with* the landscape**

*I am grocery shopping after a long day of writing about the concept of dwelling. The face mask feels uncomfortable, but I keep it on due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Moving around in the store, I can feel a heavy collective atmosphere of depression, even fear and paranoia. It moves through me, leaving little energy for anything else. Although we are actively keeping our distance, I am linked to*

*all these others, my fellow grocery shoppers, to this landscape and beyond.  
Linked by this virus.*

*Then, a sudden smile in the eyes of a stranger, playfulness, and empathy behind a mask. What an impact! Joy! It feels like this one look is more important than any other eye-contact I have experienced in a very long time. I can feel it rush through my body: hope in the form of an opening toward the other.*

In my native language, Finnish, 'being' is denoted as pre-individual with a passive form of the verb 'to be': *ollaan*. There is no-one yet that is, rather the verb describes being as such. Philosopher Pauli Pylkkö (1998) claims that in our Finno-Ugric language, we are able to be 'less individual', freed from the straitjacket of the subject and therefore somehow closer to the experience of the 'other'. With this claim, Pylkkö aims to *locate* experience, to think spatially about that which seems to escape mediation and representation. He places experience not only 'in-the-middle' but suggests that it pre-exists the subject. This understanding impairs the autonomy and rationality of the Western knowing human subject and has consequences to what counts as knowledge. In this paper, I attempt to stay with this kind of being, which takes place before the articulation of subject-object divisions, since Pylkkö's reading of *ollaan* fits well with Erin Manning's (2020) call for deeply engaged thinking that emerges from the becoming-body's connecting to the world's rhythms. *Ollaan* connects to the more-than of existence that composes us in the practice of art-based 'research-creation' (Manning, 2016b; 2020; Manning & Massumi, 2014). It also reminds us of the language-centeredness of our normative modes of inquiry, and the dominant role of English in academic knowledge production, in which dictionaries often function as our closest co-writers if we happen to come from another language background. *Ollaan* locates knowing within our landscapes of research-creation.

To think with this trans-subjective, collective, and spatial conceptualization of knowing, I connect two different arenas of life: academic research and young people's hanging out in the city. In doing this, my aim is to touch upon the significance of wasting time to sense with the *affective landscapes* that take part in our research-creation (Anderson & Harrison, 2010). With *affect*, I refer to the circulating intensity, moving between and through bodies, which Thrift (2004) has called the 'push of life'. Affect envelops bodies, spreads, and multiplies, it triggers action (Bennett, 2010). Affect unsettles landscapes, it haunts and informs us. John Wylie (2005; 2009) reconceptualizes the concept of *landscape* in geographical research by moving away from the traditional idea of looking at a scenery, and hereby refusing to treat landscape as an 'external' canvas for human life. The concept then moves away from the colonial, optical appropriation of space, and refers to the materialities and sensibilities with which we are always in relation – and which we thus sense and see *with* (also Ingold, 2011; Rose & Wylie, 2006). In resonance with Wylie's work, J-D Dewsbury (2015, p. 40) discusses the becoming subject as choreographed by its landscape in such a way that an individual knower cannot be claimed to preexist the actions that define it. Our bodies are part of the landscape that runs through us with all its affective force, with its interplay of the near and the far. As Ingold (2011, p. 134) describes: '...when the body feels, the wind feels, since the wind, in its currents, has already invaded the body's tactile awareness.' It is from this

turbulent opening, the *affective atmosphere*, that our knowing subjects emerge, and to which they dissolve (Anderson, 2009; also Dewsbury et al., 2002; Thrift, 2008). We can then sense with the *event* – as Manning (2020, p. 116) points out, we can become attuned to *the ecology of practices* that come into formation as event, and let our bodies reveal the potential of the world to us through the diverse, uneasy, more-than-human encounters we take part in.

By stressing the importance of attending to our shared affective landscapes, I am not proposing a style of research that relies on ‘personal feeling’, or as Manning (2020, p. 116) puts it, a variability of content (‘each has his own truth’). This is not Manning’s agenda, and it would be irresponsible in today’s post-truth political climate, in which it sometimes seems that anything goes. Rather, I wish my paper to function as a reminder of the body’s earthly *thinking-feeling* (Massumi, 2015) capacities, as an argument against the artificial division of thought and affect. In the current high-pressure academic environment, it is crucial to remain open to new associations, unforeseen questions that the world may pose us and, most importantly, to embrace not-knowing and take time to hesitate before the already-known. This *sensing* requires ‘dwelling with’ the multiple ‘others’ in a given research situation, a sort of pre-cognitive co-belonging to a shared experience of the world (Pyyry, 2019). As Jane Bennett (2010, p. xv) remarks: “The capacity to detect the presence of impersonal affect requires that one is caught up in it.” With this argument, I suggest a refusal to be an individual, an autonomous researcher who thinks the world from a distance, a knowing subject separate from its spatial relations. I suggest an open-ended hanging out with the situations our research/life presents to us. Then, the impossibility of dwelling can be understood as a question that the landscape poses to us. Hope in the encounter at the grocery store after a long day of writing about ‘dwelling’ reminded me of the power of playfulness and participation, and at the same time, the bound unhomeliness somehow sharpened the sense of ‘being of relation’ (Manning, 2020).

To highlight the importance of playfulness in opening space for new forms of relation, I think with my previous research on young people’s hanging out (Pyyry, 2015; 2016b; Pyyry & Tani, 2019). I do this here as a response to Manning’s (2016b; 2020) call for constitutively open-ended techniques for ‘life-living’ in approaching research-creation with a serious attention to the hyphenation. The link matters. My aim is to explicate the inseparability of theory/practice, thought/act, and, finally, the fundamental connection of human/landscape. Through paying attention to these constitutive relations, I hope to open new paths for researchers to somehow inhabit our work/world differently – whether in the classroom, lab or elsewhere. If we take these relations seriously, we will treat our researcher-bodies as spatial academic instruments that can detect changes and potentialities in the world as it is unfolding. I put emphasis on the word ‘spatial’ because my leading concept of ‘hanging-out-knowing’ refers to knowing that is always tied to its landscapes of emergence (Pyyry, 2015; 2019). Following the ethos of participatory action research (PAR, e.g., Pain, Kindon & Kesby, 2007) and pragmatist ideas (e.g., Jones, 2020), I therefore treat knowledge as something that resides in action and unfolds in the process of inquiry. We learn with our ‘thinking-feeling’ (Massumi, 2015) bodies, via ‘dwelling with’ our landscapes of research-creation.

In what follows, I address the pressure of formal valuation and indexing of our practices of thought

with an argument for wasting time with our landscapes of research-creation: to hang out with books, colleagues, concepts, and spoil ourselves with the luxury of contemplation – for its own sake. To place value to non-instrumental relations built in this practice, I will discuss young people’s hanging out and conceptualize it as a mode of being that cultivates dwelling with the world. Hanging out is not a method *per se*, but it can inform our practices of research-creation. As young people are the objects of the educational practices that we study, this link has a double agenda: 1) to acknowledge and give value to the many ways in which young people already know through everyday experience (Pyyry, 2015; 2016a), and 2) to join with the modalities of flesh and blood experimentation that work beyond innovation and the constant self-evaluation that most academics have internalized in the era of ‘knowledge-based economization’ (see Moisio, 2018). To encourage researchers to be wasteful of their time, I will show that the joyous mode of open-ended participation makes space for affective encounters that push for new associations. I argue that in moments of hesitation connected to these encounters, the world gets to pose questions to us, and new knowledge emerges. I conclude the paper by claiming that although these encounters are always impromptu, we can carve space for them by hanging out with our landscapes of research-creation.

### **Hanging out is play with the landscape**

Figure 1 presents a photograph from Helsinki, taken by one of the 38 young people I did research with in 2013 on their hanging out practices in the city. Although the images in this paper are offered as generative rather than representational material, it must be noted that the same shopping mall was pictured in many of the participants’ photographs, pointing at the uniqueness of seemingly meaningless *non-place* (see Augé, 2008) spaces in young people’s everyday lives. Many times, young people hang out in spaces that are not planned for them: street corners, beaches, parks, parking lots, and quite commonly, at shopping malls. In fact, when looking at urban spaces in particular, young people are often actively *planned out* of them with prohibitions signs, surveillance, and other means of control (Skelton & Gough, 2013). This leads to a continuous play of ‘cat and mouse’ with security guards and other supervising adults, and the creation of *back stages* while being *on stage* for peers (see Lieberg, 1995). The *rationale of security* (Katz, 2006) and utilitarian use of urban space has narrowed down the possibility of surprising encounters, and gradually turned many public spaces into cozy – but somewhat dull – living rooms. In this functional landscape, the atmosphere often feels nice and home-like, but makes people politically and intellectually passive – paradoxically so, considering the historical democratic ethos of public spaces. Furthermore, the city only belongs to those who fit the desired image of the living room (Pyyry, 2016b). Through open-ended play with this *domesticated* landscape (Jackson, 1998), young people carve space for themselves to just *be*, without the restricting schedules and plans of everyday life. It is, indeed, this playful spatial negotiation in young people’s hanging out that I want to emphasize here, in dialogue with Manning’s (2020, p. 117) agenda of attuning to ways of participation that complicate notions of individual subjectivity. As I will discuss in this section, hanging out can be approached as a mode of being that supports spatial sensitivity, a way to open oneself to the push and pull of ecologies forming the event. The receptivity of this practice of *actively doing nothing* points out the importance of the process and movement itself: non-

instrumental engagement with friends, spaces, and things around builds new relations (Pyyry, 2016b).

*Figure 1*

'Just hanging out.' An affective landscape of dwelling with. Photo by a participant, 'Matu', 15 years (nickname by him).



The research project, 'Geographies of hanging out', was linked to a 9<sup>th</sup> grade geography course during which the students were learning to do small-scale studies on their everyday environments (Pyyry, 2015). The point was to show the students that their mundane knowledge matters and links to school geography, which too often remains detached from young people's lives. In resonance with Manning's (2016b, p. 133) aim of troubling the prevailing ideas of 'what knowledge might look like', the idea was to bring playfulness and experimentation to formal education in a way that would both create breaks in knowledge and inspire new associations. The students' 'doodling' on the image shows that the atmosphere of hanging out punctured the institutional settings of the school. During schoolwork that connected to the project, the drifting rhythm of hanging out entered the classroom so that it no longer felt like a formal educational space. This atmosphere tuned the students toward playfulness, freeing 'minor' tendential movements that soften the default settings and open space for difference (Manning & Massumi, 2014, p. 99). Reading Figure 1 now, very little can be said about the location or even about young people's hanging out. The ordinariness and boredom are accentuated, despite the humour of the doodling on the photograph. Yet, discussing the photograph with the young participants back then made it possible for me to 'see' them making jokes while sitting there, laughing, and running around, provoking the security guards that often told them to leave – amusing each other and having fun. Whether or not my imagination captures what really happened at the mall, many of the stories I heard were filled with funny memories and passing incidents that pointed to feelings of friendship, joy, and spatial engagement – even though youth often felt unwelcome in these spaces of hanging out. This atmosphere of joyous participation is key to the story here, as it refuses an instrumental, categorically personal relationship with the world. When things matter, it becomes possible to genuinely engage with, and attune to the landscape (see Manning, 2020).

In today's world of self-development and project-led life, movement without destination – just playing and hanging out – may seem like a refusal to participate. Still, and precisely for this reason, I argue that this purposeless being offers young people a chance to engage and improvise with their everyday landscapes and can then, in fact, deepen their involvement in the world through becoming attuned to the ecology of practices that make up the emerging event (see Manning, 2020). Reluctance to participate (in the adult world) works against the conventional sense of time management and may then make space for participation (in the form of openness to the world). As Zygmunt Bauman (1993, p. 171) writes: *"to play is to rehearse eternity... Nothing accrues, nothing 'builds up', each new play is an absolute beginning."* Approached from this perspective, play is important unto itself – not as a path to development, growth, or education (Rautio & Winston, 2015). While hanging out, young people escape the seriousness of the adult world and are open to new encounters with spaces (including other beings, human and non-human). As the shift in the atmosphere at the grocery store described in the opening vignette, the joyous sense of play is essential here, as it allows for openness and changes of direction. Hanging out combats cynicism through a creation of transitory *micro-atmospheres of play*, a kind of counter-politics of affect that reworks the landscape from within (Pyyry, 2016b).

Ingold (2000, p. 357) talks about 'gradual attunement of movement and perception' when he refers to bodily capacities in different situations that are produced through engagement with

everyday landscapes. In hanging out, this process is linked to creative appropriation of spaces in an adult dominated world, sometimes consciously but more often in passing adjustments to the current situation. When young people take part in urban life, they are open to the intensities of the landscape and create momentary attachments with the city. They 'build' new spaces through playfulness and waste of time, moving together with the landscape, creating 'bodyings' that temporarily trouble the expected ways of being (see Manning, 2020). By marking spaces for themselves in the city, young people claim temporary 'hangout homes' for themselves, and hereby make space for being otherwise (Pyyry, 2016b). As Michel de Certeau (1984) might have framed it, they participate in 'writing the urban text' with their bodies and challenge the dominant strategies of urban control. The 'structure' of this language is nonrepresentational, as this 'writing' emerges from the circulation of (joyous) affects. Therefore, this participation is pre-individual and links to the idea of the landscape composing the human subject, as the Finnish word *ollaan* would suggest. It is a meandering of coming-together and drifting-apart, a multidirectional movement. When hanging out in urban environments, young people 'dwell with' the city (Pyyry, 2016b).

Dwelling with refers to claiming space for oneself in the world through engagement with one's landscape (see Pyyry, 2016b; Rose, 2012). In a world that emphasizes productivity, the 'uselessness' of hanging out turns into time-space appropriation. Dwelling with the landscape intensifies in playfully free situations when there is time and space to wander and wonder. I argue that this mode of being creates space for exposure to the 'other' because of the openness to being itself. To put it simply, dwelling with is participation, but in addition to humans this participation includes active involvement of the more-than-human world with which we live: the landscape we engage and become with. This nonrepresentational understanding of landscape that refuses individuation and the privileging of consciousness links to Pylkkö's (1998) attempt to approach experience as trans-subjective and Manning's (2016b) quest for beginning in the middle, in the mess of relations. Dwelling with rests on the idea that human intentionality is only one force among many: in every situation, there are multiple forces affecting its course, often in a turbulent movement (e.g. Bennett, 2010). Humans never build the world alone. Dwelling with the landscape is an ongoing spatial practice that makes it possible to temporarily experience one's belonging to the world, to live intensely together (see Massumi, 2015). This belonging is not only about presence, though, but is often accompanied by unhomeliness, loss, and distancing. 'Hangout homes' are built in a world that is never fully one's own (Pyyry, 2016b). The quest for making a home for oneself in a turbulent world is a method of being that is not about 'owning'. While hanging out, young people make temporary spatial claims in a city that is not theirs, they are 'tenants' in the adult world. Dwelling *with*, then, includes a reaching for the unreachable. This failure to connect is an opening toward the 'other' that is at the heart of knowing (otherwise) (see Wylie, 2009). Ergo, the landscape proposes situations that we need to somehow deal with. It pushes us to create new passages and build the world with the multiple others we encounter. Dwelling with is *joint-participation* in which different elements of the landscape come together, and encourage us to engage with the world (see Massumi, 2011).

The concept of dwelling with makes it possible to think of knowing as a spatial process, as I will show in the next two sections. It opens up the idea of how the landscape participates in our lives,

how we get attached to places that move us. Or to be precise, how we move together. We come to know and enact the world from inhabiting it, from becoming attuned to its differences, frictions and positions (Anderson & Harrison, 2010). Research-creation is a constitutively open-ended process (Manning, 2016b). Approaching hanging out as a practice of ‘actively doing nothing’ highlights the importance of the movement itself: engaging with the environment builds new relations – but may also create feelings of being lost in a world to which one can never properly belong (see Pyyry, 2016b). Taking inspiration from hanging out resonates with Manning’s passion for experimental practice that is never risk-free, since only through embracing chaos and uncertainty we can open ourselves to being moved, questioned, and touched by the other(ness). Hanging out has potential for the exploratory openness that lies at the core of research-creation, which is co-causal and catalyzing of variation (Manning & Massumi, 2014, p. 94). This view is a statement for the value of young people’s lives as such (not as objects of development or education), and a reminder to academics to trust their embodied ‘thinking-feeling’ (Massumi, 2015) and take the time to listen to it. As Thrift (2011) notes, this is the task of social scientists at a time when much of what has been understood as our field of inquiry, is part of the processes through which the world is continually built. In addition to explaining the world with words and orders, we therefore need to come up with new techniques of experimenting with that which escapes these explanations. Intellectual work then always has an orientation toward possible futures, it is not an act of distancing the world with representations.

### **Hesitation before the world**

Manning (2020, p. 221) shows that research-creation unsettles the certainty of what we approve as knowledge – taken that it keeps testing limits and resisting the domestication of knowledge to the measurable and accountable. This echoes with young people’s practices of hanging out. When hanging out is conceptualized as dwelling with, attention is directed to both 1) the openness and exploratory nature of this non-instrumental way of being, and 2) the multiple ways in which the world invites us to play, makes us turn, trip, disturbs our paths, and so on. As Figure 2 hints, in a disruptive *encounter*, we can feel the intensity of world that we never build alone, and sometimes it gives us no choice but to detour. The painter of the picture on the ground appears to have created the ‘traffic sign’ in dialogue with the urban landscape. As J.-D. Dewsbury (2015, p. 34) writes: “The materiality of the milieu speaks of the agency of both the individual body and the landscape as it emerges in the encounter. Thought is always collective, and knowledge emerges in-between, in affective encounters with the materialities and sensibilities of the open-ended landscape. In resonance with Dewsbury’s theorization, Helen F. Wilson (2006) points out that an encounter is always more than a meeting of two entities: it entails difference, rupture, and surprise. An affective encounter forces us to try an alternative route when the world creatively argues with us (Pyyry, 2019). Affective encounter forces a new perspective to the world, but it does not have to be verbally reflected upon to count as important. This opening of horizons does not happen by a rational ‘subject’s’ recognition of an ‘object’, but, as Gilles Deleuze (1994) describes, the encounter is felt ‘in a range of affective tones: wonder, love, hatred, suffering’. The subject arises from the circulation of affect, from the ecology of practices. This idea of a forceful, fundamental encounter links to effectivity rather than representation (and reflection), it is an



invitation of the landscape to inhabit the world slightly otherwise. This perspective places spatial practice as the study itself, resisting the draining demand for representation (see Manning, 2020). Linked to experimentation and possibility, affective encounters challenge what is known bit by bit, they produce new worlds and selves through *moments of hesitation* (see Thrift, Harrison, & Anderson, 2010).

*Figure 2*

An affective encounter with the landscape forces a new direction. Photo NP.



Young people's hanging out may consume impressive amounts of time in an economy where 'time is money'. While hanging out, young people both move with the rhythms of the landscape (and may be caught up by them, for example at the shopping mall) and interfere with the dominant ideas of movement and production. I therefore argue that hanging out has both 'in-sync' and 'out-of-sync' potential, and the indifference and lack of direction resists the forces that aim to capture it. The resistance arises of immanence: it is counter-politics of affect that is not planned or led, since this 'critique' is 'one with its enaction' (Massumi, 2015, p. 106). As Manning (2020, p. 222) might word it, hanging out makes space for 'thinking wildly' since it goes against the idea of the renewal of the productive capitalist subject. The openness of hanging out cultivates dwelling with the sensibilities of the landscape, which, in turn, is key to carving space for affective encounters. I place the generative moment of hesitation in these encounters at the core of building new knowledge. It is this short-lived moment of uncertainty that needs to be sensed before anything genuinely (ontologically) different can emerge. Then, indulgent wasting of time

and space, or time-spaces, proves to hold potential for exposure to the 'other', i.e., seeing things anew and re-cognizing the familiar (see Thrift, 2011).

What I am referring to here, is a powerful 'being-together' where the emergence of the world is emphasized in the moment of hesitation. In this radical moment, everything becomes unusual, surreal and strange (see Joronen, 2012; Stone, 2006). It is then not about being captivated by an extraordinary beauty or a unique occurrence, but about the most familiar turning into uncanny (Pyyry, 2016a). In a moment of hesitation, all things become odd. The moment therefore offers an opportunity to question our thoughts, of our own taken-for-granted truths. Here, a moment of confusion and uncertainty turns into sense-making and new possibilities. In the encounter, the exposure to the 'other' is a desire to know that which cannot be known. Hanging out with our affective landscapes of research-creation then reminds us that knowing is always collective: a body (of knowledge) encounters another in a turbulent opening, and something else emerges. Never complete, never fully understood – but, intensely felt. The effects might escape representation, but even so, new possibilities that come with them can be sensed in the encounter. Although not fully here-yet, this potential is not just a possibility but 'an active part of the constitution of that situation' that is in creation in the spatial process of encirclement (Massumi, 2015, p. 57).

### **Hanging-out-knowing is dwelling in the transversal**

To dwell with the world requires openness to what is going on, and most importantly, vulnerability before the 'not-quite-yet' (see Manning, 2016b). Giving into the intensities of the landscape, moving with it, is a process of tuning into the unfolding of the event. As Manning (2016b; 2020) reminds us, to genuinely question the conditions of knowledge means that the research needs to stay under construction, resisting the pressing demand of closure and indexing. This is dwelling in the transversal. Certainty of how things stand will make us blind to alternative possibilities, since we are not open to chance encounters with the unfolding world. Dwelling is never an achieved state of being – it is always only a claim in a turbulent world that we are thrown into (Rose, 2012). The growing field of new empiricist and nonrepresentational research shares this understanding of the human subject as an inseparable of its space: is the combination is fluid and in-the-making (e.g. Anderson, 2009; 2014; Anderson & Wylie, 2009; Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010; Latham & McCormack, 2004; McCormack, 2013; St. Pierre, 2016; Wylie, 2005). All knowledge of our world(s) is situated and partial, and research-creation is then a continuous journey of thought, experimentation that goes on and on.

Research-creation that resists certainty and the logic of the institution raises a collective capacity to act. Once the work becomes the practice, inventing its own language, it shakes the foundations of the Western language-centered academic practices (Manning, 2020, p. 221). Through dwelling with the affective landscapes of our research-creation, academics can learn to re-cognize and carve space for knowledge that has been labeled as irrelevant 'noise' and stand up for alternative arguments worth listening to (see Rancière, 2010). We can learn to hang out with the hesitation. Affect has a key role in encountering this knowledge and unsettling predefined systems of

thought. Noise can then be turned into world-building *rhizovocality* ‘to reference those unstable voices as excessive, transgressive, overflowing, and surprising’ (Youngblood Jackson, 2014). Instead of being thrown into a leftover category X that disturbs the linear scientific analysis, disturbance itself becomes relevant. This practice of the affective encounter is a genuine joint-participation of theory/practice, thought/act, and knower/known.

In the face of its metaphysical enemy, The Western World, the antihumanist rhythm of *ollaan* is a declining language’s desperate exploration of that which precedes the forementioned divisions (Pylkkö, 1998, p. 48). The pre-individual form points to being *with* the landscape, subverting the rationality of the human subject. This is the onto-epistemological basis of hanging-out-knowing (Pyyry, 2015; 2019). Although the concept is inspired by the 20<sup>th</sup> Century avant-garde Situationist practice of the *dérive*, a spontaneous drift through the city, hanging-out-knowing is nonrepresentational and rests on the idea of an emergent human subject (*dérive*, see Debord, 2006). This non-linear ‘thinking-feeling’ (Massumi, 2015), which refuses the demand for clarity and precision, takes place with everything that comes together in the landscape of research-creation. Like research-creation, hanging-out-knowing refuses to disconnect practice and thought. I have previously linked this process to the radical experience of *enchantment* and argued that this generative event may be foreclosed by inciting curiosity (Pyyry, 2016a; 2019; Bennett, 2001; Stone, 2006). For the sake of this paper’s argument, it is important to ask whether the rush and continual quest for results in much of today’s academic research does, indeed, prevent us from what Manning (2016a) encourages us to do: to begin in the middle and dwell in hesitation to create fractures in our accepted knowledge. As the academic system functions through the logics of the curious individual researcher, the ‘I’ is continuously reinforced. Under the individual pressure, the subject’s attention is seduced by the achievable, narrowing its horizons in the process. Curiosity killed the cat, but could it be killing thought in the academia, as well?

When the researcher refuses to look at the world from a distance as a separate knower, the research becomes the practice, and, as Manning (2020, p. 221) promisingly remarks, a new language is invented, and therefore ‘research-creation deeply threatens the power/knowledge that holds the academy in place’. This notion has fundamental consequences to how we think of doing research, but also impacts our educational practices, as it frames knowing/learning to be much more than an individual endeavor or a linear process. It is then a statement for the importance of open and ethical human involvement with the world, as new knowledge is understood to stem from the multidirectional interplay of practice and cognition. It is a statement for the fundamental importance of ‘just hanging out’ – with friends, colleagues, books, cities, and other research participants – since knowing takes time and space. Finally, it is an argument against the commodification and instrumentalization of education, because it asserts that neither research results nor learning need to be represented (with tests or numbers) to count as valuable. Hanging out without a clear destination or goal can be taken as an energizing technique of relation: an encouragement to being open to emerging connections, following the call of the unfolding world. An imaginative attempt to dwell (inhabit) otherwise.

But, as Manning (2020, p. 221) warns us, research-creation, just as any alternative idea, can easily

be domesticated and reduced to what counts as valuable in the prevailing system. Just as punk aesthetics has been turned into fashion and political graffiti into commercial art, the capitalist knowledge economy warmly welcomes variation from the normal if it can be turned toward profit-making (Pyry & Tani, 2019). Artistic practice is more and more often embraced in the academia, and we have seen inventive forms of research-creation, disrupting the idea of what counts as knowledge. However, what may feel like a celebration of difference, may turn out to be calculative use of power that only reinforces the existing system. It has not been long since hanging out was considered mostly an unwanted phenomenon at commercial spaces, such as shopping malls. Today, young people are often welcomed to the mall by nice sitting areas and water fountains, since they are considered as potential future shoppers. Hanging out as a way of being is promoted as a form of personal renewal, a way to recharge oneself for the demands of the economy. So, how to, then, promote this way of being as important in-itself and resist the powers that seek to capture it? How to value knowing as such, as a form of spatial inquiry that tests the limits of this world and creates moments of seeing it anew through reiteration?

As a takeoff, we should start trusting the knowledge piled up and moving through our bodies. We should align ourselves with our landscapes of research-creation. Here, I want to refuse any mystical explanations of intuition and treat our bodily knowledge as a significant part of our academic life. Indeed, intuition is knowledge piled up in the body, moving through it, always situated (see Paterson, 2009). Different bodies tell different stories, but always with the landscape they become with, including various 'partners in knowing', human and non-human. As Pylkkö's (1998) reading of *ollaan* would suggest, the refusal of the autonomous 'I' as a researcher can open possibilities for real collaboration with others, human/non-human, academic/non-academic without an emphasis on the often taken-for-granted divisions. This is ethical science making that can fight the feeling of hopelessness and cynicism in the (academic) world. Hanging-out-knowing places value to the ephemeral, the irregular, and the ongoing – the excess of the world that escapes much of our current research practice and the 'methods' we use. As Manning (2016b, p. 135) reminds us: '...knowledge is invented in the escape, in the excess.' That said, there is no standardized method for this knowing, but it emerges from a way of being that is self- and world-affirming: *ollaan*. It emerges in dwelling with. Through affective encounters that become possible in hanging out, when we waste space and time to think, we become-together with our spatio-temporal relations – our affective landscapes, which include the academic concepts we take along – and let the world pose questions to us. These questions we can only *sense* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994).

### *Hope in the form of alternative movements*

*Deeply engaged, thinking wildly, touching the limits of thought, the becoming-body can finally stim as much as it needs to, connecting to the world's rhythms, its bodyings out of sync with the forces that would seek to capture it, outside the cycle of recognition that would identify it as the guarantor of the university's system of debt and credit (Manning, 2020, p. 222).*

In today's world, it has become pressingly relevant to believe in something, to engage and connect in ways that resonate empathy and ethical commitment to the various others we live with. Without this belief, we lack the collective energy to act. I was reminded of this with the 'smile behind the mask' at the grocery store that I mentioned in the opening vignette. Hope fights cynicism, it opens the subject toward the other and makes it possible to imagine better futures. And when we are open to authentic participation, we "feel more thinkingly, towards acting differently together" (Massumi, 2015, p. 106). Belief in the world can then form through recognizing the familiar, through a shared desire of a different future. This turns experience into a study of its *conditions* and makes space for alternative ways of operating through immanent critique.

Manning (2020, p. 224) beautifully reminds us to trust our bodies and the knowledge they present us when we dwell with our landscapes. With the concept of *dwelling with*, the event of knowing can be sketched as deeply relational. New associations are then always built with multiple different 'partners in knowing' that make up the research landscape, i.e., the given time-space of thought. Knowing as dwelling does not begin or end with the human: it is always a co-creation in being. The knowing human subject is not separate from, or at odds with the world it does research on, rather it is constituted in the research encounters that fill it with what it contemplates (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 212).

Without the time and space to dwell with our landscapes of research-creation, we become untouched and indifferent towards our work, and the world. Just like young people in the city make temporary homes for themselves by hanging out, academics need to appropriate space for thought in the university. The city can emerge as a space of both diversity and oppression, and similarly research-creation is a both site of hope and potentially brutal (academic) control. Sense-making is connective, and it is up to us to value the useless waste of time and move our academic (and educational) practices toward genuine connectivity and the rule of joy. And, as Brian Massumi (2015, p. 44) reminds us, joy has very little to do with happiness (which is sold to us everywhere we turn these days). Rather, joy is deep ontological energy that amplifies our powers of existence. Joy can be disruptive, but it is an affirmation of life: "a sensibility, a feeling-with, of a body-world in transformation" (Manning, 2020, p. 242). It makes better research and inspires us to imagine alternative worlds and ask what other forms knowing and learning could take. Playfulness can bring openness and receptivity to the research process by creating cracks in the existing knowledge, hence potential for the emergence of new forms of relation.

By discussing hanging out in a paper that deals with qualitative inquiry in educational research, I have wanted to emphasize the intrinsic value of playfulness, drifting rhythm, and participation in the world through contemplation. I have argued that the mode of being characteristic to young people's hanging out has potential for re-cognizing the familiar, and that this mode can, therefore carve space for non-instrumental (scientific) thought, as well. With this story, I want to encourage researchers to improvise with their practices of research-creation like an educated jazz-musician does, playing it by the ear, trusting the talent and experience they have – while simultaneously attuning to the cues of the 'audience', i.e., to the tendencies that make up the event (see

Manning, 2020). We should learn from young people's practices of hanging out to re-install playfulness into our work, so that the concepts we use can act as openings to new possible worlds. Then, academic research can be approached as a discussion of the human subject with its landscape. Our work can become the practice, calling us to act and invent new forms of research. If we allow ourselves to be less individual, we can *feel* the intensity of world and let it pose questions to us in moments of hesitation. Even though these moments can never be manufactured, we can carve space for potentially disruptive encounters by hanging out with our landscapes of research-creation. We can attune our thinking bodies to the rhythms of the landscape, try plugging concepts to new sockets, hopefully opening new areas of thought. Link that which cannot be linked and be liberated in surprise (this also goes for academic thinkers that may seem incompatible – let us bring them together and colour outside the lines!). When we stop focusing our attention only to the next task in front of us, we may expose ourselves to the multiplicity of the world. This notion may seem naïve in today's academic world with the pressures for productivity – and I feel the paradox as I am writing this paper in the late hours of my tenure track days. I am, indeed, writing *with* the affective landscape of innovation and instrumentality, sensing its pressures in my body. I fear that suggestions for 'slow science' lack the political power needed in the current landscape but, at the same time, *think-feel* that it is crucial to resist the ethos of individuality and make space for alternative forms of knowledge. As any landscape, also this one needs to be studied from within. If we take time to hang out with our colleagues, texts, places, things – with our affective landscapes – a revolutionary wave of new associations can be felt as questions, which may not yet be verbal but are all the more intense. We can give value to the process for the sake of itself, just hang out with all the 'noise' around us and let ourselves be addressed by the event. To do this, it is the academic 'I' that needs to be overcome. The world is known through dwelling with: *ollaan vaan ja hengailaan*.

#### *Acknowledgement of funding.*

This research has been conducted with support of the Tenure Track Starting Grant of the Department of Geosciences and Geography at the University of Helsinki, WBS 7510155.

#### **References**

- Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(2), 77–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2009.08.005>
- Anderson B. (2014). *Encountering affect: Capacities, apparatuses, conditions*. Ashgate.
- Anderson, B., & Harrison, P. (2010, Eds.). *Taking-place: Non-representational theories and geography*. Ashgate.
- Anderson, B., & Wylie, J. (2009). On geography and materiality. *Environment and Planning A*, 41(2), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3940>
- Augé, M. (2008). *Non-places: An introduction to supermodernity*. (Original work *Non-lieux: Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité* published in 1992.) Translation: Howe, J. 2nd English-language edition. Verso.
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern ethics*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Bennett, J. (2001). *The enchantment of modern life: Attachments, crossings, and ethics*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400884537>
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Duke University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822391623>

- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.
- Debord, G. (2006). Theory of the dérive. In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist international: Anthology*. Bureau of Public Secrets, pp. 62–66. (Original work published in 1958)
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference & Repetition*. Translation by P. Patton. Columbia University Press. (Original work *Différence et Répétition* published in 1968.)
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* Translation by G. Burchell & H. Tomlinson. Verso. (Original work *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* published in 1991.)
- Dewsbury, J.-D. (2015). Non-representational landscapes and the performative affective forces of habit: from 'Live' to 'Blank'. *cultural geographies*, 22(1), 29–47.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474014561575>
- Dewsbury, J.-D., Harrison, P., Rose, M., & Wylie, J. (2002). Introduction: Enacting geographies. *Geoforum*, 33(4), 437–440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(02\)00029-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(02)00029-5)
- Hultman, K. & Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). Challenging anthropocentric analysis of visual data: A relational materialist methodological approach to educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 525–542.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.500628>
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2011). *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. Routledge.
- Jackson, P. (1998). Domesticating the street: The contested spaces of the high street and the mall. In Fyfe, N.R. (Ed.) *Images of the street: Planning, identity and control in public space*. Routledge, pp. 178–191.
- Jones, O. (2020). Pragmatism, anti-representational theory and local methods for critical-creative ecological action. In Wills, J. and Lake, R. (Eds.) *The power of pragmatism: Knowledge production and social inquiry*. Manchester University Press, pp. 210–227.
- Joronen, M. (2012). Heidegger, event and the ontological politics of the site. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38(4), 627–638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2012.00550.x>
- Katz, C. (2006). Power, space, and terror: Social reproduction and the public environment. In Low, S. & Smith, N. (Eds.) *The politics of public space*. Routledge, pp. 105–121.
- Latham, A. & McCormack, D. (2004). Moving cities: Rethinking the materialities of urban geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(6), 701–724.  
<https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph515oa>
- Lieberg, M. (1995). Teenagers and public space. *Communication Research*, 22(6), 720–744.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/009365095022006008>
- Manning, E. (2016a). For a pragmatics of the useless, or the value of the infrathin. *Political Theory*, 45(1), 97–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591715625877>
- Manning, E. (2016b). Ten propositions for research-creation. In Colin, N. and Sachsenmaier, S. (Eds.). *Collaboration in performance practice: Premises, workings, failures*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 133–141. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137462466\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137462466_7)
- Manning, E. (2020). *For a pragmatics of the useless*. Duke University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478012597>
- Manning, E. & Massumi, B. (2014). *Thought in the act: Passages in the ecology of experience*. University of Minnesota Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679669.001.0001>
- Massumi, B. (2011). Conjunction, disjunction, gift. *Transversal. A multilingual webjournal*. Retrieved from <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0811/massumi/en>

- Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of affect*. Polity Press.
- McCormack, D.P. (2013). *Refrains for moving bodies. Experience and experiment in affective spaces*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822377559>
- Moisio, S. (2018). *Geopolitics of the knowledge-based economy*. Routledge.
- Pain, R., Kindon, S. & Kesby, M. (2007). Participatory Action Research: making a difference to theory, practice and action. In Kindon, S., Pain, R. & Kesby, M. (Eds.) *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place*. Routledge, pp. 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203933671>
- Paterson, M. (2009). Haptic geographies: Ethnography, haptic knowledges and sensuous dispositions. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(6), 766–788. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132509103155>
- Pykkö, P. (1998). Suomen kieli on vetäytymässä ja jättämässä meidät rauhaan toisiltamme. *Niin & näin*, 1/98, 44–49.
- Pyry, N. (2015). *Hanging out with young people, urban spaces and ideas: Openings to dwelling, participation and thinking*. University of Helsinki, Department of Teacher Education, Research Report 374. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:78-951-51-1126-5>
- Pyry, N. (2016a). Learning with the city via enchantment: photo-walks as creative encounters. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 37(1), 102–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.929841>
- Pyry, N. (2016b). Participation by being: Teenage girls' hanging out at the shopping mall as 'dwelling with' [the world]. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 18, 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2016.01.006>
- Pyry, N. (2019). From psychogeography to hanging-out-knowing: Situationist dérive in nonrepresentational urban research. *Area*, 51(2), 315–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12466>
- Pyry, N. & Tani, S. (2019). More-than-human playful politics in young people's practices of dwelling with the city. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 20(9), 1218–1232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2017.1358823>
- Rancière, J. (2010). *Chronicles of Consensual Times*. Continuum. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350252073>
- Rautio, P. & Winston, J. (2015). Things and children in play—Improvisation with language and matter. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2013.830806>
- Rose, M. (2012). Dwelling as marking and claiming. *Environment and Planning D*, 30(5), 757–771. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d6809>
- Rose, M. & Wylie, J. (2006). Guest Editorial: Animating landscape. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24, 475–479. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d2404ed>
- Skelton, T. & Gough, K. V. (2013). Introduction: Young people's im/mobile urban geographies. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 455–466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012468900>
- Stone, B.E. (2006). Curiosity as the thief of wonder: An Essay on Heidegger's critique of the ordinary conception of time. *KronoScope*, 6(2), 205–229. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156852406779751881>
- St. Pierre, E.A. (2016). 'The Empirical and the New Empiricisms', *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 16(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636147>
- Thrift, N. (2004). Intensities of feeling: Towards a spatial politics of affect. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 86(1), 57–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00154.x>
- Thrift, N. (2008). I just don't know what got into me: Where is the subject? *Subjectivity*, 22, 82–89.



<https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2008.1>

- Thrift, N. (2011). Lifeworld Inc—and what to do about it. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29, 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d0310>
- Thrift, N., Harrison, P. & Anderson, B. (2010). ‘The 27th letter’: An interview with Nigel Thrift. In Anderson, B. & Harrison, P. (Eds.) *Taking-place: Non-representational theories and geography*. Ashgate, pp. 183–198.
- Wilson, H. F. (2016). On geography and encounter: Bodies, borders, and difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(3), 374–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516645958>
- Wylie, J. (2005). A single day’s walking: Narrating self and landscape on the South West Coast Path. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30, 234–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2005.00163.x>
- Wylie, J.W. (2009). Landscape, absence and the geographies of love. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34(3), 275–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00351.x>
- Youngblood Jackson, A. (2014). Rhizovocality. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(5), 693–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000142968>