

Knowing through Artist-led Practices for the Inclusion of Nature as a Stakeholder**ABSTRACT**

Stakeholder theory has become an influential framework for addressing current managerial and organizational challenges, including issues related to sustainability. Stakeholder research has suggested that nonhuman nature can be included as an organizational stakeholder in addition to the human stakeholders. This article answers recent calls to identify alternative ways of knowing and examine how they can advance the (non-anthropocentric) inclusion of nonhuman stakeholders in organizational activities. We turn to art and examine artist-led practices by focusing on the projects of two pioneering eco-artists, Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison. We suggest that artist-led practices, firstly, expose the temporal, spatial, and transformative aspects of the human-nonhuman distinction that hinder nonhuman stakeholder inclusion, and secondly, provide propositional, emotional, and imaginative ways of knowing that are necessary for challenging and overcoming the distinction. The article contributes to stakeholder theory by providing a non-anthropocentric way of knowing and including nature as a stakeholder. This advances the practical applicability of stakeholder theory to respond to urgent environmental challenges.

Keywords:

Nature as a stakeholder, knowing through artist-led practices, stakeholder inclusion, stakeholder theory

Knowing through Artist-led Practices for the Inclusion of Nature as a Stakeholder

Stakeholder theory as an influential framework has provided considerable insights in the conversion of managerial strategy and practice towards ethics and sustainability (Hörisch et al., 2014; Freeman et al., 2010; Kujala et al., 2022). However, it has not kept a sufficient pace in adopting a non-anthropocentric approach which is required to address pressing environmental challenges. While stakeholder theory once included only human entities, a stream of research has emerged that suggests that non-human nature can, and should be, understood as a stakeholder (Driscoll & Starik, 1995; Haigh & Griffiths, 2009; Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Starik, 1995; Tallberg et al., 2022; Waddock, 2011). We use the term ‘non-human nature’ (thereafter nature for ease of reading) to refer to the natural environment or parts of it. The human-non-human nature distinction (thereafter human-nature distinction) is used as an analytical framework that allows us to appreciate the particular qualities of non-humans (Heikkurinen et al., 2021), yet does not suggest an ontological separation in which humans would not be understood as a part of nature (Kortetmäki et al., 2022).

Such an expansion of the stakeholder notion that includes nature as a stakeholder, however, is not widely accepted, and scholars have argued that the difficulty of identifying typical stakeholder characteristics—such as stakes, interests, or voice—in nature implies that it cannot be included as a stakeholder equivalent to humans (Orts & Strudel, 2002). This is due to an anthropocentric bias in management studies that maintains the distancing of nature from organizations, as well as humans from nature. (Heikkurinen et al., 2022; Painter-Morland & ten Bos, 2016). Accordingly, recent research has suggested that the established ways of knowing about nature remain inevitably limited (Allen et al., 2019; Heikkurinen et al., 2016; Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Tallberg et al., 2022). We understand ways of knowing as how we know which underpins how we arrive at what we claim to know and obtain the experience of knowing.

Alternative ways of knowing are necessary in order to enable non-anthropocentric approaches that include nature as an organizational stakeholder and help respond to urgent environmental challenges.

As environmental disasters loom, Latour (2020) points to art and suggests that a paradigm shift can arise from artist-led practices. Art facilitates a critical reworking and reimagining of human existence on Earth, expands the boundaries of the human intellect, and challenges mental frameworks and belief systems (Haraway, 2016; Latour, 2020). We build on the premise that knowing enabled by artist-led practices may require a certain type of responsive understanding that is typically not generated in traditional stakeholder inclusion practices. In particular, we argue that the reason for excluding nature as a stakeholder lies not in the lack of non-human voices but in humans' inability to listen or know about the needs, interests, and stakes of non-humans (Kortetmäki et al., 2022). We maintain that artist-led practices open up spaces for different ways of seeing, doing, and thinking (Berthoin Antal & Strauß, 2013), thereby aiding us in knowing nature on its own terms and helping to direct research towards a more-than-human perspective that explores ways that humans might develop relationships with non-humans that are less threatening and more inclusive (Haraway, 2014). It goes without saying that artistic work is complex; how new insights emerge from artwork is not always clear. As a consequence, transferring this approach to the management field is not straightforward (Pässilä et al., 2016). To contribute to the adaptation of artist led-practices in the management field, a careful analysis is needed to open up the black box of how new insights and ways of seeing are generated. Our study, therefore, addresses the following question: How can knowing through artist-led practices foster the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder?

Empirically, we examine the artist-led practices of an artist duo, Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison, who have produced works of art addressing ecological issues since 1969.

Our analysis focuses on eight selected art projects, completed between 1974 and 2021, by drawing on various sources of empirical material documenting both the art projects at hand and the artists' own descriptions and interviews undertaken with them. Specifically, we concentrate on identifying the human-nature distinction and knowing through artist-led practices, that enable overcoming this distinction. In doing so, we contribute to research on nature as a non-human stakeholder in stakeholder theory (Driscoll & Starik, 2004; Haigh & Griffiths, 2009; Waddock, 2011) in the following ways. First, we set out the human-nature distinction as including *temporal*, *spatial*, and *outcome aspects* that hinder the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder. These aspects prevent humans from knowing about nature's needs, interests, and vulnerabilities. Upholding an anthropocentric focus on these aspects, which stems from unchallenged human-centric assumptions, harms the environment and prevents the adaptation of non-anthropocentric management approaches. Secondly, we identify *emotional knowing*, *imaginative knowing*, and *propositional knowing* as knowing through artist-led practices that foster the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder. These kinds of knowing facilitate gaining a broader and deeper understanding of nature's stakes and interests, thereby increasing humans' ability to respond to them. Knowing through artist-led practices calls dichotomies into question, thus enabling individuals, stakeholders, and organizations to overcome them and create an opening for a gradual alignment between humans and nature.

THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

Non-human Nature as a Stakeholder

Stakeholder theory has sought to acknowledge nature initially through proxy stakeholders and intermediaries, such as environmentally-oriented organizations (Haigh & Griffiths, 2009; Phillips & Reichart, 2000; Schaltegger et al., 2019). Numerous scholars have criticized this view as insufficient and argued for granting nature the status of stakeholder, based on its physical, legal, socio-emotional, and ethical qualities and characteristics (Driscoll & Starik, 2004; Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Starik, 1995; Tallberg et al., 2022; Waddock, 2011). Despite the promising points of departure on non-human stakeholders, three main challenges prevail in the literature: anthropocentric bias (human-nature distinction), stakeholder identification issues ('Can non-human stakeholders express stakes and interests?'), and practices of inclusion ('How can an organization include non-human nature as a stakeholder?')

Anthropocentric bias is related to the perceived dualism between humans and nature (Romero & Dryzek, 2020). Opposing constructions, for instance, nature versus culture, have been problematized as they explicitly or implicitly foster privilege, dominance, and hierarchy (Phillips, 2019; Shelton & Dodd, 2021) due to their reductive, potentially damaging, and inherently value-laden nature. This old dualistic, historically Western conception of the natural world results from humanity beginning to perceive themselves as being above nature, rather than part of it (Haila, 2000). This mode of thinking expands the chasm between humans and non-humans and reinforces the challenges of coexistence (Gladwin et al., 1995; Painter-Morland & ten Bos, 2016; Shrivastava et al., 2012).

In addition to the human-nature distinction, anthropocentrism presents challenges for the identification of non-human stakeholders. Stakeholder identification is a focal discussion in stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984; Mitchell et al., 1997; Phillips & Reichart, 2000). The most

well-known definition identifies stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” (Freeman, 1984, p. 46).

Furthermore, stakeholder identification is based on defining stakeholders’ interests and stakes.

Yet, anthropocentric bias has resulted in the argument that, in the absence of a human voice, nature is unable to express its interests and, hence, lacks stakeholder status (Näsi et al., 1998;

Orts & Strudler, 2002). This view has been challenged by research suggesting that nature indeed has a voice, yet it is qualitatively different from the human voice (Dryzek, 2002; Romero & Dryzek, 2020).

The challenges related to non-human stakeholder identification impede non-human stakeholder inclusion, too. Stakeholder inclusion refers to the presence of stakeholders and valuing their contributions, viewpoints, and expertise in organizational activities, such as decision-making (Kujala et al., 2022; Mitchell et al., 2015). Inclusion requires the full commitment of participating organizations and a thorough comprehension of the nuances of inclusion (Waxenberger & Spence, 2003). It is evident that the inclusion of non-human stakeholders requires novel ways of understanding and approaching nature in organizations (Kortetmäki et al., 2022), for the traditional modes of understanding and interacting with nature are clearly limited. Quick and Feldman’s (2011) definition may be more helpful here because it approaches inclusion as an ongoing framework of interaction and foregrounds the creation of links among people, between subjects, and over time. This definition pays more attention to the diversity of actors, as it focuses not only directly on the ‘what’ and ‘who’ (human actors, entities, and particular ideas), but also on the ‘how’ (domains of interaction and involvement initiatives), thereby suggesting the action-focused nature of inclusion. This understanding of inclusion enables learning more about stakeholders by creating openness towards different modes of collecting information and knowing, aiming not only for the granting of stakeholder status, but

presumably also approaching the actual presence of stakeholders in particular activities and knowing their perspectives and needs.

Knowing Non-human Stakeholders

Stakeholder knowledge has been discussed as a crucial element of stakeholder integration (Mitchell et al., 2022; Plaza-Ubeda et al., 2010), that is, recognizing stakeholder needs, understanding their demands and the significance thereof, as well as those features that aid in prioritizing and integrating them into business management. Studies suggest various ways of knowing that are relevant in order to understand non-human stakeholders on their own terms. Tallberg and colleagues (2022) suggest that affective and embodied knowing allow us to experience the interests of non-human stakeholders, such as animals, through the ‘emotional qualia’ of humans. Donovan (2006) explains this notion as embodied knowledge obtained via paying attention and reaching awareness, in this way enabling agency through embodied occurrences (Pullen & Rhodes, 2015). Radical reflexivity is suggested as a way to embed humans with nature rather than separate them from it. It questions epistemological and ontological assumptions by signaling how human interpretations are shaped by their embeddedness in time, social and material space, and power structures (Allen et al., 2019). Radical reflexivity demands engaging in ‘epistemological pluralism’ and ‘multiple ways of knowing’ (Miller et al., 2011), thereby attaining awareness of how suppositions, value statements, feelings, and identities are entangled in sense-making. The scope of socio-material embeddedness includes ecological embeddedness and ecological materiality (as the physical and material components of a natural environment) as important factors in ecological sense-making (the way in which actors recognize, bracket, link, choose, and enact spatial and temporal signals triggered by ecological occurrences) (Whiteman & Cooper, 2011).

An inclusive way of knowing is described as having certain qualities, such as resilience, persistence, and optimism (Feldman et al., 2006), to which Feldman and Khademian (2000) add expansiveness as a means of expanding repertoires by engaging diverse stakeholders. Other relevant qualities in inclusive knowing are hope, which is conceived of as the continuous redirection of knowledge (Miyazaki, 2004); pragmatic imagination, used as the ability to imagine new opportunities and ways to act on them (Stephenson, 2009); and passionate humility, understood as combining commitment, caring, and openness to realizing new ways of attending to matters of concern (Yanow, 2007). Beyond this, emotions can be a source for knowing that cannot be revealed by way of reasoned thinking (Shrivastava et al., 2012; Scott et al., 2009). In the present contribution, however, we consider that the concept of ‘knowing’ (rather than knowledge itself) is more relevant to stakeholder inclusion. Knowing is a process; an action that is situational, relational, and generative, and which aids in questioning dichotomies and recognizes ambiguity as a space for action (Feldman et al., 2009; Quick & Feldman, 2011).

Knowing through Artist-led Practices

The growing interest within management practice and research for the arts and aesthetics is not recent (Anderson et al., 2011; Barry & Meisiek, 2010; Berthoin Antal et al., 2019; Darsø, 2009; Skoldberg et al., 2018). Studies draw on the arts to address ‘not-knowing’ in organizations (Berthoin Antal, 2013) to inform innovation, competitive advantage, leadership, organizational learning and change (Anderson et al., 2011), management learning, and pedagogy (Nissely, 2002; Sutherland, 2012), extending our understanding of alternative ways of organizing (Holm & Beyes, 2021) and contributing to research methods and new knowledge (Berthoin-Antal & Strauß, 2013) and theories (Roulet & Bothello, 2021).. Ladkin and Taylor (2010, p. 235) ascribe the rationale for this turn towards the arts and the search for new approaches to the need for making sense and meaning: “[W]e live in a complex world, which cannot be fully understood

solely by reference to scientific forms of logic and sense-making. The arts, and art-based practices, provide different ways of both describing and relating to that complexity, thereby offering novel ways of responding.”

Studies utilize the arts in numerous ways. Art as a metaphor provides a theoretical lens through which specific elements of art can shed light on business concepts, as has been done, for example, by using ballet choreography to theorize stakeholder systems (Roulet & Bothello, 2021). Other studies have focused on the practical implications of including artists within organizations—for example, artistic interventions in organizations that offer spaces for novel and varied modes of seeing, thinking, and personal development (Berthoin-Antal & Strauß, 2013).

Artist-led practices deploy different forms of art to facilitate, capture, and transform perceptions (Adams & Owens, 2021; Barone & Eisner, 2012; Leavy, 2018). In contrast to cognitive maps, measurements, and surveys—conventional tools for documenting perceptions—artist-led practices allow for recognition of not only cognitive constructs but also emotional and sensory-based components of an experience and its subsequent interpretation (Benmergui et al., 2019; Barone & Eisner, 2012). For instance, artists use metaphors in their thinking process and story-building because metaphors shape our perceptions and comprehension, allowing us to understand an experience in terms of another. (Ortony, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Various terms such as ‘artistic practices’, ‘artistic interventions’, and ‘art-based methods’ are used in the management and organization studies literature and carry subtle differences in meaning. We use the concept of ‘artist-led practices’ to refer to the acts of artists when producing art. This entails making conventional artifacts (paintings) or unconventional artifacts (growing orchards) and emphasizes the involvement of the artist in doing the artwork by way of their inspirations, ideas, materials, and skills. In this context, knowing through artist-led practices designates the process of knowing that is guided by an artist’s practice, aesthetic attention, and

subjectivity to the context and the issue, as the artist maintains a critical distance from both existing forms of knowledge as well as unchallenged practices and agendas, thereby yielding unexpected insights and new ways of seeing (Kestler, 2004; 2011).

METHOD

In order to explore how knowing through artist-led practices can foster the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder, we selected the practices of two eminent artists, Helen Mayer Harrison (1927–2018) and Newton Harrison (1932–2022), collectively referred to as the Harrison Studio or ‘the Harrisons’. Their conceptual artwork revolved around ecological issues, which they approached through artist-led practices and other disciplinary lenses. They have practiced art that benefited nature since 1969 at great scale and informed policy changes at both the local and international levels (Craig, 1992; Douglas & Fremantle, 2016a, 2016b; Kopytin & Levine, 2021). The Harrisons collaborated with individuals ranging from biologists and urban farmers to architects and policymakers, exploring creative ways to protect biodiversity, endangered meadows, portable orchards, and disappearing rainforests, foregrounding our co-dependence on non-human entities and ecological processes (Kopytin & Levine, 2021). An examination of their work enables us to analyze the ways of knowing that emerge from artist-led practices.

We selected eight projects for our empirical investigation from 40 environmentally-oriented projects of various scales that the Harrisons produced over the course of 50 years. The Lagoon Cycle (1974–1984), Sacramento Meditations (1976-1977), The Green Heart of Holland (1994-1995) Serpentine Lattice (1991-1993), Peninsula Europe (2000–2004), Greenhouse Britain (2007-2009), The Deep Wealth of This Nation, Scotland (2018), Sensorium for the World Ocean (2021). Our selection was made on the basis of these projects’ notability, for instance, recognition in the form of awards, size, and reputation, as well as availability of information about project. We also wanted include different time periods, Projects range from

the Harrisons' earliest work, the Lagoon Cycle (1974–1984), to their most recent work, Sensorium for the World Ocean (2021).

To support our investigation of the eight selected projects, we gathered various sources of publicly available material consisting of audio, video, and written interviews with the Harrisons, their available catalogs, videos, and published books (Table 1). We used the extensive material written by the Harrisons on their work, thought processes, and contexts of their projects (Harrison & Harrison, 2001; 2007; 2016). This was complemented by work on the Harrisons produced by researchers in science and art, as well as art critics (see Harrison & Harrison, 2016; Douglas & Fremantle, 2016a, 2016b). Although the aim of the research materials (see Table 1) is to describe, promote, and disseminate the artists' work and thinking, we accept the words as they appear and the practices of the Harrisons as they are described in the published source material. Given that the majority of interviews were produced in the past decade, following Helen Mayer Harrison's diagnosis with Alzheimer's disease, interviews and presentations conducted with Newton Harrison outweigh those with Helen.

 Insert Table 1 about here

In terms of analysis approach, we used qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014) to expose how knowing through artist-led practices facilitates the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder. In a first step, we examined the Harrisons' artwork, which encompassed a combination of visual and textual elements, typically including large maps accompanied by poems and sometimes additional drawings, hand sketches, and photographs (Figure 1). The Harrisons frequently employed a practice they call it: 'Metaphorical Flip', which refers to finding the dysfunctional metaphor that harms the web of life and replacing it with a guiding generative metaphor. Artist-

led practices related to generating maps, constructing metaphorical flips, and writing poetry came to form the basis of our analysis (Table 2).

 Insert Figure 1 about here

 Insert Table 2 about here

In a second step, we focused on identifying and exposing the distinction between humans and nature, as well as the ways of knowing that overcome this distinction in the Harrisons' work. With this aim in mind, we used the artists' description of their process to guide our analysis:

“Our work begins when we perceive an anomaly in the environment that is the result of opposing beliefs or contradictory metaphors. Moments when reality no longer appears seamless and the cost of belief has become outrageous, offer the opportunity to create new spaces, first in the mind and thereafter in everyday life.” (S26)

We searched in the extant material for critical questions, observations, and moments provoked by the Harrisons that challenge human-centered assumptions, meanings, and judgments associated with such anomalies in the environment: Which belief systems cause these anomalies? What are the contradictions that create disharmonies between nature and humans? And, finally, how do the artists address these disharmonies?

As a result of this, we identified temporal, spatial, and outcome-related ways of exposing the human-nature distinction, as well as propositional, emotional, and imaginative ways of knowing that guide us overcoming the distinction.

FINDINGS

We organize our findings into two sub-sections (Table 3). First, we describe how the selected artist-led practices (generating maps, constructing a metaphorical flip, and writing poetry) expose the human-nature distinction—which limits knowing—and hinder the inclusion

of nature as a stakeholder. Second, we outline how artist-led practices enable three ways of knowing that foster the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder.

 Insert Table 3 about here

Human-Nature Distinction

Temporal aspect. This aspect is exposed in the Harrisons' work through constructing maps and writing poetry. In building their maps, the Harrisons start by asking stakeholders: "How long is now?" (S24). This powerful question draws our attention to temporal contradictions and exposes the dualism between a human timeframe and that of nature. Beyond this, the temporal aspect relates to postponed responses to urgent natural crises. In their mappings, the Harrisons display the effects of global warming on regions around the world, transporting a significantly large amount of sophisticated and technical information originating from various stakeholders. Overall, the Harrisons use mapping to define a problematic area, the 'field of play'.

Primarily, mapping allows artists to change their perception of time by appealing to the concepts of 'beginning' (of the ecological continuum) and 'end' (of the urban continuum) and communicating the relevance of these concepts to human and non-human stakeholders (S15). The artists' maps expand the scope of the project not only by considering humans' immediate practical concerns but also by highlighting the nuanced longer-term perspectives of nature. By posing the fundamental question "How long is now?" (S24), the Harrisons reveal that, from nature's perspective, "now" is ongoing. It goes without saying that a human understanding of urgency differs from that of nature; although humans comprehend the urgency of the global environmental crisis, the pace of responding to it is slow.

The Harrisons highlight disconnection from the timeframe of nature, and their poems reveal the existence of two different time frame scenarios (that of humans and that of nature) in juxtaposition to each other. By opening up the temporal perspective of nature, the Harrisons demonstrate that humans' judgments are trapped predominantly within their own timeframe. From nature's perspective, the human time frame appears to be limited to short-term objectives and immediate concerns.

Spatial aspect. The Harrisons open up the spatial aspect of the human-nature distinction, which stands for the contradiction between urban and rural priorities and humans' separating between the responsibility for urban and rural well-being. The Harrisons expose this spatial aspect through their practice of generating metaphors. The artists begin by identifying the dysfunctional metaphor that perpetuates the contradiction between urban and rural priorities, subsequently suggesting an alternative metaphor that provides a new way of seeing the complexity at hand. For instance, in the Sacramento Meditations Project the Harrisons identified that dikes were "seen as saving the city", which is a dysfunctional metaphor as it represents a belief system that prioritizes the city yet is costly to the environment. The solution here requires a new metaphor, or a different belief, that is grounded in "seeing dikes as imprisoning the water". Thus, removing dikes means freeing water—a perspective that recognizes the river. The Harrisons went on to suggest that "flood control is the spreading of waters", a formulation that shifts the focus and challenges the belief system. This metaphor signals the divide between the town and the river, urban and rural, and presents its dysfunctionality in terms of the inclusion of nature. The use of a dysfunctional and guiding metaphor uncovers how human priorities (here, the city) are prioritized in judgments and decision-making and suggests shifting the framing to focus on the priorities of nature (here, the rural).

The spatial aspect relates to the separation of urban and rural well-being. The metaphor of the ‘heart’ in The Green Heart of Holland Project positions green space as central to the Netherlands’ livelihood. The biodiversity corridors in the Harrisons’ map can be seen as arteries and veins that transport lifeblood (clean water, fresh air, nutrition) and richness to the urban areas. In addition, such green corridors provide natural borders that separate and preserve the individual characteristics of the Randstad’s ever-growing cities (see Figure 2).

Similarly, the metaphors of “dikes saving the city” and “dikes imprisoning the water” indicate how humans distinguish between the well-being of humans and the well-being of nature. In the words of the Harrisons themselves:

“[S]omeone might ask, ‘Why not choose another metaphor rather than that one?’ [...] In response to ‘dikes are about the saving of the town’, we say, we agree, ‘it is about the town, but it’s also about the responsibility for this river and the wellbeing of both.’ This begins the reversal of a metaphor required to generate a new form of design.” (S24)

Exposing the spatial aspect of this distinction enables the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder by communicating a way of seeing reality that is more nuanced than that typically seen by humans. By using generative metaphors in their projects, the Harrisons demonstrate how the choice of a metaphor that can reverse the priorities in any given problem is critical to reflecting upon specific issues within our perspective on reality.

“Any metaphor, by virtue of the beliefs embedded in it, has an implicit narrative structure. Any complex narrative has metaphors embedded in it. In the first example, the principle is to work with the implicit metaphors that can be seen to guide human design as they affect the ecosystem. The idea is to identify among them those whose grounding (operation in the physical world) is most dysfunctional with respect to a given problem and pose alternative intentional groundings. The object here is to identify and work

through the consequences of a new metaphor conceived to result in actual physical work in a cultural landscape.” (S24)

Outcome aspect. The Harrisons expose the outcome aspect through the practice of writing poetry, which takes as its point of departure the observation that a contradiction exists between nature outcomes and human outcomes. The Harrisons suggest that the language of poetry is inclusive, in the sense that it avoids planning language, scientific language, and all further forms of specialized languages that are barriers to creating connection between nature and humans (S1, S3, S24). The nuanced language of poetry avoids the human-nature distinction and draws our attention to how this opposition has permeated our languages. The Harrisons suggest that the language of poetry invites multidisciplinary while “turning the face of disaster to the face of opportunity” (S1, S24). This optimistic poetry vocalizes the contemporary distinction between denying and accepting climate change.

“We think that the rising ocean is an opportunity for transformation, but it is exactly the reverse of a new frontier to overcome from civilization's perspective; now, from the ocean's perspective, its boundary is perhaps a continuing, evolving, transforming new frontier.” (S26)

In addition to this, the outcome aspect relates to the absence of optimism in the face of transformation. In their poetry, the Harrisons emphasize the potential for transformation that has been left unaddressed:

“Assuming a rapid rise of waters, even for a modest 5m in 100 years, there are apparently no models of precedence, no information, design nor planning on the table, with the exception of ocean defenses and typical development models, albeit more energy-efficient ones.” (S26)

The writing of poetry in the Harrisons' projects reveals a lack of optimism on the part of humans when facing environmental challenges. Here the artists are striving to confront humans with reality, yet resist helplessness by suggesting that we instead engage in transformational opportunism.

“It is the intention of *Greenhouse Britain* to begin generating the thinking, the design, perhaps the new belief structure, perhaps even indicating new economic structures that may be required for the democratic dispersal of support for an upward-moving population within the context of a gradually shrinking landmass.” (S26)

Exposing the outcome aspect of the distinction between humans and nature through the writing of poetry promotes the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder by demonstrating in plain language. It exposes how the emphasis lies on humans' outcomes and the ways in which communication about these outcomes remains pessimistic and passive, in the sense of not exercising opportunities.

Knowing through Artist-led Practices

We identify three ways of knowing through artist-led practices: (1) propositional knowing that relates to novel ways of recognizing and proposing solutions; (2) emotional knowing that relates to emotional, artist-led practices enabling emotional connection to other stakeholders' stakes and interests; and (3) imaginative knowing that relates to imaginative artist-led practices enabling the pausing of rationality in order to expand how we think and know nature

Propositional knowing. It is responsive knowing that addresses a situation by reframing the issue through the practices of generating metaphors and narratives that challenge assumptions, unblock bottlenecks, and provide guidance towards a solution and change. This entails a change in perspective that generates the ability to take action while learning to see in novel ways. Specifically, such knowing is enabled through the artist-led practices of constructing maps and writing poetry.

Propositional knowing relates to reframing the question or problem at hand. Through their practices, the Harrisons aimed at reframing problems so as to include the interests of nature as a stakeholder. In the Green Heart of Holland project, Dutch policymakers started with the question of "How many houses could comfortably be developed in the available space?" (S15). In their provocative and unconventional response, the artists printed the map 'backwards' to imply that the Dutch were planning their country backwards, thus drawing attention to the issue at hand (S22, S15). The Harrisons proceeded to reframe this question as "What is the best way for an urban continuum to end and an ecological continuum to begin?", and "Is there a way for this mutual beginning and ending to give advantage to both?" (S25, p. 261). These questions allow us to understand nature's stakes in the context of decision-making.

Furthermore, propositional knowing relates to suggesting action through stories because it is related to knowing the ‘how’, rather than the ‘what’ of stakeholders’ stakes and interests. It is knowing in action. Through their poetry and storytelling, the Harrisons invite us to act on the new realities that can now be imagined. Reframing the issue at hand suggests approaching it from the point of view of the connections that pertain between the interests and stakes of various stakeholders, thus generating a deeper understanding of the interaction between nature and humans. In particular, readers are provided with the opportunity to take on the role of actors and are encouraged to respond to the questions posed—and this leads to knowing that it is propositional. In Newton Harrison’s words:

“We’re storytellers of a sort. We actually believe that almost everything that happens in the environment is people telling each other stories. Speculating and dreaming and then acting. Let’s put a bridge there and develop here.” (S5)

Knowing through propositions fosters the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder in the sense that it suggests a shift in the dynamics of power that underlie decision-making by emphasizing nature’s concerns (the ‘ecological continuum’). By tying the interests of humans more tightly to the interests of nature in the context of decision-making, propositional knowing not only grants nature more space but also provides it with a primary role in the process of decision-making.

Emotional knowing. It is a form of knowing that enhances people’s ability to assess, access, and communicate with their emotions in understanding an issue, as well as to use their emotions when making decisions and judgments about issues. Emotional knowing is subjective rather than neutral; and it complements objective ways of knowing, thereby making an individual part of the knowing process and helping to create sense and meaning. Based on our findings, we suggest that the practices of mapping, poetic texts, and generative metaphor, as used by the Harrisons, lead to emotional knowing.

Emotional knowing relates to expanding empathy. In their practice, the Harrisons highlight that our emotions carry critical awareness. Referring to the Sensorium of the Ocean project in 2021, Newton Harrison explains that we can advance our understanding of the ocean by engaging in emotional work, that is, stretching human empathy precisely enough to include the ocean.

“Can I stretch my empathy to include a small ocean? The answer is maybe. Then, when you look at the other work, *Sensorium*, if you blow the image up big enough to read it, you will see that I’m now closer to being able to stretch my empathy to deal with the whole ocean. Would an oceanographer ask such a question?” (S4)

Beyond this, emotional knowing relates to transferring our emotions (source) to nature (target). Knowing through emotions, as activated by the Harrisons’ practices, is also about emotions relating to a problem as faced by nature. With the emotive language of metaphor and poetry, artists invite us to reflect on our emotionally-laden stakes and interests and to regard nature’s stakes and interests as bearing the same emotional meaningfulness. For example, by offering us a vocabulary rooted in emotions and affiliations, the Green Heart metaphor, introduced to frame the urban development problem (see Figure 2), provides a novel lens through which to view the issue at hand. Specifically, due to our strong affiliations with ‘heart’ and ‘life’, we cannot imagine the web of life of the Netherlands thriving without a green heart. Engaging with this way of knowing enables humans and nature to align themselves more strongly.

In a similar vein, the metaphors of ‘dikes saving the city’ versus ‘dikes imprisoning the water’ are connected to emotional experiences associated with the need for freedom and, therefore, induce us to see the river as an entity that shares the same needs as humans. Emotional knowing evokes an alternative response—“flood control spreading water”—that resists the urge

to place humans above nature. The cost of constructing dikes and channeling flood water was redirected into acquiring land above the city so as to let the river spread its excess water.

“The dysfunctional metaphor lies in the observation that if flood control is the engineering processes that generate dykes and channelization to *save the city*, then ‘flood control is the destruction of the well-being of rivers. (I.e., the well-being of the river is traded off for that of the city.) This state of affairs requires a metaphorical flip [...]. Put succinctly, the new or emergent metaphor is that if you address the well-being of both the town and the river, then ‘Flood control is the spreading of waters’. It’s not the controlling and the imprisoning of waters but the freeing of waters in a way that not only does not endanger but enhances the well-being of the city as well.” (S24)

Emotional knowing fosters the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder by making nature’s interests and stakes included, as they become emotionally relatable and personally meaningful to human beings. With emotional knowing, nature is included by developing empathy, caring for nature’s stakes, and making sense of these emotions, in a manner that connects such emotions to personal interests.

Imaginative knowing. It is an active, generative process that allows individuals to imagine beyond the limits of rational knowing, and to think of various possibilities in the context of nature’s continuously changing conditions and concomitant issues at stake over time. Imaginative knowing involves provocation, that is, seeing that which is neither obvious nor immediate; and it is enabled through artist-led practices of writing poetry.

Imaginative knowing relates to the pausing of rational thinking. In their work, the Harrisons purposefully remove the authoritarian voice of rationalization in order to make us see and imagine in other ways (e.g., that the ocean can speak), rather than to be trapped by analytical thinking. In the Harrisons’ words, “a decision made outside the domain of rationalization is what

we lost and what we seek to reestablish” (S13, at minute 10). Poetic language allows artists’ thinking to escape the trap of Western modernity, or the “Kantian enigma” (Foucault, 1994, p. 546). In Newton Harrison’s recent work *Sensorium for the World Ocean* (2021), the world of the ocean is given a voice, and the artist conducts a creative conversation with the formerly voiceless ocean, scientists, and other stakeholders. By pausing rational thinking, their poetry draws attention to the cost of the status quo, that is, the cost of belief, as illustrated in the following excerpt from the *Peninsula Europe* poem that demonstrates a conversation with nature (S24):

*You said,
 “Most of Europe’s water begins there.”
 I said,
 “If the forests were left to regrow
 and the grasslands released from overgrazing
 Then the resulting bio-mass
 Could help to purify
 The outpouring of water.”
 And you said,
 “Then biodiversity ribbons again can grow across the high grounds from the Pyrénées
 to the Carpathians
 I asked,
 “Where would you begin?”
 And you said,
 “Where the terrain permits and the will exists
 Choose your mountain.”*

Imaginative knowing further relates to opening up possibilities for interpretation. Once the dominant rational voice is overshadowed by the voice of images, it becomes possible to project a new scenario of reality in which the values of nature and those of humans no longer compete but are, instead, connected.

In addition to pausing rational thinking, imaginative knowing is also related to opening up possibilities for interpretation. In this context, fixed meanings may act as blocks that prevent new ways of seeing and hinder reinterpretations, whereas open, indeterminate narratives encompass all possible scenarios and perceptions that might occur, hence inspiring new

meanings and insights. Helen Mayer Harrison comments on expanding possibilities through poetry and avoiding fixed meaning (S3).

“We chose it [poetry] because the poet has the advantage over the discursive writer. For discursive writers, words mean exactly what they say. But with the poet, you have the connotations of the words as well as their denotation to express your meaning. The connotation has all the possibilities and images that emerge from the use of that word.”

(S3)

This openness of poetic language invites us to speculate, dream, and envision the future more positively. Poetic language offers a figurative way of knowing about things, the abstract nature of which is hard to comprehend through other ways of knowing. In other words, knowing through imagination that is enabled by poetic language provides space for obscure complexity to be present in our vision of the future, even if we cannot understand it rationally. This, then, leads us to acknowledge the intricacy of the interconnections between humans and nature without the addition of a pragmatic lens. Furthermore, this also supports creating belief in a positive scenario, even when directly faced by such potentially overwhelming complexity.

Imaginative knowing fosters the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder, first, by facilitating a novel image of reality where humans can hear and understand the voice of nature and be in a dialogue with it; and, second, by creating an alternative future scenario where we plan *with* nature instead of merely devising a plan *for* nature. Imaginative knowing enables a more inclusive vision that recognizes the role of nature as a stakeholder once it is provided with both figurative space and voice.

DISCUSSION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This article contributes to stakeholder theory, and more specifically, to theorizing on non-human nature as a stakeholder (Driscoll & Starik, 2004; Haigh & Griffiths, 2009; Waddock,

2011), in two major ways. First, we expose the temporal, spatial, and outcome aspects of the human-nature distinction that hinder the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder. Second, we provide propositional, emotional, and imaginative ways of knowing that are necessary for challenging and overcoming this distinction. The present article expands our understanding of stakeholder theory by providing a non-anthropocentric approach to inclusion, as well as examining the way in which artist-led practices can contribute to organization studies.

In this study, we specify three aspects of the human-nature distinction preventing the inclusion of nature as a crucial non-human stakeholder. In doing so, we add to the research on non-human nature as a stakeholder by making visible and specifying the separation of humans and nature that has been identified as a challenge for non-human stakeholder inclusion in previous research (Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Painter-Morland & ten Bos, 2016; Tallberg et al., 2022). The aspects of human-nature distinction identified in this study are the temporal, spatial, and outcome aspects. These aspects develop our understanding of how we, as humans, construct the distinction between humans and nature, and how we see nature as ‘the other’ (Hatami & Firoozi, 2019), thereby creating hierarchy. The distinction is related to unchallenged human-centered assumptions and belief systems, creating disharmonies between humans and nature. First, the temporal aspect (now/future) signals how our actions are embedded in our sense and understanding of time, predominantly guided by a human timeframe and concomitantly delayed responses to environmental challenges. Second, the spatial aspect (urban/rural) specifies how our actions are embedded in our sense and understanding of space, and how we divide this into space for humans (urban) and space for nature (rural). Third, the outcome aspect (disaster/opportunity) marks how our actions are embedded in our understanding of potential outcomes. Taken together, these aspects of the distinction between humans and nature demand new forms of communication and ways of knowing in order to overcome anthropocentric biases.

Our results extend theorizing in stakeholder theory by suggesting propositional, emotional, and imaginative ways of knowing as forms of non-anthropocentric knowing that serve to include nature as a stakeholder. By facilitating ways to know non-human stakeholders on their own terms, these ways of knowing contribute to overcoming the anthropocentric argument that nature does not have a voice with which to express its stakes and interests (Näsi et al., 1998; Orts & Strudler, 2002). Furthermore, the ways of knowing suggested in this study respond to calls in recent non-human stakeholder research urging for alternative, non-instrumentalizing ways to listen to nature (Allen et al., 2019; Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Tallberg et al., 2022). We maintain that imaginative, propositional, and emotional knowing are active, interrelated, and generative processes that expand the human capacity to involve nature in decision-making processes by understanding nature's needs and the issues at stake. We suggest that such ways of knowing expand our understanding of inclusive ways of knowing (Feldman et al., 2006) by including components such as the tolerance of not-knowing and engagement with different ways of knowing in the continual process of problem-solving. In particular, tolerance for not-knowing can be developed through establishing emotional energy and emotional connection in stakeholder interaction, creating alternative scenarios pertaining to our socio-material and ecological embeddedness, and generating optimism that solutions can very well be discovered through uncertainty. We suggest that, if used as a constant practice, artists' capacity to engage in not-knowing (Berthoin Antal, 2013) can help to recognize the stakes and interests of nature as a non-human stakeholder.

Specifically, emotional knowing goes beyond the notions of affective salience (Tallberg et al., 2022) and passionate humility (Yanow, 2007) by illuminating that not only may we know a non-human stakeholder by way of our emotions (for example, care, commitment, and openness), but that we may also use our emotions in contexts previously addressed solely

through the rational mind. We need emotions to create eagerness in noticing and accepting the unknown. Emotions facilitate internalizing the stakes and interests of other (non-human) stakeholders by emotionally connecting with them. When we extend our care to include someone (or something) else, their needs achieve the same importance to us as our own. When we care, we truly become open to listening to the other, even in cases where we remain unable to grasp their ideas fully, or cannot rationalize them—we accept not-knowing, trusting instead in others knowing what is best for them. In this way, emotional connection bridges an experiential gap (Feldman et al., 2006), for it compensates for both not-knowing and the lack of sharing the same experience.

Imaginative knowing, as opposed to radical reflexivity (Allen et al., 2019), not only questions our assumptions about our relationship with the world (in both the social and physical sense), but also allows us to imagine our lives as if they were not constricted by our particular socio-material embeddedness. Imaginative knowing goes beyond ecological sense-making (Whiteman & Cooper, 2011) by allowing us to create expansiveness in knowing (Feldman & Khademian, 2000). Specifically, it generates alternative narratives about how we connect, select, and enact spatial and temporal signals triggered by ecological processes. It guides our sense-making by following those narratives, thereby expanding our vision of reality beyond that which is self-evident.

Propositional knowing, similar to hope (Miyazaki, 2004) and pragmatic imagination (Stephenson, 2009), is a future- and action-oriented way of knowing, as it directs us towards both a solution and change (Feldman et al., 2006). However, propositional knowing highlights reframing, which is an element that facilitates our movement in the direction of these solutions. In addition, the inherited optimism within propositional knowing invites openness to not-

knowing and, consequently, alternative scenarios, where we integrate the interests and stakes of others.

Our findings offer insight into knowing through artist-led practices as a non-anthropocentric approach to inclusion within stakeholder theory. This contributes to the achievement of inclusion (in terms of creating links among people, between subjects, and over time) as defined by Quick and Feldman (2011). Specifically, we demonstrate the value of propositional, imaginative, and emotional knowing in overcoming spatial, temporal, and outcome aspects of the human-nature distinction. Our results complement ideas of ‘epistemological pluralism’ and ‘multiple ways of knowing’ (Miller et al., 2011) by explaining how knowing through artist-led practices increases consciousness of the connections between human sense-making and their beliefs, values, and feelings, which, in turn, increases the awareness essential for overcoming the limitations set by sense-making (Kortetmäki et al., 2022; Feldman et al., 2009) —a particularly critical component in coming to understand non-human stakeholders (Kortetmäki et al., 2022). Even when nature’s stakes and interests are formally acknowledged (as, for example, in the Sacramento River and The Green Heart of Holland projects), unchallenged human-centered assumptions result in the prioritization of human (rather than nature’s) stakes and interests. Hence, we see inclusion as a mindset shift that builds gradual alignment between the stakes and interests of humans and nature. In this way, we agree with Quick and Feldman (2011) that inclusion is a continuous, complex, and ongoing process, not a single step (such as the formal acknowledgement of stakeholder status).

Finally, with this contribution, we develop discussion in the literature on the use of artist-led practices in business studies (Pässilä et al., 2016). Such practices are not widely used in stakeholder theory to understand stakeholders’ stakes and interests, yet by analyzing specific

types of artist-led practices, our study illustrates ways in which new insights can be transferred to the field of business.

As part of the managerial implications of this study, we call attention to the paradigm shift that needs to take place within organizations in order to include nature as a stakeholder. We argue that instead of active appropriation and instrumentalization of the arts in stakeholder inclusion, organizations would be well advised to focus on understanding how artist-led practices, such as those deployed by eco-artists, can foster fresh ways of knowing for different actors. Such ways of knowing challenge the dualism of human nature that has been taken for granted. We have demonstrated here in detail how artist-led methods are authentic ways of generating an awareness that serves to include nature in the context of the problems that are to be managed, develops an emotional connection to nature as a stakeholder, creates an inclusive image of the future, sustains openness and optimism, and, lastly, facilitates action. We suggest inviting artists to participate in co-creation initiatives between individuals, organizations, and communities in order to help generate solutions that are beneficial to non-human beings and ecological processes. This collaboration with artists will yield an awareness that results in the augmented ability to respond and adopt actions that include nature.

Although this paper has explored the practices of one of the most distinguished eco-artists of our time—the Harrisons—and chosen projects from the work they produced over five decades, we acknowledge that this study relies solely on their work. Future research, potentially a comparative case study, can investigate those practices used by other artists that facilitate the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder. Furthermore, we encourage future studies to explore how collaboration between artists and organizations can be coordinated for the inclusion of nature. Finally, future research could further delve into understanding how managers can learn from

artists in avoiding approaches based solely on binaries, thus activating more nuanced and inclusive ways of knowing.

CONCLUSION

Artist-led practices that accomplish the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder present vast potential for extending stakeholder theory towards a more-than-human perspective that addresses urgent environmental crises. These practices can empower stakeholders in understanding and developing relationships with nature by means of emotional experiences, imagining opportunities, and proposing novel solutions whilst overcoming human-non-human hierarchy and anthropocentric biases. Knowing through artist-led practices presents a nuanced mode of knowing about the web of life and ecosystems that is distinct from rational ways of knowing, and can be employed as an overdue antidote to anthropocentric thinking. Such knowing allows us to understand nature on its own terms and is a crucial element in fostering the inclusion of nature as a stakeholder.

We conclude with a quote from the Harrisons:

“Why not artists? Art is the court of the last resort—and our best hope. The evidence is overwhelming, and many people are indeed overwhelmed. But case after case that we have looked at all over the world, these issues have been looked at locally—we saw a crying need to find ways to talk about the problem at the scale at which it is occurring. That can be terrifying and discouraging, but for us it opens the door to creative possibilities.” (The Center for Force Majeure, n.d., n.p.)

REFERENCES

Adams, J., & Owens, A. (Eds.) 2021. *Beyond text: Learning through arts-based research*. Intellect Books.

- Allen, S., Cunliffe, A. L., & Easterby-Smith, M. 2019. Understanding sustainability through the lens of ecocentric radical-reflexivity: Implications for management education. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154(3): 781–795.
- Anderson, J., Reckhenrich, J., & Kupp, M. (2011). *The fine art of success: How learning great art can create great business*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Barone, T. & Eisner, W.E. 2012. *Arts based research*. Sage.
- Barry, D., & Meisiek, S. 2010. Seeing more and seeing differently: Sensemaking, mindfulness, and the workarts. *Organization Studies*, 31(11):1505–1530.
- Benmergui, R., Owens, A., & Pässila, A. 2019. *Beyond text: Arts based methods for research, assessment and evaluation*. Retrieved from https://beyondtext.weebly.com/uploads/1/1/4/3/114307963/beyond_text_ebook.pdf on 18 January 2022.
- Berthoin Antal, A. 2013. Art-based research for engaging not-knowing in organizations. *Journal of Applied Arts & Health*, 4(1):67–76.
- Berthoin Antal, A., Debucquet, G., & Frémeaux, S. 2019. When top management leadership matters: Insights from artistic interventions. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 28(4), 441–457.
- Berthoin Antal, B., & Strauß, A. (2013). Artistic interventions in organisations: Finding evidence of values-added. *Creative Clash Report*, WZB.
- Bonnedahl, K. J., & Heikkurinen, P. 2018. *The case for strong sustainability*. Routledge.
- Darsø, L. 2009. *Artful creation learning-tales of arts-in-business*. Samfundslitteratur.
- Driscoll, C., & Starik, M. 2004. The primordial stakeholder: Advancing the conceptual consideration of stakeholder status for the natural environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49(1), 55–73.
- Dryzek, J. S. 2002. *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press.
- Douglas, A., & Fremantle, C. 2016a. *Inconsistency and contradiction: lessons in improvisation in the work of Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison*. Gaia Project Press.
- Douglas, A., & Fremantle, C. 2016b. What poetry does best: The Harrisons' poetics of being and acting in the world. In H. M. Harrison & N. Harrison (Eds.) *The time of the force majeure: After 45 years counterforce is on the horizon*. Prestel.

- Feldman, M. S., Khademian, A. M., & Quick, K. S. 2009. Ways of knowing, inclusive management, and promoting democratic engagement: Introduction to the special issue. *International Public Management Journal*, 12(2), 123–136.
- Feldman, M. S., Khademian, A. M., Ingram, H., & Schneider, A. S. 2006. Ways of knowing and inclusive management practices. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (1), 89–99.
- Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. 2000. Managing for inclusion: Balancing control and participation. *International Public Management Journal*, 3(2), 149–167.
- Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & de Colle, S. 2010. *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. 1995. Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(4), 874–907.
- Haila, Y. 2000. Beyond the nature-culture dualism. *Biology and Philosophy*, 15(2), 155–175.
- Haigh, N., & Griffiths, A. 2009. The natural environment as a primary stakeholder: The case of climate change. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 18(6), 347–359
- Haraway, D. J. 2016. *Staying with the trouble*. Duke University Press.
- Harrison, H. M., & Harrison, N. 2016. *The time of the force majeure*. Prestel.
- Hatami, A., & Firoozi, N. 2019. A dynamic stakeholder model: An Other-oriented ethical approach. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 28(3), 349–360.
- Heikkinen, A., Mäkelä, H., Kujala, J., Nieminen, J., Jokinen, A., & Rekola, H. 2018. Urban ecosystem services and stakeholders: Towards a sustainable capability approach. In K. J. Bonnendahl & P. Heikkurinen (Eds.) *Strongly Sustainable Societies*. Taylor & Francis.
- Heikkurinen, P., Clegg, S., Pinnington, A. H., Nicolopoulou, K., & Alcaraz, J. M. 2021. Managing the anthropocene: Relational agency and power to respect planetary boundaries. *Organization & Environment*, 34(2), 267–286.
- Heikkurinen, P., Rinkinen, J., Järvensivu, T., Wilén, K., & Ruuska, T. 2016. Organising in the Anthropocene: An ontological outline for ecocentric theorising. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 113, 705–714.
- Holm, D. V., & Beyes, T. 2021. How art becomes organization: Reimagining aesthetics, sites and politics of entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 43(2), 227–245.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840621998571>.

- Hörisch, J., Freeman, R. E., & Schaltegger, S. 2014. Applying stakeholder theory in sustainability management: Links, similarities, dissimilarities, and a conceptual framework. *Organization and Environment*, 27(4), 328–346.
- Kester, G. H. 2011. *The one and the many: Contemporary collaborative art in a global context*. Duke University Press.
- Kester, G. H. 2004. *Conversation pieces: Community and communication in modern art*. University of California Press.
- Kopytin, A. I, Levine, S. 2021. **An interview with Newton Harrison. *Ecopoiesis: Eco-Human Theory and Practice***. 2 (1), 74-82 DOI 10.24412/2713-184X-2021-1-74-82
- Kortetmäki, T., Heikkinen, A., & Jokinen, A. 2022. Particularizing nonhuman nature in stakeholder theory: The recognition approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–15.
- Kujala, J., Sachs, S., Leinonen, H., Heikkinen, A., & Laude, D. 2022. Stakeholder Engagement: Past, Present, and Future. *Business & Society*, 61(5), 1136-1196, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503211066595>
- Ladkin, D., and S. Taylor. 2010. Leadership as art: Variations on a theme. *Leadership*, 6(3): 235–241.
- Laine, M. (2010). The nature of nature as a stakeholder. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(suppl. 1): 73–78.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. 2008. *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. 2020. Seven objections against landing on earth. In B. Latour & P. Weibel (Eds). *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. (pp. 12–19). MIT Press.
- Leavy, P. 2018. Introduction to arts-based methods. In P. Leavy (Ed.) *Handbook of Arts-Based Research* (pp. 3–12). Guilford Press.
- Lischinsky, A. 2015. What is the environment doing in my report? Analyzing the environment-as-stakeholder thesis through corpus linguistics. *Environmental Communication*, 9(4): 539–559.
- Mayring, P. 2014. *Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt. URN:<http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>
- Miller, T. R., Munoz-Erickson, T., & Redman, C. L. 2011. Transforming knowledge for sustainability: Towards adaptive academic institutions. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 12(2): 177–192.

- Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. 1997. Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4): 853–886.
- Mitchell, R. K., Van Buren III, H. J., Greenwood, M., & Freeman, R. E. 2015. Stakeholder inclusion and accounting for stakeholders. *Journal of Management Studies*, 52(7): 851–877.
- Mitchell, J. R., Mitchell, R. K., Hunt, R. A., Townsend, D. M., & Lee, J. H. 2022. Stakeholder engagement, knowledge problems and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 175: 75–94.
- Miyazaki, H. 2004. **The method of hope: Anthropology, philosophy, and Fijian knowledge.** Stanford University Press.
- Näsi, J., Näsi, S., & Savage, G. T. 1998. Nature as a stakeholder: One more speculation. In J. Calton & Rehbein, K. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the International Association for Business and Society*, pp. 509–512.
- Neumayer, E. 2012. Human development and sustainability. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 13(4): 56–579.
- Nissley, N. 2002. Arts-based learning in management education. *Rethinking management education for the 21st century*, 14(5): 27–61.
- Orts, E. W., & Strudler, A. 2002. The ethical and environmental limits of stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 12 (2): 215–233.
- Ortony, A. E. (1993). *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Painter-Morland, M., & ten Bos, R. (2016). Should environmental concern pay off? A Heideggerian perspective. *Organization Studies*, 37(4): 547–564.
- Pässilä, A., Malin, V., & Owens, A. 2016. Arts and business oriented thinking: The problematic when bringing together two different worlds. *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2016, No. 1, p. 16571). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Phillips, R. A., & Reichart, J. 2000. The environment as a stakeholder? A fairness based approach, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 23: 185–197.
- Phillips, M. 2019. “Daring to care”: Challenging corporate environmentalism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4): 1151–1164
- Plaza-Úbeda, J. A., de Burgos-Jiménez, J., & Carmona-Moreno, E. 2010. Measuring stakeholder integration: knowledge, interaction and adaptational behavior dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(3): 419–442.

- Polonsky, M. J. 1995. A stakeholders theory approach to designing environmental marketing strategy. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 10(3): 29–46.
- Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. 2015. Ethics, embodiment and organizations. *Organization*, 22(2): 159–165.
- Quick, K. S., & Feldman, M. S. 2011. Distinguishing participation and inclusion. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 31(3): 272–290.
- Romero, J., & Dryzek, J. S. 2020. Grounding ecological democracy: Semiotics and the communicative networks of nature. *Environmental Values*, 30(2), 407–429.
- Roulet, T. J., & Bothello, J. 2021. Tackling grand challenges beyond dyads and networks: Developing a stakeholder systems view using the metaphor of ballet. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1–31.
- Scott, A., Carter, C., Brown, K., & White, V. 2009. ‘Seeing is Not Everything’: Exploring the landscape experiences of different publics. *Landscape Research*, 34(4): 397–424.
- Shrivastava, P., Ivanaj, V., & Ivanaj, S. 2012. Sustainable development and the arts. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 60(1–2): 23–43.
- Scholes, E., & Clutterbuck, D. 1998. Communication with stakeholders: An integrated approach. *Long Range Planning*, 31(2): 227–238.
- Skoldberg, U. J., Woodilla, J., & Berthoin Antal, A. (2018). *Artistic interventions in organizations: Research, theory and practice*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Starik, M. 1995. Should trees have managerial standing? Toward stakeholder status for non-human nature, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14 (3): 207–217.
- Stephenson Jr, M. 2009. Exploring the connections among adaptive leadership, facets of imagination and social imaginaries. *Public Policy and Administration*, 24(4): 417–435.
- Sutherland, I. 2013. Arts-based methods in leadership development: Affording aesthetic workspaces, reflexivity and memories with momentum. *Management Learning*, 44(1), 25–43.
- Tallberg, L., García-Rosell, J. C., & Haanpää, M. 2022. Human–animal relations in business and society: Advancing the feminist interpretation of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(1): 1–16.
- The Center for the Study of Force Majeure. (n.d.) Works. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforforcemajeure.org/#works> on 18 January 2022.
- Waddock, S. 2011. We are all stakeholders of Gaia: A normative perspective on stakeholder thinking. *Organization & Environment*, 24(2), 192–212.

Waxenberger, B., & Spence, L. 2003. Reinterpretation of a metaphor: From stakes to claims. *Strategic Change*, 12(5), 239–249.

Whiteman, G., & Cooper, W. 2011. Ecological sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 889–911.

Yanow, D. 2007. “*And when I am only for myself...*” *Ways of knowing, reflective practice and passionate humility. Augural lecture for the strategic chair in Meaning and Method*, at the Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, May 9, 2007.

TABLE 1*

Research material

Type of research material	Title Interviewer/author	Year	Length	Source
Written interviews with H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	<i>Case study: Changing our perspectives through art</i> by Joe Hughes	2008	N/A	S1
	<i>Newton & Helen Mayer Harrison: How big is here?</i> by John K. Grande	2012	N/A	S2
	<i>Beth and Annie In Conversation. Part one: Interview with Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison</i> by Elizabeth Stephens and Annie Sprinkle	2010	N/A	S3
Written interviews with N. Harrison	An interview with Newton Harrison. <i>Ecopoiesis: Eco-Human Theory and Practice</i> by Alexander Kopytin	2021	8 pages	S4
	<i>UCSC art professor on championing environmental change since 1969</i> by Calvin Men	2018	N/A	S5
Article with interview extracts	<i>How two Santa Cruz artists changed the course of environmental history</i> by Chloe Veltman	2016	N/A	S6
Audio interview with N. Harrison	<i>Newton and Helen Mayer Harrison</i> by Brainard Carey	2017	30m 31s	S7
	<i>Provocateurs: A Conversation with Eco-Art Luminary Newton Harrison pt. 1</i> by Janeil Engelstad	2017	15m 21s	S8
Video interview with H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	<i>Helen and Newton Harrison</i> by Meredith Drum	2011	6m 08s	S9
	<i>Helen Mayer & Newton Harrison</i> by Nada Miljković	2013	48m 02s	S10
		2013	29m 36s	S11
Video interview with N. Harrison	<i>Newton Harrison Interview</i> by Various Small Fires Gallery, Los Angeles	2021	41m 06s	S12

Project video	<i>Sensorium for the world ocean</i> , by N. Harrison	2021	13m 42s	S13
	<i>Newton Harrison's deep wealth of this nation: Scotland</i> by N. Harrison, recorded by the Center for Force Majeure	2019	5m 06s	S14
Other videos with H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	<i>A Counterforce on the Horizon / Helen Mayer & Newton Harrison</i> / by TEDxSantaCruz	2015	17m 07s	S15
	<i>What is Negentropy?</i> by Nada Miljkovic	2013	3m 46s	S16
	<i>Helen Mayer & Newton Harrison "On Mixing, Mapping & Territory" Lecture</i> , posted by Nada Miljković	2013	50m 49s	S17
Other videos with H. M. Harrison	<i>What is Empathy?</i> posted by Nada Miljković	2014	1m 07s	S18
Other videos with N. Harrison	<i>The Sagehen Experiment</i> , by Center for the Study of Force Majeure, Nada Miljković	2015	4m 29s	S19
	<i>The Harrison Studio presents Wilma the Pig</i> by Nada Miljković	2013	1m 21s	S20
	<i>Long video.</i> by The Barn Arts, Aberdeenshire, UK	2018	56m 04s	S21
	<i>Newton Harrison.</i> The Barn Arts, Aberdeenshire, UK	2018	76m 02s	S22
Own books, catalogs, and articles	<i>Being there</i> by H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	2001	20 pages	S23
	<i>Public culture and sustainable practices: Peninsula Europe from an ecodiversity perspective, posing questions to Complexity Scientists</i> by H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	2007	39 pages	S24
	<i>The time of the force majeure.</i> H. M. Harrison and N. Harrison	2016	465 pages	S25
Website	TheHarrisonStudio.net	n.d.	N/A	S26

TABLE 2

Practices

Practices	Explanation	Exemplifying elements
Generating maps	<p>Maps reframe the issue at stake by posing alternative questions, which intertwine human activities and nature’s needs. This draws new spaces and roadmaps, initially in the mind and imagination before doing so in the real world.</p> <p>These maps challenge perspectives, proposing solutions and establishing links between subjects, across time and space.</p>	<p>For example, see Figures 1, 2 and 3. Maps are related to the field of play and are defined by “How long is now?” and “How big is here?”</p> <p>Maps generated by questions “How many houses can comfortably be developed in the space available?”, which the Harrisons reframed as, “What is the best way for an urban continuum to end and an ecological continuum to begin?” (The Green Heart of Holland);</p>
Constructing a metaphorical flip	<p>Artists identify dysfunctional metaphors (later here DM) that harm nature and replace them with generative metaphors (later here GM), thereby proposing new ways of knowing, overturning the problem, and addressing disbelief.</p>	<p>Example 1: DM: development; GM: settlement (Greenhouse Britain).</p> <p>Example 2: DM: Flood control controls water; GM: Flood control spreads water (Sacramento Mediations).</p> <p>Example 3:DM: A forest is a farm of trees; GM: A forest is generative land (Serpentine Lattice)</p>
Writing poetry	<p>Creative storytelling that gives voice to nature. Such dialogue evokes emotions and enables participants to access their emotions.</p> <p>This pauses rational thinking by dreaming and speculating, followed by calls for action. This poetry conveys optimism and openness.</p>	<p>For example, see Findings section below</p> <p>“What if” and “Maybe” are elements of optimism and proposition;</p> <p>Often use the structure of “I said, You said”</p> <p>It encourages conversation between nature and humans.</p> <p>Condensed language that avoids disciplinary jargon and makes language accessible to all stakeholders.</p>

TABLE 3

Findings

Artist-led practices (generating maps, constructing a metaphorical flip, writing poetry)	Exposing human-nature distinction	Temporal Postponed response to urgent crisis of nature Disconnection from the timeframe of nature
		Spatial Disconnection between urban and rural priorities Separation of well-being between urban and rural
		Outcome Contradiction between nature outcomes and human outcomes Absence of optimism in facing transformation
	Enabling ways of knowing	Propositional Reframing the question Suggesting action through stories
		Emotional Expanding empathy Transferring own emotions (source) to nature (target)
		Imaginative Pausing rational thinking Opening up possibilities for interpretation

FIGURE 1

Example of an artifact produced by the Harrisons encompassing maps and poems
(Greenhouse Britain Project).

