**The New Learning Organisation:**

**PART I – Institutional Reflexivity, High Agility Organising and Learning Leadership**

**Professor Elena Antonacopoulou[[1]](#footnote-1)**

GNOSIS Research, University of Liverpool

United Kingdom

[EAGNOSIS@LIV.AC.UK](mailto:EAGNOSIS@LIV.AC.UK)

<https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/management/staff/elena-antonacopoulou/>

**Associate Professor Christian Moldjord**

Norwegian Defense University College/Royal Norwegian Air Force Academy

Norway

[Christian.Moldjord@lksk.mil.no](mailto:Christian.Moldjord@lksk.mil.no)

<https://militaryschooldirectory.com/norway-norwegian-air-force-academy/>

**Associate Professor Trygve Steiro**

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Norway

[trygve.j.steiro@ntnu.no](mailto:trygve.j.steiro@ntnu.no)

<https://www.ntnu.edu/employees/trygve.j.steiro>

**Major Christina Stokkeland**

Norwegian Defense University College/Royal Norwegian Air Force Academy

Norway

[Christina.Stokkeland@lksk.mil.no](mailto:Christina.Stokkeland@lksk.mil.no)

<https://militaryschooldirectory.com/norway-norwegian-air-force-academy/>

**Acknowledgements**

The authors acknowledge the support of the RNoAFA in undertaking the research reported in this paper. We also offer gratitude to **Colonel Rune Gaustad**, Commandant RNoAFA,

**Lieutenant Colonel Professor Dag Henriksen**, Head of the Air Power Leadership Group and **Professor** **Karl Erik Haug**,who has been Dean of RNoAFA until 1 of August 2018. All have offered invaluable support and guidance in the production of this paper and shared their direct experiences in multiple leadership roles within the RNoAFA and the working groups in the Educational Reforms and wider Modernisation programme in Norwegian Defence.

**THE NEW LEARNING ORGANISATION:**

**PART I – INSTITUTIONAL REFLEXIVITY, HIGH AGILITY ORGANISING AND**

**LEARNING LEADERSHIP**

**ABSTRACT**

**Purpose**

This paper aims to revive the old idea of the Learning Organisation by providing a fresh conceptualisation and illustration. The *New Learning Organisation* is conceptualised focusing on the common good through responsible action. It is positioned as responding to the VUCA (*Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity* and *Ambiguity*, Bennett and Lemoine, 2014) conditions with a VUCA approach to *Learning Leadership* fostering *Institutional Reflexivity* and *High Agility Organising*.

**Design/methodology/approach**

The paper presents a new organisational learning framework – the 8As – Sensuous Organisational Learning framework. It illustrates the operationalisation of this framework in PART II through the educational practices and learning culture of the Norwegian Defense University College, Royal Norwegian Air Force Academy´s (RNoAFA) approach to growing (Military) leaders.

**Findings**

The *Sensuous Organisational Learning – 8As framework*, illustrates how *Attentiveness, Alertness, Awareness, Appreciation, Anticipation, Alignment, Activation* and *Agility* form an integral part of the *New Learning Organisation*. Their unique contribution as aspect of a *Sensuous Organisational Learning framework* is that they explicate how the three principles of *Institutional Reflexivity,* *High Agility Organising* and *Learning Leadership* can be operationalised to serve the common good.

**Research Limitation/Implications**

The paper presents a novel way of reviving the Learning Organisation beyond an ideology, as a practical approach to responding to VUCA conditions. It introduces a new learning theory and injects a fresh perspective in our understanding of the role and impact of learning in the workplace.

**Practical Implications**

By focusing on *Learning Leadership* practices that extend previous Organisational Learning frameworks, the *New Learning Organisation* promoted here focuses on responsible action to serve the common good through *Institutional Reflexivity* and *High Agility Organising.*

**Social Implications**

By focusing on how the common good can be better served, the *New Learning Organisation* becomes a mantra for social change to identify the higher purpose that social actions must serve.

**Originality/value**

The need for fresh contributions in the Organisational Learning debate are long overdue. This paper marks a new chapter in Organisational Learning research and practice by demonstrating the value of sensousness as a foundation for improving the practical judgements across professional practices.

**Keywords:**

Learning Organisation, Organisational Learning, Sensuousness, Learning Leadership, Institutional Reflexivity, High Agility Organising

**Introduction**

With this paper, we aim to contribute to the ongoing efforts, especially in this journal to keep the idea of the Learning Organisation alive (Pedler and Burgoyne, 2017). Recognising that the idea of the Learning Organisation continuous to endure, is testament that it is not a ‘dead metaphor’ (Blantern *et al.,* 2013). Even if it provokes a paradoxical response - of being for and against it at the same time (Vince, 2018), maybe the tensions it incites are the very foundations of the extensions it supports in advancing learning and knowing practices that can improve everyday action in organisations (Antonacopoulou, 2008). We see such extensions not least, as the opportunity it invites to return to the fundamentals that once defined this debate and advance a new organisational learning framework.

We take the relationship between the Learning Organisation and Organisational Learning (Easterby-Smith *et al.,* 1999) as intimately connected in the way we also see Organisational Learning as multilevel and multidimensional (Crossan *et al.,* 1999; 2011). And because we recognise the power and political dynamics that inform learning, knowing and acting, we focus on extending earlier accounts of these connections (Antonacopoulou, 2006). We seek to explicate the possibilities that have not been fully explored in the space in-between stimulus and response which have defined previously the way learning has been conceptualised as single, double and triple loop (Argyris and Schön, 1978).

In this space-in-between learning loops, lies what Antonacopoulou calls ‘learning with a difference’, the kind of learning that is ‘*sensuous’* (Antonacopoulou, 2018a, p. 20), because it goes beyond knowledge acquisition and behavioural change in accounting for learning. Instead, *Sensuous Learning* is that learning which *'*aligns cognitions, emotions and intuitive insights by fostering critique’. Such critique is placed as integral to the way practical judgements are formed in addressing tensions and in doing so, aligning *sensibility, sensitivity* and *sentience* guiding the reflexivity that must necessarily underpin responsible action in professional conduct. Thus, sensuousness, presents a renewed focus in learning theory more generally and organisational learning research more specifically. As a foundation of a new organisational learning framework – the *8As Sensuous Organisational Learning* framework - sensuousness, reflects the process of growth and maturation of individuals, communities and organisations by fostering greater *Attentiveness, Alertness, Awareness, Appreciation, Anticipation, Alignment, Activation* and *Agility* as integral to the unknown conditions that call for actions whose consequences cannot be predicted nor controlled (Antonacopoulou, 2018b).

In other words, *Sensuous Organisational Learning*, demonstrates the value of *‘sensuousness’* as a way of knowing and acting to address the *Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity* and *Ambiguity* (VUCA, Bennett and Lemoine, 2014) as the conditions that mirror the rhythm of the 21st Century. These conditions have been ‘the reality’ that Military organisations like the Royal Norwegian Defence operate with in their daily practices. We present in PART II insights from the lived experiences of *Sensuous Organisational Learning* in the educational practices of the Norwegian Defence University College, Royal Norwegian Air Force Academy (thereafter RNoAFA) in growing learning leadership. In PART I we focus on explicating why *Sensuous Organisational Learning* is a strategic response to the VUCA conditions energizing responsible action that serves the common good. The latter can form the foundation of theorising the ‘New Learning Organisation’ explicating *Institutional Reflexivity,* *High Agility Organising* and *Learning Leadership* as key characteristics.

In this paper we revisit recent calls for the ‘New Learning Organisation’ (Daly and Overton, 2017) and go beyond the focus on ‘the clarity of purpose’ that necessarily must drive the ‘shared vision and an open dialogue in how people are valued and need to adapt to deliver the organisation’s performance’ that Daly and Overton (2017, p. 7) suggest. Such a clarity of purpose, we would argue, must fundamentally arise from the drive to serve the common good. Similarly, driving the New Learning Organisation is rightfully about ‘holistic people experience’, ‘thriving ecosystem’, ‘agile - digitally enabled infrastructure’, ‘intelligent decision making’ and ‘continual engagement’ (Daly and Overton, 2017, p. 8-9) that are seen to form the expanded dimensions of Senge’s (2006) earlier framing of the Learning Organisation. However, valuable as these dimensions are, they are still unlikely to lead to the sustainable impact that organisational learning is expected to provide, because what is potentially missing is the focus on the common good (MacIntyre, 1985).

We explicate the common good as the ‘mission’ of the *New Learning Organisation* we conceptualise, because we want to illustrate that in attending to the VUCA conditions such a ‘mission’ shapes the ways of knowing and acting of both individuals, communities and the organisation as a whole. We illustrate this ‘mission’ in PART II in the way the RNoAFA as an educational institution, has been navigating the VUCA conditions of the recent modernisation and educational reforms in Norwegian Defence.

We elaborate *Sensuous Organisational Learning* to explain how and why *Sensuous Learning* reflects the *Learning Leadership* critical for the *New Learning Organisation*. By returning to review the role of leadership in organisational learning research we want to go beyond personal and relational leadership to also make the case for organisation-wide (institutional) leadership as essential in serving the common good especially when it fosters *Institutional Reflexivity* and *High Agility Organising*.

**Sensuous Organisational Learning for VUCA**

Despite ongoing debate especially in journals dedicated to advance managerial and organisational learning (e.g. *The Learning Organisation Journal* and *Management Learning*) we have not seen new and exciting advancements in Learning theory. If anything, the field can best be described as being in a state of stalement, not least because we seem to take learning as given, not frequently critiquing what is learning, how it takes place in everyday life beyond work and educational contexts, or indeed why it remains not only necessary and problematic in equal measure, but essential to survival. We make the case in this paper that in order to arrest the complexity of learning as a phenomenon and a dynamic social process, we need to do more to explicate how the social complexity of learning across levels and units of analysis can be understood and worked with (Antonacopoulou and Chiva, 2007). We need to design modes of learning that are not only robust in dealing with VUCA conditions, but reflect ‘VUCA learning’ as Antonacopoulou (2018c, p. 3) suggests. We therefore, make the case for a new learning theory – *Sensuous Learning*.

***Sensuous Learning***

Sensuous Learning is at the core of the work of the GNOSIS 2020 Network that brings together scholars across disciplines, artists and professionals across the professions to advance this new and innovative mode of learning that improves professional practices. The work of the network, featured in two edited book volumes elaborates *Sensuous Learning* and presents the cutting edge Arts-based Methods and Interventions that facilitate *Sensuous Learning,* as well as the impacts of such learning (Antonacopoulou and Taylor, 2018a; 2018b). Arts-Based Methods and Interventions are elaborated as the means of advancing *Sensuous Learning*, not only because they adopt a non-traditional, ‘presentational’ way of knowing that ‘provides relatively direct access to our felt experience and draw upon our emotional connection to our self, others, and our experience’ as Taylor and Ladkin (2009, p. 56) suggest. Arts-Based Methods and Interventions liberate aesthetic, intellectual and emotional engagement and promote a mode of learning that emphasizes *practising* (Romanowska *et al.,* 2013). The emphasis on practising is a critical condition for the kind of learning that cultivates character and conscience and not only the development of skills and competence.

Central to *Sensuous Learning* is practising *sensibility, sensitivity* and *sentience* that enables the detection of small perturbations, before they evolve to a full blown crisis or error. Such learning, supports sensing the anomalies and disharmony between what is done and what needs to be done. It expresses the sensuous interrelationships between body, mind, materiality and environment to form *sensoriality* as a process enabling re-viewing and re-vising the ways actions are formed and transformed every time they are performed. Sensoriality in this sense, reflects how practising unveils possibilities, when people reflect, refine and extend established ways of doing things. This process accounts for the *Sensuous Learning* theory that marks a new chapter in Management and Organisational Learning theory, research and practice.

*Sensuous Learning* has been defined as that ‘learning which aligns cognitions, emotions and intuitive insights by fostering critique such that the complex – *symplegma* - of emerging sensations inspires acting, reacting and conducting one’s practice with freedom of choice’ (Antonacopoulou, 2018a, p. 20).

Consistent with the ways Organizational Learning has been hitherto conceptualized, *Sensuous Learning* is presented as a practice that may take place in organizational settings not simply as the sum of the learning of the individuals in the organization. Consistent with Crossan *et al.* (1999) *Sensuous Organizational Learning* is a multilevel process that begins with individual learning, that leads to group learning, and that then leads to Organizational Learning. We also recognise that these levels, are connected by bidirectional processes that involve both the creation and application of knowledge. The original 4I (Intuiting, Interpreting, Integrating, and Institutionalizing) Organisational Learning framework proposed by Crossan *et al.* (1999) and their more recent recursion (Crossan *et al.,* 2011) promotes new theorising in Organisational Learning as cross-paradigmatic, systemic and organic - like a tree - but with the focus on a solid trunk, than many more branches.

Drawing inspiration from this framing, *Sensuous Organisational Learning* (Antonacopoulou, 2018b, 2018c) elaborates sensuousness and sensoriality as a lens for rethinking Organisational Learning. It invites delving into cross-paradigmatic dialogue in exploring further through a radical humanism and an interpretative paradigm (as Crossan *et al.,* 2011 explain drawing on Burrell and Morgan, 1979) the emerging paradigm of *emplacement* (Pink, 2011).

***Emplacement – A New Paradigm for Organisational Learning***

Emplacement as a new paradigm extends previous perspectives promoting enactment and embodiment in understanding complex phenomena like learning. Emplacement acknowledges the intuitive insights and interpretative aspects of the Organisational Learning framework that Crossan *et al.* (2011) propose as powerful forces shaping the learning process. And whilst, the Art-Based Methods and Interventions could elaborate Integration and Institutionalisation in Crossan *et al.’s* 4I framework, neither Radical Structuralism, nor Functionalism express satisfactorily the way experiences of learning are designed to support *Sensuous Organisational Learning.* This is because the objective is not to put forward a prescriptive theory of Organisational learning nor to suggest that *Sensuous Organisational Learning* guarantees the emergence of a Learning Organisation. What we seek instead, is to maintain open the question: how might sensations and sensuousness enrich learning across levels in response to the unknown (VUCA)? This question invites further inquiry into the *power of critique* (Antonacopoulou, 2010).

***The Power of Critique and Phronesis as Critical Dimensions***

The *Sensuous Organisational Learning* perspective presented here, focuses specifically on enriching the ways of knowing and acting by embedding critique as an essential dimension. The latter has been found to be absent not only among individuals but also organisations even if they proclaim themselves to be ‘Learning Organisations’ (Örtenblad, 2013). The absence of critique is not due to limited scope of asking questions or engaging in critical reflection. It is the often limited capacity for practical judgement that emanates when established routines and practices – including modes of learning – fail to instigate such critique as part of learning.

This is clearly demonstrated in Antonacopoulou and Sheaffer’s (2014) account of why organisations and individuals fail to learn from failure and repeat the same mistakes again and again. By embedding crisis in learning in the mode of learning they define as ‘Learning-in-Crisis’ (Antonacopoulou and Sheaffer, 2014, p. 4) they highlight the centrality of critique and practical judgement (phronesis) in developing a new understanding of a given situation, questioning current practices, experimenting with existing knowledge to develop improvements in actions, negotiating emotions, attitudes and behaviours in responding to political forces shaping learning.

This focus on critique and phronesis promotes *readiness* and *resilience*, but also searching and *re-searching* as integral to *renewing* the ways of knowing and acting as an approach to individual and collective learning (Antonacopoulou, 2018d). *Sensuous Organisational Learning* is positioned as a strategic response to the VUCA conditions. Embedding the paradigm of emplacement and the power of critique and phronesis, as the backdrop for the new *Sensuous Learning* theory, calls for energizing ways of knowing and acting directed to serve the common good.

***A Framework for Sensuous Organisational Learning: The 8As***

*Sensuous Organisational Learning* attends to the ongoing *review, reflection* and *reflexivity* as central to cultivating critique and phronesis. It promotes emplacement in the learning process by provoking *Attentiveness, Alertness, Awareness, Appreciation, Anticipation, Alignment, Activation* and *Agility*. In other words, it invites individuals, communities and organisations to consistently engage in practising learning with a difference, exploring the space-in-between single, double and triple-loop learning directed towards actions, values and learning practices. In doing so, *Sensuous Organisational Learning* surfaces the tensions between ways of knowing and ways of acting and provides the foundations for extensions of the possibilities to know and act in service of the common good. Figure 1 presents the *Sensuous Organisational Learning* framework diagrammatically and illustrates how the relationship between knowledge and action remains central to the organisational learning process it supports.

<Insert Figure 1 here>

*Sensuous Organisational Learning* is consistent with the very foundations of organisational learning theory that Argyris (singularly and with his collaborators) over many years (1957; 1993; 2003) has explicated. Yet, as an organisational learning theory it goes beyond ‘Model I’ and ‘Model II’ theories of action. It focuses on responsible action and this means that the relationship between governing variables, action strategies and consequences must necessarily extend beyond individual learners’ ‘theory-in-use’. The latter as Argyris showed, produces unilateral control often supported by defensiveness, misunderstanding, self-fulfilling and self-sealing processes, which results in skilled unawareness and incompetence. Model II on the other hand, promotes ‘espoused theories’ of action that disturb current practices and seek to introduce new actions by generating new knowledge about ways in which the existing problems can be overcome.

Yet, to ‘espouse’ action does not necessarily translate into actual doing. Hence, responsible action becomes the space-in-between Model I and Model II provoking both ways of acting to be infused with critique and phronesis. In this respect *Sensuous Organisational Learning* promotes *sensibility, sensitivity* and *sentience* in acting responsibly, not by pre-empting the negative consequences of actions (as this is unrealistic), but by seeking to serve the common good.

Correspondingly, single and double loop learning provide the basis of becoming better aware of the inconsistencies between actions and their consequences and in doing so attending to the actions themselves or the governing values and knowledge that inform actions. Essentially single loop learning is predominantly concerned with identifying and correcting a problem and depending on the consequences if the problem persists, because the actions taken failed to address it, then one has to consider alternative actions. Double loop learning on the other hand, still propounds a problem-solving mentality as the core of learning, however, the focus shifts to the underlying norms and objectives, which have guided the implementation of the initial action. Triple loop learning is oriented towards learning how to learn (Flood and Romm, 2018) and yet, it still does not address the value of tensions as a foundation for extension that the crisis in learning necessarily also entails as Antonacopoulou (2018a) shows in her framing of *Sensuous Organisational Learning* (see Figure 2).

<Insert Figure 2 here>

Interestingly, tensions are at the core of what Argyris refers to as ‘defensive routines’ as they reflect the incompleteness of learning as a process. In other words, tensions expose the unintended consequences of actions that may generate new problems that need to be resolved through further learning. They also capture the ways in which individual and collective learning practices affect the development of the organisation in the culture that governs the way learning transcends across levels and potentially becomes institutionalised (Crossan *et al.,* 1999; 2011).

The tensions embedded in individual and collective learning practices, also lend more visible the intensions of actions and the associated knowledge. They expose the dynamics of learning in the power and political forces that affect the choices made in relation to what, how and why learning may or may not take place (Antonacopoulou, 2006). Tensions reflect the inherent dilemmas and paradoxes that challenge what one knows and the connections necessary to deal with the unknown. This is not always recognised in accounts of the paradoxical nature of the Learning Organisation (Vince, 2018).

Tensions as a productive force supporting *Sensuous Organisational Learning*, reveal the ways in which insights fed back through the loops of learning create the space for extending ways of seeing, being and becoming. However, they are no guarantee that the impact of learning will be realized if the dynamics of reflexive practice and the ways in which learning and changing are negotiated are not appreciated (Antonacopoulou, 2004). Through adopting a critical stance that engages with the identified tensions as a foundation for creating new possibilities, reflexive critique encourages multiplicity in possibility (Antonacopoulou, 2010). The capacity to encounter the familiar as new (unfamiliar) becomes a central quality reflecting on one’s reflections as much as one reflects on actions, assumptions and the knowledge that guides such actions. This quality of enriching the ways of seeing casts a gaze on the issues at hand with a greater capacity for intuitive insight. Such insights in turn, align perspectives from the inside and outside the issue simultaneously (Antonacopoulou, 2018a). This is how reflexivity is conceptualised in this analysis and why the New Learning Organisation would elevate it as an institutional priority rather than an individual and relational practice.

**The New Learning Organisation**

Conceptualising the *New Learning Organisation* as promoting a different way of learning such that the ways of knowing and acting that underpin it invite critique and phronesis, calls for practices that are also principles defining the character of such a Learning Organisation. In this paper, we propose three principles and practices: *Institutional Reflexivity, High Agility Organising and Learning Leadership*. We discuss each of these in turn.

***Institutional Reflexivity***

In this analysis, we explore reflexivity across levels of analysis to show what happens when it supports personal and collective development. Hence, why we also refer to reflexivity as an institutional phenomenon in relation to organisational learning. In our analysis ‘institutional reflexivity’ is defined as the capacity to connect ways of knowing and acting to serve the common good. This conceptualisation extends beyond accounts of reflexivity as acknowledging the effects of our circumstances on our actions, thus questioning what is taken for granted in one’s own and other’s beliefs (Archer, 2012; Suddaby *et al.,* 2016; Cunliffe, 2016). Instead, by developing the capacity to act responsibly reflexivity prompts the ‘impulse’ to act mindful of the ‘impact’ of actions taken adding to the *intentionality* and *intensity* of action also *integrity*. It is here where the connection between reflexivity and the common good can best be illustrated, when the role of reflexivity in supporting learning and changing also acknowledges the value it adds in cultivating not only competence but also character and conscience (Antonacopoulou, 2018a).

This focus on institutional reflexivity as integral to *Sensuous Organisational Learning* recognises the centrality of phronesis in reflexivity at the individual and collective levels (Antonacopoulou, 2010) which often calls for knowing and acting beyond rules (Brown, 1988) in striking the golden mean (Rorty, 2000). A focus on practical judgements orientates learning and knowing on the ‘right’ way to act not only on the basis of existing knowledge but on the emerging learning as one navigates the unknown (Antonacopoulou and Sheaffer, 2014). This also explicates the distinctions Antonacopoulou (2018d) draws between *review, reflection* and *reflexivity*, with the latter becoming the process by which possibilities are envisioned as new ways of making sense of the world are formed in the action choices that are directed to serve the common good. Such action choices are manifestations of agility.

***High Agility Organising***

This focus on *Institutional Reflexivity* extends the principles of High Reliability Organising (thereafter HRO) where ‘collective mindfulness’ supports the preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify interpretations, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience, and deference to expertise as Weick and Sutcliffe (2015) advocate. In this analysis we want to suggest consistent with the GNOSIS 4R framework of *Sensuous Learning* (Antonacopoulou, 2018b; 2018d) we referred to earlier, that embedding a widely-distributed sense of vulnerability, responsibility and accountability demands also, what we will refer to here as *High Agility Organising*.

This implies that the *Institutional Reflexivity* we discuss is not only a mode of sense-making but also a way of knowing and acting expressed in practical judgements and choices. Such judgements and choices are cultivated through *Sensuous Organisational Learning* (as reflected in the 8As - *Attentiveness, Alertness, Awareness, Appreciation, Anticipation, Alignment, Activation* and *Agility)* to serve the common good. *High Agility Organising* calls for embracing a crisis in learning as an integral way of meeting the VUCA conditions without presuming what is already known to be sufficient to define the course of action (Antonacopoulou and Sheaffer, 2014). Agility then is born out of the ongoing adjustments that acting and knowing demand, when learning remains itself an active process that reshapes both knowing and acting at the same time.

The kind of learning we recognise as sensuous, extends beyond capturing lessons learned, itself a practice that we appreciate is important to foster resilience. However, we feel that resilience, demands not only distilling the ‘right’ lessons but that in doing so, one is able to learn beyond the specific experience. This means that it is imperative to experience learning itself and in doing so recognise that learning is a struggle whose impact is not only evident in the knowledge acquired and improvements in competence, but also in the way one conducts themselves when feeling vulnerable. Such vulnerability demands new ways of safety. We would suggest that agility, is one such safety platform.

Hence, the *Sensuous Organisational Learning* that *The New Learning organisation* promotes, as we discuss it in this paper, is highlighting sensuousness and sensoriality as a safety platform to work with vulnerability that the unknown presents. *High Agility Organising*, then goes beyond resilience. It embraces the VUCA, as a force transforming confusion into curiosity, confidence to explore and candour in assessing what is the appropriate response beyond what previous experiences may have distilled as lessons learned. Instead, it guides responsible action given the conditions those action are expected to realise the positive impact they set out to achieve. And for this reason the actions themselves remain flexible and malleable to adjustments.

It is the practical judgements (phronesis) that guide responsible action that enables the ongoing adjustments. Practical judgements are not merely deliberations fostered through practising reflexivity. They are active steps to engage in VUCA conditions with a commitment and courage to go beyond what is currently known. Therefore, phronesis, is not merely a process of decision making where alternatives are assessed and the best option is selected. Phronesis, is not just a process of acting morally either. For an extensive overview and illustrations of what practising phronesis means see Shotter and Tsoukas (2014a, 2014b). Suffice it is here to say, that when cultivating practical judgement towards serving the common good, a higher purpose also emerges as receiving prominence over and above the personal and situational constraints of the here and now.

Serving a higher purpose provides a platform of organizing for agility. In this respect, *High Agility Organising* is about mobilizing *Sensuous Learning* that informs practical judgements and goes beyond the confusion otherwise VUCA conditions create. This itself is an illustration of what *Learning Leadership* entails.

***Learning Leadership: Personal, Relational and Organisational***

We build here on earlier efforts to position leadership as an integral aspect of the vision and journey of becoming a Learning Organisation (Senge *et al.,* 1994; Marsick and Watkins, 1999). Space limits the scope to elaborate on the advancements in Leadership research that inform the *Sensuous Organisational Learning* framework we explicate in this paper. Suffice it is to say however, that as elaborated extensively elsewhere (Antonacopoulou and Bento, 2016) *Learning Leadership* promotes: learning to feel safe being *Vulnerable;* learning to remain *Unnerved* by the unknown, learning to demonstrate *Candour* and learning to experience *Awakening* (Antonacopoulou, 2018c)*.* These dimensions of leadership reflect the *courage,* *commitment, confidence* and *curiosity* to persevere when navigating the unknown (Antonacopoulou and Bento, 2018). They account for the dynamic, collective, relational, as well as reflexive (Alvesson *et al.,* 2017) nature of leadership that is situated and socially defined, and where practising receives special consideration given the orientation to learning to foster human flourishing.

In this respect, *Learning Leadership* is integral to the *New Learning Organisation* as it supports the ongoing process of growth that aligns the needs of individuals, communities and organisations in the context (sector and national context) in which they operate and in relation to the social, political and environmental conditions that define the appropriateness of the action choices. Our account of *Learning Leadership* therefore, exemplifies not only reflexivity and critique in rethinking the loops central to the models of action Argyris proposes. These loops are not only a reflection of the feedback mechanisms. They are also a reflection of the *practising* that is so central to the process of learning, changing and becoming a ‘leaderful’ organisation (Raelin, 2016).

By shifting the focus on the practice of leading and the practising it calls for learning to be orientated towards maximizing the impact of *repetition* as integral to *re-*hearsing, *re-*viewing, *re-*newing, *re-*searching, not an attempt to replicate the same experience, akin to following a recipe to ensure a particular outcome (Antonacopoulou, 2008). Practising leadership is about endorsing difference (Deleuze, 1994), discovering new dimensions to issues and mastering the courage when balancing curiosity and confidence in equal measure to define the choices in dealing with the unknown.

This approach to practising is in line with Argyris’ commitment to foster Organisational Learning that ‘reduces injustices [that] ‘inhibit[ed] the expansion of liberating alternatives’ (Argyris, 2003, pp. 1178-1179). However, we go beyond personal and relational learning leadership in addressing ‘self-sealing’ and ‘inner-contradictions’ that support self-defeating actions. These tendencies are not only a matter of insufficient learning systems or organisational culture, they are also the product of the ‘ambiguous, contested, contradictory and fluid interpretations of confusing events’ (Haaland, 2016) that stand in the way of learning. This is why we make the case for *Learning Leadership* as a means of cultivating the *Institutional Reflexivity* that support *High Agility Organising* as key principles of the *New Learning Organisation*. In short, we want to make the case for organisational leadership being a mark of how organisational learning takes place and how the *New Learning Organisation* leads the way in their given context to serve the common good. We illustrate this diagrammatically in Figure 3.

<Insert Figure 3 here>

**Conclusions**

In this paper we presented a new *8As Sensuous Organisational Learning Framework* to explicate the idea of the *New Learning Organisation*. We have extended previous accounts of single, double and triple loop learning and in doing so, we highlighted how practising reflexivity and critique in practical judgements can elevate responsible action as the foundation of serving the common good. By positioning the common good as the mission of the New Learning Organisation we shift the focus to the alignment of three key principles and practices – *Institutional Reflexivity, High Agility Organising* and *Learning Leadership*.

We made the case for *Institutional Reflexivity* as the orientation to serve a higher purpose beyond the typical efficiency and effectiveness targets. Equally, the focus must necessarily be on the practical judgements that reflexively critique not only assumptions and perspectives, but elevate tensions and differences to the capacity to make a difference collectively. We have explicated *High Agility Organising*, as an extension of earlier accounts of High Reliability Organising because, we recognise that without agility, resilience is unsustainable, especially in VUCA conditions. This is why in suggesting the need to support learning with a difference we expand not only the modes of learning but the centrality of critique as an inseparable aspect of *Learning Leadership*. And precisely because critique is so critical, we elaborated on earlier accounts of the importance of practical judgement in leadership to explain why the *New Learning Organisation* we envision is practically experienced when leadership becomes an organisational characteristic and not merely a personal or relational process. Taken collectively these key characteristics of the *New Learning Organisation*, energise a different way of learning – *Sensuous Learning.*

*Sensuous Organisational Learning* exposes what lies in the space-in-between loops of learning. We have accounted for the *Attentiveness, Alertness, Awareness, Appreciation, Anticipation, Alignment, Activation* and *Agility* as dimensions of the 8As framework, presenting sensuousness and sensoriality as integral to the *New Learning Organisation*. By drawing attention to the paradigm of emplacement we sought to extend the focus on how learning is enacted and embodied by individuals, groups and the organisation at large through a greater focus on tensions. Tensions are integral to the practising that defines an emplaced approach to learning by fostering safety in vulnerability, unnerved by the unknown, signalling candour in engaging with complexity and the clarity it demands. Such mode of learning is possible because of the awakening that responsible action promotes.

Put differently, the new paradigm of emplacement on which *Sensuous Learning* is founded, accounts for the 8As of the *Sensuous Organisational Learning* framework, by fostering reflexivity and critique. It is here where we also see the centrality of practical judgements in responsible action. Hence, our motivation in promoting a ‘new’ Learning Organisation is to expand the growing momentum that the idea continues to receive and in doing so offer a new conceptual framework that revisits the ways of knowing and acting by encouraging new ways of learning – *Sensuous Learning*.

The *New Learning Organisation* we conceptualise in this paper therefore, explicates the principles that form the practices that enable learning with a difference. Hence, why in our analysis we propose three principles – *Institutional Reflexivity, High Agility Organising, Learning Leadership* - that express the commitment of the Learning Organisation to serve the common good. In PART II we illustrate these principles in the educational practices of the Norwegian Defense University College, Royal Norwegian Air Force Academy.
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**Figure 1:** The 8As Sensuous Organisational Learning Framework. (Adapted from Antonacopoulou, 2018b)

****

**Figure 2: Organisational Learning Revisited** (Adapted from Antonacopoulou, 2018b)



**Figure 3: The New Learning Organisation**
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