

Sustainable inclusion without sustainability

Working with equal participation and unforeseen
movement in physical education, sports, and research

Åsa Andersson



Sustainable inclusion without sustainability

Sustainable inclusion without sustainability

Working with equal participation and unforeseen
movement in physical education, sports, and research

Åsa Andersson



© ÅSA ANDERSSON, 2023
ISBN 978-91-7963-133-8 (print)
ISBN 978-91-7963-134-5 (pdf)
ISSN 0436-1121

The publication is also available in full text at:
<http://hdl.handle.net/2077/74657>

Distribution:

Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, PO Box 222, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden, or
acta@ub.gu.se

Doctoral thesis in Sport Science at the Department of Food and Nutrition, and
Sport Science, University of Gothenburg.

Photo: Åsa Andersson

Print: Stema Specialtryck AB, Borås, 2023



Thank you all, without you I am not much

Abstract

Title: Sustainable inclusion without sustainability – Working on equal participation and unforeseen movement in physical education, sports, and research

Author: Åsa Andersson

Language: English

ISBN: 978-91-7963-133-8 (print)

ISBN: 978-91-7963-134-5 (pdf)

ISSN: 0436-1121

Keywords: Sustainable inclusion, unforeseen movement, not knowing, case-assemblage, research interests, ethics, qualiting, non-fulfillmenting, open-teaching systems, extra-professional

In this PhD project, I put forward the importance of becoming more comfortable with the oscillating nature of wisdom in physical education, sport, and research. This is also what the word 'without' in the title 'sustainable inclusion without sustainability' implies. To open our activities for more knowledges than our own, to face interruptions, and to work on the edge of our knowledges in sustainable inclusive events. Thinking with Deleuze and a ten-second swimming event where Amira learns to float, I challenge the understanding of human being that often informs inclusive work in physical education, sports, and research. Namely, the Cartesian idea of the knowing subject. Within this approach, much research describes inclusive processes as various invitations to predetermined activities. The focus is on the excluded and their rights to participate, and to facilitate physical education, sports, and research so that people can participate. While offering some easily accessible methodological designs, they also provide us with a perspective of absence and that these activities are supposed to add health, wellbeing, knowledge, and credibility to peoples' lives. And, this is good. What I suggest, however, is that such activities based on grand narratives and dogmas can just as easily exclude, and that sustainable inclusive activities may be dependent on the opposite, i.e., the possibility of not knowing what people need to be healthy, knowledgeable, and credible. In tune, the aim of this project is to shed light on other ways of understanding, relating to and creating inclusive processes. Including a process-ontology, this project suggests that the task of physical education, sports,

and research is to create the future without falling into the trap of doing this in isolation. As I see it, we cannot escape collective creations of the future. We cannot evade those for whom our activities are a matter of concern. Experimenting on, and speculating about, what this immanent approach may do to qualitative case studies, research interests, ethics, qualities, educational organization, curricula, professionalism, and much more, I provide theoretical extensions that may be important to think with if we are serious about reaching more inclusive physical educations, sports, and research. I guess, non-sustainability is the other of sustainable inclusion, without which sustainable inclusion would not be what it is?

List of Original Papers

Andersson, Å., Korp, P. & Reinertsen, A. (2020). Thinking With New Materialism in Qualitative Case Studies. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920976437>

Andersson, Å., Korp, P. & Reinertsen, A. (2021). Becoming interested – the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports. *Qualitative Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941211061053>

Andersson, Å., Korp, P. & Reinertsen A. (2021). Is it Possible to Think Physical Education Forward and Dismatle Ourselves – In a Quantum Space?. *International Review of Qualitative Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19408447211002770>

Andersson, Å., Reinertsen, A. & Korp, P. (2022). Re-thinking official educational organization towards friction-zones between divergent knowledges. *Policy Futures in Education* . <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103221089466>

Supervisors

Principal Supervisor

Peter Korp, PhD, Associate professor

Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg,
Gothenburg, Sweden

Co-supervisor

Anne Beate Reinertsen, PhD, Professor

Department of Education, ICT and Learning, Østfold University College,
Halden, Norway

Contents

THE (NON-)STRUCTURE OF THIS THESIS.....	15
A SUBSTITUTE FOR A PREFACE	43
PARTICIPANTS MATTER AND SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN FOR GRANTED	51
THINKING WITH NEW MATERIALISM IN QUALITATIVE CASE STUDIES.....	63
BECOMING INTERESTED – THE EVOLVEMENT OF RESEARCH INTEREST IN CASE STUDY RESEARCH ON SPORTS	73
RESPONSIBILITIES BEYOND PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND MORALS IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION, SPORTS, AND RESEARCH.....	91
TEACHING THE UNTEACHABLE AND STAYING WITH THE PROCESS.....	101
A STAND-IN FOR A CONCLUSION: PERHAPS WE NEED FAILURE TO STAY OPEN FOR THE BECOMING OF CONTINUOUSLY INCLUSIVE FUTURES?	109
IS IT POSSIBLE TO THINK PHYSICAL EDUCATION FORWARD AND DISMANTLE OURSELVES – IN A QUANTUM SPACE?.....	117
SUBSTANCES ARE NOT PERMANENT AND QUALITIES ARE NOT CONSISTENT.....	133
RE-THINKING EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION TOWARDS FRICTION-ZONES BETWEEN DIVERGENT KNOWLEDGES	145
PERSPEKTIV OCH UTVIDGNINGAR.....	159

The (non-)structure of this thesis

This thesis does not provide a comprehensive introduction to established practices of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research. Nor do I describe the most common processes of inclusion very deeply or establish and define many concepts and procedures or discuss in detail why it is important to work inclusively in physical education, sports, and research. As I see it, this has already been done successfully by others (see e.g., Fitzgerald 2018; Barker 2019; Green 2007; Lagergren & Fundberg 2009; Coakley 2011; Bailey 2017; Ekholm & Dahlstedt 2017; Agergaard 2018; Stengers 2018). What I provide is rather a space that can potentially open up for novel thinking (and learning) when it comes to processes of inclusion and much more.

Therefore, this thesis does not also repeat linear proceedings or offer convenient answers. I do not provide a readymade handbook of inclusion to be uncritically used in encounters with others. Perhaps I do not even refer to inclusive processes as many of us have come to know them. My main objective is to introduce an approach where the path to inclusion encompasses more knowledges than our own in physical education, sports, and research. For me, it is a matter of equality. To constantly create and recreate activities together with participants. To become participant and participate on equal terms. With others. And this is not just an opinion I hold. According to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), all children have equal value and the same rights to participate in various activities. Regardless of activity, this implies a condition of pluralistic factuality which, I suggest, requires methodological and pedagogical approaches in which two or more states, principles, or knowledges are allowed to coexist. In extension, it is a quest for deeper critical views of our daily practices and more principled scholarship related to a view of knowledge that includes constant ruptures and resistance but no struggles of power. It is not about favouring one knowledge over another or searching for the lowest common denominator but

about creating encounters between different participants that put everyone's knowledge in motion.

It seems, however, that the most common reference area on inclusion is education. It may also be argued that the widespread notion of 'inclusive education' (UNESCO 2008) and the idea of bridging the divide between regular and segregated provision of education is a possible reason why participation and non-participation are so intensively discussed in today's physical education (Goodwin 2009; Coates & Vickerman 2010; Kiuppis 2018). According to UNESCO (2008), inclusive education is a policy tool for re-formulating 'education for all' plans and making education more inclusive by not only ensuring full access to education but by also taking seriously and facilitating active participation and achievement. For Kiuppis (2018) this raises awareness about the importance of extending the concept of inclusion. Instead of merely making sure that people get the chance to participate, he argues that we need to adopt a more process-oriented approach. In tandem, I put forward the importance of making it possible for various established and non-established knowledges to encounter. Elsewhere, I call these encounters 'friction-zones'. Friction-zones that comprise humble experimentations (and innovations) that not only enable us to challenge conventional qualities and goal achievements in our daily practices but also make possible constant inclusions of each other.

By stressing the rights of all children to participate in (and benefit from) an education, the notion of inclusive education has also become subject of (other) academic discussions. For instance, some researchers point out that a common practice of physical education is to invite all students to participate in integrated classes (see e.g., Fitzgerald 2006; Haegele 2019). This approach is also challenged by questioning whether these settings meet the wishes and needs of all students and truly work as inclusive practices. In accordance with Lavay and DePaepe (1987), Haegele and Zhu (2017) describe integrated classes as 'dumping grounds' where various students are placed in the same class but where content and instructions in relation to various lessons remain the same and do not take into account different needs. This, in turn, sparks debates about whether inclusive physical education should imply educational activities related to specific target groups in integrated settings or should widen our focus and inspire us to create educations for all and reach out to heterogenous student groups by embracing diversity. According to Evans (2014:322), however, it is important that we do not

reduce inclusive education to a debate about 'inclusion of special need pupils'. This is because such debates would deviate our attention away from (and give us opportunities not to question) poor methods, i.e., methods which do not acknowledge pluralistic factuality and thus also do not address the interests of every child within ongoing processes of creation. In accompaniment, I introduce case-assemblage as a possible way to work more inclusively. I also introduce another way of thinking when it comes to creation of interests and particularly research interests.

It seems, though, that many unwelcome and potentially exclusive situations arise from poor methods, not least when participants are members of marginalized communities. And even if teachers, coaches, and researchers have sincere intentions to create new knowledges and illuminate various procedures and phenomena that serve to engender and sustain exclusive practices, there is an imminent risk of losing knowledges and perspectives of participants under the influences of more talkative and confident teachers, coaches, and researchers. To reduce such privileges, I create various concepts (extended professionalism, non-fulfillment, open-teaching systems, qualiting, and much more) to think with and, in extension, make possible an extended approach to inclusion that I call sustainable inclusion without sustainability. For me, sustainable inclusion without sustainability is a paradoxical process within which our (mine, yours, and others) control is occasionally lost and where established knowledges in physical education, sports, and research are disrupted. A paradoxical process that can perhaps also replace our loss of control with a deeper and more innovative engagement among all participants involved in the situation. It is important to note, though, that the wording 'without sustainability' here challenges linear and uninterrupted processes of maintaining certain approaches in physical education, sports, and research much more than it criticizes ongoing environmental, economic, and social issues defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987).

However, in regard to inclusive education it is suggested that we need to question to what extent, and how, the idea of bridging the divide between regular and segregated provision of activities translates into sports (Kiuppis 2015). The main issue seems to be that sports recognize an 'inclusion spectrum' where segregated/segregating activities (for instance disability-specific activities) are accepted as a part of sporting activities across a continuum and where the other

extreme is an inclusive approach addressing the interests of every child. Within this context, the purpose is to make it possible for people to participate in the ways they want in activities of their choice (Misener 2014). Since sport is often associated with health and well-being (in addition to inclusion), it is often argued that it is our right to individually choose which sport activities we will participate in. This in turn, implies that inclusion debates in sports are not so much about how to replace segregated/segregating activities with more inclusive ones. Rather, the issue is to give each approach equal value and trustworthiness (Kiuppis 2018) regardless of whether they give off segregating or inclusive effects.

Simultaneously, much research still describes processes of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research as simplified, instrumental, and (overly) technical procedures based on tolerance. Within this approach, inclusion becomes a conscious act of will or perhaps a personality trait, and where we (teachers and students, coaches and athletes, and researchers and data) tend to think that some activities (and people) are better than others. In relation to physical education and sports, for instance, we often talk about 'assimilation processes' (cf. Haug 2017; Agergaard 2018) where teachers and coaches make an effort to get students and athletes to participate in already established and highly valued activities (see e.g., Rekaa et al. 2019), and when it comes to research, labels like 'Mode 1' (Gibbons 2020) are widely used. In tune, Flintoff and Fitzgerald (2012) note that it seems very difficult to invite differences into our practices, and Griminger (2014) as well as Munk and Agergaard (2015) point to our lack of ability when it comes to challenge historically well-established and reputable practices. Rather we often strive to invite people to predetermined activities. Ekholm and Dahlstedt (2022) point out that there seems to be a generally accepted idea that sport in its most traditional and autonomous form automatically promotes inclusive situations, and thus also counteracts various exclusion-related risks. When this happens, sports are limited to need-oriented activities. The focus is on the excluded and their rights to participate in these 'needed' activities, and to facilitate sports so that people can participate. While offering some easily accessible methodological (and pedagogical) designs, these need-oriented approaches also provide us with a perspective of absence and the suggestion that these needed activities add health, wellbeing, knowledge, and credibility to peoples' lives. And, this is good. What I suggest, however, is that such activities based on grand narratives and dogmas can just as easily exclude (see e.g., Luciano & Chen 2015; Haegele & Sutherland 2015; Singh 2018), and that sustainable inclusive activities in physical education, sports,

and research may paradoxically be dependent on the opposite, and to open up for the possibility of not knowing what people need to be healthy, knowledgeable and credible. Similarly, Reinertsen (2021) puts forward that taking a not-knowing-position can be seen as an inclusive activism of knowledge and learning, and Penney et al. (2018:1072) give an emphasis to shared decision making and argue that re-visioning inclusive practices must start with a desire to co-construct these practices together with participants within processes of mutual learning.

What is happening here is a reconceptualizing of the reasons and ways in which we engage in inclusive processes. In tune with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), UNESCO's notion of 'inclusive education' (2008), Reinertsen (2021) and Penny et al. (2018), I suggest that we should move into a space where all participants are involved in the creation of inclusive practices. This is also what I provide in this thesis. A space where we move from individual perspectives to collectivity. A space full of paradoxes, unanswered questions, negotiations, and explorations where elements normally constructed as opposites (teachers and students, coaches and athletes, researchers and data) are allowed to coexist, come together, connect, affect and where we are not sure what exactly is going on. A space where there are no truths. A space where we must acknowledge the singularity and uncertainty of every encounter. I wonder what happens in this space? I wonder what happens when we simultaneously try to ensure sustained participation and encourage non-sustainability though active participation in physical education, sports, and research? Perhaps this is also as close as I get to a research problem? Experimenting on not knowing and co-creating physical education, sports, and research with students, athletes, and data within processes of mutual learning. For me, it is to rule out one-directional flows of knowledge as the only and dominant way to interact and engage within physical education, sports, and research. Rather than solely relying on teachers', coaches', and researchers' explanations, knowledges, authority, and influence in various situations, I see much generative capacity, value, and importance in knowledges that flow from students, athletes, and data. Working with more than one voice seems to make it possible to bring other, contemporary, and potentially new knowledges of inclusion (and much more) to society and existing practices of physical education, sports, and research.

This thesis, then, is a onto-epistemological research project with didactic implications positioned in the field of sport science. Important to note, though, is

that I do not engage in a question/answer linearity. Rather, I try to avoid the unilateral nature of a more traditional research problem and the immediate imposition of a sense whereby this thesis suddenly fulfills something promised, guaranteed, or predicted. For me, it is a way to enable wonder and surprise that may add to the current processes of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research by complementing them much more than confirming them. The aim is to shed light on other ways of understanding, relating to and creating inclusive processes. Experimenting on not knowing I loosen up the certainty and distinctness of various concepts (inclusion, participation, case-study, research interests, professionalism, ethics, quality, educational organization, and much more) and fill them with other content. Among various things, this makes me create a terrain and a language of minor-case-studies, re-think the creation of research interests, discuss the importance of open-ended activities, and suggest an alteration when it comes to the encounter between various claims of knowledge. The contribution of this thesis is not, however, planned beforehand. I simply do not know what effects it will give off, and I sincerely invite you to travel with me and explore this further.

I guess, it was my encounter with the City of Gothenburg and its goal to create a more inclusive and equal city that aroused my desire to adopt this process-oriented and non-linear approach. By reducing differences in living conditions, the City of Gothenburg expected that improved cohesion, participation, and health would emerge among all citizens. To achieve this (among other things) all children (7 and 9 years old) were offered free swimming training within the school subject of physical education. This activity was called -Simlyftet- and included a ten-stage model that was expected to ensure the development of all students' swimming skills. As a doctoral student, I was also encouraged to confirm the reliability of the ten-stage model, and thereby make it possible for the City of Gothenburg to export the Simlyfts concept to other cities. I could not help but wonder if the ten-stage model was the best (and only) solution for increasing swimming skills of children in Gothenburg? My wonder emerged in relation to my experiences as a youth worker, my sociological training, and other research (see e.g., Bullough et al. 2015; Pilgaard et al. 2019). Other research that I discuss elsewhere and which indicates that general educational efforts do not contribute to increased swimming skills. The proposed solution in this research is to start when the children are younger. In tune with Lewis et al. (2006), Coates and Vickerman (2008), and Haegele and Zhu (2017), I wonder, though, if the trouble with general efforts and the

development of swimming skills (and in extension inclusion and equality) has so much to do with age? Perhaps it has much more to do with the design of these efforts? And how we rely on established knowledges, and the assumption that “one size fits all”?

As teachers, coaches, and researchers, I suggest we dismantle our (at least sometimes) all-too-common loyalty to everything we think we know about physical education, sports, and research and try to pay much more attention to the knowledges that might lie buried in students, athletes, and data. What I put forward here can perhaps be understood as a Derridean thinking with *aporia*? To elaborate, *aporia* is Greek for impassable or puzzlement. For Derrida *aporia* seems to imply the deconstruction of binary opposites and an attempt to recognize the merits and value of those we so carefully exclude each time we privilege one entity over another (teachers over students, coaches over athletes and researchers over data). *Aporia* is also displayed as an occasional incapacity to move when facing the *impasse* and a ‘testing out of the undecidable; only in this testing can a decision come about’ (Derrida 2005:154). I guess, Derrida suggests that the so often neglected counterparts (students, athletes, and data) in our key oppositions are worthy much more love and attention? And, even if Derrida’s philosophy to some extent seems to include conflictualities, I do not want us to use *aporia* to attack traditions. To attack established physical education, sports, and research. Rather, I want us to be cured of our love for crude simplicity and our tendency to imagine that related to every problem of inclusion is a good and neat solution to be found in our established knowledges regarding physical education, sports, and research. I want us to be more comfortable with a permanently oscillating nature of wisdom. This is also what the word ‘without’ in the title ‘sustainable inclusion without sustainability’ implies. To Open up activities for pure interruptions, and work on the edge of our (mine and yours) knowledges in sustainable inclusive events. However, for Derrida the word ‘without’ does not denote a lack. It is much more a critique of the grounds and boundaries of our considered decisions and sensible conclusions. Being uncertain and confused around inclusive activities in physical education, sports, and research is not a sign of weakness and stupidity, but a central mark of maturity. I guess Derrida (1993:17) would say that messiness and unsureness is simply evidence of the adulthood of our minds and that without us thinking (and working) with ‘without sustainability’ when it comes to sustainable inclusion (and experiencing paradoxes) there is no responsibility.

This, in turn, challenges an understanding of human being that most often informs today's physical education, sports, and research. Namely, the Cartesian idea of the knowing subject (see e.g., Bailey 2018:52-54; St Pierre 2016). I guess Descartes is most known for the phrase, 'I think therefore I am' (Descartes 1993:18). Within this 'system of thought', Descartes doubt everything but the subject (cf. Derrida 2008:146). It is the rational mind of man that can think and produce knowledge. As teachers, coaches, and researchers, we tend to put our knowing, doubting, and agentive capacities ahead of the world. Ahead of students, athletes, and data, who become silent and passive participants. In our daily work this happens every time we present and carry out a ready-made plan of education, training, and research. At the same time, I guess we design a description of students, athletes, and data (as well as human being more broadly) that does not exist before we introduce our sessions of physical education, sports, and research. In other words, the ontology of physical education, sports and research does not exist before we come up with it. Today, however, it seems very difficult to think outside the Cartesian subjectivity and ontology in our daily work within in the fields of physical education, sports, and research. Even our language includes a Cartesian take on the subject. For instance, we use phrases like 'the coach gives instructions to the participants'. In this sentence one might assume that the coach exists before he (or/and she) gives instructions to the participants. One might even assume that the instructions exist before the participants. Following Nietzsche (1887/1992:481) on the other hand, I guess we could suggest that the coach only exists in the very brief moment of instructing, in the doing. The coach (the subject) is not given, and the instructions never refers back to the coach (a subject). The coach is something we have made-up. A fiction that we have habitually begun to believe in. A sort of illusion of sports that can hardly be improved upon. I elaborate on this because if we are serious about reaching sustainable inclusion, we must understand that the relations of teachers and students, coaches and athletes, and researchers and data may not be the same anymore. Their differences may no longer imply contrapositions. Rather, they are put into a positive perspective and in which various bodies (human and non-human) encounter each other and give off new forms of physical education, sports, and research.

With sustainable inclusion without sustainability, I suggest an approach to inclusion where practices of physical education, sports, and research are in positive relation to their negatives. Sports, for instance, has a relation with non-sports that echoes its effects. Even physical education has a relation with non-physical

education, and research has a relation with non-research. And, this is not to say that sports must establish the visible shape and configuration of those of us who are not athletes, that it must open our eyes and teach us to exercise. Nor do I say that physical education must teach us to understand the importance of becoming active, or that research must teach us to explore and ultimately know things. Such methodologies (and pedagogies) are only possible if the practices of physical education, sports and research are in essential relationships with the No:es that concern them. Instead, I suggest a style of thought that includes physical education, sports, and research in a non-positivist manner, and which offers us opportunities to view physical education, sports, and research as occasional and performative practices. Sustainable inclusion in physical education, sports, and research is thus pre-sustainable insofar that we consider it independently of the established practices that come to occupy it, and non-sustainability is found where the practices encounter singularities and hence the crowded anarchy of various No:es (chaos). And just as physical education needs non-physical education to creatively increase its potentialities, sustainable inclusion seems to need non-sustainability, perhaps not so much as beginnings or ends, but in every moment of its evolvment and, hence becoming.

This thesis, then, includes a process-ontology and suggests that physical education, sports, and research consists of affective encounters between various elements and hence processes of becoming rather than various objects that exist independently of each other. I put forward that the task of physical education, sports, and research is to create the future without falling into the trap of doing this in isolation. As I see it, we cannot escape collective creations of the future. We cannot evade those for whom our activities are a matter of concern. Like the mathematician and philosopher Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947), I relate the future to uncertainty and change much more than progress and advancement of various knowledges. I suggest that we cannot know in advance what our future will be like, or how it will be affected. For Whitehead (1929/2014:73), processes are real while motions and changes are not. Changes emerge as differences between actual occasions within specific events. Thus, actual materialities are what they are and (technically) they never move. There are simply not so much fluxes or flows in Whitehead's transitions, and the notion of change is made rather static. At the same time, Whitehead (1929/2014:35) implies something very important. Namely, that motion presupposes rest. This is quite the opposite of Henri Bergson's (1859-1941) idea that everything is in motion and that rest presupposes

motion. While Whitehead (2014:35) states that there is 'no continuity of becoming, but only a becoming of continuity', I guess Bergson would say that there is no becoming of continuity, but only a continuity of becoming. Influenced by both these approaches (and others), the philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) developed an inspiring ontology of becoming in which becoming means motion, ceaseless flow, and activity as much as it means immobility, stasis, and inactivity. And, this is not a simplistic and incompatible acknowledgement of Whitehead and Bergson's approaches to becoming, but rather an action of interpreting these ontologies otherwise, and as process where becoming is both motion and rest. For Deleuze (1988:123), this is also the plane of immanence as well discussed by Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677), and which cannot be thought since it is (in itself) the infinite movement of thought. Both Spinoza and Deleuze suggest that matter and thought occur simultaneously and are not reducible to each other. Although both Spinoza and Deleuze have sometimes been criticized for giving primacy to thought (see e.g., Nail 2019:47), I guess Deleuze's philosophy of immanence is a radical attempt to ontologically equate matter and thought.

Among other things, this implies an extension of post-structuralist engagements with the discursive formation of meaning and invites matter as an intra-active becoming substance. When it comes to sport science, this is not a particularly new approach. In tune with authors like Rich (2010), Larsson and Quennerstedt (2012), Fox (2013), Pavlidis and Olive (2014), Markula (2014), Larsson (2014), Thorpe (2014), Fullagar (2017), Monforte (2018), Landi (2019), and Safron and Landi (2022), I replace the idea of studying things (what they are) with an interest in how various phenomena materialize. This implies that I understand the material world of physical education, sports, and research as relations. Relations that are always put in motion by the bodies (human and non-human) involved in various situations. It also implies an interest in how bodies are produced in (and produce) their situations. An important point here is that this material approach challenges the common idea of interpreting physical education, sports, and research as socially constructed and how these phenomena become meaningful when they are represented by language. Within Deleuze's philosophy of immanence there are no such things as independent elements that represent. Nor are there elements to represent. For Deleuze, this distinction creates a dominant image of thought that I suggest enable the steady growth of already known activities when it comes to inclusion in today's physical education, sports, and research, and a way of thinking that, supported by established facts, excludes diversity and multiplicity.

Thinking with Deleuze and the rejection of overarching images of thought makes it possible to account for material processes more inclusively, and thus creates a more complex and theoretically situated discussion about sustainable inclusion practices and processes than is usually addressed in physical education sports, and research. I will discuss the complexity, multiplicity, and uncertainty embedded in inclusive processes, how bodies are arranged and re-arranged in various forms, how they entangle and re-entangle with other bodies, and how they are at least occasionally released and become other. At the same time as these arrangements and entanglements blur the boundaries between those who include and those who are included, they also make the boundaries between working inclusively, theorizing, thinking, and reflecting less distinct. Among other things, this implies that the analyses within this thesis are not continuously guided by Deleuzian concepts, the agenda, and dominant knowledges following with them. It is not so much that I first try to explain various concepts and their relationships and then apply them to the data. Rather than relying on these predefinitions, I find much more potential in testing temporally stabilized thoughts in relation to various Deleuzian concepts and reasoning. Sometimes these concepts and reasoning return in relation to other temporally stabilized thoughts elsewhere in this thesis, and sometimes they do not. The purpose of this thesis, then, is not to propose that all inclusive processes should be messy procedures of affective bodies coming together in various situations, nor to suggest that the sections in this thesis reject and completely re-work inclusive practices and processes that have long been at the center of how participations in physical education, sports, and research are offered. My suggestion is much more modest, and that thinking with the Deleuzian philosophy of immanence may help to shed light on other ways of understanding, relating to, and creating inclusive processes, catch a glimpse of constraining and releasing processes that might be happening differently, and perhaps increase our sensitivity of inclusion.

Immanence means ‘the inherent’ and I have become interested in the ‘life’ that emerges between different elements, knowledges, categories, actors and relationships in physical education, sports, and research. To elaborate a bit, this implies that I am less comfortable with the language of transcendence sometimes indicated by Derrida and his philosophy of aporia. Thinking with Deleuze (1994:46), I try to avoid turning immanence into something that is immanent to a thinking subject (the phenomenological tradition) and thus recreate a

transcendence in some occurring gap between the plan of immanence and those who perceive it. To state my approach more clearly, there seems to be a distinction between how Derrida and Deleuze conceptualize difference. While Derrida understands difference as a negative fissure or rupture including conflictuality and a 'not', difference for Deleuze is relationality and pure affirmation (Cisney 2012:175-176). For me, it is to establish 'the logic of the AND' (Deleuze & Guattari 1988:25) rather than the logic of one or the other and become a positive difference to every element in the thesis including data, theory, methodology and perhaps you. I guess it is important to mention that the value of overcoming dualistic splits is also noted by philosophers such as John Dewey (1995:131) who described these situations as 'peculiar conditions of differential-or additive-change'. For Dewey, additive change implies various conditions of possibility which by necessity emerge in between the old and the new. Rather than reducing Deleuze and Dewey's philosophies to a single common denominator, however, I suggest that they comprise some similar premises in which experiential and experimental approaches are focal for learning. Although Dewey's philosophy still provides a large scope for further exploration of physical education, sports, and research, thinking with Deleuze has been done to a considerably lesser extent. It is one way of moving that nullifies beginnings and endings. It is also to write myself into a tradition of inquiry (see e.g., Reinertsen 2007: 20-22). Together and separately, we proceed from the middle rather than starting and finishing. Coming and going as inter-beings and alliances. And a rhizome (which I elaborate on elsewhere) which is by no means a consensus agreement or an average result. We do not move from one thing to the other, and we certainly do not go back again. Rather, we move in perpendicular directions. Intersecting and transversal movements that pick up speed in the middle, undermine our substances, and sweep us away in various directions.

This is also the structure that constitutes the un-structure of this thesis. This thesis includes ten separate but related sections within which I (and perhaps you) among other things think with a ten-second swimming event where Amira learns how to float in the water. I did not check the time very carefully, but the swimming event was part of the Simlyfts-project and hence of the school subject of physical education in Gothenburg, Sweden. Perhaps it is also important to mention that I work in two different ways when it comes to ethics. On one hand, I follow official requirements for information, consent, confidentiality, and usage, and on the other hand I try to stay open to what is to come without knowing what that might be.

While the former is a transcendent approach to research and something I must do according to ethical guidelines, the latter is an immanent approach implying a positive power perspective and where every element in a relation has power to affect (and be affected). An immanent approach that strongly suggests waiting, and contributes to equalizing power relations between Amira, me, and other materialities within the swimming event.

In this ethical context, I also discuss myself. For me, it is a way to make explicit my position (of power) and to open up the ethical discussion even further. It is a way to invite Amira and other materialities in the swimming event as forces in the situation, and in all seriousness open up to their desire and agency. Amira-and-I simply becomes my power position. Elsewhere, I call this an auto-ethnographic-like approach. Simultaneously, we become collective subjects implying that our bodies can be defined only by the sum of elements belonging to them under given relations of movement and rest as well as the sum of affects we are capable of in the situation. Perhaps Deleuze (1988:260), following Spinoza would suggest that we are longitudes and latitudes and thus sets of speed and slowness between unformed elements in physical education, sports, and research?

I guess Amira and I (and other materialities) have the individuality of each other. This is also how I use 'I' and 'we' interchangeably (and often invite you) throughout the thesis. At the same time as we become subjects for each other, something also happens to us, physically and mentally. As I discuss elsewhere, Amira relaxes in the water and my research interest changes. In tandem, I (and we) empty the content of various concepts (participation, inclusion, case-study, research interests, professionalism, ethics, quality, educational organization, and much more) and fill them up again. As I see it, these movements are qualities as much as they are parts of the ethical relation we are creating. Elsewhere, I suggest we are 'qualiting' and where qualiting become an affective-virtual-concept related to situations where Amira and I, among other things, create ethics together. As much as it is an ethical approach, it is also potential additions to the already known regarding how to reach 'education for all' and much more. While we are often preoccupied by cognitive and social processes, these re-conceptualizations seem to evolve much more materially. For me, they are affective extensions that (among other things) open up for complexity when it comes to sustainable inclusion. Sustainable inclusion that only works without sustainability and implies iterations that never come back on the same track. Neither do the sections in this thesis.

Each section deals with one area of inclusion puzzling that I find important for teachers, coaches, and researchers interested in inclusive work to address. And, even if inclusive work extends within and between these fields, I have no intention of covering all the territories. Instead, published articles are placed here and there, and interspersed with small talk and what Deleuze would perhaps call minor sections. Minor because they emerge in between. Perhaps, even the articles are minor sections? Once, it was suggested by one of my supervisors that, considering who physically wrote the articles, maybe I should be the sole author of some of them. But for me there are no sole authors. Authors are always several. We are not one, two, or three authors all by ourselves at the same time, but one, two and three authors among others. With others. It really does not matter who presses the keys, there is always a swarming crowd in it. In becoming author, it is the positions of the masses that are important as well as the positions of the subjects in relation to the inquiry-multiplicities. How we join or do not join the masses, how far away we stay, how we do or do not hold to the multiplicities.

And, this is a challenging approach. For example, as a PhD -student, I am expected to deliver a thesis which somehow indicates independence and has my name on the front no matter what my philosophical approach implies. I can, of course, refuse to do this and perhaps leave the graduation without my doctorate. And, it is possible that I am too weak if I give in to the restrictions and follow the rules? Yet, I do not think that is my decision to make, not least on my own, and I sincerely invite you to be a co-writer and take part in the considerations. To facilitate participation, I leave empty spaces in the thesis. Here and elsewhere you (and I) can write down emerging thoughts, evolve with the text, expand on the text, and much more. I also leave an empty space on the front where you can put your and others' names. For me, this is a way to encourage movement, openings, and productions of the new. And, to avoid drowning in some center of the thesis. It is an attempt to stay on the periphery and work on the edge of the multiplicity. To be a fully part of the crowd and at the same time completely outside it. In tandem with you. Me and you, walking each other into the future. Are you ready for that? To continuously be inspired of each other, multiplied and perhaps aided?

I invite you to work on the edge of our knowledges. It may not be an easy way to move along, nor an easy position to stay in or maintain. But for me it is nonetheless important. There is always a risk that this thesis, attributed to the subject of sustainable inclusion, also will seize the subject of inclusion. Not least because it is written down. And articulated. Maybe it gives off lines of segmentarity, territories, and strata, and excludes other knowledges. And maybe we will end up with thoughts of inclusion that we have already been thinking and lose novel learning. For me, this is a terrifying scenario and inviting you to be a co-writer is one way to counteract a stable state of viscosity where established knowledges of inclusion constitute a thick, sticky and semifluid paste due to internal friction in the thesis. It is a way to leave room for the exteriority of its relations, and open up the thesis for lines of flight, movements, deterritorializations, and destratifications. Together with all these lines and speeds (viscosity and inertness as well as disruptions and accelerations) the thesis constitutes an assemblage and a multiplicity. And, we do not know yet what will be produced in that assemblage and what it will entail to be a multiplicity. While one side of the thesis-assemblage will always signify determination attributable to the thesis and the subject of inclusion, the other side

will continually dismantle the thesis and the subject of inclusion, causing pure intensities to swirl. And to facilitate the latter, I would like to emphasize that the sections in the thesis do not need to be read in any particular order. Perhaps, there will also be inspiring to do some parallel readings of the sections and of other materials.

Encouraging parallel readings is a way to invite irruptions and provocative interferences that may extend the discussed topic of sustainable inclusion. It is not so interesting what this thesis means or what it looks like, and I do not want you to look for things to understand in it. Rather, I want you to ask what it interacts or perhaps intra-acts (Barad 2007) with. And, in what relations it does and does not pass on intensities from one element to another, in which other multiplicities it is inserted, how words and phrases are metaphorically applied to it, and how it metaphorically applies words and phrases to objects and actions. The thesis exits only through the outside and on the outside. All we have is a multiplicity that encounters other multiplicities. Writing this thesis then has nothing to do with expressing ideas by signs, as distinct from the physical form in which it is expressed. Writing has to do with exploring and mapping milieus (even those which are yet to come). And, co-writing with you may create openness, novel thinking, alternative expressions, and perhaps new and interesting learning about sustainable inclusion and much more?

In relation to most theses, I guess this thesis may seem altogether different. It is not only produced by me, and it does not trace and reproduce the logic of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research. Rather, it forms a map in a rhizome. A map that may be about processes of inclusion, or something completely else. What distinguishes this thesis-rhizome from a conventional thesis is that it is entirely oriented toward experimentations in contact with the real. Important to note, though, is that a thesis-rhizome and a conventional thesis are not two opposing models. There are rhizomatic offshoots in a conventional thesis just as there are knots of linear logic in a thesis-rhizome. And, while the former operates as a transcendent model and occasionally escapes confinement and control, the latter operates in processes of immanence and from time to time engenders its own hierarchies. It is not a matter of writing this or that thesis or sticking to a particular thought. It is a matter of thesis model that is constantly arising or falling apart, and of a thesis process that is constantly extending itself, cracking into pieces and starting up again.

And no, it is not my intention to create a new or different dualism between a conventional thesis and a thesis-rhizome. I invoke this dualism of thesis models only to reach a process that challenges all thesis models and arrives at the rearranging formula of pluralism. Inclusive processes that take place in this thesis do not arise from the bottom up, nor do they occur from the top down. It is not that the participants in the swimming event in Gothenburg have dictated the terms of this inquiry, and there is no overarching theoretical or methodological pattern that has forced me to prioritize some data over others. The thesis is not defined by a set of binary relations between points and positions. The thesis-rhizome is made only of segmenting and quantifying lines. And, these lines should not be mixed up with lineages where various processes of creation have clear origins. The thesis-rhizome is not the object of reproduction. Rather, it is an anti-line of descent and a non-genealogy that can hardly be traced from a specific starting point. With no predefined paths, the thesis-rhizome functions by variation and positive differences where various elements encounter and give off stabilizations and destabilizations. And, it relates to a non-centered map that is constantly changing. A map that has multiple entryways and exits, and that can be defined merely by the flow of states. What is at issue in the thesis-rhizome are relations between me, you and other materialities. Relations that are totally different from hierarchical forms of connections, and where everything is a matter of becoming simultaneously included and inclusive.

The first section (‘A Substitute for a Preface’) works as a non-introduction. Since the thesis has no clear beginning and the sections are not designed to flow toward a culmination point and a definite end, it is a bit problematic to write a conventional preface, simply because it implies a specific starting point. Rather, I proceed from the middle and through the middle as an intensity among other intensities and compose the thesis of various sections in which even the texts within these sections operate in the middle of readings, writings, theories, methods, ideas, physical education, sports, academia, publications, and research notes. I have been writing here and there for a while, and minor sections have evolved in relation to the published articles. Sometimes everywhere and occasionally nowhere. So, what I am trying to say is that this first section will not provide a massive and substantial theoretical overview regarding various inclusive processes and the extensions I discuss later. I use the space conventionally kept for a preface to make available theoretical traces and suggestions of inclusive activity styles, and how we may encounter participants in ways that potentially

open up for novel thinking and hitherto unknown activities in physical education, sports, and research.

In the second section (‘Participants matter and should not be taken for granted’) the intention is to inspire teachers, coaches and researchers to reconsider how we define and assign roles to participants in various activities. I put forward a consideration that we need to re-think how we position ourselves in relation to participants and start to work outside the realm of our own knowledges and convictions. I want us to release the knowledges of participants, and invite them to become co-teachers, co-coaches, and co-researchers at the same time as we become co-students, co-athletes, and co-data. Sometimes, I wonder how it comes about that our training of teachers, coaches and researchers so often seems to lead to one-directional and arrogant forms of communication? How do these quite naive exchanges of information affect inclusion? And, how do they limit education, sports, and research?

‘Thinking with new materialism in qualitative case studies’ is the title of the third section. It focuses on how elements in a swimming event come together and produce various research-cases. More specifically, I draw attention to what happens to a case study when we take an ontological step towards immanence and invite every entity in the inquiry to affect the creation of cases. I suggest that immanent cases work as life-giving forces, and my intention is to move our thoughts away from cases as predefined study objects. An immanent approach to case studies offers new possibilities to discover and explore cases as well as the affects that produce research desire and research interests. Simultaneously, this section encourages us to think with the philosophy of immanence in order to open up research processes for more knowledges, research interests, and desire to explore various cases.

The fourth section of this thesis, ‘Becoming interested – the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports’ challenges research political assumptions of research interests as context-specific phenomena predefined by researchers and others in case study research on sports. I enroll myself into a conversation about the importance of thinking with theory in qualitative research, and I reorient research interests and case productions beyond methods and methodologies. More specifically, I provide an analysis that implies that research interests are areas of material affects that refuse to be reduced to expressions of the single body of a researcher or collaborations with extra-academics during the

planning phase of a case study. Rather, my immanent approach shows that data and other material elements seem pretty much alive and claim to be a party to the production of research interests. Following this line of thought, research interests evolve as causes of interactions between various bodies, and the process of researchers becoming interested is placed in the middle between these bodies. Yet, one interest does not become the other; a research interest evolves between bodies. Hence, the evolvement of research interest is an issue of assembled relations in a 'case' that produces various desire to explore.

Predetermined processes of involvement and participation do not guarantee inclusion. Rather, inclusion calls for responsible decision making in uncertain situations. In the fifth section, titled, 'Responsibilities beyond professional obligations and morals in physical education, sports, and research', I initiate ethical discussions to remind teachers, coaches, trainers, researchers, myself and perhaps you about our responsibilities outside the professional acts to which we are morally or legally bound. I question general and easily applicable working methods within all these milieus, and I problematize teachers, coaches, and researchers as creators and users of fast and stable educational and methodological activities. The intention is to view another professionalism by directing our attention to multiple viewpoints, uncertainties, movements, cultural values, troublesome situations, and unthinkable educational and methodological milieus.

Ethical approaches to physical education, sports, and research come in different forms. In addition to ethical actions that are politically influenced, many ethical actions relate to educational settings, teaching and learning. Personally, I find it very difficult and challenging to teach about ethical activities, especially, if we want to take greater responsibility than just following formal ethical guidelines. And I guess, creating ethical milieus in physical education, sports, and research requires something out of the ordinary. This is also why I have dedicated the sixth section in this thesis to ethics in extended professionalism, and named it 'Teaching the unteachable and staying with the processes'. In this section, I discuss ethical activities as encounters between different knowledges. From a professional perspective (no matter if we consider ourselves as teachers, coaches, or researchers) this is to open up for the small worlds politics and invite every entity in the events to become knowledgeable. I suggest that the occurrence of teaching, learning, professionalisms, and knowledges forms complex and messy relations between expectations in daily practices, moralities, ethics, teaching, learning and

much more. Each time I engage in educational activities and encounter students, these relations seem to be enacted differently.

I cannot continuously tell you what inclusive physical education, sports, and research means and will be good for, because I simply do not know yet. My only knowledge is that processes of inclusion need humble encounters with others. And, I am aware that this may expose me to some scornful laughs and judgements in the academic (pseudo-)market ruled by competition? In this section (which is also the afterword of this thesis named 'A stand-in for a conclusion: Perhaps we need failure to stay open for the becoming of continuously inclusive futures'), I propose that I am not equipped to formulate the future. I am not even close to anticipating it. And, this is not because I lack competence. Rather, my competence seems to be under attack by oppressive demands of linearity, specified in various strategic plans and evaluations. Simultaneously, I often feel forced to specialize myself in already recognized issues. Issues that are publishable in high-ranking journals, and for the most part, defined as important by nobody outside the academic field. During my time as a PhD-student I would say that I have become more and more separated from people outside academia, and thus from the capacity of encounters with others. And, that my capability to feel, think, and imagine is at stake. There is simply not much room for creative cooperations, failures, and novelties. I refer to creative cooperations as ceaseless and unfinished encounters that pose occurring and endless challenges to our practices (no matter if it is physical education, sports, or research) due to their evolving and unexpected characters. When we approach our practices without ready-made ideas of what will happen, from the angle of creative cooperations, we engage in changes, reinventions, and revisions. And, we certainly commit to view and visualize our practices in different ways. This also implies that we rarely fulfill predetermined goals. I put forward that we are much more interested in non-fulfillments. And perhaps 'non-fulfillmenting' because inclusive practices need to be in motion, constantly looked into and questioned. As inclusive teachers, coaches, and researchers, I suggest that we should not be satisfied with today's practices. To make them suitable for new students, athletes, and projects, we should rather open them up for change in character and composition. It is like any good craft. Besides that, we know how to use our tools, this is hardly done by adapting the context to the tools. Rather, a good craft is performed by assessing which tools are suitable in the context. And, we do not only think it through, we also think it forward. And, speculate. Furthermore, I use creative cooperations and non-fulfillments as tools

to think with when asking questions about various processes of inclusion in our practices, stabilizations and destabilizations, and ultimately to think about sustainable inclusion without sustainability.

The eighth section, 'Is it possible to think physical education forward and dismantle ourselves – in a quantum space?' I explore how a student and a swimming instructor dismantle themselves to get hold on themselves through the encounter with each other, and hence become capable of learning again. I suggest that we need to support and maintain teaching as an 'open system' and relate training activities to situational circumstances rather than predetermined results. In open teaching systems training activities do not turn up ready-made. They do not pre-exist but have to be invented by those who participate in the event. The job of teaching is to contribute to the production of new training activities with their own necessities, requirements and indispensability of/in the moment. And, hence start to learn again. Dismantling ourselves is not only about taking a step back, putting our roles aside, and opening up for others to affect local training activities within our so-often rigid spaces of physical education. It is also about allowing changes in the constant curricula, and thus endlessly renewing the space it striates.

In the ninth section, which I call 'Substances are not permanent and qualities are not consistent' I invite you to a conversation in which we have a chance to reimagine quality within physical education, sports, and research. In the moment when Amira learns to float there was no pre-given objects and subjects. It simply happened in a teaching-learning-collectivity, which is something other than the linear teaching proposed by the ten-stage-model produced (and used) by the City of Gothenburg. Within this situation bodies have no predetermined characteristics, there are no specific categories of people like teachers, students, coaches, athletes, researchers and data. Rather, we are what we become aware of in a rhizomic-encounter. Thinking with this encounter, I suggest that qualities cannot be specified in advance. They cannot be determined on beforehand and cannot be linked to various conceptualizations of good practices. Thinking with rhizomic-encounter is to move away from the binary relation between the assessor and the assessed. I cannot help but wonder why we so rarely talk about this relationship in physical education, sports, and research? I wonder why we do not talk about this relationship as an assumption and not the truth? Perhaps qualities

are not even specific things but what we do when we open up our activities for affects in encounters with others. Perhaps we are qualiting?

I suggest we need to acknowledge the existence of more knowledges than our own. In the tenth section, titled 'Re-thinking educational organization towards friction-zones between divergent knowledges' I provide an alternative to the linear and hierarchical logic often associated with today's educational organizations. Inspired by the encounter with Amira and the swimming instructor, I suggest that it is possible to understand educational realities as nomadic systems consisting of actual-virtual flows. While the former stabilizes positions, interests, categorizations and top-down controlled knowledges, the latter destabilizes them by enabling the bodies involved to resist those kinds of restricting forces. More specifically, I suggest that educational organizations (and others) may have two odd. What I think is interesting here is what happens between the two odd? What internal conditions for knowledge production are established between these odd? What happens in the friction-zone between actual and virtual flows of knowledge production? What happens to various knowledges, bodies, definitions and conceptualizations? Following this line of thought, I put forward that perhaps, actual-virtual flows have much greater significance for sustainable inclusion in educational organizations than those of right and wrong related to formal statements and established models related to various educational settings.

References:

- Agergaard, S. (2018). *Rethinking sports and integration: Developing a transnational perspective on migrants and descendants in sports*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bailey, R. P. (2017). "Sport, Physical Activity and Educational Achievement—Towards an Explanatory Model". *Sport in Society* 20 (7): 768–788.
- Bailey, R.P. (2018). Sport, Physical education and educational worth. *Educational Review* 70 (1), 51-6.
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Barker, D. (2019). In defense of white privilege: Physical education teachers' understandings of their work in culturally diverse schools. *Sport, Education and Society*, 24 (2): 134–146.
- Bullough, S., Davies, L. E., & Barrett, D. (2015). The impact of a community free swimming program for young people (under 19) in England. *Elsevier, Sport management review* 18:32–44.
- Cisney, W.V. (2012). *Toward a philosophy of difference: From Derrida to Deleuze*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: “What counts as positive development?” *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35(3), 306–324.
- Coates, J., & Vickerman, P. (2008). Let the children have their say: Children with special educational needs and their experiences of physical education – a review. *Support for Learning*, 23(4), 168–175.
- Coates, J., & Vickerman, P. (2010). Empowering Children with Special Educational Needs to Speak up: Experiences of Inclusive Physical Education. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 32 (18): 1517–1526.
- Dahlstedt, M., and D. Ekholm (eds.). 2021. *Idrottens Kraft? Ungas Livsvillkor Och Ojämlighetens Problem i en Segregerad Stad [The Power of Sport? The Living Conditions of Young People and the Problem of Inequality in the Segregated City]*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze, G & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* London: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.
- Derrida, J. (1993). *Aporias* (T. Dutoit, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2005). *Paper machine*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2008). *The animal that therefore I am*. (D. Wills, Ed.; M.-L. Mallet, Trans.). New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Descartes, R. (1993). *Discourse on method and Meditations on first philosophy* (4th ed., D. A. Cress, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett. (Discourse on method first published 1637 and Meditations on first philosophy first published 1641)

- Dewey, J (1995). Does Reality Possess Practical Character? In Russell B. Goodman *Pragmatism A contemporary reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Ekholm, D., & Dahlstedt, M. (2022). Conflicting rationalities of participation: constructing and resisting 'Midnight football' as an instrument of social policy. *Sport in Society* 25 (6), 1142-1159.
- Ekholm, D., & Dahlstedt, M. (2017). Football for inclusion: Examining the pedagogic rationalities and the technologies of solidarity of a sportsbased intervention in Sweden. *Social Inclusion*, 5(2), 232–240.
- Evans, J. (2014). Equity and inclusion in physical education PLC, *European Physical Education Review* 20 (3), 319-334.
- Fitzgerald, H. (2006). Disability and physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The handbook of physical education*, 752–766. London: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, H. (2018). Disability and Barriers to Inclusion. In: Brittain I., Beacom A. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Paralympic Studies*, 55–70. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flintoff, A., & Fitzgerald, H. (2012). "Theorizing Difference and (In) Equality in Physical Education, Youth Sport and Health." In *Equity and Difference in Physical Education, Youth Sport and Health: A Narrative Approach*, edited by F. Dowling, H. Fitzgerald, and A. Flintoff, 11–36. London: Routledge.
- Fox, N. (2013). Creativity and health: An anti-humanist reflection. *Health*, 17(5), 495-511.
- Fullagar, S. (2017). Post-qualitative inquiry and the new materialist turn: Implications for sport, health and physical culture research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 9(2), 247–257.
- Gibbons, M. (2020). Mode 1, Mode 2 and innovation. *Encyclopedia of Creativity, Invention, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 1661-1668.
- Goodwin, D. (2009). The Voices of Students with Disabilities: Are They Informing Inclusive Physical Education Practice. In *Disability and Youth Sport*, edited by H. Fitzgerald, 53–75. London: Routledge.
- Green, M. (2007). Governing under advanced liberalism: Sport policy and the social investment state. *Policy Sciences*, 40(1): 55–71.
- Griminger, E. 2014. "Getting Into Teams in Physical Education and Exclusion Processes Among Students." *Pedagogies: An International Journal* 9 (2), 155–171.
- Haegele, J. A. (2019). Inclusion illusion: Questioning the inclusiveness of integrated physical education. *Quest*, 71(4), 387-397.

- Haegele, J. A., & Sutherland, S. (2015). Perspectives of students with disabilities toward physical education: A qualitative inquiry review. *Quest*, 67(3), 255-273.
- Haegele, J. A., & Zhu, X. (2017). Experiences of individuals with visual impairments in integrated physical education: A retrospective study. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 88(4), 425-435.
- Haug, P. (2017). Understanding inclusive education: Ideals and reality. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 19(3), 206-217.
- Kiuppis, F. 2015. "Friendly but Demanding"? On Different Meanings of Inclusive Education as an Imagined Concept in National Reform Planning." *Opuscula Sociologica* 1, 5-21.
- Kiuppis, F. (2018). Inclusion in sport: disability and participation, *Sport in Society*, 21(1), 4-2.
- Lagergren, L., & Fundberg, J. (2009). Integration i förening – Kritiska reflektioner kring ett projekt Integration in association - Critical reflections on a project. *Educare*, 1, 43-59.
- Landi, D. (2019). Queer men, affect and physical education. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(2), 168-187.
- Larsson, H. (2014). Materialising bodies: There is nothing more material than a socially constructed body. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(5), 637-651.
- Larsson, H., & Quennerstedt, M. (2012). Understanding movement: A sociocultural approach to exploring moving humans. *Quest*, 64(4), 283-298.
- Lavay, B., & DaPaepe, J. (1987). The harbinger helper: Why mainstreaming in physical education doesn't always work. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 58(7), 98-103.
- Lewis, A., Parson, S., & Robertson, C. (2006) *My School, My Family, My Life: telling it like it is: a study detailing the experiences of disabled children, young people and their families in Great Britain in 2006: executive summary*. Disability Rights Commission: London.
- Luciano, D., & Chen, M. Y. (2015). Has the queer ever been human? GLQ: *A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 21(2-3), 183-207.
- Markula, P. (2014). The moving body and social change. *Cultural Studies? Critical Methodologies*, 14(5), 483-495.
- Misener, L. 2014. "Managing Disability Sport: From Athletes with Disabilities to Inclusive Organisational Perspectives." *Sport Management Review* 17, 1-7.
- Monforte, J. (2018). What is new in new materialism for a newcomer? *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 10(3), 378-390.

- Munk, M., & S. Agergaard. (2015). "The Processes of Inclusion and Exclusion in Physical Education: A Social-relational Perspective." *Social Inclusion*, 3 (3), 67–81.
- Nail, T. (2019). *Being and Motion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1887/1992). *On the genealogy of morals*. In Basic writings of Nietzsche (W. Kaufmann, Ed. & Trans., pp. 437-599). New York, NY: Modern Library.
- Pavlidis, A., & Olive, R. (2014). On the track/in the bleachers: Authenticity and feminist ethnographic research in sport and physical cultural studies. *Sport in Society*, 17(2), 218–232.
- Penney, D., Jeanes, E., O'Connor, J., & Alfrey, L. (2018.) Re-theorising inclusion and reframing inclusive practice in physical education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(10), 1062-1077.
- Pilgaard, F., Östergren, P-O., Olin, A-L., Kling, S., Albin, M., & Björk, J. (2019). Socioeconomic differences in swimming ability among children in Malmö, southern Sweden: Initial results from a community-level intervention. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*.
- Reinertsen, A. (2007). *SPUNK – A LOVE STORY Teacher community not*. Trondheim: Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet Fakultet for samfunnsvitenskap og teknologiledelse Pedagogisk institutt.
- Reinertsen, A. (2021). The Art of Not Knowing: The Position of Non-Knowledge as Activisms. *International review of qualitative research*, 14 (3), 476-482.
- Rekaa, H., Hanisch, H., & Ytterhus, B. (2019). Inclusion in physical education: Teacher attitudes and student experiences. A systematic review. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66(1), 36-55.
- Rich, E. (2010). Obesity assemblages and surveillance in schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23 (7), 803-821.
- Safron, C., & Landi, D (2022). Beyond the BEEPs: affect, FitnessGram®, and diverse youth. *Sport, Education and Society*, 27(9), 1020-1034.
- St Pierre, E. (2016). CHAPTER ONE: Curriculum for New Material, New Empirical Inquiry. *Counterpoints* (New York, N.Y.), 501,1-12.
- Stengers, I. (2018). *Another Science is Possible - A Manifesto for Slow Science*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Singh, J. (2018) *Unthinking Mastery: Dehumanism and decolonial entanglements*. Durham NC, Duke University Press.

- Thorpe, H. (2014). Moving bodies beyond the social/biological divide: Toward theoretical and transdisciplinary adventures. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(5), 666–686.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2008. *Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future. General Presentation of the 48th Session of the ICE*. Paris: UNESCO. Available online: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48th_ICE/General_Presentation-48CIE-English.pdf. (Accessed on 28 January 2023).
- United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989. Available online: <https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention/convention-text> (Accessed on 28 January 2023).
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929/2014). *Process and Reality* (Corrected Edition, D.R Griffin and D. W Sherburne Trans.). New York, NY: THE FREE PRESS.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Available online: <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf> (Accessed on 12 January 2023).

A substitute for a preface

The conception of sustainable inclusion without sustainability illustrates inclusive processes without strict lines that mark the limits of the spaces. These processes lack normative structures. They have no clear beginnings, and they may occur at any time. And, by so doing, they may give us a sense of uncertainty and loss of control. We do not know in advance where we are going. Sometimes, they can even be confusing and exhausting and perhaps make us long for some clarities? Sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies inclusive processes that most likely generate activities that challenge and exert force on today's physical education, sports, and research.

In *A Thousand Plateaus* Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1988) put forward engaging ideas suggesting that we need to be vigilant regarding destructive systems of capitalist modeling. While these systems seem to put us in positions where we are not under control, or under power of another, and are able to act and do as we wish, they also put us in a 'machinic enslavement' (Deleuze & Guattari 1988:457). In physical education (see e.g., Evans & Davies 2014, Fitzpatrick & Powell 2019:2, Lundvall & Gerdin 2021:149), sports (see eg. Thorpe & Rinehart 2013:134, Goodley 2017:177) and research (Lather & St. Pierre 2013), machinic enslavement seems to appear in the form of a profit-based neoliberal logic. Within this logic, I have witnessed the growth of instrumental practices in which time most often equals money. As teachers, coaches, and researchers, we are expected to engage in activities that bring clear and fast benefits. Spending time on doing things should be economically worth it and during the last decades, I guess most of us have experienced pretty sharp intensifications in our work situations. Simultaneously, we may also have noted the emergence of new time-saving technologies that facilitate communication and accessibility. In tandem, we have become increasingly business-like by bringing in ideas and practices from the private sector. Perhaps we are all familiar with notions as transparency, ability, flexibility, and quality? And, we all seem to compete for resources (money and others) through

various forms of measurements and evaluations. Doing the right thing is money, and money is time. Time is money, and money is doing the right thing. Within these tenets we all become either winners or losers, right or wrong, good or bad, knowledgeable or ignorant, experts or laypeople.

For me, these (and other) binary divisions are one of the main crises arising with neoliberalism that urgently call for reworkings of our inclusive processes. Despite increased communication opportunities, we do not, for instance, seem very successful at inviting participants' competences and capacities into our current practices (see e.g., Evans 2014:555; Giroux 2015, Chomsky 2016). We just do not have time for the delay these processes of inclusion might cause. Today's inclusive practices are much more about getting from one point to another in the shortest possible time, and participants are often uncritically spoon-fed with easily digestible information to further encourage the consumption of what Hein (2017:657) calls dogmatic images of thought, and hence pre-given knowledges ratified by common sense. And, we do not want them to make any noise and spit them out on the floor. We cannot afford anything other than passive consumers, and hence participants who obediently move along the lines we have so carefully drawn in advance. It is simply not profitable.

With the notion of sustainable inclusion without sustainability, I suggest that activities of inclusion cannot be affected and transformed by current neoliberalist, instrumental, and corporate-like climate. And, since we cannot escape our own contemporaries, we need to take action and reshape it. We need to move beyond linear processes of pre-defined starting points, pure absorption, and predetermined ends, and promote cluttered clashes and messy encounters between divergent knowledges. I guess, however, that it is not easy to rethink situations that are so obvious and so taken for granted in our everyday lives that we may not even notice them. One of Deleuze's (1994:251-252) main concerns is how to move away from conventional thinking and achieve infinite learning. And to do so, he argues that we need to get in touch with others. Unexpectedly and surprisingly be provoked by others, create singular points of our own bodies with components from other bodies, and be driven forward into the new. Together, me, you, and others. And to get in touch with neoliberalism, we need to engage in it like it is one positive entity among many. At stake here is how we understand difference. For Deleuze (1994:65,70), differences have nothing to do with contradictions. As discussed elsewhere, it is not the negativities that are the driving forces. Rather,

there are positive differential elements which regulate the occurrences of both affirmations and the differences affirmed in an event. With this approach the instrumental logic of neoliberalism is abolished as a problem. Neoliberalism is not our enemy. And, it no longer authoritatively dictates our principles. In accordance with Ros e Braidotti (2013:162?), and other new materialist scholars inspired by Deleuze and Guattari, I rather suggest that we let the logic of neoliberalism contribute to new beginnings of inclusive and open-ended processes. This is a radical move, ethically, ontologically, and epistemologically.

Ethically, because I insist on immanent experimentations and connection-making activities that purposely mix entities with each other, and hence cause confusion in the aforementioned binary divisions of superior and subordinate bodies. Simultaneously, I emphasize the impossibility of distinguishing between knowing subjects and objects to be known, processes of knowing and learning, and hence relations between teachers and students, coaches and athletes, and researchers and data. And, I suggest that we pay attention to the evolving character of these relationships and how they perhaps change our paths. This thesis is thus devoted to processes of becoming, and especially processes of becoming other. Similar to this, many scholars interested in physical education, sports, and research (see e.g. Dillon: 2018:170-171; Markula 2019:1; Fullagar 2017:248; Fox & Alldred 2017;4 Coole & Frost 2010:6-7), find it both keen and refreshing to study various materialities embedded in our cultural and social practices. In harmony with these new materialist thinkers I do not, for example, replace one entity (or knowledge) with another, nor do I reduce one entity to another, and I do not establish identities by judgements (the sun is yellow, she is a football player). This thesis occurs much more through diversity, multiplicity, and the destruction of identities (cf. Deleuze 1995:44). And, it implies that we break free from our current roles, habits, traditions, and understandings of physical education, sports, and research, and co-create novel practices in encounters with others.

Within these encounters, I suggest we make positive-practical use of disparities and othernesses produced by tenets of neoliberalism. Conventional issues like students who do anything but learn what we are trying to teach them, kids who engage in completely different things than what should be done during football trainings and participants who answer research questions we did not even ask are within this approach no longer considered as troublesome. Rather, they become positive entities in various learning situations in which at least sometimes old habits

of our minds are transformed. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies that we open up ourselves and our activities to every entity in the situation, and hence to multiplicities, and perhaps 'through the harshest exercise in depersonalization' (Deleuze 1995:6) become other. And as you may have already figured out, processes of sustainable inclusion without sustainability are much more like love affairs than actions of subjection. Within these processes, we all become a set of liberated singularities, titles, roles, names, words, activities, body parts, outfits, equipments, and accessories: quite the reverse of authoritative teachers, coaches, and researchers who maintain predefined activities within the commonly used binary logic of neoliberalism in today's physical education, sports, and research.

A set of liberated singularities do not have one singular and well-balanced order. Nor is it a member of a specific species that protect its origin. Rather, it works like a machinic assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari 1988:141). Ontologically, it can be approached as something in the making and of which we do not know what is yet to come. Within machinic assemblages, various entities encounter and give off flows that are broken by other entities. What is going on in machinic assemblages is that things are felt, desired, and created. As machinic assemblages, physical education, sports, and research are no longer seen as continuous practices defined by pre-established ideas. Instead, each practice embraces internal differences (dissimilarities, divergences, and diversifications). These practices are, without doubt, chaotic in the sense that their evolving and volatile orders are always created in and by situations of disorder. I guess, Deleuze and Guattari (1988:6) might relate this image of physical education, sports, and research to the notion of chaosmos. With the notion of chaosmos, Deleuze and Guattari suggest that the world (or cosmos) goes beyond the stability of a transcendent earth. There is no established continuity in which the tones in our songs are played in one and the same harmonic tonality. And, this is not to say that sustainable inclusion without sustainability in physical education, sports and research concerns only unstable states of our practices. Rather, sustainable inclusion without sustainability includes two simultaneously ongoing modes of reality, stability, and instability. Thinking with this process-ontology, physical education, sports, and research become constant infolding processes, and their existences depend on random outsides we cannot fully control.

And because we are both producing and gaining knowledge, I suggest that we are never innocent parts in our activities, neither in terms of physical education, sports, or research. Instead, we are responsible agents always involved in its processes. Further, this thesis also draws on the idea that participants in our activities cannot be seen as resources, solid surfaces, or billboards on which information is displayed. Rather, we are all simultaneously subjects, objects, and knowledge engendering processes, intertwined and twisted together. Inspired by Barad (2007), I suggest that these situations of inseparability between knowing subjects and objects to be known recognize an 'ethico-onto-epistemology', and hence imply that we (humans and non-humans) are all 'becoming with the world' as well as that 'becoming with the world is a deeply ethical matter' (Barad 2007:187). Epistemologically this strongly suggests that there are not two independent and distinct entities in the thesis, those who represent and those who are represented. For Deleuze, this division is precisely what creates a dominant image of thought, and hence representational knowledge that effectively excludes diversity. To escape this and practice non-representational research, I do not start so much in methodology but engage increasingly in theory. Thinking with theory does not mean that I am altogether free of methodology (although I sometimes wish I were). Since I am trained in traditional qualitative methodologies, it would be quite unethical to claim that I am able to totally ignore these methodologies, especially case study methodology which works like a positive co-actor throughout the thesis.

Sustainable inclusion without sustainability is an unstable title, and so is this thesis-rhizome. Perhaps St Pierre (2015:79) would say that it is a 'new empirical inquiry' always partially becoming, and a methodologically inclusive journey without clear beginnings or endings but multiple paths to move along. And, I guess we will move along different paths you and I. Paths that do not include pure answers to what inclusive physical education, sports, and research really is, but occasional interruptions of our habitual thinking. And at the same time as our thoughts are extended in various ways, it may tickle our stomachs a little. Perhaps we even need to slow down and catch our breath for a while. But do not worry, becoming breathless should not be confused with failure. For me, there is something promising about breathing breaks. And their potential has not so much to do with the opportunity to rest for a while as with the ability to sit still and encounter others. So, in this thesis I encourage you to move outside your comfort zone and allow yourself to lose your breath from time to time, challenge the already known, and move into the new. Together with me and others.

References:

- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2016). *Who rules the world?* Hamish Hamilton (Penguin Books), New York.
- Coole, D., & Frost, S. (2010). *New materialisms ontology, agency, and politics*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dillon, L. (2019). Queer men, affect, and physical education. *Qualitative research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(2), 168-187.
- Evans, J. (2014). Neoliberalism and the future for a socio-educative physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 19(5), 545-558.
- Evans, J., & Davies, B. (2014). Physical Education PLC: neoliberalism, curriculum and governance. New directions for PESP research. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(7), 869-884.
- Fitzpatrick, K., & Powell, D. (2019). Critical pedagogy and neoliberalism. *Movimento* 25(1), 1-12.
- Fox, N. J., & Alldred, P. (2017). *Sociology and the New Materialism: Theory, Research, Action*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Fullagar, S. (2017). Post-qualitative inquiry and the new materialist turn: implications for sport, health and physical culture research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 9(2), 247-257.
- Giroux, H. (2015). *Dangerous thinking in the age of the new authoritarianism*, Paradigm Publishers, Boulder, CO.
- Goodley, D. (2017). *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Hein, S. F. (2017). Deleuze's New Image of Thought: Challenging the Dogmatic Image of Thought in Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry* 23(9), 656-665.
- Lather, P., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2013). Introduction: Post-qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 629-633.
- Lundvall, S., & Gerdin, G. (2021). Physical literacy in Swedish physical education and health (PEH): what is (im)possible in becoming and being physically literate (educated)? *Curriculum Studies in Health and Physical Education*, 12(2), 140-155.
- Markula, P. (2019). What is new about New Materialism for Sport Sociology? Reflections on Body, Movement and Culture. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 36, 1-11.
- St. Pierre, E.A. (2015). Practices for the “new” in the new empiricism, the new materialism and post qualitative inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & M.D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and the politics of research* (pp. 75–96). Walnut Grove, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Thorpe, H., & Rinehart, R. (2013). Action sport NGOs in a neo-liberal context: The cases of Skateistan and surf aid international. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 37(2), 115–141.

Participants matter and should not be taken for granted

Amira is 11 years old, and has learned to float in the water. I know this because I was sitting in the stands when it happened, when the swimming instructor waited in her instructions for a short while and started to listen to Amira, and when they co-created a methodology that simultaneously gave off the effect that Amira became a 'floaters'. And, I must admit that I often return to my notes about this encounter to (at least sometimes) feel the rush in my veins while new thoughts emerge. This time, I started to think about participation. When the swimming instructor invited Amira to co-create a methodology of floating, and took a not-knowing position to include Amira in the swimming education, it was a sensitive and humble activity that I think is important to bring into the discussion of how we think and design processes of participation in physical education, sports, and research.

For a long time, I thought my biggest problem with teaching was that I did not really have any special skills to transfer. I thought I had to acquire knowledge from somewhere else. Read more books, watch new documentaries or whatever just to be able to gain some knowledge to offer when I met them, the students. And, I prepared my teaching plans really carefully. I made dense power points so as not to forget important details on the subject. I prepared practical examples to increase the chances for the students to understand what I was talking about. My time-schedules for various moments were meticulous, and prepared answers to every possible question I could imagine. And to be honest, my training plans as a handball coach and research plans as a PhD -student did not differ much. I so wanted to appear as a knowledgeable expert, who in a credible way, could carry out various tasks, teaching, coaching, and research. Knowledgeable in the eyes of the participants, in the eyes of colleagues and in the eyes of my employers. What I did not realize, however, was that my actions may also have contributed to the

creation of rigid, striated, and hierarchical spaces. Spaces with clear lines of demarcation. Spaces that produced exclusion?

And I guess, I am not alone in wanting to appear good in the eyes of others. Although the syllabus in physical education clearly indicates that students should produce knowledge in motion, teachers often activate students by reproducing a given content for the subject (Larsson 2016:22). Perhaps, participants (students, athletes and data) are such central elements in our work situations that the role of participants, the conceptualization of participants and the way in which participants work, affect and change with our activities, are taken for granted? At least to me, it seems that we oftentimes act as if participants in physical education, sports, and research are given, and that we already know what they need to move in the right directions. We simply plan what to do with them, how to interact with them, and how to increase their possibility to becoming what we want them to become, before we even met them. And, this is worrying. According to the Swedish Schools Inspectorate (2018), for instance, one-fifth of the students in primary school do not regularly participate in the physical education class, and give as reasons for this absence the environment, choice of activities, teaching organization, and also teaching methods and rules that the schools have developed. Despite these signals of exclusion, however, we tend to remain loyal to the transformation of the Swedish school system towards increased competition and target control in the early 1990s (Börjesson, 2016) by practicing even more instrumental and rigid teaching methods in physical education.

However, thinking with the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor, I want to claim that participation can paradoxically be dependent on the opposite, to open up for the possibility that we do not have all the answers in advance. And, that we do not know everything. Not knowing implies invitations of more knowledges than our own knowledges, and can be seen as an inclusive activism of various knowledges that come together and create novel learnings (Reinertsen 2021). Novel learnings which are important for each other and humbly brings us together in various situations. As I speculate elsewhere, I guess it is a bit like falling in love? And, to make love within a methodology of floating, and a floating methodology that continuously opens up for our potentialities? Amira's, the swimming instructor's, mine, and perhaps yours? And, where curiosity, patience, uncertainty, and waiting become important ingredients for our participations. Amira and the swimming instructor neither confirm nor deny

established knowledges but tend to treat the ten-stage model for learning to swim as one knowledge among many. And hence, put it in motion in an unforeseen way. Their focus is in the middle of various knowledges, and they do not think so much of where they come from or where they are going. They are only inspired by each other's movements, and to become safe in the water.

In my everyday life, I often encounter teachers, coaches, and researchers who try to persuade me that participants are, or at least should be, equipped with some basic knowledge (literacy) essential to understand the (linear) activities we produce, and especially to accept and enjoy the transformations these activities offer. And, when participants resist by leaving and avoiding our activities, the diagnoses often point to the lack of perseverance, morality, understanding, loyalty, and team spirit. And as an accompaniment, I am often told that these participants fail to understand that our activities will move them in the direction of better bodies, better health, better results, better knowledges, better democracy, and ultimately better lives. Sometimes it is even said that these participants need to understand our working situations as well as the methods we use to achieve specific standards, and not confuse these with other values. And, that it is not our intention to deny people the right to participate in our activities, but they should do so only to move in the right directions and not mix these activities up with their own beliefs and judgements of what is important in life. And if people hesitate to participate in our activities, I guess the response would be that we need to approach them where they are which implies that we present our standard repertoires in various situations where we think that these people feel safe (see e.g. Ekholm & Dahlstedt 2017; Arnoldsson 2019; Ekholm & Lindström Sol 2020). Physical education, sports, and research belong to all, as long as we play the same game (and draw the same conclusions).

It does not take much training in theory of science to come to the conclusion that this is a rational behaviour that overcomes any doubt and effectively reconstructs our practices. Our established knowledges in physical education, sports, and research convincingly call out their truths, and at least sometimes I guess we cannot help but enjoy the authority they give us. As teachers, coaches, and researchers we are often parts of 'normal physical education', 'normal sports', and 'normal research', and hence communities working within typical standards, patterns, and models that we rarely feel the need to question. Perhaps we do not even see the circumstances that makes questioning possible? I guess we work

within what Thomas Kuhn (1962) calls paradigms. For Kuhn paradigms are generally known scientific results that, for some time, provide us (teachers, coaches, and researchers) with ‘normal knowledge’, and thereby clearly defined problems as well as their solutions. Even though I want to appear good and credible in the eyes of others, however, my encounters with Amira, the swimming instructor, Deleuze and others have given off the effect that I feel it is almost impossible to act in accordance with (what I perceive as) the normalized idea (in physical education, sports, and research) that some knowledges are more credible and thus valuable than other, and thus that some people are more worthy of attention than others. Every single day I experience the dogmatic thinking brought about by this invisible normativity, and hence the common sense role it plays when it defines how the world around us is constituted (ontology), what questions can be asked, what activities can be performed, and what methods can be used to get reliable answers and achieve the right goals. As I see it, representing standard repertoires have not so much to do with the situation Amira and the swimming instructor encounter as participants. Amira and the swimming instructor do not just stick to facts. Rather they worry, care, think, imagine, stumble and hesitate together. Often they are unsure and simply need to pause before they are saying and doing something. And while our activities of physical education, sports, and research usually seem to be about ‘matters of fact’, Amira’s and the swimming instructor’s participation seem to have much more to do with ‘matters of concern’. Inspired by Isabelle Stengers (2018:3), I borrow this conceptualization from Bruno Latour. Concern cheerfully comprises both conscious choices and situations of concern that we are not yet aware of, situations in which we feel interested, troubled, disturbed, upset and perhaps fascinated. And, I suggest that we do not confuse these situations with political engagement. For me, it is quite far-fetched that occasional situations like the one where Amira learns how to float incorporate well-planned and well-thought-out political positions in relation to physical education, sports, and research. What they do incorporate, however, is our thoughts about what concerns us and, in this thesis, I argue for the importance of not letting matters of fact play a decisive role when we encounter participants in physical education, sports, and research. To reach sustainable inclusion, we simply need to get rid of the idea that some answers are more correct than others and that some people are better than others.

By challenging established knowledges, it is often suggested that Deleuze develops a new kind of materialism. In tune with thinkers like Spinoza, he suggests that

matter's capacities to take on forms are immanent to matter and that matter does not need external processes to organize itself. To elaborate a bit, there is an energy of matter that is self-organizing just as I suggest that there are self-organizing properties of participation-energy in the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor. This also implies that substantial objects and structures like activities, methods and models in physical education, sports, and research are simply reductions in speed, and hence processes of liquid flows of matter-energies that have changed into more solid states. For Deleuze, matter has similar creative capacities that I suggest emerges in the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor. This in turn, shifts focus away from stratified and pre-determined participation, and opens up for participation-energies, participation-movements and participation-flows in physical education, sports, and research.

Participation is thus linked to processes of the present. Even if Deleuze has no concept in his philosophical work of participation, he is interested in the relationship of univocity and multiplicity. For Deleuze, there is no established other. And in tune with this, I suggest that participation cannot be thought of in logical and moralistic terms. There is no correct participation. Nor is there an incorrect participation. Participation can only be felt and sensed. Simultaneously, it seems to be a process of chaos, creativity, and movement that inspires us to experiment in the present. Amira and the swimming instructor's participation is not created in the past and continues through the present and into the future. Nor is it an infinite result of possible future circumstances. Their participation is much more related to the process that brings past, present, and future together. Participation is thus linked to processes of becoming, and hence a time-space in the middle of past, present, and future. This implies that participation does not go beyond the present and it does not involve so much reflections on and calculation of the future. Amira and the swimming instructor's participation is thus radically different from the purposeful participation bound to future linear and controlled outcomes we so often expect in today's physical education, sports, and research. Participation seems to be much more of a chaotic flow of interactions, and thus what Deleuze (1994:212) perhaps would call a virtual process that includes differences as creation.

Importantly, this brings back the students, athletes, and data to the process of participation. And the affective flows between us (students and teachers, athletes and coaches, data, and researchers) become an experimental method for

participation, and hence a transit-zone from the virtual to the actual where participation for a brief moment may be defined. This is also why I suggest that the activity of participation is not so much discursive but pre-discursive, and results from various encounters within which we come into contact with each other. Participation is an immediate creation of the formless, and I guess no one has the exclusive right to define participation in advance or equate participation with specific actions and activities. And, I suggest that we leave the definition of participation to those for whom (in various situations) this is a matter of concern. However, this is not to suggest that teachers, coaches, and researchers should completely give in to students, athletes, and data or that the agency of students, athletes, and data should exclusively control the directions in physical education, sports, and research. Nor is it to suggest that teachers, coaches, and researchers in any way know what participants want, need, require, and care for. Rather, I want us to stop controlling participants, and I want us to experiment on novel physical educations, sports, and research together with participants. And I wish that these processes, where we start to lose control over participants, will show us that both participants, and methods/methodologies we use when we work with participants, will become infinite and multiple. Perhaps even the stability of our activities (physical education, sports, and research) will be questioned? In this sense (and others), participants fascinate me. It is not that they just please us by participating in our ready-made activities, but that they may also change and transform these activities, at least if we start to treat them as credible and knowledgeable people.

Concerning theory of science, this implies something else. Incommensurability between various knowledges is no longer a problem. Instead, Amira and the swimming instructor's assessments of the reality at stake in the swimming event is given voice(s) in their encounter. And for those of us in physical education, sports, and research who believe in the authority of facts, this may be a disappointment. As Ludwik Fleck (1979: 92) probably would suggest, there is not much of a meta-position from which the quality of Amira and the swimming instructor (as participants), as well as their knowledges, are assessed. They just participate, alter with each other, combine, and create what they, for the moment, acknowledge as the real methodology of floating. Amira and the swimming instructor's knowledges are simultaneously in motion and stasis, and so is their practice itself. Within this practice, it is the differences between Amira and the swimming instructor that puts them in contact. And perhaps, this is the realm of all differences, a realm that Deleuze perhaps would equate with 'the virtual', and that

constitutes 'the actual' practice that (I guess) Amira and the swimming instructor perceive in the water. To me, it seems that Amira and the swimming instructor's thinking about participation challenges the dominant notion of participation as a general acceptance of what happens without active response or resistance (and that requires an external form to actually exist). It also seems that they challenge our tendencies to view participants in terms of stable identities (she is a teacher, and she is a student). They simply invite a more creative ontology of both difference and participation to their situation. While we, in accordance with Kuhn, so often tend to protect our paradigmatic autonomy in physical education, sports, and research, and keep it safe from everything that comes from the outside and does not fit with the course of our normal, cumulative knowledge productions, Amira and the swimming instructor walk a somewhat different path, and in accordance with Fleck their thoughts about methodologies of floating seem to change with the bodies involved in the swimming event, and the truth about methodologies of floating seems to be created by a network whose form changes as soon as new actualities emerge. Hence, there is not so much established thoughts in the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor, and their concerns about floating capabilities are active ingredients in the temporary stabilization of the methodology of floating. This is also where sustainable inclusion without sustainability comes into the picture. To put it simply, activities in physical education, sports and research can make it possible to get in touch with differences. Amira and the swimming instructor show us that our activities may have the capacity to invite differences, and hence disrupt and confound at least some of our established ways to think and perceive things in our daily practices. At the same time as they open up for uncertainties, hesitations and changes, they also provide us with an ontological view of participation that (I suggest) corresponds to today's highly diversified landscapes of physical education, sports, and research.

While today's landscapes of physical education, sports, and research include a large number of knowledges, the value of these knowledges often seem to be increasingly uncertain and untrustworthy. To me this is paradoxical combination that not only challenges Kuhn's idea of autonomous communities, but also implies that we should invite students, athletes and data and create humble partnerships where we engage openly and honestly in various matters of concern? I guess we need to put ourselves out there, and face more questions than our own? Questions that are both interesting and have the capacity to be inconvenient, and that make

us irresolute by inviting us to winding courses where we are no longer guided by stable knowledges and paradigms. And just like Amira and the swimming instructor, become much more with the encounters. Perhaps this is also what Lundvall and Thedin Jakobsson (2021:93) imply when they talk about an emergent need for flexibility when it comes to physical activities for and with young people? In a Kuhnian perspective, however, hesitant and irresolute teachers, coaches, and researchers do not maintain and strengthen established knowledges, and perhaps we will become unproductive in the eyes of those who stick tight to the paradigms and hold key positions in our practices. Interrupting these fast and cumulative practices unequivocally implies that we will bite the hand that feeds us. And, I guess we cannot always afford that? And, sometimes we may not even have the courage to stick our necks out and challenge the prevailing circumstances?

What I suggest here, is not so much that we should follow Fleck and divide our practices into two circles where one is the knowing 'circle' ('esoteric circle') that includes specialists, and where the other is a circle with hangarounds ('exoteric circle') who agree with and support the specialists and their established thoughts by producing strong and clear images of what is important, but are not invited to actively take part of evaluations of various productions. It is not that Amira just agree with the swimming instructor and support her style of teaching. Amira enters much more forcefully into what seems to be a situation of collective participation with the swimming instructor, and I guess none of them fear to be put at direct service of the other. They do not even seem to know what is meant by a methodological fact of learning to float anymore, no matter if it is a Kuhnian or Fleckian fact. Within the collective participation Amira and the swimming instructor take the time they need together, and they misunderstand (each other) together, they think together, and they digest together. And I guess they cannot always tell us what their activities in the water mean and where they lead, because they simply do not know until the moment when Amira suddenly becomes a floater.

My point here is that we have perhaps passed the time when we, as 'professionals' in physical education, sports, and research, could benefit from both autonomy and the respect that comes with the service of the right and often general interests in our landscapes. Perhaps it is not even possible to talk about disciplinary knowledge anymore? And, I do not suggest that we should develop some general interdisciplinary approach to handle the situation. Or, holistic in that respect. I

guess that actively including them all is not the way to go here, but we must seriously invite peoples' knowledges and simultaneously open up physical education, sports and research for questioning. And, this is urgent. While our objective, rational and linear approaches in physical education, sports, and research clearly serve as means of pursuing the aim and policy included in our practices, they also effectively sort out those who do not have capabilities to take part in our predetermined activities. Perhaps we even silence people by strictly maintaining our established knowledges as the right ones. Considering the declining number of students in physical education classes and a decreasing number of young people in organized sports (Norberg 2020; Borgers et al 2016), I would guess that the silenced voices now are expressing their disapproval, and at least attracts my attention to such an extent that the idea that established knowledge would increase the participation that established knowledge has undermined is no longer credible.

Working within participation collectives implies that we need to take full account of the messiness in our various situations of physical education, sports, and research. And, this should not be confused with some common cognitive reflexivity developed in these situations. It is much more about inviting knowledges that are at variance with those commonly held in our practices, and letting various knowledges encounter around issues of common concern. This implies demanding environments in physical education, sports, and research where participants are considered to be experts of their “own” situations. Simultaneously, we (teachers, trainers, and researchers) need to behave humbly and not act in ways that may create contrasts in relation to participants (students, athletes, and data), but that enable relationships. And just as Stengers (2018:101) suggests, we cannot present ourselves as we hold various attributes that students, athletes and data do not have. We also need to be sincere in our concerns and interests and recognize the concerns and interests of students, athletes, and data. Similarly, Nowotny (2015) argues for radical openness and implies that we need to accept the existence of and embrace uncertainty. Amira does not produce some alternative knowledge that need to be recognized by the swimming instructor. And, the swimming instructor acknowledges that the ten-stage model loses its credibility in the encounter with Amira. At the same time, the swimming instructor re-creates this credibility by letting the relations that emerge in the teaching situation affect the ten-stage model. I guess physical education, sports, and research starts to thrive when we work on the edge of our knowledges?

To reach sustainable inclusion, we could perhaps pay more attention to the ways in which participants intra-act with us rather than providing ready-made answers and pointing in the “right” directions in physical education, sports, and research? And, perhaps we could ask more questions about participation, the role of participants and how we so often come to know relationships between students and teachers, athletes and trainers, data and researchers as one-directional, hierarchical and hence controlled by teachers, trainers and researchers? How do these superior positions affect us, activities (of physical education, sports, and research), and participants? For me, these are important questions. Without paying attention to the effects these positions give off, we run the risk of continuing to position ourselves above students, athletes, and data, and hence claiming that we know and understand what is best for participants. I wonder what happens if we start listening to participants? And, think of participants as not known in advance,

but as uncertain, diverse, and constantly in motion? Even when we do not know what participants want, I guess something happens...

References:

- Arnoldsson, J. (2019). *Idrott för nyanlända 2015–2018*. En rapport om verksamhet, uppföljning och forskning inom satsningen. [Sport for newly arrived 2015–2018. A report on activities, follow-up and research within the initiative]. Riksidrottsförbundet.
- Borgers, J., Seghers, J., & Scheerder, J. (2016). Dropping out from clubs dropping in to sportlight? Organizational settings for youth sports participation. In K. Green & A. Smith (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of youth sport* (pp. 158–174). Routledge
- Börjesson, M. (2016). *Från likvärdighet till marknad : en studie av offentligt och privat inflytande över skolans styrning i svensk utbildningspolitik 1969-1999*. Diss. Örebro: Örebro universitet.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. London : Athlone.
- Eckholm, D., & Dahlstedt, M. (2017). Football for inclusion: Examining the pedagogic rationalities and the technologies of solidarity of a sports based intervention in Sweden. *Social Inclusion*, 5(2), 232–240.
- Eckholm, D., & Lindström Sol, S. (2020). Mobilising non-participant youth: using sport and culture in local government policy to target social exclusion, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26(4), 510-523.
- Fleck, L. (1979). *Genesis and development of a scientific fact*, Edited by: Trenn, T. and Merton, R. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962/1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Labaree, D. F.
- Larsson, H. (2016). *Idrott och hälsa : i går, i dag, i morgon*. Stockholm : Liber
- Lundvall, S., & Thedin Jakobsson, B. (2021). To move on... - a comparative study of Swedish adolescents in a changing sport and leisure-time landscape, *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 18:1, 82-97.
- Norberg, J. R. (2020). *Statens stöd till idrotten – en uppföljning 2019*. [A follow-up of governmental support for sport]. Centrum för idrottsforskning. [The Swedish Research Council for Sport Science]. 2020:1.

- Nowotny, H. (2015). The radical openness of science and innovation. *EMBO reports*, 16(12), 1601-1604.
- Reinertsen, A. (2021). The Art of Not Knowing: The Position of Non-Knowledge as Activisms. *International review of qualitative research*, 14 (3), 476-482.
- Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektionen) (2018). *Kvalitetsgranskning av ämnet idrott och hälsa i årskurs 7-9*.
- Stengers, I. & Muecke, S. (2018). *Another science is possible : a manifesto for slow science*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thinking With New Materialism in Qualitative Case Studies

International Journal of Qualitative Methods
Volume 19: 1–9
© The Author(s) 2020
DOI: 10.1177/1609406920976437
journals.sagepub.com/home/ijq


Åsa Andersson¹ , Peter Korp¹, and Anne B. Reinertsen²

Abstract

In this article, we discuss challenges and implications of thinking with new materialisms and the Deleuzian philosophy of immanence in qualitative case studies. The aim is to establish a terrain and language of “minor case studies.” Deleuze denies two-world ontologies and the ontologically status of single bodies, emphasizing instead how assemblages of human and non-human bodies together produce the world. In this terrain, cases are not objects of inquiry, but life-giving forces that create movement. This in turn changes the premises for how we can approach and explore cases. Rather than represent, comment and explain what cases are, we illustrate how a case-assemblage creates possibilities for event-based thinking regarding interesting phenomena (cases), and how these cases are twisted, stretched and pulled out of a conventional case study design. We conclude by discussing epistemological consequences of new materialist ontology.

Keywords

philosophy of science, social justice, virtual environments, dialectic critique, case study

Introduction

In recent decades, new materialisms and the turn to matter have gained popularity as a philosophical framework for qualitative case study research in the social sciences of sport. Informed by post-structuralist, feminist, post-colonialist and queer theories they reject the earlier historical materialism of Hegel and Marx, which focused on the development of social institutions and practices within a broad economic and political context of material production and consumption (Fox & Alldred 2017). By assessing such economic and structuralist determinism as insufficient to question rationalism, patriarchy, modernism and science, the new materialisms have become a critical stance for researchers who find materiality of great importance but do not want to prioritize one stratum over another in order to explore various sport related phenomena.

More specifically, the philosophical framework of new materialisms entails a Deleuzian idea of immanence which means that there are no structures, mechanisms or systems at work governing the world from the outside. Instead, there are events comprising affective flows between various bodies (human and non-human), and within which the realms of nature and culture together produce the world (van der Tuin & Dolphijn, 2010). To deal with this unstratified terrain, some efforts have been made to make use of traditional case study designs within which data sources provide researchers with the ability

to analytically move beyond dichotomies like agency/structure and animate/inanimate, and instead map affective flows, relations and territorializations in assemblages (see e.g. Enright & Gard, 2016; Hordvik et al., 2019; Thorpe & Clark, 2020).

Hence, one way to address the philosophy of new materialism is that any and all case study designs are appropriate as long as they provide the researcher with suitable data. In our view, however, this is an awkward combination of the idea of immanence and data-driven approaches to research that indicates an ontological confusion (cf. Fullagar, 2017; Giardina, 2017; cf. Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; Mazzei, 2014). Rather than relying on the ontology of immanence as research design, this is a way to privilege pragmatic choices of method as starting places for new materialist case studies. While method-driven approaches may be useful in order to map the processes of change going on in various events without referring to stratified orders, a crucial problem is that we make use of

¹ Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden

² Østfold University College, Halden, Norway

Corresponding Author:

Åsa Andersson, Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 320, 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.
Email: asa.andersson.2@gu.se



methodological conceptions that are ready-made and already at work when we start to think. As researchers, we simply rely on a methodological common sense (Hein, 2017, p. 659). At the same time, we treat research design as a transcendent, i.e. an independent process separated from the event it attempts to make into data (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 361). Method-driven approaches simply do not challenge the established body of traditional methodology as the privileged locus where the design of a case study appears (cf. Hein, 2017). The very idea of using a predetermined method forces us into a prescribed order that preclude all other bodies in the research process to participate in the case study design.

Such reflections about the prioritized status of the methodological body of traditional case study research, and hence pre-defined cases, have generated an increased interest in “minor science” and how continuities, fluxes and affects in an event produce cases (cf. Fox & Alldred, 2015; Jackson, 2017; St. Pierre, 2017). Instead of strengthening the status of established case study methodologies, minor science promotes all components (human and non-human bodies) included in an event to come together and produce cases. In this paper, we wish to explore what happens to a case study when we take this ontological step; establish a terrain and a language for Deleuzian-inspired “minor case studies”; and discuss how this may bring new epistemological conditions within which infinite learning is produced. This approach entails a radical shift that moves our thinking about cases away from predefined study objects toward performativity and cases as live-giving forces. Thereby, it also changes the premises for how we can approach and explore cases.

Traditional Case Studies

Given that immanence is not dependent of anything outside itself, it could perhaps be considered an ontological divergence to even mention traditional case studies at this moment. But, since we are trained in traditional research methodology, and interested in what the ontology of immanence may do to a traditional case study, and among other things wish to communicate with a field where traditional case study methodology undoubtedly is practiced within new materialist inquiries (see e.g. Enright & Gard, 2016; Hordvik et al., 2019; Thorpe & Clark, 2020), it would be quite unethical to pretend that traditional case study methodology does not exist. It would be both dishonest and disrespectful to explore what happens to a traditional case study within an immanent ontology without inviting traditional case study methodology to the inquiry. Instead, we suggest that we need to understand the situation where traditional case study methodology encounter immanence through all the components involved in the event, and not decide in advance what really matters and what does not.

Overall, case studies have a long tradition in qualitative research (Andrews, 2017; Gerring, 2011), and has contributed to a numerous research projects across a broad range of social science fields (Yin, 2014). In general, case studies are conducted as contextually located empirical in-depth

investigations of phenomenon that are of a specific interest to the researchers (Ketokivi & Choi, 2014; Longhofer et al., 2017; Yin, 2009) and do not include the idea of having a formal design. A case may be successfully created out of any phenomena as long as it has identifiable boundaries and comprises the primary object of a study. Yet, every type of case study involves the desire to analyze the case in relation to contextual conditions and some of the cases may even include embedded units of analysis (Yin, 2014). While the boundaries between each key term (context, case and embedded units of analysis) are defined in relation to each other and thus not likely to be sharp, traditional case study researchers often attempt to enforce stable definitions and boundaries in order to prevent the case from growing too large (Andrews, 2017; Gerring, 2011). When it comes to defining the key terms of a case study, spatial- and activity driven boundaries are more apparent than temporal boundaries (cf. Creswell, 2003; Gerring, 2011; Ketokivi & Choi, 2014). Traditional case study researchers tend to be confident about *what* is going on within a case and *where* the geographical area of a case begins and ends, but have less interest in determining *how*, *when* and *why* a case begins and ends.

Another reason for creating stable definitions of the key terms of a case study is to achieve transparency. This is one of the most fundamental characteristics of qualitative research (Ketokivi & Choi, 2014). In order to evaluate the quality of an argument, the logic that generates the conclusion as well as the premises that supports it need to be accessible. Hence, credible case studies need to be detailed regarding both how the studies are framed and how the analyses are conducted (Ketokivi & Choi, 2014; Yin, 2014). Overall, the credibility of case research is established by the duality of being situationally grounded and seeking a sense of generality. Case studies need to be empirically disciplined and take account of contextual particularities already in the data collection phase. A sense of generality, then, appears when the researcher goes beyond the empirical findings and seeks broader theoretical understandings through abstraction (e.g. Gioia et al., 2013). For example, a case study about how young people’s health is produced within a specific learning event cannot be just about how young people’s health is produced within a specific learning event. It needs to address more general questions like for instance the relational production of agential capacities that make young people change position from not knowing to knowing within the learning event. Hence, generality within qualitative case studies is not a question about the possibility to generalize the results to other empirical contexts or cases, but rather the extent to which a sense of generality can be found in terms of theory (Yin, 2014).

The essence of traditional case studies is thus to create local empirical knowledge as well as general theoretical knowledge. To this end, case study researchers distinguish between at least three methodological practices, induction, deduction and abduction by which they proceeds from a set of grounds to a set of claims (Toulmin, 2003). Briefly, inductive case studies (cf. Eisenhardt, 1989) entail an option to generate general

theoretical knowledge by conducting empirical analysis. The approach proceeds from a number of empirical results and assumes that the connection that has been observed in all these results is also generally valid. In contrast, deductive case studies proceed from a pre-selected theory that works as a general rule, and asserts that this theory explains the case. By explicitly contextualizing the selected theory before subjecting it to empirical tests, the researcher's claims become situationally grounded. In addition to induction and deduction, many case studies are based on abduction where a single case is interpreted through a hypothetical overarching pattern (Alvesson & Sköoldberg, 2009). Unlike deduction, the researcher does not make use of the theory as if it was "true." Rather the researcher investigates the theory and the context simultaneously and elaborates the theory with the aim to make it compatible with the empirical material. In establishing a sense of generality, abductive case studies have connections to a perspectival approach wherein empirical facts are always theory laden (Hanson, 1958).

When it comes to the interplay between context, theory and empirical data, the methodological practices of induction, deduction and abduction include different ways of thinking. They simply assign different roles to the context, theory and empirical data and thus include different plans of action in order to meet the conventional requirements of credibility in case study research, i.e. the duality of being situationally grounded and seeking a sense of generality. However, an attempt from our part to broaden the definition of qualitative case study design by moving toward new materialist theory would unavoidably struggle with these methodological practices. Not least with the stratified orders between theory/empirical analyses, researchers/data and context/case/units of analysis. But, our point here is not so much an argument in favor of the ontological step toward immanence when it comes to case study design. Instead, we wish to discuss what it means to encounter and address such an ontology and hence consider what the turn toward immanence may do to a traditional case study.

The Idea of Immanence, Minor Science and Assemblages

Immanence is a pivotal principle in Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy, and a starting place for much new materialist theory (see e.g. Fox & Alldred, 2015, 2018). Drawing on Spinoza's monist rejection of a transcendent level independent of the everyday world of material interactions, Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 45) describe immanence as something boundless and to which there is no previous or beyond. Thereby, Deleuze and Guattari reject two-world ontologies and their transcendent perspectives that acknowledges privileged standpoints. For Deleuze and Guattari, immanence first and foremost means the denial of vertical orders, and hence the existence of underlying and overlying realities. In that sense, immanence is discussed as an absolute immanence and a plane (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 47). Important, though, is that the plane of immanence

cannot be considered the uppermost layer of something nor an enclosed volume. Rather it is "a virtual, an open whole that (ontologically) prevents absolute closure" (Hein, 2019, p. 84).

Deleuze, distinguishes the virtual from the actual (Deleuze, 1994, p. 272). This does not mean that neither one is independent of the other, but their relation is asymmetrical and with continuous exchange. In terms of reciprocal relationship, the virtual becomes actual in relation to the actual and the actual becomes virtual in relation to the virtual. Simultaneously, both the virtual and the actual includes an irreducible pluralism which means that the virtual-actual movement is anything but linear and do not proceed step by step toward a predefined goal. Hence, the actual has no consistency with the virtual it embodies. It simply does not follow the rule of being alike. In relation to the aforementioned sociocultural approaches of case study research this means that the plane of immanence establishes unstable situations, i.e. their ability to create, diverge and move in different directions. In that sense, the plane of immanence adds creativity to traditional case study research in actual situations.

Even if the plane of immanence is present through the entire work of Deleuze, it is not until "What is Philosophy?" that it is examined more specifically. In this work, the plane of immanence is described as the horizon of thought (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 37–38), and thereby a foundation of thought. What emerges from this is a radical critique of a dogmatic image of thought (Hein, 2017, p. 657), i.e. thinking as a process of recognition and representation of the already known that has its basis in common sense. Instead, Deleuze (1994, p. xvi) argues that the plane of immanence require us to replace this kind of thinking with a more genuine thinking and thus a non-representational image of thought where the thought is not predetermined by mainstream knowledge. In fact, genuine thinking is not an element of knowledge but that of infinite learning. Learning, then, means composing singular points of our own bodies with elements of other bodies, to tear apart but also to be pushed forward into the unknown (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 251–252). However, living this kind of thinking-learning is not an easy task. It requires us to become something new and not repeat the already known. What complicates the situation, though, is that genuine thinking is not a natural capacity that everyone possesses. For Deleuze (1994) we are born into a conformist mode of thinking. Our thoughts are restricted by the conventional and involve processes of recognition and representation (Hein, 2017, p. 656). Generally, we are only capable of thinking that which is already recognized and recognizable and we actively need to engage in processes of thought that draws thought out of its self, to become something new. As Deleuze (1972, p. 108) explains,

Thought never thinks alone and by itself. . . Thinking as an activity, is always a second power of thought, not the neutral exercise of a faculty, but an extraordinary event *in* thought itself, for thought itself. Thinking is the *n*-th power of thought. . . But it will never attain this power if forces not do violence to it. Violence must be done to it *as* thought, a power, the force of thinking, must throw it into a becoming-active.

For our thoughts to become active and accordingly genuine, we need to be confronted with something that disturbs common sense (Jackson, 2017), and that forces us to produce new thoughts. Specific to genuine thinking is thus the un/conscious production of concepts that correspond to real and singular problems. Conceptual innovation, then, is an act of thought (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 21). Concepts produced by genuine thinking are not essences that determine the intrinsic nature and quality of something, nor are they things or objects distinct from living sentient beings. Rather, they are intense events consisting of an infinite number of elements which assemblage at a certain point. In this sense, concepts are relative to the elements they are composed of, but absolute in terms of their affects. Since concepts are productive forces consisting of non-constant elements, there is no reason to make use of or even discover existing concepts. Instead, the plane of immanence entails that “new” concepts have to be produced by their own distinct but inseparable components. However, it is important to remember that these productions are not processes of cause-and-effect or gradually development. Rather they are open-ended in regard to the ways they shape and reshape concepts.

For Deleuze and Guattari there is a close relationship between the plane of immanence and the production of concepts. More specifically, they are mutually interdependent. No concepts can be produced without the texture that the plane of immanence forms, and the plane of immanence cannot be thought without the concepts that populates it (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 21). Their relation constitutes the internal condition for thinking (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 44). Thinking consists of infinitive movement. Infinitive movement is what constitutes thinking and hence, what thinking has to deal with when producing concepts. This is also why the plane of immanence cannot be confused with being a concept that underlies all other concepts, i.e. dealt with as a transcendence or transcendent of anything (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 44–45). Rather, the plane of immanence is a territory which enables the texture that makes genuine thinking viable.

When it comes to case study research, the plane of immanence involves attending to a territory that is in infinitive change and becoming, and not accepting anything given whether it is about thoughts or concepts. The understanding of concepts as performative forces rather challenges the traditional understanding of words and their power to represent pre-existing things. As researchers, we can no longer position ourselves as subjects who are able to design case studies and define data in advance, nor can we make use of theoretical perspectives to order and homogenize the data. For Deleuze, this would be severe limitations of both cases and data and is illustrative of the aforementioned problem with stratified orders between researchers and objects of knowledge in traditional case study research. Deleuze explicitly rejects any idea of predetermined subjects who are transcendent or capable of transcending anything. Within an immanent terrain, researchers are not separate entities that make decisions outside the event under study or separated from data. Rather all bodies

(human and non-human) are regarded as relational having no ontological status outside the assemblage that constitutes the event. In this way, Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 361) emphasize a “minor science.” In contrast to royal science and its attempt to order research processes as well as data in controllable ways and prepare it to fit in a theoretical model, minor science works to maintain variation as well as the existence of heterogeneous spaces. In this sense, minor science adds force to the singularities and the turbulent flows of data that royal science is so dedicated to prevent (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 362). Instead of designing a case study upon pre-existing and established methodologies, minor science therefore encourages us to start elsewhere and thus make room for the assembled entities in the event to produce something new.

At this point, we want to mark the assemblage as an important terrain where new materialist research designs emerge. Within assemblages there are amounts of relations that interact and produce various capacities in bodies to do, feel and desire (Deleuze, 1988, p. 256). Important to remember though, is that these movements of bodies are not based on cognitive decision making. Rather, affective flows within assemblages produce various desires that bodies do. In this perspective desire is not a representation of a gap or a lack of something waiting to be addressed by some acquisition activities, but a pushing and performative force that moves bodies in various directions. Desire is thus productive and includes creative capacities of bodies to engage with other bodies and consequently affect them to move in different directions. Such flows of desire replace the conventional conception of agency (as well as its conceptual opposite: social structure). Agency is simply the capacity to affect or be affected and become something else. Becomings, represent changes of capacities and states of both human and non-human bodies (Deleuze, 1988, p. 258).

Within assemblages there are at least two processes of change within which capacities, states and movements of bodies may alter: territorialization and aggregation. Territorialization refers to affects that establish bodies’ capacities to produce specific qualities, and hence clearly set out and shape their capacities to affect other bodies in the assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1984, p. 273). At the same time as bodies become territorialized, their possibilities to affect other bodies in the assemblage are established. However, in this flow of changes not all affects are territorializing affects. Some affects deterritorialize and reterritorialize bodies, and hence reshape both possibilities and limitations of what bodies can do.

Aggregation, on the other hand, refers to molar affects that aggregate bodies into groups by assigning those converging identities and capacities. These affects act unifying on multiple bodies at the same time and organize what often appear to be scattered bodies in specific ways. Against these processes of aggregation, Deleuze and Guattari (1984, p. 273) contrast molecular affects that produce singular outcomes. In these processes bodies are cut loose from constraining identities, categories and clusters. By ascribing bodies no significance beyond themselves, these processes of singularization may also be driving forces of deterritorialization processes simultaneously

giving bodies capacities to resist constraining and gathering forces and opening up bodies' capacities to do, feel and desire, that at least sometimes lead to a "line of flight" (Deleuze & Guattari 1987, p. 216). And, even if there is no guarantee that molecular flows produce lines of flight it is important to note that molecular flows and the molar often seem to "interfere with each other and while this brings some flexibility to the molar it also brings some rigidity to the molecular" (Andersson et al., in press). Politically, they simply operate as two extremes in a continuum. While the molar include standardizations of cultural norms, categorizations and systems of organization, molecular flows enable bodies to resist these limiting forces.

Along with the conceptualization of desire as a productive force, these two processes of change (territorialization and aggregation) play an important part in our further exploration of what an ontological shift toward immanence may do to a case study. In this perspective, the emergence of new materialist case studies has everything to do with how human and non-human bodies, ideas and social institutions fold and unfold in the event under study. Affective flows within the event produce, connect and territorialize these entities, and also produce their capacities to act and desire. In relation to traditional case study methodology, this establishes a fundamental change by inviting every entity in the event under study to contribute to the design of the case study. Instead of the traditional approaches where researchers as sense-making human agents make use of already established case study methodology in order to design a case study, new materialist case studies need to emerge from the event under study, and thus from the affective flow within a case-assemblage.

Case-Assemblage

At a first glance, it might seem a bit awkward to combine "case" and "assemblage" in the conception of case-assemblage, and that we perhaps tend to repeat the same mistake that we initially accuse many of us of doing by starting with ready-made concepts and methods in new materialist case studies. As mentioned above, however, assemblages connect numerous elements. And, the flows of affects between these elements produce bodily desire and capacities. Case-assemblages may thus be understood as "machines" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 333) that produce desire to explore various phenomena. There is simply a virtual-actual flow within case-assemblages that establishes the internal conditions of case productions—that is infinite movement. Infinite movement is also what has to be handled by our thoughts when they crystalize into specific conceptualizations of cases. However, conceptualizations of cases do not only respond to specific thoughts, they also work as life-giving forces and make possible various developments of our thoughts. Within an immanent milieu, it is not that actual cases and virtualities in/of assemblages are opposed binary forces. Rather, they presuppose each other and co-exist as different forms of investigational segmentarities fully comparable to the aforementioned molar and molecular lines of relations (cf. Deleuze &

Guattari's, 1987, pp. 199–200), and where the emergence of cases is anything but linear and do not proceed step by step out of some predefined methodology.

To provide an example of a case-assemblage, we will make use of an emerging "case" (the event of a swimming lesson within which young people become confident in mutual learning situations) and explore the mix of relations and affects that produced it. The "case" grew out of a swimming event in elementary schools in Gothenburg, Sweden, 2018–2019. We have written about this swimming event before (Andersson et al., in press), and occasionally we return to this event because it tends to interfere with our conventional thinking. The "case" turned up in our thoughts for the very first time during a turbulent encounter with some activities going on in the pool. While we were sitting on a bench beside the pool, we noticed that a girl would learn to float and that the swimming-instructor habitually hold her hands under the girl's shoulders. At first, this act did not seem to turn out very well but after a moment of panic and fear, the girl placed her hands on the swimming-instructor's arms, and as a response to that movement the swimming instructor moved her whole body closer to the girl's shoulders. This in turn made the girl relax and rely on the swimming-instructor, the water and finally herself. And, after a short while she also learned how to float.

As researchers trained in traditional methodology, we had of course another predefined case in focus (the event of a swimming lesson within which people become healthy). This is also the reason why we initially entered the swimming event at all. However, the activities in the pool inserted themselves like a set of cutting edges into our predefined case and drew mutations and variations out of it. As we see it, this was also the moment when our predefined case was taken up by a case-assemblage and its deterritorializing movement, and hence encountered the ontology of immanence. The effects were produced in a situation where various bodies (human and non-human) met each other and where at the simplest one body created a flow that was broken by another body. As we sat on the stand and focused on the swimming lesson as an event in which people become healthy, the actions of the student and the swimming instructor did not resemble that of our predefined case. Even if the swimming instructor and the student had no intentions to cause difficulties, the activities going on in the pool did not make any sense to us. The student did not develop swimming skills in the way we expected her to do, and the swimming instructor was far more humble when it came to sharing the expert role with the student than we could ever have imagined. So, we were hit by new thoughts and were hitting new thoughts in quite uncontrollable ways. Simultaneously, our desire to explore various phenomenon within the swimming event changed rapidly in various directions. All at once, we wished to explore both how teacher-student expertise evolved in the swimming event and how the teacher and the student became confident in the water.

However, even if this was a liminoid moment that more or less seduced us with its charm of co-produced expertise and safety, our desire to explore how teacher-student expertise

evolved in the swimming event and how young people become confident by swimming lessons did not emerge without resistance. By reminding us of the importance of our predefined case and its potential to fill various predefined gaps of knowledge, previous research, textbooks of traditional case study methodology, colleagues at our department and the City of Gothenburg as the responsible organization of the swimming event came to act as territorializing forces that not only produced effects that further territorialized our research interest, but also kept us aggregated as traditional case study researchers exploring a predefined case. For a brief moment, we even got stuck in what Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 334) call a “black hole” within which we became isolated from all other elements in the swimming event and were just spinning around in circles and explored nothing more than the echo of ourselves.

However, while the territorial forces of traditional case study methodology, previous research, our colleagues and the City of Gothenburg produced effects of closure that kept our predefined case in its original position, both the student’s and the swimming instructor’s actions also broke with our preconception that it should be the swimming-instructor who produces safety in children, and not the other way around. Yet, the echo of ourselves, and hence the idea of a one-directional process and its straight transfer of knowledge from a knowing body to a non-knowing body did its best to keep us territorialized in this view. And, we had to return to our notes repeatedly before we realized that this process was not about knowledge at all. Rather, this was a two-directional, or even multi-directional process of learning. Once again, our desire to explore changed. This time we wished to explore how young people become confident in situations of mutual learning within the swimming event. Together with the turbulent ruptures where the student did not learn in the way we expected and where the teacher was overwhelmingly humble sharing her expert role with the student, this brought some molecular lines of relations that extracted themselves from the aforementioned molar lines of relations, and while producing the reciprocal destruction of each other’s segmentarity, a complex line of flight including various singularities was produced. In this process we were not only cut loose from our identities as researchers and the right to authoritatively define cases, we were also equated with all other entities within the swimming event.

For us, this situation is important to bring up because it certainly increased our understanding of inhibition and innovation in case production, and where phases that made us self-conscious and unable to follow the flow in the swimming event suddenly became associated with the release of our crossroad behavior. At the same time as we could not explore anything but our own echo, we also had a complex relation to the effects of our notes. At this moment, senses of frustration and curiosity appeared simultaneously in our researching bodies and we started to ask ourselves what was really going on in the pool. We also started to question our ability to predefine cases and stay focused to them. Was it even possible to hold on to a predefined case when the data told us otherwise? And if so, for what reason? In retrospect, we understand that this was the

situation where we opened up for assembled entities in the event to produce cases. This was also the situation where we entered an immanent case study that was (and still is) in infinite change and becoming, and before we knew it, a “minor-case study” took shape.

At its simplest, we were dealing with a learning event in the water that involved two bodies. The one who learned and the one who taught. While the affects within this assemblage were in part physical, stimulated specific movements and swimming techniques, perhaps produced trust and self-confidence, there were typically many more relations in the case-assemblage we became a part of than just the two bodies. Except other relations linked to the physical learning event such as personal and cultural contexts, past events, water, codes of conduct, memories and experiences and so forth, there were at least three other bodies involved in the case-assemblage, namely the two bodies of the researchers and the body of traditional case study methodology. If the former relation was in part physical, the latter was for the most part sociocultural and psychological and created anxiety, curiosity, pride, distance, uncertainty and so forth among the researchers. Consequently, the case-assemblage comprised at least five bodies, the learner, the teacher, the two researchers and the body of traditional qualitative research. Moreover, it comprised physical elements such as water, social norms, past experiences and circumstances, personalities and expectations (not least from colleagues, previous research and the City of Gothenburg).

At the same time as the affective flow associated with this case-assemblage linked all these relations rhizomically, new capacities were not only produced in the student and the teacher, but also in the researchers and the body of traditional case study methodology. Productive forces made new affects come into existence leading to new research situations, curiosity, desire for new knowledge production (deterritorialization and reterritorialization of research interests), and also some doubts about what is going on in the pool. When it comes to the emerging case, these forces seem to extend the assembling affects beyond the swimming event and gather together various capacities produced in previous academic and non-academic events, cultural codes of academic conduct and experience of swimming-lessons and research. For instance, at the same time as we realized that the data (the teacher and the girl) was not just objects of knowledge letting themselves be understood in a predetermined manner, the traditional body of case study methodology started to make resistance. Reminders of the importance of rigorous and trustworthy research appeared intensively and created hesitation, nervousness and anxiety in our researching bodies. Among other things, we started to think about the immanent terrain of a case-assemblage and how it would impact issues like, the capacities of researchers to explore a case, the production of research interest, the bounding of a case and the emergence of a case. In practice, our thinking about case-assemblages evolved along with the emergent case, but for clarity and as a trivialized review we will draw out four features from its immanent terrain that we found valuable when it comes to establishing a language of new materialist case

studies. It should be mentioned, though, that even if these conceptualizations are situationally created along with the disruption of our conventional thoughts about traditional case study research in a swimming event, we do not consider any of these conceptualizations particularly unique for new materialist case studies in the social sciences of sport.

The Conceptualizations of New Materialist Case Studies

Beginning with the capacities of researchers to explore a case, the analysis above sets out how a case-assemblage comprises both affective forces produced in the present event and accumulative capacities that bring together affective forces from previous events. Hence, it is also an example of how a case-assemblage may link bodies together and how two researchers' entrance to a swimming event may reterritorialize further research capacities. By re-establishing the researchers' possibilities to do, feel and desire, the development of a research case is an unpredictable and fluid product of a case-assemblage that may reshape the codes of research conduct, the view of how the world is constituted and consequently how case studies may be performed in various directions. However, it also shows the reverse, namely, how molecular forces within the case-assemblage may deterritorialize the research desire and at least for a moment cut all these positions (including the case definition) loose on a "line of flight" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 277).

The affective flow associated with a case-assemblage reflects one of the most important assumptions in the aforementioned description of traditional case studies, namely that research interests and definitions of specific cases may not emerge solely because of some gap in previous research or that the researcher is fascinated and curious of a specific phenomenon. The desire to explore a case is simply not based on a lack of knowledge or some individualized eagerness. Rather, the desire to explore is based on assembled creative forces that produce research capacities. While the desire to explore affects all other components in the event, it also produces interested bodies. In this perspective, neither research interest nor cases can be understood as pre-existing things, but produced out of the components in a case-assemblage. Researchers are therefore not so much interested in a predefined case, but become interested in relatively unforeseen cases during the process of exploration.

This in turn, troubles the very notion of predefined boundaries as well as the existence of underlying and overlying realities in traditional case studies. A new materialist case study does not begin with predetermined identifiable boundaries between conventional key terms i.e. context, case and embedded units of analysis. Rather, the plane of immanence provides a terrain where the boundaries (if any) are emergent within the event under study. Methodologically, this is a shift toward co-produced case studies and away from transcendental approaches of conventional case study designs. Practically, the key terms of a case study firmly shift from the context, case and

embedded units of analysis to case-assemblages. In contrast to conventional case study methodologies, the concern is no longer with what spatial or activity-based boundaries there are, but with the affective flows, interactions, desire, feelings and capacities of action within a case-assemblage that produce research interests, and hence cases (cf. Deleuze, 1988).

The traditional idea of a case as closely related to the specific interest of a researcher, research identity and the researcher's affiliation to a specific research field is thus radically re-conceptualized as a co-produced interest emerging from the flow of affect in a case-assemblage. Following this, new materialist case studies may come into existence in two ways. First, their emergence has to do with the process of deterritorialization. The flow of affect within an event may be nomadic and encourage unforeseen movements. Bodies come together and produce new and unpredictable capacities in each other, different research desires, curiosity, research interests as well as an amount of other capacities not normally related to research at all. These nomadic- and consequently minor case studies has nothing to do with constrained activities like filling out a gap in previous research or satisfying a pre-determined research interest. Rather, these studies produce occasional and unexpected cases that are of specific interest to typically many more bodies than the researcher and perhaps the current research field. However, new materialist case studies may also come into existence by molar and aggregating flows of affect. These affects successfully restricts the production of research interests and hence the production of cases. Instead of releasing curiosity and desire to produce occasional cases, these affects tend to organize the case production in agreed and predictable schemas. Thereby, territorialized cases direct research desire toward a narrow range of research capacities, and by doing so they also lose their nomadic character. Deprived of their fluidity, they are no longer able to escape methodological biases such as predefined cases.

In this section, we have tried to explore how the design of traditional case studies change when it is opened up the new materialist ontology of immanence. We also suggest a language and an environment for Deleuzian-inspired "minor case studies" that turn the focus away from researchers as subjects and sole owners of research interests and toward the affective flows within a case-assemblage. Minor cases emerge not as specific interests to the researcher, but as co-produced entities of affective flows between human and non-human bodies. In the last section, we will discuss how minor cases challenge epistemological conditions included in the established body of case study research, along with other challenges raised by the plane of immanence.

Discussion

Our intention in this paper has been to explore how the design of a traditional case study change when it is opened up for the new materialist ontology of immanence. Hence, we shift the focus away from single researchers and their abilities to define proper cases, and toward all components in the event under

study, and pay attention to their relations, how they assemble and produce flows of affects, research desire and consequently new minor cases. To do so, we set out the case-assemblage as the environment where minor cases emerge. This immanent terrain forces us to give up static properties of traditional case study methodology in favor of the analysis of how research desire is produced as well as how it changes in processes of territorialization and aggregation. One of the most prominent consequences of this terrain is that cases may no longer be seen as stable entities possible to define in advance. Rather, cases always emerge from the affective flow between the components in the event under study. This in turn may result in an emergent and unpredictable series of minor case productions (cf. Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 361). While the implementation of traditional case studies is characterized by homogeneity, linearity and an academic orientation, the execution of new materialist case studies is characterized by diversity, non-linearity and reflexivity. When it comes to the organization of case study design, traditional case studies are hierarchical and tend to maintain their shape. New materialist case studies on the other hand, are flat and mutant. Moreover, traditional case studies solve problems in a context governed by a specific academic community, while new materialist case studies comprise collaborations between temporary and heterogeneous practitioners on problems defined in specific and localized context of an event.

As a consequence, new materialist case studies avoid to produce knowledge in academic isolation or in advance, but is always a result of bodies coming together in case-assemblages. Hence, the plane of immanence reorients the production of knowledge in case study research to a novel and continuous process of variation and diffusion. Ultimately, this is a call for experimentation constructing a continuum of variation around knowledge production and thus disrupting processes of reterritorialization. At the same time, new materialist case studies step beyond the endeavor of traditional case study research to achieve validity. Rather evaluative categories like extraordinary, interesting and meaningful become important. Thereby they also dissolve the binary division of trustworthy research/non-trustworthy research to recognize the self-organizing properties of data itself and open up all kind of possibilities for “becoming,” including possible case-assemblages, phenomena of interest, cases and knowledge productions. The reorientation toward such productive processes move case study research from dealing with the constant to dealing with variation and the spreading of research interests and case definitions more widely, and hence the production of novel and heterogeneous knowledge without being restricted by the methodological biases of traditional case study research.

In conclusion, we would suggest that new materialist case studies could advantageously be designed along the features of minor science. Thereby, new materialist case studies would offer new possibilities to discover and explore cases as well as the flows of affects that produce desire to research and hence research interests. The ontology of immanence make case study research infinitely more complex and unpredictable than

the traditional approaches discussed above (induction, deduction and abduction). Simultaneously, they are inherently political with an intention to encourage and bring up researcher to let go of predefined methodologies and thus open up for processes of deterritorialization when it comes to research interests and desire to explore various cases. Thereby they challenge methodological territorializations of any kind, and supports lines of flight that put an end to privileges of researchers’ knowledge, in all bodies involved.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Åsa Andersson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-2646>

References

- Alvesson, M., & Sköldböck, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology*. Sage.
- Andersson, Å., Korp, P., & Reinertsen, A. (in press). Becoming interested—The evolution of research interest in case study research on sports. *Qualitative Research*.
- Andrews, P. (2017). Is the “telling case” a methodological myth? *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(5), 455–467.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Deleuze, G. (1972). *Proust and signs*. George Braziller.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy*. City Lights.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1984). *Anti-oedipus capitalism and schizophrenia*. Athlone.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Athlone.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* Columbia University Press.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532–550.
- Enright, E., & Gard, M. (2016). Media, digital technology and learning in sport: A critical response to Hodgkinson, Biesta and James. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 21(1), 40–54.
- Fox, N. J., & Alldred, P. (2015). New materialist social inquiry: Designs, methods and research-assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 18(4), 399–414.
- Fox, N. J., & Alldred, P. (2017). *Sociology and the new materialism, theory, research, action*. Sage.
- Fox, N. J., & Alldred, P. (2018). Mixed methods, materialism and the micropolitics of the research assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(2), 191–204.
- Fullagar, S. (2017). Post-qualitative inquiry and the new materialist turn: Implications for sport, health and physical culture research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 9(2), 247–257.

- Gerring, J. (2011). The case study: What it is and what it does. In R. E. Goodin (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of political science* (pp. 1246–1284). Oxford University Press.
- Giardina, M. D. (2017). (Post?)qualitative inquiry in sport, exercise, and health: Notes on a methodologically contested present. *Qualitative research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 9(2), 258–270.
- Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 15–31.
- Hanson, N. R. (1958). *Patterns of discovery: An inquiry into the conceptual foundations of methodology*. Open University Press.
- Hein, S. F. (2017). Deleuze's new image of thought: Challenging the dogmatic image of thought in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(9), 656–665.
- Hein, S. F. (2019). Deleuze, immanence, and immanent writing in qualitative inquiry: Nonlinear texts and being a traitor to writing. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(1), 83–90.
- Hordvik, M., MacPhail, A., & Ronglan, L. T. (2019). Negotiating the complexity of teaching: A rhizomatic consideration of pre-service teachers' school placement experiences. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 24(5), 447–462.
- Jackson, A. Y. (2017). Thinking without method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(9), 666–674.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. Routledge.
- Ketokivi, M., & Choi, T. (2014). Renaissance of case research as a scientific method. *Journal of Operations Management*, 32, 232–240.
- Longhofer, J., Floersch, J., & Hartmann, E. (2017). A case for the case study: How and why they matter. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 45(3), 189–200.
- Mazzei, L. A. (2014). Beyond an easy sense: A diffractive analysis. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(6), 742–746.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2017). Haecceity: Laying out a plane for post qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(9), 686–698.
- Thorpe, H., & Clark, M. (2020). Gut Feminism, new materialisms and sportswomen's embodied health: The case of RED-S in endurance athletes. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 12, 1.
- Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument* (Updated ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- van der Tuin, I., & Dolphijn, R. (2010). The transversality of new materialism. *Women: A Cultural Review*, 21(2), 153–171.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage.

Becoming interested—the evolvment of research interest in case study research on sports

Qualitative Research
2021, Vol. 0(0) 1–17
© The Author(s) 2021



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/14687941211061053
journals.sagepub.com/home/qrij



Åsa Andersson  and Peter Korp

Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Goteborg, Sweden

Anne B Reinertsen

Department of Avdelning for lærarutdanning, Østfold University College, Halden, Norway

Abstract

This article challenge research political assumptions of research interests as context specific phenomena predefined by researchers and others in case study research on sports. By adopting a Deleuzian perspective of materiality, the aim is to overturn academic power dimensions as well as anthropocentric focuses and instead explore how research interests emerge in case-assemblages. This is a radical shift that re-theorizes the production of research interests as co-produced capacities in researching bodies. The analysis is done by mapping territorializing, deterritorializing, and reterritorializing affects as well as molar and molecular affects. We use these affects to explore how our research interest evolved in a case study on a swimming event. We conclude by extending this critical exploration to the production of research interests in general and the exaggerated belief that research interests are attributes of specific human bodies (researchers) that precede studies.

Keywords

Materiality, Deleuze, case-assemblage, research interest, desire

Corresponding author:

Åsa Andersson, Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 320, Läroverksgatan 5, Göteborg 405 30, Sweden.

Email: asa.andersson.2@gu.se

Introduction

In the social sciences of sport, traditional case study methodology is quite common. Often, we conduct case studies as empirical in-depth investigations of context specific phenomena that are of specific interest to ourselves (see, e.g., Barker-Ruchti et al., 2019; Edmonds, 2020; Ketokivi & Choi, 2014; Longhofer et al., 2017; Puddle et al., 2019; cf. Yin, 2009). In focus are objects of our perceptions that in turn constitute cases that we want to explore in order to fill various gaps of knowledge. As researchers, we are driven by curiosity, desire, or what we in this paper call research interest. Without always being clearly stated, though, the proceedings within which our research interests emerge often include vertical productions that can be related to Aristoteles' conceptions of episteme and phronesis (cf. Flyvbjerg, 2001; Irwin, 1999). Along the epistemic thread, our research interests are established by ourselves and the specific academic communities we belong to. As researchers we are authoritative and define research interests strongly linked to our overall research field and its cultural-political ideas of what "new" knowledge that is needed. In this way, the production of research interests is downward and preserves the sociocultural order of the field and from there supports a wider social and political order. Along the phronetic thread research interests are shaped and set in collaboration with others, that is, "extra-academics" (Burawoy, 2005) outside the academic field, and only then they become objects of our perceptions. As researchers, we obtain knowledge from extra-academics and are loyal to that knowledge. In this sense, phronetic interest productions are upward and may resist the overall research field and its quest for a specific social and political order. The reason for producing such research interests is to give extra-academics voice regarding what new knowledge that is needed. Thereby, the intention is to challenge the existing cultural and political order in the field.

One difference between epistemic and phronetic case study research is thus for whom knowledge is produced (Burawoy, 2005; cf. Lee, 1976). While epistemic case studies are directed to an academic audience, phronetic case studies are addressing people outside the academic field. Another difference is for what knowledge is produced (Burawoy, 2005; cf. Lynd, 1939). In this regard, epistemic case studies are interested in the ends, while phronetic case studies are more concerned about the means to reach these ends (cf. Weber, 1978.). What is rarely discussed, however, is that in both epistemic and phronetic case studies, we often try to save ourselves from criticism of credibility by protecting defined research interests (and cases) from external influences during the ongoing exploration. Nor is it noted that epistemic and phronetic case studies tend to maintain an "anthropocentric" (Braidotti, 2006:40) conception of the human and the human individual as a privileged locus where research interests appear (along with other aspects of the research process). Once the planning phase is over, we are politically conceptualized as subject-positions based in mandatory excellence, isolation and homogeneity that in turn constitutes academic power, institutionally, experientially, and discursively. It manifests within an execution culture that regards the gap between researchers and all other entities, human and non-human, as normal, convenient and plausible.

Even if the perspectives of epistemic and phronetic productions of research interests may serve as a satisfactory basis for discussions about for whom and what various

knowledge is produced, it may also be argued that these cultural models of interest production have relegated the evolvement of research interest, desire and the physicality of research practice during ongoing explorations to the status of largely unexamined backdrops to ethical discussions of power relations. One reason is that the production of predefined research interests embraces a considerable amount of power forms that may control the (life) processes of the event under study. For instance, our cognizance, awareness, and attention to specific phenomena easily become factors for the transformations of the event and hence the organization of concrete elements within the event. Drawing on Foucault (1981), Rainbow and Rose (2006:204) perhaps would call these forms of power “biopolitics.” At the same time as we as researchers are considered qualified to maintain predefined research interests, there is a significant risk that we in the name of credibility will exercise strategies to influence the existence of these phenomena of interest. Not least to be able to find answers to the right questions which is absolutely crucial in relation to most of today’s research funders. Phenomena of interest simply risk to be regulated under our truths and within discourses we speak.

In other fields, similar dilemmas of the prioritized position of researchers have generated an increased interest in anti-dualist materialist approaches that provide ontological status not to researchers as conscious subjects but to pre-human elements that interact in a web of forces, that among other things produce various bodily capacities in researchers throughout the inquiry (see, e.g., Osborne, 2006). Important to remember, though, is that these materialist approaches do not fully refuse epistemic and phronetic perspectives. Rather, epistemic and phronetic perspectives are considered to be in juxtaposition and the capacities of researching bodies to be produced horizontally. In this paper, we want to explore what might come out of this ontological step regarding the production of research interests in case study research on sport. Starting from a Deleuzian perspective of materiality, we will explore research interests not as vertical predefined phenomena, as linear consequences of academic or extra-academic research preferences, or as related to solid cases, but as becomings in assemblages of multiple human and non-human bodies, ideas and social formations that cut across the natural and cultural realms of epistemic and phronetic case studies. By expanding these sociocultural approaches to a materialist approach, we not only challenge the biopolitical control epistemic and phronetic case studies seem to include in sustaining research interests and case definitions through the execution phase, we also open up interest productions and hence cases for micro-political influences. Rather than merely emerge as political results of academics’ or extra-academics’ need of knowledge, the production of research interests become more biological, endless, and fluid. Thus, we are interested in how the production of research interests proceeds in various directions during the ongoing exploration of a case, and we explore empirical data on the evolvement of two researchers’ interests in a case study performed at a swimming event. Thereby, we provide a third, immanent, perspective on case study research that shifts the locus of research interests away from human bodies and individuals toward affective flows within case-assemblages (Andersson et al., 2020). Particularly, we are interested in how various forces between human and non-human bodies produce, but also challenge specific interests in the researchers, and hence change the researchers’ desire to explore various cases.

Materiality, assemblages and case-assemblages

Starting from a perspective of materiality entails that we recognize humans as one materiality among many, and that material forces continuously produce the world (Fox & Alldred, 2017). Given that these processes are rhizomatic and entirely experimental in contact with the real, it could perhaps be considered an onto-epistemological divergence to trace various Deleuzian concepts in the way we might do in this section. And, perhaps it would be quite unethical to pretend that this inquiry is a straightforward process where we deliberately move from one concept to another when we much more pick up speed in the encounter with these concepts, and continuously become with these concepts. Immanence is arguably the terrain here, which includes a rejection of two-world ontologies and their transcendent perspectives that acknowledge privileged standpoints from which external point of views can be taken. Hence, the often so dominant understanding that language represents the world as well as the conventional mind-matter dualism in social theory is put into question. There are simply no vertical orders or underlying and overlying realities. Rather, Deleuze and Guattari (1994:47) describe an immanent terrain as an absolute immanence and a plane. The plane of immanence is not inside anything or the uppermost layer of something, it does not belong to anyone, nor is it dependent of an object or related to a subject. Rather it is “a virtual, an open whole that (ontologically) prevents absolute closure” (Hein, 2019).

Entering this terrain, we are interested in the relational character of matter, and how matter is linked to other matter within assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988:88). Assemblages develop unpredictably around events or actions, and comprise a web of forces and encounters between various materialities (human and non-human bodies). Within the encounters various affects are produced. In tune with the immanent terrain, these affects are not in polemic and try to attack each other on disagreements, nor do they seek consensus based solutions. For Deleuze (1988:101), these affects rather change states and capabilities of bodies in relations by chance. Simultaneously, they are the means by which bodies in assemblages unfold, “become” something new (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988:258), and give off new affects. Hence, the agentic capacities of bodies always change. Within an assemblage, every affect produces new affects, like a subsequent flow of affects that continuously produce new capacities in bodies to act and desire. Desire, then, is a pushing and performative force that moves bodies in various directions. Unlike the conventional use, the Deleuzian desire is not a representation of the absence or the lack of something. Driven by affects in assemblages, desire is rather unconsciousness-productive of actions, interactions, ideas and interests (Fox & Alldred, 2017:101) that in extension produce new affective flows in assemblages.

At this point, we want to flag this approach to desire and how desire is produced and produces new affects in assemblages as an important companion in our further exploration of how research interests evolve. It is important to note, though, that Deleuze and Guattari’s conception of assemblage differ fundamentally from the conventional English understanding of assemblages (Nail, 2017). While the conventional understanding of assemblages means the union of two things or things gathered in units, the Deleuzian understanding of assemblages means arrangements of heterogeneous entities. Not paying

attention to this difference brings at least two implications that may jeopardize the ontological understanding of immanence that Deleuzian assemblages comprise: First, the emphasis on the multiplicity of entities risks to be mixed up with the state of entities as joint units and second, the emphasis on events risks to be mixed up with essences. In fact, Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy of immanence provides a different logic than that of an organic whole. While a whole is defined by its intrinsic relations and each part carries out a function that reproduces their relations and finally the balance of the whole, assemblages as well as the elements of assemblages are defined only by their external relations. When it comes to change, organic wholes may develop, but never change what they are nor can their parts be re-combined without being destroyed (imagine the human body and its organs). Assemblages (and the elements of assemblages), on the other hand, change by being added, subtracted, or recombined with each other in never ending processes. Rather than being a whole or a part of a whole, assemblages are multiplicities and thus "fragmentary wholes" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994:16).

For the social sciences of sports, the immanent perspective of materialism and theories of assemblages are far from new. Over time, a number of authors have applied the perspective of materiality to sport and physical culture (Andrews, 2016; Markula, 2014; Millington & Wilson, 2016; Pavlidis & Fullagar, 2014; Pringle et al., 2015; Roy, 2014; Weedon, 2015) and used case study design (Enright & Gard, 2016; Hordvik et al., 2019; Thorpe & Clark, 2020). Perhaps, it would be fair to say that this materialist literature involves a spectrum of methodological approaches that more or less embrace the theory of assemblages as well as the complex and entangled relations of our embodied lives as researchers. Hence, the methodological challenges of assemblage theory that require us to think theory and method together (cf. Jackson, 2017; Mazzei et al., 2018; St. Pierre, 2017) in order to unsettle the isolation and homogeneity of the researcher and produce different ways of doing research have been recognized to varying degrees. Inspired by this literature, we suggest in a previous paper (Andersson et al., 2020) that out of respect for the bodies involved, qualitative case study research in the social sciences of sports need to challenge traditional boundaries of knowledge production and thus transgress what has been normed as constituent of qualitative case study research. For instance, if a qualitative case study should align with the Deleuzian perspective of materiality it is not possible to extract a case from its context and all the social units and circumstances that made possible the specific case. Instead, we need to acknowledge that a vast network of processes shapes the case continuously. In the aforementioned paper (Andersson et al., 2020), we call these networks "case-assemblages." When it comes to the production of research interest we also suggest that case-assemblages, rather than individual researchers should be in focus. Thereby, we move the production of research interests away from individual bodies. In relation to traditional case study research, this is a radical shift that re-theorizes the production of research interests as a pre-human affective flow within case-assemblages that in turn produces various capacities (interests) in researching bodies.

However, case-assemblages are not just mixtures of diverse elements involved in the research process, but just like all other assemblages (cf. Nail, 2017), they entail constructive processes that lay out at least three characteristics that define their arrangement. First, all case-assemblages are networks of specific external relations. Each

case-assemblage is defined by its own set of relations. Deleuze and Guattari would call these relations their “abstract machines” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988:141). Abstract because they do not really exist in the world, but consists of various relations within which concrete elements and productions appear and become visible in the moment. Machine because various concrete elements meet each other and where one element creates a flow which is broken by another element. What happens in this machinery of a case-assemblage is that things are felt, desired, and produced.

Second, a case-assemblage includes concrete elements. The concrete elements constitute the visible form of a case-assemblage. Even if abstract machines work as case-assemblages’ local conditions of possibility, they do not define the concrete elements of case-assemblages in advance, nor do they provide them with a certain course along which they will move. Rather, abstract machines support combinations of concrete elements and admit the possibility of their simultaneous occurrences. Hence, abstract machines and concrete elements are mutually decisive and immanent to each other (Deleuze & Guattari 1988:141). If abstract machines change, concrete elements change and vice versa. Following this movement, formations of our researching bodies are always dynamic and include relatively intense capacities to both affect and be affected. Likewise, the capacities of our researching bodies are constantly changing. This is also why concrete elements of case-assemblages should not be confused with essences. There are no transcendent relations between abstract machines and concrete elements. Defined by constantly changing external relations, concrete elements are only being settled at a given point.

Third, case-assemblages have agents. These agents are immanent to both external relations and concrete elements in case-assemblages. Thereby, they are not rational subjects making decisions without being affected by the concrete elements and external relations of a case-assemblage. Nor are they enslaved by these features and completely incapable of action. Rather, the agents are mobile figures able to “connect various concrete elements together according to their abstract relations” (Nail 2017:27). Important to remember, though, is that Deleuze and Guattari treat agents as collective subjects of ongoing events meaning that agents never act in first person, but rather as a collectively immanent third-person (Deleuze & Guattari 1994:64–65) of a case-assemblage.

Within case-assemblages external relations, concrete entities and agents can be arranged in different ways. In these arrangements, they may have different opportunities to exert influence on each other and produce various processes of change (Nail 2017). Each potential change is a result of its network and thus the social and historical processes it is connected to (cf. Deleuze & Guattari 1994). Deleuze and Guattari clarify that there are at least two processes of change going on in (case-)assemblages. First, there is a territorialization–deterritorialization–reterritorialization process (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988: 88–89). This process addresses how concrete elements as well as relations between concrete elements continuously are affected by various features in their immediate environment. A territorialization appears when a specific environment of external relations establishes a concrete element’s capacity to produce specific qualities. Imagine a stick lying in the woods. If you pick the stick up and use it as a tool to put the sausage on as you cook it over an open fire, the capacity of the stick simultaneously will change from a random stick to a barbecue stick able to produce a sense of well-being, security and

control when it comes to your cooking. The stick has become territorialized. A de-territorialization, on the other hand, appears when an environment of external relations generalizes and destabilizes concrete elements and their capacities to produce specific qualities. For instance, when you have finished grilling and the stick is no longer needed you may throw it back into the woods. In that moment, the stick changes from a barbecue stick to a random stick. Thereby, its capacities to produce qualities also changes from being specific to become more generalized. In its most radicalized form, the deterritorialization may lead to a “line of flight” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988:277) moving the stick towards new and unforeseen possibilities. Sooner or later, however, the stick will end up in a new environment with a new set of external relations that will reterritorialize the stick by (re)specifying it and (re)shaping its capacity to produce “new” specific qualities. It is not our intention, however, to diminish the concepts of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization while they are explained. In an assemblage, there are only co-constitutive forces. For instance, while you are working with and upon the stick, the stick is also working with you. Hitting each other and becoming hit by each other you simultaneously become other. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1988:249) would say that you and the stick become with each other, you become (with) stick as stick becomes (with) you. This implies that neither you nor the stick is defined by your internal elements. Rather you are multiplicities defined by the number of dimensions you have. At the same time as you gain or lose a dimension, you also change in nature. I guess it would be fair to say that both you and the stick are composed of heterogeneous terms in symbiosis, and that you in the encounter in the wood are transforming yourselves and each other into a string of other multiplicities according to the threshold.

The second process of change going on in case-assemblages relates to the distinction between molar- and molecular flows of affects produced in environments of external relations (Deleuze & Guattari 1984:273). While molar flows of affects produces aggregative effects that tend to organize concrete elements into groups by assigning them converging identities and capacities, molecular flows of affects produce singular outcomes in concrete elements without grouping these elements into categories or other clusters. In the example above, the stick in the woods become aggregated into a barbecue stick in the moment you chose to pick it up. And, as soon as your satiety makes you stop grilling sausages and throw the stick back into the woods, the immediate environment of external relations produces molecular affects and the stick become singularized. Politically, then, molar and molecular affects operate as two extremes in a continuum where molar affects include systems of social organization, categorizations and standardization of cultural norms, and where molecular affects simultaneously enable concrete elements to resist these constraining forces. By revealing the forces that trespass concrete elements, these affective flows enable critical understandings of power not far from the biopolitical effects of epistemic and phronetic interest productions we discuss initially and hence how micropolitics of power acts upon the actions of researchers. However, it is important to notice that the process of change related to biopolitics is downward and has its starting place in the mass of knowledge at a certain time and place, while the processes of change related to molar and molecular affects are horizontal and start with interactions between external relations. This shift in perspective makes it not only possible, but also inevitable

to discover and map molecular affects, and in the extension create critical understandings of resistance. This since various relations (social, cultural, psychological, emotional, physical, and biological) make available new capacities in concrete elements to act and desire and thus resist forces of territorialization. For Deleuze, this is a process of becoming. For us it is undoubtedly an experimentation of what is and what might become in a case study on sport.

Dead-data and the emergence of research interests in a case-assembly

We will now explore how the affective flows within these two processes of change (territorialization/deterritorialization/reterritorialization and molar/molecular) contribute to the production of new capacities of bodies to act and desire and hence play an important part when it comes to the evolution of research interests in a swimming event. The data we present is drawn from observations and dialogues within a case study of this swimming event in elementary schools in Gothenburg, Sweden conducted by the authors in 2018–2019. Initially, our research interest was to explore how young people become healthy by increased swimming skills. Traditionally designed along the phronetic thread, the case was defined as the production of health in the ongoing swimming event, the context as the overall school project within which children were supposed to learn how to swim and the embedded units of analysis as the children and teachers involved in the swimming education. However, in our further exploration of the evolution of research interest, we do not start from this upward and hence vertical approach to case study research, but operate also in a horizontal dimension of materiality with the attempt to map the conditions that (for the very first time) made us think differently (cf. Deleuze, 1994: 183–184) about case study research and predefined research interest, and consequently moved our recognition of research interest out of its dominant tradition of predetermination and the human individual as a privileged locus for its appearance. Central to this movement was the abstract machine of a case-assembly. We pay attention to the abstract machine of the case-assembly because it consists of external relations, and thus encounters that provided us with the opportunity to catch a glimpse of how our research interest evolved during the ongoing exploration of the swimming event. We then extend this critical exploration to the production of research interests in general and the exaggerated belief that research interests are attributes of specific human bodies (the researchers) that precede studies.

So, how can the relationality and the flows of affects within this case-assembly be illustrated? Considering a learning event in the water involving two bodies at the simplest. The one who learns and the one who teaches. While the affects within this assembly are in part physical, stimulating specific movements and swimming techniques, perhaps producing trust and self-confidence, there are typically many more relations in a case-assembly than just the two bodies. Except other relations linked to the physical learning event such as personal and cultural contexts, past events, water, codes of conduct, memories and experiences and so forth, there are at least two other bodies involved in a case-assembly, namely, the body of a researcher and the body of traditional case study methodology. Even if these relations are in part physical, they are also sociocultural and

psychological creating anxiety, curiosity, pride, distance, uncertainty and so forth among the researcher. Consequently, the case-assemblage comprises at least four bodies, the learner, the teacher, the researcher, and the body of traditional qualitative research. Moreover, it comprises physical elements such as water, social norms, past experiences and circumstances, personalities and expectations.

However, of far more interest than simply listing these external relations are the changes of capacities and states produced by these relations within the case-assemblage. Such changes of bodies and the micropolitics they reveal will help us to map how our research interest transformed from being considered predetermined and of particular interest to us into a becoming with all the elements in the swimming event. Despite that the body of traditional case study methodology did its best to territorialize us and force us into a relative stable form of recognizable case study research and apply what we had learned from academic textbooks and university courses, the encounter with the swimming event was quite confusing. For instance, while we tried to stay focused on gathering the data we needed to answer the predefined aim of our study (to explore how health comes into beings with increased swimming skills, and with what effects?), new questions came cross our bodies quite uncontrollable. The children did not seem to learn to swim in the way we had expected. Nor did the teachers act in the way we had foreseen. While the children often perceived the water too scary, the teachers acted much more caring than we could ever imagine. We also discovered that for some of the children, increased swimming skills were not the obvious goal of the swimming event. An 11-year-old girl found other capacities just as important to develop:

The most important thing is to learn to trust others, only then can you learn to trust yourself. If you don't trust yourself, it is very scary to do things you don't know how to do. Today, for example, we have jumped from the edge of the pool without knowing how to swim.

At that moment, curiosity was created in our researching bodies about what was really going on in the pool. This desire to know was further reinforced by another 11-year-old girl who was unsure of what grade she would receive next year for school physical education because she could not swim. Nevertheless, developing swimming skills was not her only focus during the swimming lesson. She was also paying attention to various challenges and to build pride in herself by overcoming these challenges.

I always feel so proud in the afternoons when I leave this swimming education because I have always done things I never thought that I would do

On these occasions, our desire to explore specific phenomenon changed rapidly in various directions. Before we even knew it, we wished to explore both how young people become confident- and how they become proud with increased swimming education. These changes not only felt fun and positive, they also created uncertainty in our researching bodies. Questions like, what are we really looking at? Are we paying attention to the right things? And how do we know what to focus on? Immediately turned up. In retrospect, we appreciate that these occasions were encounters that provoked our

understandings both regarding the development of swimming skills and the privilege of researchers to hold on to specific predefined phenomena of interest in a case study, and that it was in this moment we started to perceive our presence at the swimming event differently. We were not in a controlling position anymore. And, we were certainly not alone in deciding what phenomena to observe. It was like our eyes were becoming increasingly cloudy and we could only see clearly for short moments. Sometimes, it felt like we could not see anything at all. And, if so, what was it that we saw? Was it a real phenomenon or a fictional one? Did it exist or was it an imagination brought into existence like a creation? At the same time as we realized that the data was not only “dead-data” letting themselves be understood in a predetermined manner, our research interest became increasingly unspecified. Moreover, we began to doubt our possibilities to make observations on data. The volatile images we managed to catch in the swim event were rather created in collaboration with data, which in turn forced us in to a situation of what we may call creative observations. Creative because we associated these observations with movement, and within which we increasingly seemed to lose our position as subjects and instead become the ones who got things moving by highlighting interesting phenomena produced in various interaction in the swim event. However, this was not an easy process and it certainly did not happen without resistance. Along with the traditional body of case study research, the physical environment with swimming pools and benches to sit on beside the pools repeatedly tried to (re)territorialized our researching bodies into traditional observers as well as experts regarding swimming education. One swimming teacher honestly apologized for addressing one of us as we sat on benches on different sides of the pool:

I shouldn't really bother you while you do your observations, but what do you think about the swimming education so far? What exactly are you looking at? And, do you think we are doing alright, or can you give us some advice so that we can improve?

While answering politely by giving a brief explanation of what we were doing and what we have noticed so far, this conversation also led to a friendly chat about research approaches. Was it appropriate to have a conversation like this with the “data” during the observations, or not? And, how would such a conversation be considered by other researchers? Even if the talk between us was easygoing, it was also a reminder of conventional research and the importance of being able to perform research that is considered rigorous and trustworthy by others. Our concern probably arose because neither we, nor researchers in our vicinity, seem ready to trouble the notion of one-directional relations between researchers and “data” and ultimately give away some control to “data” during the exploration phase. Due to the slow drip of neoliberalism (including market-orientation and expectations of increased productivity and cost-efficiency) as a normalized pattern of interactions, we often lack time and work with limited financial resources, and hence we prefer to stay safe and conduct epistemologically tailored data collections that are just as large as they need to be in order to answer specific research questions. Thereby, we are also accustomed to focus more on the procedures of data collection and data analysis and less (if anything) on the roles of data. Rather than being an aspect of production, data is

thus habitually treated as a distant object possible to possess. From a materialist perspective, this is a severe limitation of data that tends to further limit our capacities to produce knowledge. Rather, we are suggested to shift focus from acting on data to the workings data is doing on us and thus destabilize the roles of both data and ourselves and in extension become with data. However, the physical effects of data as always knowable, fixed and certain combined with the status the very research title seemed to entail further stabilized and ranked the bodies in terms of physical attendance in the research process. The one who learned and the one who taught were participating in the water while the body of established qualitative methodology and the researching bodies sat on the bench and watched the show, even though the latter no longer were sure of what they were looking at, or what roles they were undertaking.

In this process, however, various material components in the swimming event somehow took action and external relations within the case-assemblage affected our researching bodies into positions where the given concerning development of swimming skills and emergence of research interests no longer sufficed. The familiar landmarks of our thoughts regarding case study research began to fall apart and we felt like we lost our orientation for a while. As concrete elements, we were in a process of deterritorialization and our capacities to produce specific qualities were both generalized and destabilized. No longer able to define a long-lasting research interest and consequently a solid case, it felt like the conventional approach of phronetic case study research started to undo itself. To a large extent, however, the assemblage we inhabited comprised ready-made methodological designs and normative forms of thinking that did their best to prevent us from these liberating forces. The main objective seemed to be to maintain credibility, validity and stability. Among other things, this representation of conventional thinking also constantly tried to make us (re)define the case, its context and its embedded units of analysis into spatial and activity based boundaries. The case was (again) defined as the production of something (health, confidence or pride) in the ongoing swimming event, the context as the overall school project within which children were supposed to learn how to swim and the embedded units of analysis as the children and teachers involved in the swimming lesson. Micropolitically, these interactions produced formal and informal hierarchies which further reinforced the gap between the researchers and all other material components as normal, and who might have the right to define and investigate whom, and consequently the right to define what phenomenon that is of specific interest to explore. The researchers, the context, the case, and the embedded units of analysis were all assigned different roles. It also produced limited research capacities in that our researching bodies were focusing more upon doing the right things and not challenging existing arrangements, than interacting and exploring the ongoing swimming event by following the rhythm of occasions.

The traditional body of case study research (re)territorialized our researching bodies and again ascribed value to traditional case study designs. The playful and friendly exchange of ethical and methodological remarks with peers as well as the competitive posturing of qualitative research in general sustained us within this position, aggregating our research into what many qualitative scholars would describe as rigorous and trustworthy. As aforementioned, however, not all occasions at the swimming event were

aggregative. Sometimes, singularizing affects derived from disrupting encounters during the observations and imposed themselves on our thoughts. Simultaneously, these affects effectively generated new relations that completely changed our understanding of research interests and how they evolve. This was not a smooth awakening, but rather turbulent to our researching bodies. For instance, we experienced such a turbulent encounter when we realized that the production of knowledge in the swimming pool was not one-directional, but at least two-directional if not multi-directional. The one who was supposed to teach also learned and the one who was supposed to learn also taught. An example of this is when a girl would learn to float and the swimming instructor habitually holds her hands under the girl's shoulders. After a short moment of panic and fear, the girl placed her hands on the swimming instructor's arms and as a response to that movement, the teacher moved her whole body closer to the girl's shoulders. At the same time as the girl learned how to float, the teacher learned that physical contact and closeness were important for the girl to feel safe in the water. In relation to this, the swimming pool also had different meanings. One moment it was an arena for a child's education, the next moment it was an arena for the instructor's further training and the development of the swimming education in general. When it comes to case study research, these specifications were not only non-aggregative regarding case study research, but produced capacity generalization and thus a deterritorialization of our predetermined research interest opening up new possibilities for action and interaction with various material components in the swimming event. In this moment, the research interest also became an experimental tool born out of the materiality of a case-assemblage. Simultaneously, we realized that this was a "line of flight" propelling that once we have entered the terrain of immanence research interests cannot be known in advance and regulated by gaps in previous research or by extra-academics' predefined need for knowledge nor can they be a plan or starting place. Rather, they are emergent and evolving and have to be uncovered in fragments in collaboration with all other material components during the ongoing exploration.

Collective production of research interests

The analyses above demonstrate that research interests are areas of material affects that refuse to be reduced to expressions of the single body of a researcher or collaborations with extra-academics during the planning phase of a case study. Rather, our materialist perspective shows that data and other material components that researchers encounter during ongoing explorations seem pretty much alive and claim to be party to the production of research interests. Perhaps this is also what Koro-Ljungberg (2016:48) implies when she writes about "methodological fluid spaces," "data-wants," and "data's desire" to enable researchers to think differently about the relationship to data, and what Safron (2019:6) suggests when she encourage us to re-imagine what matters in inquiries through an affective lens. In company with these lines of thought, we illustrate at least some of the complex relations that surround the evolvment of research interests in a case-assemblage at a swimming event. And, while Hickey-Moody (2013:82) argues that human bodies are extensions of substances and constantly re-make themselves through their relations,

interests and actions in the context which they live, our findings indicates that relations between researchers and other material components are not stable but constantly in change and affected by processes of territorialization and deterritorialization as well as molar and molecular flows that aggregate and singularize bodies that at least sometimes cut them loose on a line of flight regarding research interests and how they evolve. Following these analyses, research interests evolve as causes of interactions between various bodies, and the process of researchers becoming interested is placed in the middle between these bodies. Yet, one interest does not become the other; a research interest evolves between the bodies. Hence, the evolution of research interest is an issue of assembled relations in a “case” that produces various desires to explore. Informed by our collective thinking with Deleuze (1987:361), Jackson (2017), St Pierre (2017), and Fox and Alldred (2017) we call this a multiplicity and a “minor case” (Andersson et al., 2020) where all components in an event come together and (among other things) produce various research interests. Important to remember though, is that these interests in our bodies do not emerge from cognitive decision making. As Mazzei et al. (2018:5) imply, we are no subjects who speak from positions of knowers or act independently of assemblages. Rather, the desire to explore produces specific capacities in researching bodies to act and engage in various phenomena, be it an interest, frustration, curiosity, or something else. At the same time as the desire to explore a phenomenon makes other affects flow in the “case” under study, it is also the force that drives researchers as well as research interests to become other.

This materialist analysis challenges traditional case study methodology and its pre-defined cases that are of specific interest to the researcher by suggesting that the production of research interest are far more complicated than epistemic and phronetic approaches reveal. Instead of treating research interests in ongoing case studies as linear results of predetermined research focuses and risk to end up in situations where even the most sincere intention of equal knowledge production in phronetic case studies seems to be depended on the idea of solid cases, we need to go further and consider research interests as collective productions that evolve throughout the research process and thus at a socially just level (Strom & Porfillio, 2019:3) of actions and interactions in case-assemblages. Ultimately, we enroll ourselves into a dialogue about the importance of thinking with theory in qualitative research (see, e.g., Jackson & Mazzei, 2013:261; Lather, 2007; Ringrose, 2019:2; St Pierre, 2009), and we (re)orient research interests and case productions beyond method and methodologies to an engagement with an immanent philosophy of inquiry (Giardina, 2016:262). The non-linearity of interest production is made up by a web of forces and encounters between various affects deriving from nature and culture, including the physicality of water, the culture of traditional methodology, grades, curriculums, and the awareness of bodies. Despite that the body of traditional methodology tending to position the researchers as subjects, it seems pretty clear that affective flows in case-assemblages also comprise deterritorializing as well as singularizing effects that occasionally release the researchers from being territorialized in conventional case study research, and thus from being based in mandatory excellence, isolation and homogeneity when it comes to maintaining a research interest. The researching bodies simply break free from the aggregated form of “researchers” showing us

that even though epistemic and phronetic research often is strongly limited in execution, there are always affective forces making it possible to become other and participate in more equal processes of interest production. It should be mentioned, though, that letting the material components of the research process take action and equally participate in the creation of “new” research interests like we do in this inquiry, is not a solution to ethical problems of academic power dimensions in case study research on sports. Like Fullagar (2017:248) implies, the field of sport (as well as the fields of health, exercise and leisure) is “governed by range of normative assumptions” and hence an interplay of forces that include policy narratives, institutional contexts, disciplinary conventions, and academic traditions. Nevertheless, the engagement with re-imagine and change the production of research interests in accompaniment with the Deleuzian philosophy of immanence is important to the extent that it offers an opportunity to perform research otherwise, transgress what has been normed (Kuby et al., 2015:141) and thus become interested in “new” phenomena along with other material components involved in the ongoing exploration.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Åsa Andersson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-2646>

References

- Andersson Å, Korp P and Reinertsen A. B. (2020) Thinking with new materialisms in qualitative case studies. *International Journal Of Qualitative Methods* 19: 1–9.
- Andrews G (2016) From post-game to play-by-play: animating sports movement-space. *Progress in Human Geography* 1–29 41: 766–794.
- Barker-Ruchti N, Schubring A, Post A, et al. (2019) An elite athlete’s storying of injuries and non-qualification for an olympic games: a socio-narratological case study. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11(5): 687–703.
- Braidotti R (2006) *Transpositions*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Burawoy M (2005) For public sociology. *American Sociological Review* 70(1): 4–28.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1984) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze G (1988) *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1994) *What Is Philosophy?*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze G (1994) *Difference and Repetition*. London: Bloomsbury.

- Edmonds SE (2020) Geographies of (coss)fitness: an ethnographic case study of a crossfit box. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 12(2): 192–206.
- Enright E and Gard M (2016) Media, digital technology and learning in sport: a critical response to hodkinson, biesta and james. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 21(1): 40–54.
- Flyvbjerg B (2001) *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Science Fails and How it Can Begin to Succeed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox N and Alldred P (2017) *Sociology and the New Materialism, Theory, Research, Action*. London: Sage.
- Fullagar S (2017) Post-qualitative inquiry and the new materialist turn: implications for sport, health and physical culture research. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 9(2): 247–257.
- Giardina MD (2016) (Post ?) qualitative inquiry in sport, exercise, and health: notes on a methodologically contested present. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 9(2): 258–270.
- Hein S.F. (2019) Deleuze, Immanence, and Immanent Writing in Qualitative Inquiry: Nonlinear Texts and Being a Traitor to Writing. *Qualitative Inquiry* 25(1): 83–90.
- Hickey-Moody A (2013) Affects as method: feelings, aesthetics and affective pedagogy. In: Coleman R and Ringrose J (eds), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hordvik M, MacPhail A and Ronglan LT (2019) Negotiating the complexity of teaching: a rhizomatic consideration of pre-service teachers' school placement experiences. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 24(5): 447–462.
- Jackson AY (2017) Thinking without method. *Qualitative Inquiry* 23(9): 666–674.
- Jackson AY and Mazzei LA (2013) Plugging one text into another. *Qualitative Inquiry* 19(4): 261–271.
- Irwin T (1999) *Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics (Trans. With Commentary by Irwin)*. Hackett, Indianapolis/Cambridge.
- Ketokivi M and Choi T (2014) Renaissance of case research as a scientific method. *Journal of Operations Management* 32: 232–240.
- Koro-Ljungberg M (2016) *Reconceptualizing Qualitative Research Methodologies without Methodology*. London: Sage.
- Kuby CR, Kuby CR, Aguayo RC, et al. (eds), (2015) Teaching, troubling, transgressing: thinking with theory in a post-qualitative inquiry course. *Qualitative Inquiry* 22(2): 140–148.
- Lather P (2007) *Getting Lost: Feminist Efforts toward a Double(d) Science*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lee AM (1976) Presidential address: sociology for whom? *American Sociological Review* 41: 925–936.
- Longhofer J, Floersch J and Hartmann E (2017) A case for the case study: how and why they matter. *Clinical Social Work Journal* 45(3): 189–200.
- Lynd R (1939) *Knowledge for what? The Place of Social Sciences in American Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Markula P (2014) The moving body and social change. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 14(5): 483–495.

- Mazzei LA, Graham MC and Smithers LE (2018) Enactments of a minor inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry* 26: 1–11.
- Millington B and Wilson B (2016) *The Greening of Golf: Sport, Globalization and the Environment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Nail T (2017) What is an assemblage? *SubStance* 46(1): 21–37.
- Osborne T (2006) On mediators: intellectuals and the ideas trade in knowledge society. *Economy and Society* 33(4): 430–447.
- Pavlidis MA and Fullagar S (2014) *Sport, Gender and Power: The Rise of Roller Derby*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Pringle R, Rinehart RE and Caudwell J (2015) *Sport and the Social Significance of Pleasure*. London: Routledge.
- Puddle D, Wheaton B and Thorpe H (2019) The glocalization of parkour: a New Zealand/Aotearoa case study. *Sport in Society* 22(10): 1724–1741.
- Ringrose J (2019) PhEmaterialism: response-able research & pedagogy. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology* 2(32): 1–39.
- Roy G (2014) ‘Taking emotions seriously’: feeling female and becoming-surfer through UK surf space. *Emotion, Space and Society* 12: 41–48.
- Safron C (2019) Reimagining health and fitness materials: an affective inquiry into collaging. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodologies* 10(2–3): 40–60.
- St.Pierre EA (2009) Afterword: decentering voice in qualitative inquiry. In: Jackson, A. Y. and Mazzei, L. A. (eds), *Voice in qualitative inquiry*. London: Routledge, pp. 221–236.
- St.Pierre EA (2017) Haecceity: laying out a plane for post qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry* 23(9): 686–698.
- Strom K and Porfilio B (2019) Critical hybrid pedagogies: A self-study inquiry into faculty practices in a blended educational leadership EdD program. *E-learning and Digital Media* 16(11): 1–14.
- Thorpe H and Clark M (2020) Gut feminism, new materialisms and sportwomen’s embodied health: the case of RED-S in endurance athletes. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 12: 1–17.
- Weber M (1978). In: Roth G and Wittich C (eds), *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkely: University California Press.
- Weedon G (2015) Camaraderie reincorporated. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 39(6): 431–454.
- Yin RK (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage.



Responsibilities beyond professional obligations and morals in physical education, sports, and research

What I put forward is that predetermined processes of involvement and participation do not guarantee inclusion. Despite the overall mission to include all students in physical education, recent studies show that some students still experience exclusion and a sense of not fitting in (see e.g., Azzarito et al, 2017; Barker et al, 2014; Fitzpatrick 2019; Larsson et al, 2011; Walseth, 2015). Similarly, studies of sports demonstrate that many children and youth shift away from organized activities towards self-organized and sedentary activities (see e.g., Harris et al. 2017; Eime et al. 2019; Norberg 2020). And unfortunately, research does not seem to be an exception. Even if many forms of qualitative research call for collaboration outside academia, we are still doing a lot of research on various people, and not so much with them. In the encounter with my notes about the process where Amira learned to float, these realities inspire me to confront the insufficiencies of our conventional images of thought, and raise questions about whether the undisputable framing of physical education, sports, and research as transcendent and supreme elements, to which we seem bound in our thoughts and our ethics, is precisely part of the problem? Perhaps, the crisis of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research is also an ethical crisis?

I am worried that our processes of inclusion have suffered extensively in step with the emergence of neoliberal movements in physical education, sports, and research, creating even narrower views as to what constitutes inclusive processes and perhaps responsible teachers, coaches, and researchers. At the same time as we are facing increasing financial difficulties, we seem to be encouraged to perform more and more decontextualized, disengaged, and temporal teaching, coaching

and research in order to achieve easily attainable outcomes, faster deliveries, and other cost-savings. In physical education, for instance, it does not seem to help much that the school subject has received an extended timeframe in recent years. Increased congestion in the gyms/sport halls (rooms equipped for physical exercise) and attempts to maintain the image of a professional profession through collegial collaboration where teachers encounter other teachers and deliver within-professional decisions rather seem to complicate the processes of inclusion. And perhaps swimming education (as the only terrain in the syllabus with clearly stated requirements when it comes to goal fulfillment) goes even further? When Amira takes part in the swimming lessons offered in physical education, she does not meet a teacher in physical education. Rather, she encounters a swimming instructor who is employed by the swimming arena and who has been trained to follow an established ten-stage model that clarifies how students most effectively learn to swim. And, I guess she is not the only one. In physical education, swimming seems to be increasingly taught by external instructors from other areas of employment, and we tend to rely more and more on ready-made models for teaching (and learning). Perhaps expertise in physical education issues has shifted much more to an emphasis on quick fixes, reliable methods, and certain results? I have noticed similar evolvments in sports and research. Training of professionals who specialize in specific terrains of thought, and as a result steadily add to the sum of knowledge within their particular subject area. We need rapid solutions, and we really do not have time to get lost on our way towards expected results. For me, then, the financial tensions that currently spread throughout physical education, sports, and research expose wider assumptions of what kind of professional acts are needed. They also inspire me to consider what professional acts I want to be part of, and give me the opportunity to invite you to a broader dialogue where we perhaps re-think our professional responsibilities as teachers, coaches, and researchers?

Is it possible that our professional responsibilities do not end with our duties? And, that our professional responsibilities are broader? Just like professional knowledge (knowledge about best praxis, knowledge about how to design activities, knowledge about subject-specific traditions, knowledge about important activities to come), I guess, professional responsibility can be viewed in different ways, and include both teachers, coaches, and researchers for whom physical activity is one of many activities used to achieve something else, teachers coaches, and researchers whose content area is physical activity, and many others in between.

Thinking with professional responsibility on a continuum like this may encourage complex understandings of physical education, sports, and research as well as their processes of inclusion. Perhaps it also helps us to resist firm beliefs and certainties, and thus learn new things in uncertain situations? And speculate about whether today's complex and uncertain processes of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research require new professional responsibility? A professional responsibility that puts conventional physical education, sports, and research out of order, and causes confusion in fixed professional identities?

In the contexts of physical education, sports, and research, professional responsibility is often a moral issue. It is about doing the right things to achieve predetermined goals and expected results (see e.g., Burgess 2013:12; Macdonald 2014; Quennerstedt 2019; St. Pierre et al. 2018). It is our duty to take responsibility and do our very best to move our operations as directly as possible from one point to another without, for instance, faking any results or harming anyone. This is also where our ethical commitments often come into play. Ethical commitments following from morality and binary opposites (this is right, this is wrong). It is our ethical professional responsibility (and duty) as teachers, coaches, and researchers to be honest and protect our participants from harm when engaging in our activities and moving towards predefined results. Sometimes, we are even expected to report on this to various ethical review boards. When it comes to sustainable inclusion, however, I think it is important to discuss our extended professional responsibilities in physical education, sports, and research. Professional responsibilities beyond honesty, achieved results and protection of participants. And, it is not my intention to introduce a binary relation between traditional and new professional responsibilities. Rather, I suggest that professional responsibility in physical education, sports, and research may include more than honesty, fulfillment of predetermined goals and protection from harm. I want to introduce a dialogue that opens up for complexities and do not reduce professional responsibilities to single commitments. And perhaps, Deleuze's idea of bodies as relational categories, and their constant becomings in encounters with each other may serve as a helpful conceptual way to problematize narrow views of traditional professional responsibility related to moral obligations in physical education, sports, and research, and elaborate on a novel professional responsibility that extends beyond the current assessments of physical education, sports, and research?

For Deleuze (1988:17), bodies can be defined by their capacities for being affected in the encounter with other bodies. Each body can be seen as a center through which various actions and passions are expressed. And, this should not be confused with some conventional individualism. Rather, Deleuze (following Spinoza) is interested in how affects are distributed through bodies and in how affective bodies influence each other and open up for new actions and relations. When the swimming instructor and Amira encounter each other in the water, Amira's panicked movements when she gets water in her ears make it possible for the swimming instructor to change her physical position and get closer to Amira. The swimming instructor's physical nearness also makes it possible for Amira to relax and float. It is the situation where Amira becomes a floater. She is floating. However, far from all encounters increase capacities in our bodies. Perhaps they may even reduce our abilities to act. I wonder, what happens when students are told to step aside because they do not behave properly during a swimming lesson? Or when swimming instructors are criticized by their colleagues for not following a previously agreed method of swimming? Do we silence them?

I also wonder if our rowdy students and incomprehensible colleagues (whom we so easily reject) possibly have something important to say? Important for them, and us? For Deleuze, affective flows between bodies are also about ethics. In this situation, ethics is not so much about the question of right and wrong, nor is it about performing specific activities to achieve pre-determined results. These practices are much more related to morality and the prevention of the emergence of new modes of existence. Rather, Deleuze (1997:135) wants us to avoid the application of transcendent criteria because these procedures can diminish the productive potential of our encounters in such a way that our opportunities to think novel thoughts are reduced to what is already known. Instead, Deleuze suggests that we should expose ourselves to immanent encounters within which we bump into various bodies and are bumped into by various bodies, and where various forces are produced and give rise to various bodily experiences and guide our lives in so far as they crystallize into ideas. And, to let our bodies enter into composition with each other does not imply some logic of consensus, nor does it indicate a situation where one body is taken over by the other. An immanent encounter is much more a collective innovation that, at least sometimes, inspires us with joyful passion and opens up for novel thinking and living. Ethics, then, strongly relates to the logic of becoming. Since our bodies are continuously shaped by the relations they are involved in, I guess there are no bodily essences, but just becoming bodies. And I strongly suggest that we must assume that we cannot know in advance how our bodies will affect each other, and that we need to be brave enough to rely on the encouraging speculation that we do not yet know what we might become. Nor do we know in advance what our (and other) bodies can do. We simply have to wait for them to show us. When the swimming instructor encounter Amira in the water, her professional responsibility is not so much about various judgements related to pre-determined results but rather bringing into existence another Amira, another physical education, another swimming instructor, another me and (perhaps) another you.

The swimming instructor do not employ a simple extension of traditional professional responsibility and make it include more aspects usually excluded from it. As I see it, she invites us to shift terrain in our thinking. And, move beyond an additive logic that tend to leave other key elements like meaning, consciousness and language intact (cf. Buchanan 2015:388). And for me, this is important. By merely adding, and not transforming contents and viewpoints, I guess the practice of inclusion in physical education, sports, and research would only reproduce `the

great divides' (cf. Thiele 2014:209) it aims to undo. Sometimes the immanent encounter provided by Amira and the swimming instructor inspires me to talk about individual and collective inclusion. I have done that several times by now, and while the logic of individual inclusion envisions the individual as external to the predetermined context in which he or she is expected to be included, collective inclusion implies mutual inclusion and pays attention to individuals' immanent relationships with both pleasant and unpleasant changes of our activities in physical education, sports, and research. Here, physical education, sports and research are not pre-determined. These phenomenon are rather sited at the level of creation, and hence becoming in relation to various bodies involved in them.

Perhaps, it is in relation to collective inclusion and its close connection between ethics and becoming that we can possibly catch a glimpse of what I call professional-ethical-responsibility. When the swimming instructor encounter Amira in the water, she has no intention of either maintaining or dismantling the pre-determined ten-stage model for swimming lessons. Her focus is much more on Amira, the water and perhaps me in the stand. I am not sure if she even notices that she deviates from the ten-stage model in the situation where Amira learns to float. And, that the ten-stage model just become one of many elements that affects her (and become affected by her). In tune with other authors (see e.g. Hynes 2013), she challenges my conventional thinking of ethical responsibility organized as a something caused by pre-existing subjects or agendas. In the encounter with Amira, I guess the swimming instructor do not perceive any ethical demands placed on her as a subject. Her professional-ethical-responsibility do not pre-exist the swimming event. It does not evolve from some exercise in subjective reflection on a predetermined swimming lesson, but from the encounter with Amira which seems to transform her professional thoughts far beyond collegial collaborations related to duty.

Perhaps Amira and the swimming instructor offer us a non-professional-ethical-responsibility? For Deleuze and Guattari (1994), this would not be a negative evolvment. The 'non- professional...' does not mean the lack of professional-ethical-responsibility. Nor is it about the denial of professional-ethical-responsibility. Rather, it is about the action of becoming more extensive in the encounter with other's thoughts (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:218) and opening up our conventional thinking of professional responsibility to immanent forces in encounters with others. Sometimes I even call this extra-professional-

responsibility. In a similar way, Todd (2003:141) puts forward that responsibility is produced in our relations and cannot be reduced to just cohering to pre-defined principles that we apply to recognized situations. For me, then, professional-ethical-responsibility in physical education, sports, and research concerns potentialities and what might come into being much more than what is. As teachers, coaches and researchers we cannot be blindly led by obligations to which we are morally and legally bound. Rather, we need to be vigilant about established knowledges so as to not just make progress in our own groove.

In this situation, professionalism in physical education, sports, and research also takes on another accent. There is no transcendent position from which collegial professional thoughts may be introduced. As relational bodies, we are always in the middle of other bodies (students, colleagues, athletes, datas and so on) and we become professional bodies through these interactions. While our traditional sense of professionalism might be that we (as collegial collaborators) are professional within and for physical education, sports, and research and that these terrains set the rules for what is professional conduct and not, the swimming instructor implies another professional relation where she believes in Amira as much as she believes in physical education and the ten-stage model for learning to swim. She encounters Amira as she is and does not look so much for what is acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Even if the caring and welfare-oriented form of relationship that historically has attached many of us to physical education, sports, and research perhaps have been broken for a long time and replaced with financial concerns, I guess the relationship itself is not, and the swimming instructor indicates that novel forms of it still can be created. In the midst of educational certainties, pre-defined teaching methods, goal fulfillments and students, the swimming instructor brings forth the possibility of new occurrences of professionalism that reconnect our thoughts with the affective flows that make them creative.

It is a professional-ethics that strongly interfere with my traditional thinking of professionalism. A professionalism that supports and maintain the image of physical education, sports, and research as discrete and autonomous terrains by acting in accordance with well-defined moral duties. And the swimming instructor show us that professional behavior does not have a pre-defined starting point beyond the encounter with our participants and from which professional thought would begin. The swimming instructor is much more fascinated by the outside of the ten-stage model and invites every entity in the swimming event to participate

in its creation. Perhaps Deleuze and Guattari (1988:240) would say that she introduces a professionalism before the ten-stage model as well as physical education, sports, and research. Rather than being a matter of recognition continuing to maintain binary relationships between the ten-stage model and Amira, she indicates a professional-ethical-responsibility that is much more about processes of becoming. Theorized like this, professional-ethical-responsibility always involves multiplicities. It may very well be that various bodies (teachers, students, swimming instructors, researchers, etc.) within these multiplicities value professional-ethical-responsibility differently. And, it is possible that these bodies (and others) extract from professional-ethical-responsibility specific characteristics. Teachers and swimming instructors may need professional-ethical-responsibility characteristics to classify the students' performances. Students may need professional-ethical-responsibility characteristics to evaluate the teachers' themselves. And, researchers may sort professional-ethical-responsibility characteristics according to their similarities and differences. But, as you have perhaps already noticed, the swimming instructor does not seem very interested in characteristics. What interests her is rather modes of extension, spreadings, occupations... I guess we are all multiplicities, no matter if we are teachers, coacher, researchers, or students. We are not fundamentally characteristics or a particular number of characteristics. We are teach-ing, coach-ing, research-ing, student-ing and so on. What is a lecture on sports independent of the people we want it to address?

It is precisely in this situation that the swimming instructor encounters Amira. She does not become with Amira without a fascination for multiplicity. A fascination for the outside of the ten-stage model, physical education, coaching and research? A fascination with Amira. Amira is in her. Amira is through her. Amira is in the intervening spaces of her disrupted (professional) self. Simultaneously, I guess, a command of vital importance wells up in her. Teach like a student... or do not teach at all. This affect is not a personal feeling, nor is it a professional characteristic. It is the effect of the multiplicity (and perhaps the execution of its power) that disrupts and re-organizes her professional self and make it real (if only for an instant). It is the violence of the encounter with Amira which up-root her from the established ten-stage model and invite her to fearsome and complicated extensions calling physical education toward unthinkable becomings. To act professionally-and-ethically-responsibly, then, seems to imply a specific kind of relation. A relation within which our bodies are not only connected through the

terrains of their established identities, but also through the terrains of various multiplicities. And also through a continuous exploration of relations and where we try to open up established relations and invite more expressions to the process of making known various thoughts, feelings and knowledges. For me, the swimming instructor and Amira introduce a professional-ethical-responsibility that generates collective processes of inclusion in which students and teachers, coaches and athletes, researchers and data are invited to participate on equal terms, and where we do not know yet what our thoughts and activities in physical education, sports, and research could become.

References:

- Azzarito, L., Macdonald, D., Dagkas, S., & Fiset, J. (2017). Revitalizing the Physical Education Social-Justice Agenda in the Global Era: Where Do We Go From Here? *Quest (National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education)*, 69(2), 205-219.
- Barker, D., Wallhead, T., & Quennerstedt, M. (2014). Student learning through interaction in physical education. *European physical education review*, 20(4), 536-537.
- Buchana, I. (2015). Assemblage theory and Its Discontents. *Deleuze Studies*, 9(3), 382-392.
- Burgess, R. (2013). Achieving high quality physical education through physical literacy. *Physical Education Matters* 8(1), 12-13.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza, Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco: City Light.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1997). *Essays Critical and Clinical*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* London: Verso.
- Eime, J., Harvey, T., & Charity, M. J. (2019). Sport drop-out during adolescence: is it real, or an artefact of sampling behavior? *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 11(4), 715-726.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (2019). What happened to critical pedagogy in physical education? An Analysis of key critical work in the field. *European physical education review*, 25(4), 1128-1145.

- Harris, S., Nichols, G., & Taylor, M., (2017). Bowling even more alone: trends towards individual participation in sport. *European sport management quarterly*, 17 (3), 290–311.
- Hynes, M. (2013). ‘The Ethico-Aesthetics of Life: Guattari and the Problem of Bioethics’, *Environment and Planning A*, 45(8), 1929–1943.
- Larsson, H., Redelius, K., & Fagrell, B. (2011). Moving (in) the heterosexual matrix. On heteronormativity in secondary school physical education. *Physical education and sports pedagogy*, 16(1), 67-81.
- Macdonald, D. (2014). Is global neo-liberalism shaping the future of physical education? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 19(5), 494–499.
- Norberg, J. R. (2020). *Statens stöd till idrotten – en uppföljning 2019*. [A follow-up of governmental support for sport] Stockholm: Centrum för idrottsforskning. [The Swedish Research Council for Sport Science]. 2020:1.
- Quennerstedt, M. (2019). Physical education and the art of teaching: transformative learning and teaching in physical education and sports pedagogy. *Sport, Education and Society*, 24:6, 611-62.
- St. Pierre, E., Adams Van Cleave, J., Hughes, H. E., Bridges-Rhoads, S. (2018). Writing Post Qualitative Inquiry. *Qualitative inquiry*, 24 (9), 603-608.
- Thiele, K. (2014). ‘Ethos of Diffraction: New Paradigms for a (Post)humanist Ethics’, *Parallax*, 20:3, 202–16.
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the Other: Levinas psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wallseth, K. (2015). Muslim girls’ experiences in physical education in Norway: What role does religiosity play? *Sport, education and society*, 20(3), 304-322.

Teaching the unteachable and staying with the process

Who am I to teach about ethics in physical education, sports, and research? Who am I to teach the way I do about ethics in physical education, sports, and research? To me, these are important considerations, and I am often worried that my teaching of ethics lacks an approach that responds to the majority of people who experience oppression and become silenced by our activities in physical education, sports, and research. People like the swimming instructor who perhaps are reprimanded by their colleagues as soon as they deviate from a predetermined teaching model, students and athletes who perhaps are rejected from the teaching and training due to disruptive behaviour, and data which perhaps are exposed to predefined research interests. And my worry has not so much to do with potential challenges to combining theoretical and practical teaching where the former is assumed to represent ethical theories and where the latter is supposed to foster and get our students to adopt a specific democratic character (cf. Osbeck et al. 2018). Even if the struggle for approaching this tension is ongoing in various contexts, this is not what I question as unteachable. By teachable, however, I certainly refer to ethical theories, concepts, models of argumentation and defined professional responsibilities, and hence to that part of ethics in physical education, sports, and research that can be learned through predetermined and straight-forward deliveries of established knowledges.

Sometimes I also wonder how our past in physical education, sports, and research predispose what is teachable/unteachable? How do our so often undisputable beliefs in physical education, sports, and research affect our teaching of ethics? During my time as a PhD-student, I have noticed how we, due to established knowledges, tend to categorize some students, athletes and data as disposable and even sacrifices them in order to maintain stability in physical education, sports, and research. And I guess this is easily done when we work in an audit culture inspired

by neoliberalism and ultimately have to guard our positions from further inspections. Sometimes, though, I get the suffocating feeling that we probably would have done it anyway, with or without neoliberalism, and that there is an imminent risk that we will continue to do so regardless of external pressures? To protect ourselves (and others) in the hierarchies of physical education, sports, and research, we happily seem to contribute to the creation of transcendent systems of overarching rules that effectively help us to come to sensible decisions and assessments of colleagues, students, athletes, data, and ourselves on the basis of what we are and should be.

One such sensible decision is perhaps to teach about the content of ethical guidelines? It is no surprise, then, that many of us have come to expect that teaching of ethics is about straight-forward and simplistic information. And thus to teach people how to conduct physical education, sports, and research properly, by exposing them to appropriate activities and supporting their planning of future activities. Once we have done that (grounded our ethical work theoretically), we may also include the participants in more practical discussions like asking what to do, how to do it, and when to do it. And this is important. What I try to say here, however, is that something in my body needs to struggle to stay alive when I teach ethics like this. I am not sure what it is, but while I try to equip students with ethical awareness before things happen to them (and others), I also tend to make them focus on clearly stated, simplified, and absolute answers even when they often encounter complex situations. I am not even sure if they are aware that I teach them to focus on outcomes much more than the processes that bring forth ethical activities in physical education, sports, and research?

For me, this is to teach (and learn) with the past, with past thoughts and past forms of physical education, sports, and research. And perhaps, the past will always be with us in its most stubborn and prevalent forms. I wonder, though, if the past really has to be with us in such a way that it limits our ethical work? For Deleuze, the ethical question is not so much what we have to do in various situations, but what we can do. He also suggests that we need to creatively invite more connections than those we have with the past and enable affective flows to extend our possibilities to become (other) with others. It is an immanent form of ethics that inhabits our activities much more than being applied to them, and within which we are encouraged to evaluate relations as soon as they emerge (Coleman & Ringrose 2013:11). In many situations of physical education, sports, and

research, I guess we never consider our activities as activities without definite boundaries and just surrender to the processes. Instead, we tend to impose specific forms upon them. Perhaps this is why we often ask rowdy participants to leave our activities in physical education, sports, and research? And why we can value some participants as noisy and disorderly, and others as interested and inspired? Perhaps this is why we can expose data to predefined research interests and decide which data is valuable and which data is not so valuable? Perhaps this is also why the swimming instructor is criticized by her colleagues for deviating from the ten-stage model in the moment when Amira learns to float, and also why her colleagues can so successfully come up with various accusations that place their own teaching as the right one, and the swimming instructor's teaching as the wrong one? In these situations, the definition of participation seems to be dependent of the presence of non-participation, and the definition of data seems to be dependent on the presence of non-data, as much as teaching seems to be dependent of the presence of non-teaching... and perhaps even of non-skills and non-competence. To elaborate a bit, this is also how we proved that European invasion and colonization were reasonable. And how we motivated our understanding of non-European countries and their inhabitants as empty and unused spaces that could be filled with whatever we considered appropriate.

Here, however, I call for ethical responses to non-teachers, non-students, non-data, and all those we tend to regard as disposable bodies and thus available for our use when needed. I call for a more extended ethics than our current 'between theory and practice' approach might provide us, and I want us to challenge dominant notions of physical education, sports, research, teachers, coaches, researchers, students, participants, and data. As I see it, traditional notions of these subjects offer us stable and understandable essences with particularly favoured positions and preferences regarding what is good and bad, right and wrong, strong and weak, acceptable and unacceptable, dangerous and harmless. These divisions (and others) mark clear boundaries and tend to possess a certain mastery over our bodies and other materialities in physical education, sports, and research. What the swimming instructor and Amira show us, however, is the importance of portraying subjects and subjectivities not as fixed bodies but as bodies in process. Bodies that affect and are affected in the encounter with each other. Perhaps, this is also what Deleuze and Guattari (1994:75) suggest when they say 'underneath the self that acts there are little selves which contemplate, and which render possible both the action and the active subject'. And, this is not a figurative expression of our

biological compositions. Rather, they imply the existence of multiple thinking and challenge our established conceptions of subjectivity by replacing beings with processual becomings. Processes of subjectivity often include rapid and uncertain oscillations between adopting established qualities which attach us to various positions, and movements towards more fluid situations that, at least sometimes, reshape subjectivities.

While one purpose of teaching ethics may be to socialize students into cultures of physical education, sports, and research, I guess Deleuze and Guattari suggest that the task of ethics is to create encounters where we invite (and not turn our backs on) 'sad bodies'. Sad bodies such as troublesome and awkward people who do not behave properly and participate in our activities on the terms we have collegially determined as important? And rude and stubborn people who claim to have other knowledges of physical education, sports, and research than the knowledges we have ourselves as teachers, coaches, and researchers? After all, these bodies may inspire us to think novel thoughts? By exposing themselves to a similar encounter, the swimming instructor and Amira both recognized and reshaped the negative modelling of the ten-stage model for learning to swim, and within which we were all perhaps entangled and even polluted with thoughts of right and wrong teaching when it comes to increasing students swimming skills. To me, it seems like they reframe the system of knowledge and representation? And suggest that we, in the situations within which knowledges are created, thought and taught, need to pay more attention to (and thus take responsibility for) the effects they produce. Perhaps they even suggest that we need to open up our various situations of knowledge-creation and invite more bodies? That we need to create spaces where we can elaborate on creative and innovative physical education, sports, and research? This may happen when our teaching about ethics in physical education, sports, and research is not a linear process, and where our predetermined guidelines are brought into use in open-ended ways and inspire us (teachers and students) to extend what is seen as suitable or proper behaviour in the situation. To achieve this, and not limit our creativity, I guess it is necessary to stop treating ethical guidelines as grand narratives and continuously question, revise and reconceptualize how today's socially accepted cultures in physical education, sports, and research affect our participation and establish specific forms of our practices. And perhaps my suggestion is as simple as it is complex. What if we could encounter participants' creativity with creativity?



When I teach about ethical guidelines it seems that most students oscillate between clarity and confusion. While they are quite confident in what the guidelines recommend, they are more uncertain about the implementation. I often find myself thinking that it might become easier to grasp as soon as they get more practical experience of physical education, sports, and research, and encounter various ethical issues 'out there'. At the same time, I am worried. Worried that I am stimulating overly instrumental and technical approaches to ethics and mechanical implementations of various predetermined activities. And, that I contribute to fixed and stable situations where we know how to do things before the activities of interest even occur. How can we move ourselves into situations of uncertainty and humility? How can we invite hesitations, instabilities, and humbleness to physical education, sports, and research? It is not that the swimming instructor know how to teach Amira to float. Nor does Amira know how to learn. Instead, they become with each other in a disruptive process. And while they are staying with the process, I guess their desires for more simplistic solutions are fading as much as they are learning collectively to navigate through the complex learning-to-float-process.

Perhaps ethics in physical education, sports, and research is unteachable because it requires us to work beyond the normative and visible? And that there are not so much right answers, but just many answers? Right and wrong, perhaps, in the same situation? Ethics in physical education, sports, and research is also unteachable because it is a curiosity about knowledge production. How can we teach curiosity at the same time as we are pretty sure of what we are doing in physical education, sports, and research? I guess it is not so easy to encourage ourselves to be unsatisfied with the expected and the most obvious in our practices and stubbornly continue with other (unacceptable?) actions despite difficulties and resistance. To start listening to students, athletes, and data, and wait for them, may be challenging since each body is ultimately different and no encounter with students, athletes and data is exactly the same. It may even move us away from our established thoughts and makes us think novel thoughts. Novel thoughts that perhaps extend established norms and move us beyond commanding regulations and reliable activities. At best, teachers and students, coaches and athletes, researchers and data move collectively towards the unforeseen. To elaborate a bit, collective movement occurs when we encounter each other and bodily experience affective flows

between each other that sometimes stabilize into thoughts. Within these processes we experience, among other things, other ways of knowing. I wonder what would happen if we left the teaching of ethics to some who do not know much about ethical guidelines in physical education, sports, and research? Some who are brave enough to step out of their comfort zones and become with students, athletes, and data in various situations.

Perhaps we should not worry so much about getting our teaching of ethics right, having the right guidelines to teach, and making students employable in physical education, sports, and research. I suggest that we teach for sustainable inclusion without sustainability. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies all those situations within which we encounter each other on equal terms and mutually recognize each other's knowledges. It is situations where our bodily experiences of encountering each other stabilizes, at least sometimes, into novel thoughts about physical education, sports, and research and as effects puts these activities in motion. It is situations where we take risks for and with each other. Situations where we put our roles and activities at stake (and in play) together and become simultaneously inclusive and included. Teachers and students, coaches and athletes, researchers, and data. I wonder what happens to our ethical teaching if we focus a little more on what we produce in physical education, sports, and research, and maybe a little less on what we are expected to protect?

References:

- Coleman, R., & Ringrose, J. (2013). *Deleuze and research methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* New York: Columbia University press.
- Osbeck, C., Franck, O., Lilja, A., & Sporre, K. (2018). Possible Competences to Be Aimed at in Ethics Education: Ethical Competences Highlighted in Educational Research Journals, *Journal of Belief and Values* 39(2), 195–208.

A stand-in for a conclusion: Perhaps we need failure to stay open for the becoming of continuously inclusive futures?

In this thesis, I speculate about what sustainable inclusion might become in the perspective and connections of non-sustainability? I also speculate about what sustainable inclusion without sustainability might do to professionalism, responsibility, ethics, inquiry, curricula and much more in physical education, sports, and research. I speculate because, here with you, I do not know that much. At first glance, however, I guess that sustainable inclusion without sustainability might seem to be characterized by an irresolvable internal contradiction? And I suggest we spend some time with it. And think with it. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability in physical education, sports, and research? I guess it could seem like a rather revoking process that leaves the concept of inclusion quite alone without its important companions: sustainability and non-sustainability? And, (I guess) just like a humanist Cartesian subject, a substance or an idea, inclusion seems to exist beyond its empirical spaces transcending participation in physical education, sports, and research? At the same time, how we represent processes of inclusion might seem to be ontologically distinguished from the processes of inclusion themselves (cf. Kozlenski et al. 2013:156; Naraian & Schlessinger 2018:180). Or, to put it differently, how we create knowledge about inclusive processes seems to be separated from the actual processes in which inclusion take place. Simultaneously, we seem to effectually distinguish epistemology from ontology. And in doing so, we also position inclusive activities of physical education, sports, and research outside those we want so badly to invite to participate much more than engaging in creative cooperations that might challenge our practices.

For me, however, sustainable inclusion without sustainability does not signify an *a priori* image of inclusion. Nor does it define the most effective pathways to achieve inclusion. Rather, I suggest that these linear proceedings manifest a commitment to transcendence. To elaborate, transcendence is based on the idea that one unit transcends the other. Ontologically, the units are separate self-constrained substances that interact and affect another to cause differences and changes in the world. Furthermore, there is always a subject, a form able to distance itself from other forms and ultimately know them. And, this is an approach to the world that, among other things, underpins Hegel's dialectic, Marx superstructure, Newton's physics and Descartes' dualism (Wallin 2010).

I guess, it is our commitment to transcendence that makes it possible to separate those who perform activities in physical education, sports, and research right from those who perform activities wrong, those who are good from those who are bad, those who are talented from those who are untalented and so on. I guess, it is our commitment to transcendence that makes possible exclusion? And for me, sustainable inclusion without sustainability opens up important possibilities to critically discuss these transcendent views of inclusion and suggests processes that are always in becoming. Similar to Naraian's (2021) discussion of what inclusion means in a post-human era, sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies fluid processes of inclusion and opens up for changes. Changes in our established understandings of physical education, sports, and research and the logical relation between subjects and objects (teachers and students, coaches, and athletes, researchers and data) that we have considered true for so long. And perhaps sustainable inclusion without sustainability makes it possible to reshape our recognized and generally accepted models of knowledge production and create what Deleuze and Guattari (1988:195) call situations of 'segmentations-in-progress'. It may even be the case that sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies the creation of decentralized physical educations, sports, and research and brings with it a willingness to acknowledge the importance of (rather than dismiss) uncertainties, variances, controversies and paradoxes and thus simultaneously helps us to stay away from paralyzing thoughts about the necessity of pedagogical, sporting, and scientific consensus which might even prevent mutual change and inclusion. The thing is that sustainable inclusion without sustainability draws my attention to situations of more than one knowledge, situations of non-binarity and where we encounter each other and re-think ourselves for the becoming of continuously inclusive futures.

In tune with Parr (2009) I think the key to sustainable inclusion is to attend to the processes of change implied within various encounters in physical education, sports, and research. This is also why I suggest that sustainable inclusion without sustainability has no end. Nor does this thesis. There is simply no appropriate way to stop, construct a final part, and prevent us from encounters in which new processes start. Rather than writing about fulfillment and trying to summarize various conclusions and argue for the achievement of something desired, promised and predicted, I want us to pay attention to non-fulfillments and thus unfinished physical educations, sports, and research. And with non-fulfillments, I do not refer to situations where we do not meet predetermined criteria, pass external evaluations, or live up to social expectations. Those kinds of fulfillments do not interest me here. Rather, I use non-fulfillments to work against fulfillments and the meetings of various requirements and conditions regarding physical education, sports, and research. In tune O'Donnell (2016) suggests that we need failure to stay open and keep our various situations unpredictable. Including conflictualities or not, I guess it is also important to get back to Derrida (2005) and the notion of aporia because aporetic situations open up for non-fulfillment and imply that we need to create new spaces and unexpected encounters. We simply need to do much more than fulfill our duties.

Philosophically, we move from a belief in rather positivistic approaches and linear processes of meaning making where we try to interpret and understand various objectives properly in physical education, sports, and research to focus much more on ontology and non-fulfillment, changing sustainable inclusion through the non-fulfillment of sustainability. We simply do not know what physical education, sports and research are until students, athletes, and data have shown us, and students, athletes and data do not know what they have shown us until we (re)act on it. Students, athletes, and data show us what physical education, sports, and research are, and physical education, sports, and research show students, athletes, and data what they are. As I see it, current inclusive processes in physical educations, sports and research are not ideal and finished activities. There are no truths about today's processes of inclusion in physical educations, sports, and research. They are all invented, and perhaps something we need to reinvent? Non-fulfillment in this sense suggests an extended fulfillment whether it is about inclusion, professionalism, responsibility, ethics or something completely else in physical education, sports, and research. Non-fulfillment has to do with us, teachers, coaches, and researchers, and our quest to invite others, students,

athletes, and data, to influence physical education, sports, and research. Non-fulfillment has to do with waiting, intra-acting (Barad 2007) and creating, and thus continuous change and extension.

Thinking with and working through non-fulfilment in physical education, sports, and research calls for creativity and mobility. This does not imply, however, that anything goes. Nor is it an encouragement to sit back and do nothing. Teachers, coaches, and researchers who think and work with non-fulfillment in physical education sports, and research do not engage so much in activities with predetermined outcomes, predictable methods, and fixed evaluations based on external criteria. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability, and inclusive non-fulfillment, might grow best in situations of experimentation and innovation, since non-fulfilled teaching, coaching and researching never reach something promised or predicted and, as such, constantly transform themselves into what I suggest are more inclusive and generous intra-actions capable of both creation and recreation. I guess non-fulfillment is not so much about being a good teacher, coach, and researcher but about doing and making important choices. This is also why non-fulfillment is inescapable in situations where we open physical educations, sports, and research to the world, and where we do not try to limit the knowledges of students, athletes, and data by relying of what we already know. If we just want to bask in the glory of fulfilled goals, however, I guess we risk closing the openness and instability of physical education, sports, and research. Unpredictability, experimentation, and non-fulfillment are immanent in any practices of sustainable inclusion without sustainability. And as teachers, coaches, and researchers I suggest that we need to abandon our opportunities to control physical education, sports, and research as well as students, athletes, and data. We simply need to stop proving that we are right at all costs.

When we approach sustainable inclusion without sustainability from the perspective of non-fulfillment, we devote ourselves to ceaselessly reinventing, transforming and viewing (or visualizing) physical education, sports, and research in other ways. Our work needs to stay in motion and change continuously through diversified activities and humble encounters with students, athletes, and data. It is important to think carefully about whether stable and well-established activities are desirable or whether these activities need to be opened up for uncertainties, modifications, or total dissolutions. At the same time, sustainable inclusion without sustainability is likely to produce a sense of non-fulfillment, and that we

have failed to achieve the predetermined goals of physical education, sports and research. This is because inclusive openness, and the conceptual uncertainties it involves, bring about new ideas and unforeseen outgrowths. Ideas and outgrowths that will perhaps challenge and bypass existing ideas and activities of physical education, sports, and research, create new and unknown practices, and enable connections we have not yet expected. And in the encounter with the unknown, I guess we will sometimes lose our ability to move. Elsewhere, I suggest that we may need breathing breaks in situations where there are no previously demarcated paths to follow. Within these situations, which often provide us with a sense of non-fulfillment, professional obligations and morals are not the solution, but I guess we need to question our responsibilities as teachers, coaches, and researchers.

Perhaps, we (teachers, coaches, and researchers) who think and work with sustainable inclusion without sustainability, expose ourselves to more and greater risks when we encounter students, athletes, and data? This because we need to do much more than what previously set goals indicate. And within these situations of extra-work and related extensions of physical education, sports, and research, there are no instructions to follow. Nor are there any superiors to consult. The only thing we know is that we do not know. And when it comes to sustainable inclusion, this may be important because without continuously ending up in situations where we are doing things we do not (yet) how to do, we will fail to face our extra-professional-responsibility. Sometimes, I call this professional-ethical-responsibility. A professional-ethical-responsibility we do not yet know that much about, but which may be an important ingredient in more responsible physical educations, sports, and research (cf. Derrida 1995). Perhaps, thinking and working with non-fulfillment will inspire us to be more open to students'-, athletes'- and data's knowledges, and invite to joint processes where we (teachers and students, coaches and athletes, researchers and data) can ask ourselves how various activities can be extended, how differences can be welcomed and invited to fill us with desire and possibilities to do something creative, and how becoming physical educations, sports, and research as well as teachers, students, coaches, athletes, researchers, and data, can be discerned? How do we welcome the other? Perhaps it is through non-fulfillment and humble encounters that we stay inspired and keep on growing, unsystematically? It is also possible that not-knowing opens for conceptual motions as well as theoretical and methodological changes in physical education, sports, and research. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability does not refer to one element that is once and for all included in a whole, but to several elements

affecting each other continuously. This implies that there cannot be one view, practice, or knowledge of physical education, sports and research that is greater than any other. There are only views, practices, and knowledges encountering each other. This is also why we cannot just sit back and wait for future physical educations, sports, and research to be more inclusive because they are already present in their absence.

By creating humble encounters between teachers and students, coaches and athletes, researchers and data, sustainable inclusion without sustainability experiments with other ontologies and epistemologies, implying a new norm of difference and a new theory of learning where teachers' and students', coaches' and athletes' and researchers' and data's become equally valuable. And where we learn with each other in a non-hierarchical manner. And to be clear, not through a transcendent Cartesian logic where some are more reliable than others and where we strive to gain control over both present and future processes of inclusion, but with-in a Deleuzian space incessantly adding diversities. Perhaps this is also what Reddington and Price (2018) imply when they put forward that we need to invite people to authentically participate in activities? And sometimes, I guess, this might be dangerous. In today's physical education, sports, and research, open practices without definite endpoints are often seen as a waste of both time and money because we rarely meet predefined goals. And as that were not enough, we may also contribute to undesirable changes in physical education, sports, and research. We simply do not fulfill our missions in any way. On the other hand, non-fulfillments are perhaps what keep us moving and open up our practices for creations and recreations?

When thinking and working with sustainable inclusion without sustainability, we are interested in doing things for others. We are interested in doing things that create previously unthought changes in others. Changes in physical education, sports, and research, but also in students, teachers, athletes, coaches, data, researchers, co-workers, policymakers, curriculums, theories, methods, models, and so on. Sustainable inclusion without sustainability implies that we invite participants to work closely with both us and our established practices. With open arms, we welcome students, athletes, and data. And we wait for them to express themselves, we aim to get affected by them until we can no longer be affected, and we affect them until we can no longer affect. What is interesting here is that quite similarly to this thesis, our abilities to become affected and affect do not seem to

have an end. At the same time as this process continues, however, we will fail to fulfill our official commitments regarding physical education, sports and research. And honestly, my intention is that this thesis should be incomplete in most ways. For instance, I hope that this thesis does not meet the established requirement of progression, does not meet the idea of providing potential readers with an adequate conclusion where important results are made visible, does not meet the idea of a well proven and reliable method, does not meet the expectations to represent predetermined research interests whether they are my own, the department's or the city of Gothenburg's... And I really do not hope that this thesis fills any previously defined knowledge gaps in research on physical education, sports, and research. My intention is that this thesis should be incomplete in every thinkable (and unthinkable) way. And yet affect us, me, you, and others.

Rather than searching for fulfillment, sustainable inclusion without sustainability seems to be much more about living the non-fulfillment. Maybe it is more about non-fulfillmenting, and not so much about searching for desirable and predictable results. Perhaps we need to remind ourselves to try to love the perplexity and confusion our humble encounters with participants outside the center of physical education, sports, and research continuously offer us. It is possible that our differences will encourage us to experiment and create novel practices together. All we need do is wait and open up for the possibility of not knowing to give participants and other bodies (human and non-human) in physical education, sports, and research the power to change us. Simultaneously, we have the power to act professionally-ethically-responsibly for sustainable inclusion in future physical educations, sports and research to come.

I guess, non-sustainability is the other of sustainable inclusion, without which sustainable inclusion would not be what it is.

References:

- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *The gift of death: Religion and postmodernism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Derrida, J. (2005). *Paper machine*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kozleski, E. B., Gonzalez, T., Atkinson, L., Mruczek, C., & Lacy, L. (2013). Teacher education in practice: Reconciling practices and theories in the United States context. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28*(2), 156-172.
- Naraian, S. (2021). What Can “inclusion” Mean in the post-human Era? *Journal of disability studies in education 1*, 14-34.
- Naraian, S., & Schlessinger, S. (2018). Becoming an inclusive educator: Agentic maneuverings in collaboratively taught classrooms. *Teaching and teacher education, 71*, 179-189.
- O’Donnell, A. (2014). Another relationship to failure: Reflections on Beckett and education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 48*(2), 260-275.
- Parr, A. (2009). *Hijacking sustainability*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press
- Reddington, S., & Price, D. (2018). Pedagogy of New Materialism: Advancing the Educational Inclusion Agenda for Children and Youth with Disabilities. *International journal of special education, 33* (2), 465-481.
- Wallin, J. J. (2010). *A Deleuzian approach to curriculum: Essays on a pedagogical life*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Is It Possible to Think Physical Education Forward and Dismantle Ourselves—in a Quantum Space?

International Review of Qualitative
Research
2022, Vol. 15(1) 103–118
© The Author(s) 2021



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/19408447211002770
journals.sagepub.com/home/irq



Åsa Andersson¹ , Peter Korp¹, and Anne B. Reinertsen² 

Abstract

This paper invites readers to an encounter of novel learning in the school subject physical education, and specifically swimming training. In collaboration with Deleuze's immanent philosophy and creative observations in a case-assemblage, I speculate about productive experiences and educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. Troubling situations of a standardized model of swimming training is combined with a quantum space where multiple divergent ideas, forces, and feelings interact and produce unforeseen learnings, values, and qualities. Frictions between segmented spaces and quantum spaces orient/reorient the student's/swimming instructor's/my/your? learning, values, and qualities. Finally, I emphasize quantum spaces as the heart of educational movement and the importance of creating open educational systems to perhaps think physical education forward.

Keywords

quantum space, thresholds of consciousness, novel learning, open system, quality, ontology of becoming, physical education

¹Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden
²Østfold University College, Halden, Norway

Corresponding Author:

Åsa Andersson, Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 320, 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.
Email: asa.andersson.2@gu.se

Introduction

The first time I met them was at a stand close to a swimming pool. Unusual/nonunusual girls from Gothenburg. They were 11 years old and deeply worried about their forthcoming grades in the school subject physical education. In Sweden, swimming is a part of the curriculum of physical education in elementary school, and the children are expected to pass swimming ability tests when they are 12 respectively 16 years old. I know this because the girls told me that they really needed to learn to swim this semester. They did not know how though, but while the consequences of failure was evident, they described the opportunities to succeed as almost utopian. The exercises simply contained too many elements they could not imagine themselves to perform. To let go of the edge of the pool, dip their heads in the water, and float without any help. However, at the stand there were others who were more confident about how the girls would learn to swim, namely the swimming instructors. To a large extent, their conviction was based on a carefully developed ten-stage model where the girls first had to pass level one in order to advance to level two, and so on. Each level contained specific parts that needed to be completed before they could move up to the next level, and the swimming instructors had clear instructions on which exercises each part would contain. In short, the ten-stage model of the swimming education was modeled entirely upon steps of solution that required conscious actions from the girls. The swimming instructors informed the girls what to do, and the girls were supposed to follow the order and reproduce the movements in the water. It was a static body of facts expected to enabling solutions on the public health-related problem that a significant number of 16 year olds in Gothenburg cannot swim 200 meters, and thus not get grades in physical education when they finish elementary school.

This is a serious problem. There are areas in Gothenburg where only 14% of the residents have postsecondary education, and across the city there are clear links between both educational level and the level of income, and differences in health. For a number of years now, the City of Gothenburg has been pushing for a more equal and sustainable Gothenburg (The City of Gothenburg, 2018). Briefly, this means that there is a desire to reduce differences in living conditions, and, among other things, increased swimming skills are seen as an important part of that effort. By offering all children standardized swimming training at school, there is a strong belief that the risk of drowning accidents will be reduced and that more children can become physically active and participate in more social activities close to the water. There is also a belief that more students will have the opportunity to get approved grades in physical education, and thus have the opportunity to continue to higher education. And these expectations are far from unique. In terms of educational policy, resembling assumptions that certain training activities will entail particular effects have become increasingly prevalent (Au, 2013; Barrett, 2009; Pickup, 2020, p. 6). What works to produce a specific outcome seems to be a constantly recurring issue that in turn encourages technical rationality, top-down management, measures, and quantification of performance. Several researchers (e.g., Apple, 2006; Baez, 2014; Gray, 2007; Zeichner, 2010)

therefore claim that education is involved in a societal system where “institutions are recast as markets rather than deliberatively democratic systems” (Hursh, 2007, p. 493–494), and where achievement of predetermined goals is absolutely crucial for further trustworthiness.

Hence, this article is about educational (swimming) events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. But, before I go on talking about educational processes and movements in various directions, I want you to meet someone, and perhaps get an insight into the process of becoming a person who floats in the water. I do not remember at what level, but at some stage in the aforementioned ten-stage model one of the girls would learn to float. I think her name was Amira. Or maybe she was called something else. I am not sure anymore, but she appeared to be quite afraid of the water and seemed to do everything in her power to keep her head up while the swimming instructor habitually held her hands under her shoulders and told her to act like she was sleeping. After a short moment of panic and fear, Amira placed her hands on the swimming instructor’s arms and as a response to that movement, the instructor moved her whole body closer to Amira’s shoulders. At the same time as they had increased physical contact, Amira seemed to start to trust the instructor, herself, and the water. She relaxed and let her head rest in the water, and learned to float. Can you feel the unexpected relief in her body, in the swimming instructor’s body, in my body, in your body?

To me, the temporary exchange between Amira’s body and the swimming instructor’s body determined a threshold of consciousness where their creative and spontaneous acts were adjusted to their perceptions of the relations, and as a result they provided an improvised solution to the problem of floating. In this sense, learning to float was momentary, situated, and full of infinite surprises. The increased body contact and skin-to-skin practice was an element of nature/culture that affected our minds without us being aware of it. Our learning took place in and through our unconsciousness, and established what Deleuze (1994, p. 214) perhaps would call “the bond of profound complicity between nature and mind.” I have research notes about this on a piece of paper. Notes from “creative-observations” (Andersson Andersson et al., in review) within a “case-assemblage” (Andersson Andersson et al., in review) in this swimming event in elementary school in Gothenburg, Sweden conducted by myself and a colleague in 2018–2019. Notes that I have read and re-read several times by now. Sometimes they provoke new thoughts, and sometimes they do not.

Practice of Inquiry

Letting research notes provoke new thoughts is in tune with how Amira and I interacted, or to be more precise intra-acted, and at best surrendered to each other and released each other’s energy to move around and transform both the inquiry and our understandings of what was going on in the swimming event. To elaborate a bit, creative-observations are processes of negotiations where the volatile images of learning I have managed to catch are created in collaboration with Amira. And

case-assemblage is the milieu of connections and productions within which a vast network of processes and forces continuously shaped our collaboration. A collaboration that to a large extent was and still is felt (Andersson Andersson et al., in review), and expresses dispersion, change, and instability. In both creative observations and case-assemblages as well as in my reading of research notes, Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of immanence is a pivotal principle for the (ontological) establishment of unstable situations. Immanence means the condition of being entirely within something/ someone, and signifies very small units and properties that exist on scales above, below, and beyond specific activities of both the swimming event and the inquiry. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 47) would perhaps call this milieu a plane where various processes sometimes meet, take effect, and become extended. As a plane, immanence is immanent in itself and cannot be defined as something or in relation to anything. Yet, the plane of immanence is full of potentialities in each moment and spreads out endless opportunities for action and movement in various directions. I would say that the plane of immanence is a virtuality that includes other virtualities as well as processes of actualizations that make possible consistencies in both the swimming event and the inquiry. Being a virtual also leads us further when it comes to establishment of the internal conditions of thinking—that is, infinite movement. Infinite movement is also what has to be handled by our thoughts when they take solid forms into specific concepts. However, concepts do not only respond to specific thoughts, but they also make possible various elaborations of our thoughts. The philosophy of immanence simply requires us to let go of dogmatic images of thought where our thinking consists of processes of recognitions and representations of the already known (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 37–38). Simultaneously, it enables us to replace this kind of thinking with a more genuine thinking where our thoughts are not predetermined by common sense (Deleuze, 1994, p. xvi). Hence, this inquiry is not a milieu of predetermined knowledge but that of infinite learning. Learning, then, means composing singular points of our own bodies with components of other bodies, to crack into pieces and be driven forward into the unknown (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 251–252). For Deleuze, these processes are intensive events that may consist of various series like bodies/thoughts and words/things. Within immanent milieus of creative observations and case-assemblage, bodies (human and nonhuman) are always products of intense encounters with other bodies. And, within these encounters it is not that interesting what bodies really are. What is interesting is how they change and what they can do in relation to each other. Maintaining an immanent principle in this inquiry is thus an explicit critique of every system of thought that does not allow changes. Simultaneously, an immanent principle affirms flows of thought, open systems, and processes without predetermined ends. When it comes to research, education, and training, it entails an open-ended approach that does not establish a dominant principle from which everything is derived. Rather our bodies are permitted to spread out in a milieu without dividing this milieu between us.

For me, this is a situation in/of fractal trust and where we at least occasionally trust each other and produce fluid turbulences rather than relying on some predefined

methodological system within which credible research can be performed. While I sat on the stand, Amira came by and sometimes we talked to each other. In these chats, various thoughts, questions, and answers emerged and coordinated each other. Each thought, question, and answer had affective capacities just as they were results of affective capacities. In the process of being hit by thoughts, questions, and answers and hitting thoughts, questions, and answers, Amira and I produced a zone of indetermination. Theoretically, this is a zone where various affects are produced and populates the situation through uncontrollable becomings (compare Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 173) of thoughts, questions, answers, Amira, and myself. Affects then refer to preconceptual intensities of bodily states of excited or anxious uncertainties about what happens (Massumi, 2002) in the swimming event. This, in turn, entails important destabilizations of how we perceive things. And it is precisely this kind of destabilizations and simultaneously production of new ways of feeling and seeing that is methodological central in this inquiry. How we perceive things has nothing to do with perceptions (Deleuze, 1990). Objects of our perceptions are occasional or perhaps even accidental results of the package of relations and sensations in the situation of a case-assemblage, and that live on beyond our control and within which we at least sometimes become other.

Similarly, creative observations assume no principles of truth. I would say that is to think together beyond the end in situations where we cannot be sure. And hence to speculate. However, in creative observations, there is always a risk that we use a standard language to describe novel situations, and thus express things that do not belong to the order of the situation. For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 80), this is a possible paradox in philosophy at large, and to avoid resembling contradictions I want to support infinitive movements by welcome every reader to think with me and Amira. To destabilize today's provisional result of the inquiry and become destabilized by it. By encouraging destabilizations and disruptions to multiply and spread out on their own terms outside habitual approaches and rigid regulations, my intention is to extend occasional establishments of our evaluative capacities in the swimming event to a creative plane of innovation and perhaps grasp what Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 59) call "the nonthought within thought." For me, this is both an ethical and political act of making resistance to present hierarchical arrangements and binary division of various roles. This since escaping criteria and definitions in thought by embracing multiplicities is essential for the creation of alternative democratic spaces (compare Deleuze, 1994, p. 108) in research, physical education, sport, public health and so on.

For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 399), this is to act with passion, and where we as interdependent intensities set in motion things we are not fully aware of. It is "the dawn of desire" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 9) where desire is the perceptual infrastructure that constitutes the objects we become interested in as well as the milieu in which they appear. In this perspective, desire is a productive force that makes our bodies engage with each other, and hence affect each other to move in various directions within the case-assemblage. We do not desire because we lack something, but because of the intense and productive forces of desire produced in our encounters. In other words,

desire is “what first introduces the affective connections that make it possible to navigate through the social world” (Schrift, 1995, p. 69). To achieve this, it requires us (Amira, me, and you) to move away from zones of idealistic knowledge and enter a zone of infinite learning and allow it to become increasingly unclear if we are researchers, data or readers, subjects or objects. A zone of infinite learning where we no longer are either...or, but one and all moving in multiple directions at the same time. And in this zone of indetermination I suggest that we try to collaborate like various intensities coming together to make “a new” intensity full of uncontrollable creativity (compare Deleuze, 1995, p. 136). This is my practice of inquiry, and by releasing the creativity of our collaboration, I hope we may modify some truths about learning to swim and hence educational (swimming) events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities.

What Encounters Make Students a Swimmer?

For now, Amira’s and my collaboration give rise to thoughts about the relation between learning and knowledge, and specifically the knowledge of methods for learning to swim. What encounters make students a swimmer? Amira says her family has no money. That is also why they never go for a swim together and why she is not used to this kind of water. There are simply other problems they need to address first. Like food and clothes. During my time on the stand, she comes there alone and she walks home alone. Often hungry and worried about things an 11-year-old girl should not have to worry about. It is difficult in many ways, but the difficulties are also mixed with the hope of someday becoming a lawyer. She is aware of the importance of her school results and that she cannot afford to fail on a single grade. This puts pressure on her. A pressure she sometimes handles/does not handle. All together this is constitutive of Amira, and also why she tries so hard to learn to swim even if the swimming education is hardly adapted to her as an individual, and hence moves in a different rhythm than those she knows and can possibly step into. It is not even sure she recognizes the beat. She does and does not. Statistically, she is doomed to failure. Although the studies are relatively few, they seem to point in the same direction. At a macro level, there has been a focus on the extent to which a widespread timetabling of free swimming sessions attract new swimmers and results in new swimming patterns. Beyond immediate short-term changes, there is no evidence that changes in the levels of physical participation actually took place (e.g., Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42). On a meso level it is argued, though, that structured sessions including appropriate exit routes within free swimming programs may have a greater potential to create experiences where individuals will return and gain continuity in their participation than unstructured sessions with unstructured pathways (e.g., Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42). Methodologically, it is suggested that systematic targeting is essential to attract individuals who lack a history of participation in swimming activities and the associated sporting capital (Anderson et al., 2014; compare Coalter, 2002). In any case, Pilgaard et al. (2020) show that broad investments in swimming training for everyone at an age of 7–8 years do not

seem to contribute to the coveted result that more children learn to swim, and recommend the solution to start swimming training at an earlier age.

However, these statistics (Andersson et al., 2014; Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42 and Pilgaard et al., 2020) do not ask questions about learning processes and how they could possibly change. Nor is it noted that learning processes may have affective starting places just like the skin-to-skin contact when Amira learned how to float. That is, learning is more than a cognitive process of transferring idealistic knowledge and involves affective experience-based unconscious processes where students and teachers think with each other, destabilize existing knowledge, and produce new desire. The statistics simply do not tell us what to do other than repeat the already known on younger children. Yet, there is something amorous about Amira's and the swimming instructor's learning processes, which at least at the moment seems to disarm the occurrences of fatality in traditional swim training indicated by previous research. For me, these processes seem to relate strongly to Deleuze's (1994, p. 27) when he says, "We learn nothing from those who say: 'Do as I do'. Our only teachers are those who tell us to 'do with me', and are able to emit signs to be developed in heterogeneity rather than proposes gestures for us to reproduce." So, for the moment I will try to think with Deleuze's immanent philosophy not only when it comes to create swim educations for more, but also when it comes to produce courses in physical education for all, as well as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. Therefore, I will now go on with more on thresholds of consciousness, affective starting places for learning, trust, novel learning, and ontology of becoming.

Thresholds of Consciousness and the Production of Novel Learning

How is it possible that Amira does not take part in the status quo indicated by the statistics above? Why does she float when everything we know indicates that she should sink? I am not sure, but what pops up in my mind is that at the moment when Amira became someone who floats, her body was combined with some of the others, and that could be the reason why she espoused a process that did not reproduce previous states. Amira, the swimming instructor, the water, the smell of chlorine, the waves, the ten-stage model, me at the stand, we all seemed to renew ourselves in each other. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 88), this process can be understood in terms of an "assemblage," and thus like an organic, desiring, self-organizing always becoming machine where various elements meet each other and where one element creates a flow that is broken by another. Like for example when the swimming instructor told Amira to act like she was sleeping, the moves of Amira did not resemble that of the swimming instructor's information. She says she had no intention of being troublesome, but the swimming instructor's suggestion did not make any sense to her, and did not bear any relation to how she experienced the water as something uncertain, imposed, and dangerous. And that she tried really hard but could not do it. Accidentally,

Amira responded with panic and fear and grabbed the swimming instructor's arms, and to that sign the swimming instructor responded by moving her body closer to Amira's body. For Deleuze (1994) 27), these encounters between signs and responses are precisely those spaces where novel learning takes place. And to elaborate a bit further, each sign involves heterogeneity in at least two more ways than the ones mentioned above, where neither Amira's nor the swimming instructor's responses echo that of a sign. First, in the object(s) that is, in Amira who emits the sign of panic and fear while she is doing her best to adapt to the swimming instructor's information, and in the swimming instructor who gives off the sign that Amira can manage to float while she is doing her best to save her from drowning. In a flash, there are two orders of disparate realities in their respective bodies between which the signs move rapidly. Second, in the signs where Amira's panic and fear completely surround the swimming instructor and incarnate an idea of moving her body closer to Amira's body. And where the swimming instructor's move closer to Amira envelops Amira's body and brings to life an idea of trust. A physical and mental power that moves Amira away from a mode of uncertainty and into a mode of certainty, and makes her rely on the swimming instructor, the water, and herself.

At this moment, bodily contact seems to be crucial for the development of conscious and unconscious factions in/of trust. Furthermore, Amira's trust seems to be anchored not so much in the system of the ten-stage model but in the process of the present and related to the indeterminable potential of the swimming instructor, the water, and herself. This is also why I suggest that the production of trust in physical education may not first and foremost be thought of in systematic, moralistic, or logical terms. It is not that Amira makes moral assessments whether the ten-stage model, swimming instructor, the water, and herself are trustworthy or not. Neither does she take chances to reach specific outcomes. There is simply no calculation of future risks other than that she needs to survive and get her final grades, and hence no other transgression of the bounds of the present. Rather, Amira's trust is produced within a situation of experiences. Conscious and unconscious. Between herself and others. Simultaneously, she is placed within an emergent learning process, that is, an iterative processes without mutual order. While Amira learns how to float, the swimming instructor learns that physical contact and closeness are important for Amira to feel safe in the water. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 258), these are all processes of becoming. Born within the present and placed in between the past and the future.

To theorize a bit, becoming is about to create something new (Deleuze, 1995, p. 171), rather than attain a form of representation, identification, or imitation. It is about finding a zone of juxtaposition, a zone of closeness where bodies are placed together with contrasting effect and where they can achieve a stage of immanence and open to new trajectories. A zone that "liberates desire from all its concretizations in order to dissolve them" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 86), and where desire as an engine of becoming opens up territorializations of power and forms of subjectivity. Amira says she is always so proud of herself in the swimming event. And that she does things she could never imagine herself to do. The unfolding of skills surprises her and she is not

sure why and how they emerge, or where exactly she is going. She says she does not know what will happen next. Or what she will manage to do next. If anything. All she knows is that she right now is able to laugh, splash, run, and float in the water, and that this is not enough to get a grade in physical education. Happy and unhappy at the same time. Successful and unsuccessful. Right and wrong. Relaxed and stressed. Trustworthy and not trustworthy. For Deleuze, our bodily expansions and creations occur through connections, and not due to awareness of our lackings. Amira simply does not learn to float because she knows that she cannot swim or that she needs a grade in physical education. Rather, learning is of a different nature to knowledge, and a creative process that concerns the part of our minds of which we are not fully aware but which influences our actions and feelings. The process when Amira becomes someone who floats is probably shaped by affects that are not entirely rational or which she is fully aware of, and as such neither her trust nor learning have final objects. By surrendering to the rhythm of occasions, both Amira and the swimming instructor attain a stage in which their bodies are immanent and open to new affective flows, relations, and pathways, and to me it seems like they are equipped with what Deleuze (1994, p. 173) calls “the necessary modesty not managing to know what everybody knows”. Neither when it comes to the statistics, nor when it comes to the ten-stage model and its carefully developed methods for teaching swimming. Their newly acquired knowledge is not possible to reduce to the static bodies of facts, but constitutes a dynamic process of inquiry embedded in experience. Prepersonal, experimental, and practical, and where experience is the surrounding that provides them with the capacities to affect and be affected.

The Ontology of Becoming

Amira’s and the swimming instructor’s experiences can be seen as milieus populated with relations between signs that produce affective becomings. It also seems like these relations between signs are ontologically prior Amira’s and the swimming instructor’s terms. The distinction between what Amira and the swimming instructor are simply erodes, and their previous fixed roles dissolve. There is no longer a dualistic split between Amira being the student, and the swimming instructor being the teacher. Rather, they become students and teachers, objects and subjects. For Deleuze, it is precisely this in-between relation that is ontologically basic. In the same way, he argues that the reality consists of two distinct but inseparable movements—the virtual and the actual. While the virtual comprises mobile structures where “differential elements and relations along with the singular points which correspond to them” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 272) form the creative component of reality, the actual consists of conditions and states of affairs within which spatiotemporal situations are established and form the calculable, foreseeable, and presumed component of reality. By producing singularizations that hardly fit in the predictable aggregations of the actual, virtual movements often mean the establishment of trouble in various situations. Not so much because they oppose the universal, but since they tend to extend themselves and unfold

close to each other. And this is perhaps what happens to Amira and the swimming instructor at the moment when Amira becomes a person who floats. Close to each other they start to vibrate, and the vibrations as a process generates effects of different bodies (human and nonhuman) that open up various ways to both learn and teach how to float that do not conform to a static apprehending of the aforementioned ten-stage model of the swimming education.

It is not that the approach of the ten-stage model and the process between the swimming instructor and Amira are opposed binary forces or educational worldviews; neither are they distinguished by scale, size, or dimension. Rather, they presuppose each other and coexist as different forms of educational segmentarities. While the force of the ten-stage model is rigid and delivers specific swimming training at the agreed swimming lesson, in tune with the whole (curriculum, swimming instructors, teachers, and the realms of perception and representation), the force of the process between Amira and the swimming instructor is flexible, imperceptible, nonrepresentable, and concerned with assembled bodies that are perceptually becoming. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pp. 199–200), this is a distinction between molar and molecular lines. The molar line of the ten-stage model can predominantly be defined as a calculated arrangement to “ensure and control the identity of each agency, including personal identity” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 195). In this rigid line of segmentarity, there are no becomings. It works just like an established discourse that keeps bodies in their original positions. The molecular line of the relation between Amira and the swimming instructor, on the other hand, brings about short-lived and transitory segmentations-in-progress, and sometimes (as the moment when Amira learns to float) these molecular lines extract themselves from the molar and while they mutually destroy each other’s segmentarity a “line of flight” is produced (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 197). However, there is no guarantee that molecular lines produce lines of flights. It can go either way, that is, both liberate and constrain bodily capacities. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 197) say, “there is a line of flight, which is already complex, since it has singularities: and there is a customary or molar line with segments: and between the two (?), there is a molecular line with quanta that cause it to dip to the one side or the other.”

For me, it is suddenly not so far-fetched that the heart of educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities could be quantum spaces. Or that novel learning requires quantum spaces, and not so much combinations of the curriculum or the ten-stage model as a whole and its parts, that is, students and their calculated progresses. Even if the curriculum’s or the ten-stage model’s quest for essences of problems (what) may pinpoint contradictions or socially more acceptable activities in an absolute swimming education as well as skills and abilities in absolute swimming instructors and students, they do not include emergences of the essential multiplicities of various problems. So, whenever the curriculum or the ten-stage model conceptualizes essences of problems detached from their multiplicities, they risk becoming constructions of empty universals, and where the same instructions and exercises are supposed to fit all students (compare Au,

2016, Giroux, 2010; Valente & Collins, 2016) and transform them into swimmers. And if someone unexpectedly fails to learn to swim, it is perhaps something wrong with that student. To me, this space of marginalization is almost unbearably familiar, and I guess most of us have been there. At least sometime. Thinking, preferring, wishing, and almost begging students to listen to the instructions, be more interested, stand still, sit down, not think so much of their appearance, lose weight, build some fitness, show a little courage, change into the right clothes, put some trust in us, or at least try to do the exercises, and hence learn in a way coherent with the dominant culture of a standard-based education. However, in relation to the swimming instructor, Amira seems to develop a strange passionate complicity, a whole intense molecular existence that does not even enter into a rivalry with the route she is supposed to take part of in the ten-stage model. By bodily engaging with each other, Amira and the swimming instructor are no longer individuated as subjects, but as a new set of interdependent intensities that start to unfold close to each other and set in motion various desire that make them think beyond the regulations of the ten-stage model and attend a situation of novel learning–teaching. And while their collaboration forms a smooth and flexible flow marked by *quanta*, the state of passion is perhaps what makes the swimming event endurable for Amira, the swimming instructor, me, and you?

I suggest that we slow down a bit here and try to figure out what is going on, or whatever could go on? Amira's participation in the swimming event is not imaginary; it does not go on in her/my/your head. It happens right here and now. It is for real, and Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 196) would probably say that there are “two politics involved... a macropolitics and a micropolitics” that do not envision learning processes, trustworthiness, and quality in at all the same way. And as already discussed there are two different types of relations. Some inherent to the ten-stage model involving carefully determined aggregations of those who can perform the planned exercises and those who cannot. And some slightly more difficult to localize and that are always external to themselves, and instead have to do with the flows of elements that defies or eludes these divisions between right and wrong, knowing and unknowing, taught and untaught, teacher and student. So, why is Amira not fully comfortable with the occurrence of her extra-self as a knowing and taught instructor? Why does she excuse herself and says that she did not mean to be rowdy? That she really tried to follow the route of the ten-stage model, but failed? In the middle of her success also unsuccessful. Proud and ashamed. Normal and abnormal. To me, it seems that even if the present is produced in this latter quantum flow and by the ungraspable matter of something that has already happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 196), quantum flows and lines of segmentation still interfere with each other and while this brings some flexibility to the molar it also brings some rigidity to the molecular. I mean, for a few seconds Amira perhaps reached the greatest amount of suppleness possible in her molecular relation with the swimming instructor, and which she cannot go beyond. At the same time, it seems like nothing has changed. While the swimming instructor will go on as a knowing and taught teacher, Amira will go on as an unknowing and untaught student. Yet, everything has changed. Amira and the swimming instructor seem to have reached the

aforementioned line of flight. A line that does not allow the existence of segments and seems to uncover hidden parts of both Amira and the swimming instructor. A line that makes both molecular quantum flows and molar lines of segmentation explode. At the moment when Amira learned to float, I guess she broke through the wall and got out of what Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 199) call “a black hole” of not knowing how to float in the water. She says it is difficult to orientate and she does not know where to go next, so she might have been a bit dazzled when she came out into the light. But one thing is for sure, her floating skills are not hiding in the dark anymore. Simply, because there is no darkness to hide in. No form or predetermined pattern that creates shadows and contrasts that will allow her floating skills to hide again. To get rid of that pattern, both Amira and the swimming instructor seem to dismantle themselves, Amira as a student and the swimming instructor as a teacher. To me, it is a bit like they dismantle themselves to get hold on themselves through the encounter with each other, and hence become capable of learning again.

Dismantling Ourselves—A Step Toward Physical Activation, Higher Education, and the Dissolution of Health Inequalities?

So what does dismantling ourselves really imply when it comes to educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities? To me, it seems like we need to support and maintain teaching as an “open system” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 32), and relate training activities to situational circumstances rather than predetermined results. In open teaching systems, training activities do not turn up ready-made. They do not preexist, but have to be invented by those who participate in the event. The job of teaching is to contribute to the production of new training activities with their own necessities, requirements, and indispensability of/in the moment. And hence start to learn again. But there is no way I can guarantee that we will approach courses in physical education for more. Nor can I promise immediate progression. Open teaching systems mean, per se, that we do not know the end in advance, that is, what exactly we will learn.

Perhaps it would be more reasonable to say that if we want to develop courses in physical education for more, we should do our very best to go back and forth between quantum spaces and segmented spaces. And where situations like the one where the swimming instructor discovered that physical contact is important for Amira to feel safe in the water can be a constant inspiration to the established curricula and rigid teaching models, at the same time as the ability of the established curriculum and rigid teaching models to measure activities can be helpful when it comes to the translation of the often quite “strange” results of situations like the one when Amira learned to float. I know that this is not an easy task, but ignoring what Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 486) express as “all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space” would be to do many students a disservice. The statistics have already shown us that students will have insufficient opportunities to learn if we hold on to segmented spaces (compare Poplin et al., 2011) and try to save them from

various multiplicities, and I can only speculate about what would happen if we, out of some sheer convenience, hold on to quantum spaces and try to isolate them from segmented spaces. Probably, we would not only help students to live in a lie for a short while; we would also be co-creators of that lie. It would be like helping students to become other, but not to rewrite the rules so that the changes they undergo can be recognized as qualities. To be co-creators of amazing relieves in their bodies, and at the same time throwing them to the wolves. Cynics might say that at least they will die happy, but can you feel the fear in their bodies just as the wolves attacks them, in the swimming instructor's body, my body, your body when they/we realize that they/we have failed? Again. To have become a fantastic success in one moment only to realize that they/we have become even bigger troublemakers in the next moment. Exhausting I would guess. And life-threatening. For the students. The swimming instructor. Me. You?

So, dismantling ourselves is not only about taking a step back, putting our roles aside, and opening up for others to affect local training activities within our so often rigid spaces of physical education. It is also about allowing changes in the constant curricula, and thus endlessly renew the space it striates. There is an enveloping character of this process that devoid any kind of homogeneity. No predetermined linkages between one space of physical education and the next can be defined, and the space of physical education can be affected in an infinite number of ways (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 485). When it comes to quality and quality assessment, these conditions are entirely different from those determining the metric space of physical education and its constant curricula. No longer relating to a universal stand but to concepts of our understandings in a situation, quality becomes what happens, and hence an event in the moment that defines various rhythmic values of physical education that are not found elsewhere. These values are results of various desire produced in the moment of each training activity.

Dismantling ourselves thus implies that we need to counteract every attempt to define what quality is and how quality can be assessed in the long term. And to co-create cultures of innovation where new qualities continuously can be produced and tied to novel individual values. For me, this is a political matter of equality, equality of bodily movement, and hence educational equality. And to set quality in motion, like I collectively suggest in this inquiry, puts the discussion of predetermined methods, criteria, and definitions in physical education in an ominous political perspective of exclusion, oppression, and production of otherness not far from what can be find in today's prejudices about gender, ethnicity, race, and sexuality. And to stop producing prejudices and inequalities in physical education, I guess we need to make sure that there is a lot of friction between quantum spaces and segmented spaces without ending up with one taking over the other. Hence, dismantling ourselves emphasizes the importance of trust and consultation between different interests in order to put up new ideas, that is, innovations. By supporting creative creations that make communicative differences in physical education, I guess bodies will be set in motion in relation to each other in each training event. Physical and mental motion that, if we are brave enough

to bridge divergences, will be allowed to make differences in some later events. Events that may be about physical activation, higher education, and dissolution of health inequalities, but also about something completely different. So, what do you think? Can we do it together? In a quantum space?

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Åsa Andersson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-2646>

Anne B. Reinertsen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0467-4515>

References

- Anderson, M., Bolton, N., Davies, B., & Fleming, S. (2014). Local implementation of national policy: A case-study critique of the free swimming initiative for the 60 plus population. *Managing Leisure, 19*(2), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2013.859456>
- Andersson, Å., Korp, P., & Reinertsen, A. (in review). Becoming interested—the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports.
- Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the 'right' way: Markets, standards, god and inequality*. Routledge.
- Au, W. (2013). Coring social studies within corporate education reform: The common core state standards, social justice, and the politics of knowledge in U.S. schools. *Critical Education, 4*(5), 1–15.
- Au, W. (2016). Techies, the tea party, and the race to the top: The rise of the new upper-middle class and tensions in the rightist politics of federal education reform. *The Educational Forum, 80*(2), 208–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2016.1135378>
- Baez, B. (2014). *Technologies of government: Politics and power in the "information age."* Information Age Publishing.
- Barrett, B. D. (2009). No child left behind and the assault on teachers' professional practices and identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(8), 1018–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.021>
- Bullough, S., Davies, L. E., & Barrett, D. (2015). The impact of a community free swimming programme for young people (under 19) in England. *Sport Management Review, 18*(1), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.09.001>
- Coalter, F. (2002). *Let's make Scotland more active – Entrance charges and participation: A review of evidence*. Center of Leisure Research.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *Negotiations*. Columbia university press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Bloomsbury.

- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1986). *Kafka: Toward a minor literature*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. Athlone.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* Columbia University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). Dumbing down teachers: Rethinking the crisis of public education and the demise of the social state. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 32(4-5), 339–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2010.510346>
- Gray, D. E. (2007). Facilitating management learning – developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management Learning*, 38(5), 495–513.
- Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing no child left behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 493–518. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207306764>
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: movement, affect, sensation*. Duke University Press.
- Pickup, A. (2020). Embodied phronesis conceptualizing materiality engaged practical wisdom in teaching, teacher education, and research. *Journal of Thought*, 2(1–2), 4–22.
- Pilgaard, F. I. H., Östergren, P.-O., Olin, A., Kling, S., Albin, M., & Björk, J. (2020). Socio-economic differences in swimming ability among children in Malmö, southern Sweden: Initial results from a community-level intervention. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 48(5), 495–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494818821478>
- Poplin, M., Rivera, J., Durish, D., Hoff, L., Kawell, S., Pawlak, P., Hinman, I. S., Straus, L., & Veney, C. (2011). She's Strict for a Good Reason: Highly Effective Teachers in Low-Performing Urban Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(5), 39–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200509>
- Schrift, A. D. (1995). *Nietzsche's French legacy: A genealogy of poststructuralism*. Routledge.
- The City of Gothenburg. (2018). *Göteborgs stads program för en jämlik stad 2018–2026*. Gothenburg. The City of Gothenburg.
- Valente, J. M., & Collins, K. (2016). [Dis]Ableing educational inequities: A disability studies in education perspective. Review of Disability Studies. *International journal*, 12(1), 1–19.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(8), 1544–1552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004>

Substances are not permanent and qualities are not consistent

I guess the swimming instructor did not begin her teaching with an affective lens as she made use of the ten-stage model for swimming education. Yet, as she spent more time in the water engaging with students, buoyancy aids, and the smell of chlorine, a multitude of sensations turned up. For instance, a moment with Amira emerged, and which she did not seem to be able to escape. Later, she told me that she was surprised when Amira learned to float, and that there was some kind of energy (or force?) that spread from their encounter in the water. ‘In the midst of all the surprise, I was elated, and I felt (and thought?) the importance of all bodies involved simultaneously’ (swimming instructor 2019). In this moment, I guess the swimming instructor could not be separated from Amira and Amira could not be separated from the swimming instructor. Neither of them was more significant than the other. Rather, their bodies slowed down and picked up speed in the encounter with each other. Entangled with the water, the smell of chlorine, buoyancy aids and the ten-stage model, they became a continuously varying teaching-learning-collectivity – and an assemblage. I guess, Deleuze and Guattari (1988) would say that the intensities that extend and reduce capacities of their bodies within this assemblage are affects. And, by affecting and being affected by this moment, I guess we have a chance to reimagine quality within physical education, sports, and research.

But before we go there, I suggest that we spend some time exploring the bodies involved in the teaching-learning-collectivity. In the moment when Amira learned to float, it seems like we existed without a particular arrangement or purpose. No one was pre-given as an object or a subject. When it comes to the development of swimming skills, I suggest elsewhere that the teaching-learning-collectivity is something other than the ten-stage model suggested by the City of Gothenburg. In the teaching-learning-collectivity, bodies have no essential qualities or

distinctive features, as combined, form physical and conceptual dividing lines between swimming instructors and students. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1988:223) would say that in the absence of predetermined characteristics 'we are composed of lines... or rather bundles of lines' constituted by the very materiality of the swimming event. It is processes of becoming, and while we most often tend to think of teachers and students, coaches and athletes and researchers and data as specific categories, these processes imply that we are continuously produced by various material forces and movements that together create a constant variable space of relations. Amira and the swimming instructor are not objects of perception. Rather, they are what we become aware of in the encounter.

And, this encounter in which Amira learns to float is not a simplistic relation. It is an entanglement that extends horizontally. I guess Deleuze and Guattari (1988:21) would say that it is a rhizome that unfolds along the intertwined paths we move, Amira, the swimming instructor, the water, the buoyancy aids, me, and perhaps you? For Deleuze and Guattari (1988) a rhizome is a nonpredictable web of possibilities. I guess it is quite common to think of rhizomes as various 'root-systems' that spread horizontally in the soil via different connecting knots. Root-systems that branch out unsystematically? And, these root-systems are very different from arborescent tree structures whose branches extend from a central source and are much more hierarchical, linear and predictable. Rhizomes operate through various offshoots, evolvments, and captures. Thinking with the rhizomatic-encounter in which Amira learns to float, I guess qualities can no longer be specified beforehand, they are not predetermined and linked to the abstract conception of good practices. It is not so much that the swimming instructor act like a Cartesian subject and treat Amira as an assessable and trainable object. Rather they show us an immanent situation, and perhaps a post-Cartesian logic when it comes to qualities in physical education, sports, and research. And, by moving away from the so often taken for granted binarity between the assessor and the assessed, it seems like they acknowledge the materiality of situation (swimming education).

Acknowledging the materiality of situation challenges the idea of ourselves as rational, thinking, and knowing teachers, coaches, and researchers (subjects) separated from all other elements in our surroundings. Elements which (within the Cartesian view) are most often unreliable and problematic. In their encounter, the swimming instructor does not put herself ahead of Amira, and the expression of

qualities does not refer back to the swimming instructor and the ten-stage model for learning to swim. Rather, quality seems to be represented by the process where Amira learns to float and this process is not necessarily something positive, safe, and controllable. The process whereby Amira learns to float is relational, and for me it is quite unclear where it starts and to whom it belongs. It seems to be ongoing in the pool, flowing from the water, the buoyancy aids, the ten-stage model, and the swimming instructor, but it also seems to go on in Amira who becomes affected and qualified in the moment. When we acknowledge the materiality of physical education, sports, and research, I guess, qualities often pop up surprisingly and without warning. Qualities are not characteristics. They are not personal, and they are not the same as success related to predetermined goals and thus good results of diligent practice.

What if today's common notion of quality as individual success related to predetermined goals in physical education, sports, and research is just a fiction? A fiction that we have invented and in which we, over time, have come to believe, a kind of illusion of well-executed performance that can hardly be improved? Yet, this dialectic understanding of quality and quality-assessment seems to anchor us quite firmly (and safely) in a dominant reality of physical education, sports, and research that we perhaps no longer believe in. Once we have encountered Amira and the swimming instructor, I guess the world of physical education, sports, and research seems much more fragmented. And at least for me, there is no turning back. I wonder when do we talk about the possibility that the binary relation between the assessor and the assessed (teacher and student, coach and athlete and researcher and data) is just an assumption and something we have habitually accepted as the truth? Where and when in physical education, sports, and research do we devote time and attention to the history and politics of quality and its processes of assessment? Why do we advocate one quality-assessment at the expense of others? And when do we learn that today's quality-assessment is just a construction that we have created and not a truth we have found somewhere out there?

I cannot stop wondering whether it is our knowledge of best-practice regarding quality and quality-assessment that also limits us when it comes to inventing the new. Perhaps that is also why we get so easily annoyed by the discussions in this thesis and claim that this thesis mostly contains speculations and not so many reliable answers? For me, however, the possibility of further speculation is not about negligence. Rather, it is an attempt to bring in to being what we do not yet know about quality, quality assessment, and much more. Deleuze (1994) suggests there is always a risk that our established thoughts limit us when it comes to thinking novel thoughts. And precisely therefore, I guess, it is important to talk about how our ideas about quality and quality assessment in physical education, sports and research came to be real. It is important to talk about how we maintain these ideas in today's teaching, coaching and research. And, it is important to talk about who is favoured and given voice, and who is silenced by this way of thinking and knowing quality and quality assessment? Although most of us assume we work inclusively, I guess physical education, sports, and research are too often designed to exclude. And even if this is not a particularly new speculation, it may be important to keep in mind when trying to work with sustainable inclusion.

I must admit that I had not thought much about sustainable inclusion when I first met Amira and the swimming instructor. And I had thought even less about sustainable inclusion without sustainability. Rather, I was inspired by the non-order of the process when Amira learned to float. I guess we all wondered what to do in the encounter. Entangled to each other, our wonderings were not so much individual but relational. Intertwined and twisted together, it is difficult to say how these wonderings arose and ceased. All I know is that they moved us in various directions, and that they created capacity to, among other things, rethink quality and quality assessment. What if quality in physical education, sports, and research is related to uncertainty and wonder, and our capacity to affect and become affected, and to ultimately think novel thoughts together with students, athletes, and data? Perhaps quality assessment would then be centred to process rather than outcome? To elaborate, this implies that we are interested in the middle where various connections between teachers and students, coaches and athletes and researchers and data are established and re-established. Less important are where these bodies start and where they are supposed to end. Instead, I suggest we focus on how bodies pick up speed in the encounter with each other and thus their (our?) becomings in physical education, sports, and research. Encounters where we can form a rhizome with something else is perhaps what offers possibilities for quality?

Even though physical education, sports, and research have roots, there is always an outside where we can form a rhizome with something else, with students, athletes, and data, and create various lines of flight. Perhaps quality is not a thing but what we do when we open up our activities to conjugate different flows? Perhaps we are 'qualiting'? What distinguishes qualiting from quality is that in these processes we are entirely oriented toward experimentation in contact with students, athletes and data. Qualiting does not reproduce what we already know as good results. It constructs what we do not yet know, thoughts that we have not yet been thinking regarding ourselves and others in physical education, sports, and research. When qualiting, we simply foster connections between teachers and students, coaches and athletes and researchers and data by the removal of blockages that makes bodily movements and flows between bodies impossible. We become open and connectable in all our dimensions. We become able to be removed and separated from each other. We become reversible and liable to be influenced and changed by each body we encounter. All we know about physical education, sports and research can be torn apart, turned the other way around and inside out. This implies that physical education, sports, and research can be adapted to any kind of reconstruction released and enabled by an individual, group or social formation.

I guess one of the most important characteristics of qualiting is that the process always has multiple entryways. Quality, on the other hand always come back to the same. And while quality involves competence and the ability to do something successfully, qualiting has to do with production and creation. Unlike quality (which confines every accomplishment to overarching structures) qualiting rejects any idea of predetermined performances. Performances are neither assessable stages or positions related to predefined goals. Rather, they are (political) possibilities for problems, entryways, and exits. They are situations in which students, athletes and data live out politically and with all the force of their desire. I do not intend, however, to revert to a simple dualism by contrasting the characteristics of quality and qualiting. Perhaps it is the essence of qualiting to reach quality as much as it is the essence of rhizomes to intersect and sometimes merge with various roots? And I guess the opposite is also true? It is a question of method where qualities in physical education, sports, and research should always be put back into processes of qualiting. It is important to note that both these processes are far from symmetrical, and it is not accurate to say that qualities reproduce processes of qualiting. Rather, it is like the quality criteria in the ten-

stage model, which begins with selecting and isolating students into various groups. Groups that we intend to reproduce. The idea of producing the same always creates qualities, and attracts them. I guess the quality criteria in the ten-stage model often translate the process of qualifying into an image of right and wrong. It organizes, stabilizes, and neutralizes the encounters between various bodies according to the ten stages of significance and subjectification belonging to it. It simply structuralizes the qualifying process and, when we think that we are producing something new, we are, in fact, only reproducing ourselves as teachers, coaches, and researchers. That is also why I suggest that focusing on quality in physical education, sports, and research is so dangerous. It forces us into situations which make movement difficult and where no progress seems possible. Situations in which hierarchical practices grow and form a center from which related and supplementary activities emerge. Situations of structuration, stabilization, and limitation.

I guess we are all familiar with situations where the rhizomatic processes of qualifying have been broken and where our established knowledges of physical education, sports, and research have covered the knowledges of students, athletes, and data with impenetrable blotches. Situations in which we have put it right for them and blocked all other ways out until they have begun to believe in the hierarchy of knowledges and started to desire their own guilt and responsibility. Situations in which we have rooted shame in them and closed them off from the rhizomatic processes of co-creation and co-construction of physical education, sports, and research. Situations in which we have rooted them in our established activities, occupied their bodies, and directed their minds toward what we already know as good results. And I guess, our intentions have been good every time we have taken their suggestions into account and appreciated them based on our current knowledges, just to put them back onto the established images of physical education, sports, and research. Students, athletes, and data, are all allowed to live their lives and express themselves but perhaps only after every hole they could possibly escape through has been blocked?

By encouraging and following structural events that will necessarily happen in physical education, sports, and research, we will, in one way or another, destroy the processes of qualifying. And once these processes of qualifying have been obstructed by our attempts to help students, athletes, and data acquire specific qualities, I guess it is all over? No desire makes us move around and encounter

each other anymore. And, no knowledges get mixed thoroughly, because it is always by the rhizomatic process of qualifying that desires, moves, and produces. Whenever we try to form hierarchical practices in physical education, sports, and research, unintended consequences will occur and make us stumble and fall into situations where no progress is possible. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1988:14) would say that we fall into our death; the rhizomatic process of qualifying, on the other hand, 'acts on desire by external, productive outgrowths'.

This is also why I suggest that it is so important for teachers, coaches and researchers to invite students, athletes and data to nonsystematic processes of qualifying. To connect qualities back into the process of qualifying and bring hierarchical practices of physical education, sports, and research back into a rhizome. In their unconscious moves of their encounter, I guess, Amira and the swimming instructor are qualifying in a rhizomatic process with the water, with the ten-stage model, and with me in the stand, but also with the line of flight of the floating, the learning, and much more. And it is interesting how these lines are released and how Amira's movement is made possible, how she becomes a floater without being rooted in the swimming education, without being positioned under the swimming instructor, and without being subjected to a power takeover by the ten-stage model. I would say that they extract themselves from the qualities defined by the ten-stage-model and thus the principal method of communication in swimming education where teachers teach and students learn. They simply disrupt the local balance of power. Perhaps physical education, sports, and research can be opened up in all directions and form various rhizomes? As you might have already guessed, I am a bit tired of hierarchical practices. And, I suggest that we stop believing in qualities because they cause us too much pain. As I see it, they are sad images of thought that repeatedly encourage us to imitate established practices of physical education, sports, and research.

In contrast to collaborative processes of qualifying, qualities require opposed elements. Teachers as opposed to students, coaches as opposed to athletes, and researchers as opposed to data, and where the latter parts of these relations need to run from bottom to top to fulfill necessary conditions and qualify in physical education, sports, and research. No matter how hard we try, we can never get beyond our binary relations and fake rhizomatic processes of qualifying. Preestablished knowledges, capabilities, and expertise do not move us any further. Quality systems are hierarchical arrangements with central points from

which all activities are directed, and so also subjectification. And those of us who make it, become mechanical moving devices made in imitation of physical education, sports, and research. Within quality systems, we can only receive valid information from a unit positioned at a higher level and we can only get subjectively affected along predetermined paths. And as you perhaps have already figured out, I suggest this is one of the current problems when it comes to sustainable inclusion in physical education, sports, and research. Physical education, sports, and research which still adhere to the oldest way of thinking by giving memories and central organs all the power. In quality systems, students, athletes, and data have only one active party to work with, the superior teacher, coach, and researcher. The processes of transmission are predetermined. The quality system pre-exists students, athletes, and data, who are invited to participate by being assigned a pre-selected place. And, I guess that even though we sometimes think we are working rhizomatically, it may be a false experience because these seemingly non-hierarchical processes can only be recognized as valid in hierarchical systems.

I wonder why quality systems in physical education, sports, and research are hierarchical? Sometimes it seems that we are trying to create superior narratives by providing chains of reasoning where truths about students', athletes' - and datas' achievements are established by means of already accepted truths? And I wonder if it is possible to do things otherwise? Amira do not learn to float in a centered process. She learns to float in a process where bodies (human and non-human) encounter each other and where various affects run from one body to any other. A process where she and the swimming instructor are interchangeable. A process where they are defined only by their state in the moment. A process without preexisting centers from which certain activities can be developed. A process without specific trails that connect one place of being with another. Nothing can be improved, and nothing can be worsened. Things can only change. At least sometimes. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1988:17) would suggest that 'transduction of intensive states replaces topology'. Without any copying of the ten-stage-model and without any tracing of success, Amira's and the swimming instructor's rhizomatic process of qualiting gives us a glimpse of how unconscious physical education is produced, and with it, new desires and new statements of swimming education. To be more precise, qualiting has not so much to do with representations as imaginary forces based on sensible efforts as it has to do with the explosive effects of a desiring-machine and the fractured practice of a dissolved

swimming education (cf. Deleuze 1994:98). I guess we cannot control processes of qualiting. This is also why I situate them as productions of unconsciousness practices.

It is interesting how quality has dominated the reality of physical education, sports, and research for so long. It is interesting how it has dominated all our thoughts. Perhaps we have a special relation to hierarchies, and to 'hierarchisation'; and to cultivate and train participants using linear models? The activities of students, athletes and data must meet certain criteria to be eligible for their positions and qualify for further participation. Amira and the swimming instructor's rhizomatic process of qualiting, on the other hand, is a liberation of quality, not only from achievements and accomplishments but also from assessments such as good and bad, right and wrong, and success and failure. Often, I am worried that the hierarchy has implemented itself into our bodies, making our activities in physical education, sports, and research rigid, inflexible, and condemnatory. I am also concerned that we are creating impenetrable boundaries and where some students, athletes, and data are included, and others are not. Perhaps qualiting is our only way out (and in)? Within rhizomatic processes of qualiting, there is no dualism of here and there. Nor is there a dualism of those who are valuable and useless.

What I am trying to say here is that processes of qualiting seem to connect our bodies to other bodies without regard to any hierarchical arrangements. And perhaps we are not necessarily linked to bodies with characteristics of the same nature? Processes of qualiting put into play very different knowledges (and non-knowledge), and they are not reducible to one or the other. Nor do they add one knowledge to an other. There is no right source of knowledge and there is no original source from which knowledge can be obtained. Processes of qualiting do not belong to any body. They are not even composed of units but various dimensions, and perhaps directions in motion. Processes of qualiting have neither clear beginnings nor definite ends, but always a middle from which they evolve. They are rhizomes including neither subjects nor objects. And when rhizomatic processes of qualiting change in dimension, I guess it change in nature as well. Unlike processes of quality assessment, which include established roles and positions with binary relations, processes of qualiting consists only of segmenting lines and liberating lines and where we, in connection with the latter, will undergo transformations and change in nature. Not just me, you, and other teachers, students, coaches, athletes, researchers and data, but also physical education,

sports, and research in themselves. And these changes should not be confused with goal-orientated movements from one predetermined point to an other. Unlike processes of quality-assessment, processes of qualiting do not provide us with reproductions. They work by variation, extension, engagement, involvement and unforeseen offshoots. When it comes to qualiting in physical education, sports, and research, it is precisely these processes that must be produced if we are serious about reaching sustainable inclusion. Processes that are always open-ended, inviting, and changeable. And when it comes to quality-assessments in physical education, sports, and research, I suggest that these processes are also what should be mapped. What is at stake here is our relations to students, athletes, and data, relations that are very different from hierarchical relations and where we encounter each other in the middle.

Processes of qualiting are always going on in the middle. And I suggest that the situation where Amira learns to float is made up by a process of qualiting. I use the word 'qualiting' to characterize something ongoing, a self-vibrating milieu of bodies whose evolution does not have a predetermined goal. Instead of valuating students', athletes', and data's development in relation to external ideas of acceptable results or end-products in physical education, sports, and research, I suggest we evaluate them in relation to their internal value for the processes they participate in. For instance, while the ten-stage model for swimming education has different levels for success and partial termination points and works like a uniform wave that never changes no matter what happens in the pool, we could ask: What takes place in the situation where Amira learns to float? A situation composed in the middle and that opens up for communication (affects) between various bodies: Amira, the swimming instructor, the water, the smell of chlorine, me in the stand and perhaps you? While writing this thesis, I guess I am qualiting too. Each time I start to write, I ask myself what encounter with Amira and the swimming instructor I will tackle today. I write a few lines here and there. And the lines do not seem to be very still. I have seen them move to other sections, and sometimes they have even left the thesis and proceeded to other texts and projects. And I have no intention of stopping them. For me, it is a possibility to stay in the middle, and perhaps it is also a method that successfully constructs it? A method that constructs teaching-learning-collectivities. A method that constructs physical education, sports, and research as assemblages with their outsides and not so much physical education, sports, and research as images of predetermined goals. A method that constructs rhizome-physical-educations, rhizome-sports, and

rhizome-research and not so much dichotomies, models of importance in relation to the success of something else and productions of the same.

Why is it so difficult to stay in the middle, to be in motion and to allow our activities to change? Why is it so hard for us teachers, coaches, and researchers to avoid relapsing into old habits? When Amira's floating skills came into existence, they did not occur from the swimming instructor and predetermined ten-stage model of swimming education. Nor did Amira have any particularly important prior knowledges. Her floating skills occurred somewhere in the middle. In the middle where she and the swimming instructor simultaneously became both students and teachers. In the middle where their qualities could not be separated from their encounter. In the middle where their roles were no longer permanent and the quality-assessment was no longer consistent.

References:

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* London: Athlone.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. London: Bloomsbury.

Re-thinking official educational organization towards friction-zones between divergent knowledges

Policy Futures in Education
2023, Vol. 21(1) 75–87
© The Author(s) 2022



Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/14782103221089466
journals.sagepub.com/home/pfe



Åsa Andersson 

Department of Food, Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Peter Korp

Department of Food, Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Anne B Reinertsen 

Östfold University College, Halden, Norway

Abstract

In this article, I re-think official educational organization toward friction-zones. Thinking with a swimming event in physical education, and Deleuze's notion of pure difference and its accompanying characteristics, non-linearity, decentralization, pluralistic knowledge, virtual and actual multiplicities, nomadic waiting, and open ends, I outline conditions for official educational organization in the encounter between divergent knowledges. The aim is to bring teachers and students closer to each other and paradoxically let up-coming concepts, meanings, and ideas act instead of silence everything that is not in line with predefined educational goals. It is to create common histories of learning and knowledge productions, and hence to produce common grounds in/by motion. Ultimately, it is about inclusive processes in/by motion. And, it is also a call for us all to pay attention and resist unintentional productions of exclusion, and thus all colonizing processes that includes superior knowledge.

Keywords

official educational organization, friction-zones, nomadic waiting, Deleuze, physical education

Introduction

Eleven-year old Amira said she did not know she could teach the swimming instructor anything, and even though Amira doubted that she would ever learn to swim, she paradoxically thought it was she

Corresponding author:

Åsa Andersson, Department of Food, Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 100, 40530 Gothenburg, Sweden.

Email: asa.andersson.2@gu.se

herself who would learn things in the swimming event, and not the other way around. But at the moment when Amira would learn to float and tried really hard to follow the instructions to relax and act like she was sleeping in the water, she also got water in her ears, she panicked and had a strong desire to move her body closer to the swimming instructor's body. Simultaneously, she put her hands on the swimming instructor's arms and showed the somewhat surprised swimming instructor how to move her body closer to Amira's body in order to make Amira feel safe in the water.

At the moment, it felt like a small and almost insignificant gesture that mostly violated what I was expected to do, and made me a troublemaker. But now, as we sit here and talk about it, it suddenly feels very important considering that I actually learned to float. Somehow that little disrupting movement, and the tiny little space it was given when she stopped in her tracks, become big (field note, December 2019).

I have written about this moment before (Andersson et al., 2021a). How Amira and the swimming instructor start to trust each other instead of solely relying on a predetermined 10-stage model for swim training, and dismantle themselves in an encounter in the water, and how the dichotomy between their roles (and bodies) dissolves. How they become non-student and non-teacher, and get hold on themselves as student-teacher and teacher-student and become able to learn again. And, not least how they set in motion success and non-success in an educational event.

I have to admit that this short sequence when the swimming instructor, in the midst of her amazement, takes a non-knowing position in relation to Amira and actually include Amira in the educational activity of floating by waiting for her and relying on her signs touches on something that is important to me, and which I think is crucial for how we (could) design inclusion processes in our schools. Often, we are preoccupied with knowledge and facts expressed as models and methods of teaching, and we tend to discuss educational content and practices through evidence-based research (see e.g., Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Davies, 1999; Jin and Jun, 2013). The teaching we perform must be anchored in science, and hence be knowledge-based. And, sometimes this works really well. What I find interesting, though, is that even if the swimming instructor had a pretty clear evidence-based 10-stage model to follow in her teaching, she is actually doing something else, and Amira confirms that the student's opportunity to achieve educational goals may be about something completely different. Namely, to patently leave room for nomadic movements between bodies by not moving. Nomadic movements that imply processes of waiting and waitings as processes (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 381), and where the swimming instructor shifts her focus away from the established teaching method towards treating the established teaching method as one of many elements in a swimming event. And, where we are waiting, continuing and simultaneously changing in the encounter with each other. I have seen this before. Within open youth work (cf. Seal and Andersson, 2017). The activism of not moving and hence not knowing, and what energies, novel learning situations, inclusion processes and potentialities it sets free. And where humbleness, trust, patience and uncertainty become important conditions for inviting young people to processes of mutual change and learning.

This is to practice teaching differently. And, to think outside the neoliberal framework of today's official educational organizations that often require an undeniable focus on end-products (Au, 2013; Barrett, 2009; Pickup, 2020: 6). I would say it is the end of superior knowledge, divergences of power and comparisons with each other, and an opening towards mutual recognition, coexistence and situations of pluralistic knowledge production in "pure difference." Pure difference is a Deleuzian concept and implies that difference does not resembles that of contradiction (cf. Deleuze, 1994: 65, 70). It is not the negativities that are the driving forces. Rather there are positive differential elements which regulate the occurrences of our desire and the differences in our desire.

Including a constant mesh of resistance and refractions but no struggles for power, I guess it was not a big deal for the swimming instructor to wait for Amira and simultaneously invite her to the process of becoming a co-teacher. Nor did it seem particularly problematic for the swimming instructor to deviate from the rigid structure of the 10-stage model. She simply did wrong to make right, and hence to break open what was desirable and what was possible for Amira, me and perhaps you? Unconscious and conscious. At the moment, the swimming instructor was not caught up in the striations of the 10-stage model and she was not primarily productive of practical results in the service of educational goals. Her focus was much more ethical, and to make room for Amira to participate in the swimming training on her own terms.

This is also what this paper is about. Acknowledgment of the existence of more knowledges than the established ones. And, honestly I am worried. Sometimes so much that it keeps me awake at night. And, my concern does not only include the moment when the swimming instructor invites Amira to become a co-teacher and where she simultaneously becomes a co-learner and where their creative engagement makes them cross boundaries and open up for a new way of learning to float. It includes every moment within and beyond physical education where we invite young people to participate for real and hence wait for them to act, because there is rarely room for deviations and novel solutions in today's official organizations (Taylor et al., 2018). Often, it is only the already known that is allowed to (re)circulate inside their regulated relations of predetermined knowledge, facts and expected outcomes. No matter if it is educational organizations, sport associations or youth clubs. So, perhaps without even being aware of it, the swimming instructor puts herself at risk by making use of a nomadic approach to training within an official organization that advocates a more stable and solid approach to education, and thus becomes untrustworthy, obscure, mysterious, and perhaps even threatening by conceptualizing training and education differently (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1986: 5). Eventually, she may even be excluded, and if so, the students involved in her inclusion attempts will undoubtedly be part of that exclusion (Andersson et al., 2021b). And, instead of bringing people closer together, the current style of official educational organization helps to bring them apart.

Taking this concern seriously, I argue in this paper that we perhaps need to (re)think official educational organization on the line provided by the swimming instructor, and hence to figure out what nomadic swimming training may do to the style of organization. It is about collaborative teaching-learning situations where various predefined knowledge and novel knowledge affect each other and produce results we cannot be sure of in advance. And, this is also my onto-epistemological approach. Without emphasizing conventional claims on truth, rigor, reliability, validity and generalizability and instead encouraging learning and emergence of novel understandings, I alternate creative-observations (Andersson et al., 2020) made by me and Amira within a "case-assemblage" (Andersson et al., 2021a) in a swimming event in elementary school in Gothenburg 2018-2019 with my "own" experiences, thoughts and speculations. My intention is that this auto-ethnography-like design (cf. Denzin, 2014) will enable me to create a space of inquiry within which we will be able to encounter and change our knowledges collectively, Amira, me and perhaps you. In this practice of inquiry, each piece of knowledge becomes important, performative, and methodological which in turn abolish the distinction between knowing theoretically and doing practically. Ultimately, this is to open up the inquiry to diverse visions of educational realities, to destabilize established knowledges and co-produce novel learnings. Hence, this inquiry is undoubtedly a political act within which I actively participate and enroll myself. And, as you perhaps already have noticed my philosophical approach is Deleuzian. I discuss what I call friction-zones and virtual-actual flows (Deleuze, 1994: 272) in events that establish the internal conditions for teaching and learning. And, I conclude by discussing the necessity to move from, a model-centered, autonomous and linear

organizational style with predefined ends toward a decentralized and non-linear organizational style with pluralistic knowledge creations and open ends. For Deleuze (1995: 100) this is not just an aesthetic matter. It is also ethics, as opposed to morality. The (positive) difference is that morality introduces us to a set of rules that constrain our actions and intentions as well as judge us in relation to transcendent values (this is good, this is bad), and ethics acknowledge the existence of various knowledges in a situation. Knowledges that do not have so much values in themselves, but offer each other something to think with in processes of learning. From an official organizational perspective, this is to open up for the small world's politics. By focusing on friction-zones where divergent knowledges interfere, and how various forces within these spaces constantly striates them, and how they along with these courses of striations develop other forces and give off smooth spaces (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 500), we have a chance to develop our own collective pedagogies, and to let up-coming concepts, meanings, and ideas act instead of jeopardizing the contact between various participants. It is to create common histories of learning and knowledge productions, and hence to produce common grounds in/by motion. Ultimately, it is about inclusion processes in/by motion. And, I guess it is also a call for us all to pay attention and resist unintentional productions of exclusion, and thus all colonizing processes that includes superior knowledge (cf. Stengers, 2018: 79).

Creative-observations, case-assemblage, and auto-ethnographic-like design

Resisting unintentional productions of exclusion is also what creative-observations and case-assemblages are all about. To elaborate a bit, creative-observations are processes of negotiation within which Amira and I (as well as other elements in the swimming event) interacted or perhaps intra-acted and set free each other's energies to move around and change both the inquiry and our understandings of what was going on in the swimming event. Sometimes Amira and I just talked to each other while we were sitting at the stand. In these situations, various thoughts, questions, and answers evolved and coordinated each other. Although each thought, question and answer had affective capacities, they were also results of affective capacities. Hitting each other's thoughts, questions, and answers and becoming hit by each other's thoughts, questions, and answers, Amira and I created a zone of uncertainty. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1994: 73) would say that this was a zone where various affects were produced and populated the situation through uncontrollable becoming of our thoughts, questions and answers, and that affects refer to pre-conceptual intensities of bodily states of various uncertainties about what happens. The unstable images of the swimming event I have managed to grasp are thus composed in collaboration with Amira. I call these observations creative because I associate them with movements. Movements within which Amira and I increasingly lost our positions as researcher and data as well as subject and object, and became some who set things in motion (Andersson et al., 2021b). And, the milieu for these movements was a case-assemblage where various connections and creations within a vast network of forces and processes continuously shaped our collaboration (Andersson et al., 2021b).

Working within a case-assemblage should not be confused with the English understanding of assemblages, and that means the union of things (Nail, 2017). I do not strive to create essences and link introspective stories to the cultural, political, and educational in the swimming event (cf. Ellis, 2004: 37). Nor do I seek much coherence by offering recognition and familiarity where Amira, the swimming instructor, I and perhaps you are able to identify ourselves. The Deleuzian understanding of assemblages implies much more transgressions of our habitual knowledges within arrangements of heterogeneous elements. Elements that change by being combined and recombined with each

other in ongoing processes. For Deleuze, an assemblage is “what keeps very heterogeneous element together” (Deleuze, 2007: 179), and hence the processes of organizing (Livesey, 2010: 18) various elements as alliances in a rhizome privileging connections, dynamisms, and heterogeneities, rather than hierarchical and overcoding structures that prescribe what things are and what they will become. For Deleuze and Guattari (1988: 25), rhizomes include the logic of the “AND,” a tiny little conjunction that perhaps hold enough force to shake and uproot the narrative I in conventional auto-ethnography?

And... Always in the middle, without beginning or end. Working in a case-assemblage my lived experiences and my past are no longer privileged sources of knowledge. Rather, it implies a destabilization of traditional hierarchies between researcher and data that undoubtedly moves us away from traditional auto-ethnographic (as well as phenomenological and critical pedagogical) approaches where the researcher’s voice is often used unproblematically to produce reminiscent stories that result in new discoveries and creations of ourselves (cf. Ellis and Bochner, 2000). It is a move toward situations that troubles the authority of researchers, and in accompaniment with Deleuze philosophy of immanence we disrupt the centering and the transparent effects of the narrative “I” who seem to gather up various meanings and treat processes of knowledge production as something predetermined. Immanence means existing, or remaining within, and implies a re-telling that admits and questions the limitations of one narration performed by one narrator. And just like Butler (2005: 83), I suggest that we need to confess openly the limits of our self-understanding, and perhaps replace an extended reflexivity that would reveal more about my way of knowing as a researcher with questions of what we can request from my (and others) voice?

My voice is not the origin of the case-assemblage, but that which is assembled. And, created in the middle of various elements. Working in the middle has not so much to do with expressing central or typical values in a set of data. Rather, it is to pick up speed that sweep me (and perhaps you) away in unforeseen ways. And, to work in a multiplicity of heterogeneous and equally existing elements (entities and processes) where the relations between various elements are more interesting than the elements themselves (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 23). Sometimes, the relations result in new and unusual events and hence becomings that open up what I can know, and sometimes they strengthen former knowledges and hence arrangements of elements in relation to each other according to a particular pattern. For Deleuze, there is a bi-directionality in multiplicities like case-assemblages. A bi-directionality that includes two distinct but inseparable movements, the virtual and the actual. However, the virtual is the condition for the production of various novelties and where “differential elements and relations along with the singular points which correspond to them” (Deleuze, 1994: 272) form the creative component of reality, the actual is the process of establishment and formulation of divisions that form the assumed, calculable and foreseeable component of reality. This friction-zone, then, introduces smoothness and striations as a conceptual relation to rethink spaces of official educational organization as consisting of complex mixtures between nomadic forces and sedentary captures (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988: 474). Although nomadic forces open up, displace, and sometimes efface characteristics and qualities belonging to certain elements, sedentary captures close off and establish characteristics and qualities of specific elements. Important to note, though, is that smooth spaces and striated spaces exist only in relation to each other. Smooth spaces are incessantly being translated into spaces of striation, and spaces of striations are incessantly being reversed to a smooth space. This friction-zone is also my space of inquiry, and why a small amount of empirical data (at least sometimes) may inspire a relatively broad discussion of educational organization.

Situations of pluralistic knowledge do not produce good or bad bodies

However, before I continue to discuss what that tiny little space where the swimming instructor waits for Amira implies when it comes to official educational organization, I want us to take a closer look at the swimming instructor's vulnerability as well as the importance of repealing it. By leaving room for Amira to become a co-teacher, the swimming instructor simultaneously increase the amount of expressed facts and subsequent knowledge variations in the swimming event. At once, their moment of co-teaching/learning seems to be irreducible to the 10-stage model, to be outside its sovereignty, and prior to its regulation. It comes from elsewhere. And, their method for learning to float cannot be reduced to some step in the 10-stage model. Nor can it constitute another step of the same kind. Instead, I would say that Amira's and the swimming instructor's moment of co-teaching/learning seems to be of the same nature as the Deleuzian notion of "rhizome" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 30). It is like a pure and infinite multiplicity where each component ceaselessly varies and alters in relation to the others, and that for some, who advocates a more stable and solid approach to educational spaces, may produce confusion and be perceived as chaos, loss of value and hence effect. It is a condition where the swimming instructor loses her factual superiority. She is no longer in position to define how to teach. Or, how Amira should learn. She simply bears witness to another kind of justice. She bear witness, above all, to the situational relations with Amira, the water, the smell of chlorine and perhaps me at the stand. By inviting our weak signals to affect the 10-stage model (and become affected by it), she opens up for an intense situation where more opportunities for influence are created and where we move from one experiential state of our bodies to another implying an increase or decrease in our capacities to act. It is a smooth space where there is no longer any predetermined goal. And, she unties bonds and sets free bodies in what Deleuze and Guattari (1986: 2) call "relations of becoming," much more than she accomplishes binary distributions between particular conditions of herself and Amira. In this respect, the swimming instructor's actions are of another nature/culture than what the static apparatus of the 10-stage model of swimming training advocates. And, for some, this is a negative condition that requires corrections. Corrections like, "don't forget that we have a pedagogical model to follow" (field note, December, 2019) and "how can it ever be equal when she is constantly inventing her own solutions to teach them things" (field note, December, 2019). During my time at the stand close to the swimming pool, I have seen this happen countless times. Efforts from colleagues that lead to a return to normalcy, and hence a return to the common professional and professional methods of the 10-stage model and the goal that every student should learn to swim 200 m before they finish elementary school. Ultimately, it is about transferring knowledge in a standardized and quality-assured way. And, a desire for justice where all students are offered equal access to swimming education (Stad, 2017).

And, the intention is good. More problematic, however, is what the thinking of knowledge and methods for swimming as something predefined in physical education may result in. During my time at the stand, I have noticed how this approach to knowledge can code and decode the space for the swimming training, and hence make it quite easy for some students to participate and more difficult for other students. However, the swimming education becomes very successful in relation to the students who are already prepared, capable, and qualified to learn to swim in the right way, it becomes less successful in relation to those who are not. Sometimes it even seems counterproductive. There have been several occasions when students happily have jumped into the pool only to leave it a few minutes later and sit next to me at the stand. Often completely crushed, angry, and very disappointed at themselves, the water, the swimming instructor, and the style of organization related to physical education. And, almost every time some teacher, swimming instructor, or assistant have tried to explain to me that there is something wrong with those students.

He is always so rowdy and never listens to my instructions even though I know I am right. I mean, he really need to calm down and do what he is told in the water. To some extent, he needs to take responsibility for his own security in the water, otherwise he might as well sit on the bench (field note, November, 2019).

And,

His parents are so overprotective because he has a diagnosis. I know he had to promise them to not go into the water without any buoyancy aids, but honestly I agree with the swimming instructor when he says that he cannot participate in underwater activities without taking them off. I think it goes without saying. And, right now he refuses so he simply has to sit there for a while. Hopefully, he will change his mind soon (field note, November, 2019).

So, to speculate a bit, it seems to go in one of two ways. Either the students succeed to adapt to the 10-stage model of the swimming training, or they become excluded from the swimming training. It also seems pretty clear that those who are excluded are made responsible for both their own failure and their opportunities to be invited to participate in the training again. And, this is not even the worst part. The worst part is that we seem to allow the knowledge provided by the 10-stage model of the swimming training to become something normative and create professional polarization between those instructors who strictly follow the 10-stage model and those who make exceptions. And, while the perception of normality is narrowed down by the former, carelessness, unreliability, stupidity, illegitimacy, and powerlessness are likely to be produced among the latter (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1986: 5). Organizationally, we simply seem to weaken, ridicule and shut out the only ones who actually tend to meet students on their own terms and thus counteract exclusion by non-motion/motion.

And, this is a dangerous path. However, we seek justice and equal access to swimming training, we seem to produce even more injustice and divided opportunities for participation. From an equality perspective, the 10-stage model almost appears as something negative producing dangerous knowledge and methods that we can either agree with or get lost with. Although serving us an illusion of justice and equality, it also seems to provide us with quite undesirable consequences. Consequences that are hard to overlook because at the same time as we divide knowledge, activities and students into good or bad, right or wrong, and wise or unwise, we not only tend to reinforce polarizations but also the truth of our perceptions and thus inevitably our prejudices. To speculate a bit further, this is how racism, homophobia, and other oppressive activities emerge and are established in societies, and also why we need to rethink the official organization of education on the nomadic line of pluralistic knowledge provided by the swimming instructor.

The onto-epistemology of nomadic swimming training

As discussed above, nomadic swimming training is an intensive system that rests upon the nature of the intense quantities of the bodies (human and non-human) involved in it, and which communicate through their differences. For instance, when the swimming instructor tells Amira to act like she is sleeping, Amira's response does not echo that of the swimming instructor's instruction. Rather she is doing her best to keep her head up and avoid to get water in the ears. Hence, their relation is not so much about resemblance, but of division and within which both Amira and the swimming instructor change their behavior according to their own situational order. And, in the interval between their movements there is this tiny little space Amira describes as very important for learning to float. It is a

short sequence where the swimming instructor becomes surprised and nothing happens, yet everything happens. I would say that she experiences the immensity of the empty time/space where the swimming instructor begin to notice the signs of Amira and realize that there is no danger. Amira is not dangerous. And, she is not in danger. It is just about floating (and surviving), and the instant opportunity to learn to float (and stay alive). I guess Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 256) would say that they affect each other and that these affects, that come from both bodies' own internal parts and external parts, also affect what they are able to do. To the relationship that modifies Amira and the swimming instructor, decompose them and recompose them as teacher-students and student-teachers, there simply correspond various intensities that affect them, and hence increase and decrease their power to act.

Drawing on Spinoza, Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 256) argue that affects are becomings, and becomings relates to both what bodies are capable of in relation to other bodies and what extensive relations they can be in. Furthermore, these affects move around and transform each other within "assemblages" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 257) which is self-organizing machines within which at the simplest one body produce an affective flow that is broken by another. Nobody enjoys a privilege over the others. Nobody possesses the identity of a leader, and nobody resembles a follower. Amira and the swimming instructor are neither opposites nor similarities. Rather, they are constituted by difference and their relation is very different from that of representation.

It is not that Amira and the swimming instructor do not move from one point to another, and that they do not achieve any results. But, the question is what in their movements are governed by predetermined principles and what are only consequences and factual necessities of their encounter? And to elaborate a bit, the points Amira and the swimming instructor move between seems to be subordinated to the paths they define. The point where the swimming instructor is expected to teach Amira how to float is reached only to be left behind. And, just like other points this point exists only as a relay. Furthermore, the path they move along do not assign them roles and regulates their communication. Rather, it distributes them in an indefinite, non-communicating open space that do not divide them into teacher, respectively, student. Hence, there is a significant difference between the space provided by the 10-stage model and the space of the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor. Although the space of the 10-stage model is sedentary and striated by rules, regulations and enclosures, the space of Amira's and the swimming instructor's encounter is smooth and only marked by bodily characteristics that become increasingly insignificant and displaced with their trajectory.

I noticed how the smooth space produced in the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor was a site for the actualization of novel learning and new ideas regarding swimming education. It did not seem to occur completely natural, but while Amira learned to float, the swimming instructor appeared more and more comfortable with her emerging position of not knowing, and thus with the process where the hierarchical differences between their diverse knowledges was deconstructed and assigned equal value in the situation. To put it differently, this was a situation where not yet confirmed knowledges, unsecure knowledges, non-linear knowledges and affective knowledges were invited to a complex process where more knowledges than the confirmed and secured knowledges of the 10-stage model were included, and within which novel common learning was produced. In this sense, novel learning and new educational ideas were complex multiplicities constituted of various bodies, various relation between those bodies, and virtualities corresponding to those relations in a situation. For Deleuze (1994: 364) these dimensions (bodies, relations, and virtualities) is also what constitutes multiple reason, the principle of potentiality and progressive determination. Hence, the onto-epistemology of nomadic swimming training cannot primarily be defined as a movement of bodies, but as an infinite movement of our

thoughts into a situation where more bodies than the body of the 10-stage model become important. Perhaps, Deleuze and Guattari (1994: 37) would say that this is to lay out a philosophical “plane of immanence” and provide that plane with situational concepts and understandings of swimming training through a finite movement of thoughts. And if so, nomadic swimming training do not include continuous movements (Deleuze and Guattari, 1986: 51). Rather, there are various actualities introduced that tend to cut up, divide and sometimes stop endless movements. This in turn makes nomadic educational motion extremely uneven and fractured.

Understood as nomadic systems, educational realities consist of actual-virtual flows that establish their internal conditions for knowledge production. Although the former maintains standardized cultural norms, systems of organization, and categorizations, the latter destabilize them by enabling bodies to resist such limiting forces. Educational situations thus have two odds which are dissymmetrical and dissimilar, but not negatives. Just as the Deleuzian notion of immanence, this implies a perspective that focuses on what happen between the two odds, that is, in the friction-zone where various bodies, elements, knowledges, definitions, and relations interfere with each other. And, further on, I will try to show that perhaps the notions of virtual and actual have for inclusion in official educational organizations an ontological and epistemological importance much greater than those of right and wrong in relation to representation of various educational models. Instead of judging ourselves and each other, I suggest in a previous paper (Andersson *et al.*, 2021a) that we should ask whether we encounter virtual or actual elements, and hence what volumes of singular and regular points correspond to the value of a given relation in an educational situation.

Re-thinking official educational organization towards friction-zones

So, for me, nomadic swimming training implies positive differences between actual and virtual forms of organization. On the one hand there are exterior multiplicities of conscious ordering, measuring, differentiating, and extensiveness associated with predetermined knowledge like the 10-stage model—and on the other hand, there are interior multiplicities of unconscious, intensive, libidinal, and impulsive evolutions associated with novel learning like the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor. When it comes to actual multiplicities and actual forms of organization it seems quite reasonable to use the same standard of measurement as for right and wrong. Things we do cannot be right at the same time as they are wrong. Being right is rather the absence of being wrong. From this perspective, it is not possible for the swimming instructor to teach right without following the 10-stage model. Nor is it possible for the swimming instructor to deviate from the 10-stage model without being wrong. But, in virtual multiplicities and virtual forms of organization being right does not seem equally capable of being viewed as the absence of being wrong. And, just like the swimming instructor when she did wrong to make right in the situation when Amira learned to float, I guess many of us have experience from similar situations where we have done both right and wrong at the same time. Unlike external judgements acting upon us with influences from the outside these assessments are interior, and hence productions of affects at work in our relations. This is also why they cannot be included in the same metric of performance, and why Amira and the swimming instructor, I and perhaps you do not move like grades up and down the fulfillment scale (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 361–362). This unpredictable change and becoming of success/non-success is a multiplicity of virtual organization, relational, unconscious, and irrevocably experienced, rather than predetermined, conscious, and measurable.

However, it is not my intention to establish a dualist opposition between actual and virtual forms of organizations. In the assemblage of nomadic swimming training there are only multiplicities forming multiplicities. Actual forms of organizations in virtual forms of organizations and virtual

forms of organizations in actual forms of organizations. This implies a non-dialectical politics of multiplicity ready to support and join a creative pluralism of educational organization and simultaneously counteract predetermined and controlling pluralism of educational organization. In that sense, nomadic swimming training comprise friction-zones between actual multiplicities and virtual multiplicities that replace positioning, interests, linearity and top-down control with enfoldedness, relations between bodies, and becomings. So, unlike the ordering of today's official educational organization, the organization of nomadic swimming training includes a vital onto-epistemological significance that is sensitive to various desire and do not deny open-ended change.

Open-ended change and the importance of slowness

The occurrence of friction-zones between actual multiplicities and virtual multiplicities implies that the model of nomadic organization is a vortical one (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1986: 52). Rather than secretly make space for pre-determined, linear and solid activities, it operates in an open space throughout which flows of activities are distributed. Although the rational order of the metric space of today's official educational organization often is counted in order to be occupied, I guess Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 362) would say that the smooth space of nomadic official organization is "occupied without being counted." In the same way nomadic organizations do not have overarching theoretical patterns or general goals from which they are governed. Nor do they strategically distinguish parts to develop, adjust or get rid of. Nomadic organizations are much more problematic orientated, and organizational activities are considered only from the viewpoint of the affections that currently surround them, and hence the accidental encounters between bodies that condition and settle solutions to them. Perhaps this is also what Fitzpatrick and Russell (2013: 170) suggest when they argue for the need to shift towards a more inclusive physical education that accepts and admits the existence of complex and embodied experience of young people, and what Greene (1988: 84) implies when she asks how we can make it easier for young people to break with the given and move towards what is not yet? Together with these lines of thought, I put forward that this ontological turn (Thanen, 2005) towards nomadic organization involves all kind of changes and operations in which official educational organizations designate an event much more than an essence. And, while Landi et al. (2020: 23) argue for the need to replace "McDonalds education programs" where all students are treated the same, with educational programs that meet their population, I put forward that we need to encounter students as well as other materialities on the micropolitical level in events. This is especially important when it comes to my discussion of openness and slowness in organizations. More precisely, the notion of event pinpoints the friction-zone where the actualization of the virtual and the virtualization of the actual is going on. For Deleuze and Guattari (1994: 158), an event is more unspecific yet more specific than we perhaps assume in today's educational organizations. Informed by my collective thinking with: 20, 84), Jackson and Carter (2000: 252) and Linstead and Thanem (2007: 1483), I suggest that nomadic organizational activities are not something that just happens, we do not simply decide, order, value, and judge various things. Nor are they well planned and reveal truths about general movements forward. Rather, nomadic organizational activities are not regarded as likely to happen, they are much more accidental, unexpected, and capable of opening up the future. At the same time, nomadic organizational activities make differences and change our abilities to interact. Hence, the differential nature of nomadic activities moves today's official educational organizations beyond conscious realizations of themselves and opens up for more than their immediate interests.

So, when I speak of activities in nomadic official organizations, I speak of actualizations of virtualities. And, since actualizations of virtualities never bring an end to their relations to other

heterogeneous, always simultaneous elements in the extended world of the virtual, I also speak of virtualization of actualities. This implies that actualizations are only temporal and that organizational activities are in uneven and fractured motion. This is also why nomadic organizational activity is not so much a matter of closure but of openness. Organizational activities that have undergone actualizations are simply not fixed and unchangeable. Rather they can (re)connect with “new” virtualities and become something else. What I try to emphasize here is that there is a relation between the virtual past of educational organization and the actual present of educational organization as well as there is a relation between actual present of educational organization and the virtual future of educational organization. And, just as I extract from the encounter between Amira and the swimming instructor where Amira learns to float, organizational actualizations cannot be determined in advance. This, in turn, challenges the linearity of today’s official educational organizations and require us to decenter our pre-defined goals. We simply need to slow down (Stengers, 2018: 80), and figure out how our terms for the relation between the actual organization and the virtual whole actually looks like. And, perhaps even more important what we want them to look like, and what consequences this results in for the education, the students, the teachers, me and perhaps you? Overall, it is about creating situations where nothing takes place, and leave room for infinite waiting (cf. Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 158), and thus emergence of alliances and domains of symbioses that bring into play bodies from different scales and territories. What I suggest is a heterogeneous evolution that Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 238) call “involution.” And, this should not be confused with regression. However, regression is to move towards something less differentiated, involution is the process of involving diverse bodies that run their “own” lines between the terms in play and beneath assignable relations. As Gard (2014: 840) and Lupton (2015: 128) imply, these processes will perhaps cut us out of the physical education loop. Regarding today’s official educational organizations and processes of inclusion, this becomes important in at least two ways; first, bodies cannot be defined by general characteristics like pre-determined roles, competences, sexes or ages, but are defined by populations that varies from situation to situation. Second, movement and change occur not primarily by pre-defined, well-planned, and linear activities, but also by intersecting communication between heterogeneous bodies.

And, intersecting communication between heterogeneous bodies takes time. Time we rarely have in today’s official educational organizations. Or, perhaps we just do not take us time to notice, digest and understand each other’s matter of concern? Paradoxically speaking, my whole point here is to relate the idea of slowing down official educational organizations to a more ambitious agenda than reaching predefined goals. An agenda where we actively break with superior knowledge and hence general, fast and, cumulative knowledge production by inviting divergent knowledges and questions that interfere with these advancements. And, this is not a request for some holistic approach to thinking, or active inclusion in ready-made educational processes. Rather, it is about taking people’s concerns seriously and pay attention to what is emerging in the moment. And, what feels important. However, slowing down education should not be equated with official educational organizations taking account of all messy complications in their environment. It is more about opening up the official organization for collective learning through encounters with dissenting voices around issues of common concern. This entail dissolutions of previous structures and hierarchies at the same time as we let novel uncertainties emerge. It is about trying to understand things we still do not know anything about. Things that at the first glimpse may seem precarious and do not make any sense, and from which it perhaps arises novel relations that brings us together in unforeseen ways, and that extends in the future. Floating together shoulder to shoulder in unconscious processes of collective inclusion within nomadic official organizations of education, and an ethics which takes into account the many divergent knowledges in the situation.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Åsa Andersson  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-2646>

Anne B Reinertsen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0467-4515>

References

- Andersson Åsa, Korp Peter and Reinertsen Anne (2020) Thinking With New Materialism in Qualitative Case Studies. *Qualitative Methods*.
- Andersson Å., Korp P. and Reinertsen A. (2021a) Becoming interested – the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports. *Qualitative Research*.
- Andersson Å., Korp P. and Reinertsen A. (2021b) Is it Possible to Think Physical Education Forward and Dismatle Ourselves – In a Quantum Space? *International Review of Qualitative Research*.
- Au W (2013) Coring social studies within corporate education reform: the common core state standards, social justice, and the politics of knowledge in U.S. schools. *Critical Education* 4(5): 1–15.
- Barrett BD (2009) No child left behind and the assault on teachers' professional practices and identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 25(8): 1018–1025.
- Butler J (2005) *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Darling-Hammond L, Flook L, Cook-Harvey C, et al. (2020) Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science* 24(2): 97–140.
- Davies P (1999) What is evidence-based education? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 47(2): 108–121.
- Deleuze G (1994) *Difference and Repetition*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze G (1995) *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze G (2007) *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews, 1975-1995. Semiotext(e) Foreign Agents*. New York, NY: Semiotexte.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1986) *Nomadology: The War Machine*. South Pasadena: Semiotext.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Athlone.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1994) *What Is Philosophy?* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Denzin N (2014) *Interpretive Autoethnography*. London: Sage.
- Ellis C (2004) *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Teaching and Doing Autoethno-Graphy*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Ellis C and Bochner A (2000) Autoethnography, personal narrative, and reflexivity: researcher as subject. In: N Denzin and Y Lincoln (eds) *The handbook of qualitative research*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fitzpatrick K and Russell D (2013) On being critical in health and physical education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 20(2): 159–173.
- Gard M (2014) eHPE: a history of the future. *Sport, Education and Society* 19(6): 827–845.
- Greene M (1988) *The Dialectic of Freedom*. New York, NY: Teachers Collage Press.

- Seal Mike and Andersson Åsa (2017) Managing hybrid agendas for youth work. *International Journal of Open Youth Work* 1(1).
- Stad G (2017) *Jämlikhetsrapporten 2017 Skillnader I Livsvillkor I Göteborg*. Jämlikt Göteborg: Hela Staden Socialt Hållbar.
- Jackson N and Carter P (2000) *Rethinking Organizational Behaviour*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Jin J and Yun J (2013) Evidence-based practice in adapted physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance* 81(4): 50–54.
- Landi D, Lynch S and Walton-Fisette J (2020) The A-Z of social justice physical education: part 2. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance* 91(5): 20–27.
- Linstead S and Thanem T (2007) Multiplicity, virtuality and organization: the multiplicity, virtuality and organization: the contribution of gilles deleuze contribution of Gilles Deleuze, contribution of Gilles Deleuze'. *Organization Studies* 28(10): 1483–1501.
- Livesey (2010) Assemblage. In: A Parr (ed) *The Deleuze Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lupton D (2015) Data assemblages, sentient schools and digitised health and physical education (response to Gard). *Sport, Education and Society* 20(1): 122–132.
- Nail T (2017) What is an assemblage? *SubStance* 46(1): 21–37.
- Pickup A (2020) Embodied phronesis conceptualizing materiality engaged practical wisdom in teaching, teacher education, and research. *Journal of Thought* 54(1/2): 4–22.
- Stengers I (2018) *Another Science Is Possible A Manifesto for Slow Science*. Cambridge, CA: Polity Press.
- Taylor T, Connaughton P, de St Croix T, et al. (2018) The impact of neoliberalism upon the character and purpose of english youth work and beyond. In: Alldred P, Cullen F and Edwards K (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Open Youth Work Practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Thanem Torkild (2005) A Deluzian Future for Organization Theory? *Tamara*.

Perspektiv och utvidgningar

Denna avhandling skrivs inom idrottsvetenskap på en utbildningsvetenskaplig fakultet och är ett onto-epistemologiskt projekt med didaktiska implikationer. Med onto-epistemologiskt projekt menar jag att mitt sätt att skapa kunskap inte är en isolerad företeelse utan snarare ofrånkomligt sammanflätat med hur jag tänker att värden är beskaffad. Jag tänker om (och med) världen i ett Deleuzianskt immanent perspektiv. Det betyder att jag är (i) världen. Jag står inte utanför världen och betraktar den. Det är för att jag är (i) världen som gör att jag kan lära om den (och med den) på det sätt som jag för stunden gör. Jag ser också på världen bortom traditionella uppdelningar som subjekt/objekt, språk/materialiteter, människor/icke-människor, natur/kultur osv. Världen är ingenting som bara är där. Världen finns först när vi skapar den. Tillsammans. Jag skulle säga att den är i ständigt görande. På samma sätt är skolämnet idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning i ständigt görande. För min del är det ett lustfyllt perspektiv på världen. Det skapar hopp om förändring. Det är också allvarsamt för jag förstår att jag alltid är har ett ansvar som medskapare i olika processer. Ansvar som lärare och student, tränare och spelare, forskare och data.

Givetvis går det att förstå världen på många olika sätt. På lika många olika sätt kan man också skapa kunskap om världen. Det är för att vi förstår världen på ett visst sätt som gör att vi kan lära om den och få vissa kunskaper. Förändras vårt sätt att förstå världen finns också chansen att vi kan lära annat och få andra kunskaper. Ibland uttrycks detta som en ontologisk förskjutning eller ontologisk vändning. Det är också vad jag försöker göra i den här avhandlingen. Jag försöker göra en förflyttning från den Cartesiska idén om det vetande subjektet och att vi kan ta avstamp i våra etablerade praktiker (och därmed det vi redan vet) när vi formar inkluderande processer inom skolämnet idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning, till en mer lyhörd approach där vi inte påförhand har bestämt hur våra inkluderande verksamheter ska se ut. Detta är också vad ordet 'utan' i rubriken 'hållbar inkludering utan hållbarhet' innebär. Vikten av att öppna upp våra

verksamheter och aktiviteter för fler kunskaper än våra egna, möta störningsmoment och avbrott samt arbeta på gränsen av våra kunskaper i hållbart inkluderande situationer.

Metodologiskt tänker jag med Deleuze immanensfilosofi i relation till traditionella fallstudier och utvecklar arbetssätt som jag kallar för case-assemblage, creative-observations och auto ethnographic-like-design. Praktiken som undersöks är simskoleverksamhet inom skolämnet idrott och hälsa. Projektet är beställarstyrt och handlar om att utvärdera en verksamhet som heter Simlyftet. Simlyftet är en del i Göteborgs Stads satsning på att skapa en mer inkluderande och jämlik stad och handlar om att alla barn ska lära sig simma innan de går ut högstadiet. För att försäkra sig om att alla barn lär sig simma har man inom Simlyftet utvecklat en tio-steps-modell. I detta avhandlingsprojekt uppmuntrades jag till en början att bekräfta tio-steps-modellens pålitlighet och på så vis göra det möjligt för Göteborgs Stad att exportera denna modell till andra städer. Tio-steps-modellen förväntades helt enkelt sätta Göteborgs Stad på kartan i simundervisnings-Sverige. För mig som doktorand blev detta problematiskt. Jag undrade om tio-steps-modellen verkligen var den bästa (och enda) undervisningsmetoden när det gäller att lära barn och unga att simma? Min undran uppstod i relation till tidigare erfarenheter som fritidsledare, utbildning i sociologi och tidigare forskning. Det är nämligen så att tidigare forskning indikerar att generella utbildningsinsatser inte bidrar till ökad simkunnskap. Det är också så att tidigare forskning föreslår att lösningen för att utveckla barns simkunskaper är att börja med generella insatser när barnen är yngre. I samklang med andra studier undrade jag även om problemet med generella insatser och utvecklingen av barns simkunskaper (samt i förlängningen inkludering och jämlikhet) har så mycket att göra med ålder? Kanske har det mycket mer att göra med hur vi designar dessa aktiviteter? Hur vi förlitar oss på etablerade kunskaper, och antagandet om att 'one size fits all'?

Genom avhandlingen tänker jag med tio-sekunders episod där Amira lär sig flyta. Denna episod utgör en onto-epistemologisk väv varigenom jag löser upp självklarheten och distinktiviteten i begrepp som inkludering, deltagande, fallstudie, forskningsintresse, professionalism, etik, qualité, utbildningsorganisation och mycket mer. Därigenom skapar jag bland annat en terräng och ett språk för minor-case-studies, jag tänker-om (re-think) skapande av forskningsintressen, diskuterar vikten av aktiviteter med öppna slut och reviderar tänkandet kring möten mellan olika kunskaper. På samma sätt erbjuder jag eventuella läsare att

överskrida etablerade normer och strukturer, och uppmärksamma nya fenomen i mötet med mig, Amira och andra materialiteter. Syftet med avhandlingen är att belysa andra sätt att förstå, relatera till och skapa inkluderande processer.

Avhandlingen innehåller 10 separata men relaterade avsnitt. Varje avsnitt innehåller ett komplext område som jag tycker är viktigt att lärare, tränare och forskare som är intresserade av inkluderande arbete funderar vidare kring. Publicerade artiklar är placerade här och där och varvas med mindre avsnitt. För att underlätta deltagande lämnar jag också tomma utrymmen i texten. Här och på andra ställen kan du skriva ner nya tankar, utvecklas med texten, utöka texten och mycket mer. Jag lämnar också ett tomt utrymme på framsidan där du kan skriva ditt och andras namn. För mig är detta ett sätt att uppmuntra till rörelse, öppningar och produktion av det nya. Det är också ett sätt att försöka stanna i periferin. Tillsammans med dig.

Jag bjuder helt enkelt in dig att arbeta på gränsen av våra (dina och mina) kunskaper. Det kanske inte är det lättaste sättet att närma sig inkluderingsprocesser. Det kanske inte heller är en lätt position att vara i eller att upprätthålla. Men för mig är det ändå viktigt. Det finns alltid en risk att denna avhandling som handlar om hållbar inkludering också fastslår begreppet inkludering. Inte minst för att jag skriver ner det. Och uttrycker det. Det som oroar mig är att andra kunskaper kan bli uteslutna. Jag oroar mig för att vi ska bli ståendes med tankar om inkludering som vi redan har tänkt och att vi ska förlora möjligheten att tänka nytt. Att bjuda in dig som medförfattare är ett sätt att motverka att kunskaper stabiliseras genom avhandlingen. Därför vill jag också betona att avsnitten i avhandlingen inte behöver läsas i någon särskild ordning. Kanske är det också bra att parallell-läsa olika avsnitt och/eller annat material.

Det första avsnittet ('A Substitute for a Preface') fungerar som en icke-introduktion. Eftersom avhandlingen inte har någon tydlig början och avsnitten inte är utformade för att röra sig mot en kulminationspunkt och ett bestämt slut, är det lite problematiskt att skriva ett konventionellt förord. Helt enkelt för att det innebär en specifik utgångspunkt. Det första avsnittet ger oss därför ingen översikt av olika inkluderande processer. Det behandlar inte heller de utvidgningar jag diskuterar senare. Jag använder utrymmet som traditionellt ges till ett förord för att tillgängliggöra teoretiska spår och förslag på inkluderande aktivitetsstilar, och hur vi kan möta deltagare på sätt som potentiellt öppnar upp för nytt tänkande

och hittills okända aktiviteter inom skolämnet idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning.

I det andra avsnittet ('Participants matter and should not be taken for granted') är avsikten att inspirera lärare, tränare och forskare att ompröva hur vi definierar och fördelar roller till deltagare i olika aktiviteter. Jag lägger fram en tanke om att vi måste tänka-om (re-think) hur vi positionerar oss i förhållande till deltagare och börja arbeta utanför vår egen kunskap och övertygelse. Jag vill att vi ska släppa loss deltagarnas kunskaper, och bjuda in dem att bli medlärare, medtränare och medforskare samtidigt som vi blir medstudenter, medidrottare och meddata. Ibland undrar jag hur det kommer sig att våra utbildningar och verksamheter så ofta tycks leda till enkelriktade och arroganta former av kommunikation? Hur påverkar dessa relativt naiva informationsutbyten inkludering? Och hur begränsar de utbildning, idrott och forskning?

'Thinking with new materialism in qualitative case studies' är titeln på det tredje avsnittet. Det här avsnittet fokuserar på hur element i en simundervisningssituation möts och producerar olika forskningsfall. Mer specifikt uppmärksammar jag vad som händer med en fallstudie när vi tar ett ontologiskt steg mot immanens och bjuder in varje enhet i studien att påverka skapandet av forskningsfall. Jag föreslår att immanenta forskningsfall fungerar som livgivande krafter och min avsikt är att flytta våra tankar bort från forskningsfall som fördefinierade studieobjekt. Ett immanent förhållningssätt till fallstudier erbjuder nya möjligheter att upptäcka och utforska forskningsfall såväl som de effekter som skapar forskningslust och forskningsintressen. Samtidigt uppmuntrar detta avsnitt oss att tänka med immanensfilosofi för att öppna forskningsprocesser för mer kunskap, forskningsintressen och lust att utforska olika fall.

Det fjärde avsnittet, 'Becoming interested – the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports' utmanar forskningspolitiska antaganden om forskningsintressen som kontextspecifika fenomen definierade av forskare och andra. Jag skriver in mig själv i en konversation om vikten av att tänka med teori i kvalitativ forskning, och jag omorienterar forskningsintressen och fallproduktioner bortom metoder och metodologier. Mer specifikt gör jag en analys som visar att forskningsintressen är områden av materiella påverkanskrafter som inte kan reduceras till enskilda forskares uttryck eller uttryck som uppstår i samarbeten forskare och andra under planeringsfasen av en fallstudie. Snarare visar mitt immanenta tillvägagångssätt att data och andra materiella element ofta gör

anspråk på att vara en del i produktionen av forskningsintressen. Om man följer denna tankegång utvecklas forskningsintressen i interaktioner mellan olika kroppar, och processen där forskare blir intresserade är placerad mitt emellan dessa kroppar.

Förutbestämda processer för deltagande garanterar inte inkludering. Snarare kräver inkludering ansvarsfullt beslutsfattande i osäkra situationer. I det femte avsnittet, med titeln 'Responsibilities beyond professional obligations and morals in physical education, sport and research', initierar jag etiska diskussioner för att påminna lärare, tränare, utbildare, forskare, mig själv och kanske dig om vårt ansvar utanför de professionella handlingar som vi är moraliskt eller juridiskt bundna till. Jag ifrågasätter generella och lättapplicerade arbetsätt inom alla dessa miljöer och problematiserar lärare, tränare och forskare som skapare och användare av snabba och stabila arbetsmetoder. Avsikten är att påvisa en annan professionalism genom att rikta uppmärksamhet mot flera utsiktsplatser, osäkerheter, rörelser, kulturella värderingar, besvärliga situationer och otänkbara utbildnings- och metodmiljöer.

Etiska förhållningssätt kan se olika ut oavsett om det handlar om skolämnet idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott eller forskning. Utöver etiska handlingar som är politiskt påverkade, relaterar många etiska handlingar till utbildningsmiljöer, undervisning och lärande. Självt tycker jag att det är både svårt och utmanande att undervisa om etik. Särskilt eftersom jag vill ta ett större ansvar än att bara följa formella etiska riktlinjer. Som jag ser det krävs det något utöver det vanliga att skapa etiska miljöer inom idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning. Det är också därför jag har ägnat det sjätte avsnittet i denna avhandling åt etik i utökad professionalism (extended professionalism), och döpt det till 'Teaching the unteachable and staying with the processes'. I detta avsnitt diskuterar jag etiska aktiviteter som möten mellan olika kunskaper. Ur ett professionellt perspektiv (oavsett om vi betraktar oss själva som lärare, tränare eller forskare) är detta att öppna upp för den lilla världens politik och bjuda in varje deltagare i situationen att bli kunnig. Jag föreslår att förekomsten av undervisning, lärande, professionalism och kunskaper bildar komplexa och röriga relationer mellan förväntningar i dagliga praktiker, moral, etik, undervisning, lärande och mycket mer. Varje gång jag engagerar mig i pedagogisk verksamhet och möter studenter, verkar dessa relationer utspelas på olika sätt.

Jag kan inte med säkerhet säga vad inkluderande idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning betyder och är bra för. För jag vet inte än. Min enda kunskap är att inkluderingsprocesser kräver ödmjuka möten med andra. Och jag är medveten om att detta kan utsätta mig för några hånfulla skratt och bedömningar inom akademien. I det här avsnittet (som också är efterordet till denna avhandling med namnet 'A stand-in for a conclusion: Perhaps we need failure to stay open for the becoming of continuously inclusive futures') föreslår jag att jag inte är rustad att formulera framtiden. Jag är inte ens i närheten av att förutse den. Och det beror inte på att jag saknar kompetens. Snarare verkar min kompetens vara under attack av förtryckande krav på linjäritet som anges i olika instruktioner, checklistor, strategiska planer och utvärderingar. Samtidigt känner jag mig ofta tvungen att specialisera mig inom redan erkända frågor. Frågor som är publicerbara i högt rankade tidskrifter och som kanske sällan definieras som viktiga av någon utanför det akademiska området. Under min tid som doktorand skulle jag säga att jag har jag blivit mer och mer separerad från människor utanför akademien och därmed från förmågan att möta andra. Och att min förmåga att känna, tänka och fantisera nu står på spel. Det finns helt enkelt inte så mycket utrymme för kreativa samarbeten, misslyckanden och nyheter. Jag refererar till kreativa samarbeten som oupphörliga och oavslutade möten som skapar oändliga utmaningar för våra praktiker (oavsett om det är idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott eller forskning) på grund av deras utvecklande och oväntade karaktärer. När vi närmar oss våra praktiker utan färdiga idéer om vad som kommer att hända, ur perspektivet av kreativa samarbeten, engagerar vi oss i förändringar, omskapanden och revideringar. Och vi förbinder oss att se och visualisera våra metoder på olika sätt. Detta innebär också att vi sällan uppfyller förutbestämda mål. Jag framför att vi är mycket mer intresserade av ofullständigheter. Och kanske ofullständig-göranden eftersom inkluderande praktiker måste vara i rörelse, ständigt undersökas och ifrågasättas. Som inkluderande lärare, tränare, och forskare föreslår jag att vi inte ska nöja oss med dagens praxis. Det finns ingen anledning att vakta dem för hårt eftersom dessa metoder ofta behöver vara öppna för förändringar i karaktär och sammansättning för att passa nya studenter, idrottare och projekt. Det är som vilket bra hantverk som helst. Förutom att vi vet hur vi använder våra verktyg, görs arbetet knappast genom att anpassa sammanhanget till verktygen. Ett bra hantverk utförs snarare genom att bedöma vilka verktyg som passar i sammanhanget. Och vi tänker inte bara igenom det, vi tänker också framåt. Och, spekulerar. Vidare använder jag kreativa samarbeten och ofullständigheter som verktyg att tänka med när jag ställer frågor om olika processer för inkludering i

våra praktiker, stabiliseringar och destabiliseringar och i slutändan för att tänka på hållbar inkludering utan hållbarhet.

I det åttonde avsnittet, 'Is it possible to think physical education forward and dismantle ourselves – in a quantum space?' utforskar jag hur Amira och simläraren demonterar sig själva för att få grepp om sig själva genom mötet med varandra och därmed blir kapabla att lära sig igen. Jag föreslår att vi behöver stödja och upprätthålla undervisningen som ett "öppet system" och relatera utbildningsaktiviteter till situationella omständigheter snarare än förutbestämda resultat. I öppna undervisningssystem dyker inte utbildningsaktiviteter upp färdiga. De finns inte i förväg, utan måste uppfinnas av de som deltar i undervisningen. Undervisningens uppgift är att bidra till produktionen av nya utbildningsaktiviteter med egna nödvändigheter, krav och oumbärligheter av/i stunden. Och därför börja lära igen. Att demontera oss själva handlar inte bara om att ta ett steg tillbaka, lägga våra roller åt sidan och öppna upp för andra att påverka lokala utbildningsaktiviteter inom våra så ofta rigida fysiska utrymmen. Det handlar också om att tillåta förändringar i etablerade läroplaner, och på så sätt oändligt förnya utrymmet de för stunden fastslår.

I det nionde avsnittet, som jag kallar 'Substances are not permanent and qualities are not consistent' bjuder jag in till ett samtal där vi får chansen att tänka-om (re-think) kvalitet inom idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning. I det ögonblick när Amira lär sig att flyta fanns det inga förutbestämda subjekt och objekt. Det skedde helt enkelt i en undervisning-lärande-kollektivitet som är något annat än den linjära undervisning som föreslås av den tio-steps-modell som tagits fram (och används) av Göteborgs Stad. I denna situation har kroppar inga förutbestämda egenskaper, det finns inga specifika kategorier av människor som lärare, studenter, tränare, idrottare, forskare och data. Snarare är vi vad vi blir medvetna om i ett rhizomatiskt-möte. Genom att tänka med detta möte föreslår jag att kvaliteter i våra verksamheter inte kan specificeras i förväg. De kan inte fastställas på förhand och kan inte kopplas till olika konceptualiseringar av god praxis. Att tänka med rhizomatiskt-möte är att förflytta sig bort från den binära relationen mellan bedömaren och den bedömda. Jag kan inte låta bli att undra varför vi så sällan pratar om detta förhållande inom idrott och hälsa, organiserad idrott och forskning? Jag undrar varför vi inte pratar om detta förhållande som ett antagande och inte en sanning? Kanske är egenskaper inte ens specifika saker utan

vad vi gör när vi öppnar upp våra aktiviteter för påverkan i möten med andra. Vi kanske håller på med kvalitets-görning?

Jag föreslår att vi måste erkänna att det finns fler kunskaper än våra egna. I det tionde avsnittet, med titeln 'Re-thinking educational organization towards friction-zones between divergent knowledges' ger jag ett alternativ till den linjära och hierarkiska logik som ofta förknippas med dagens utbildningsorganisationer. Inspirerad av mötet med Amira och simläraren föreslår jag att det är möjligt att förstå pedagogiska realiteter som nomadiska system bestående av flöden mellan stabila och ostabila förhållanden. Mer specifikt föreslår jag att utbildningsorganisationer (och andra organisationer) kan ha två ytterligheter. Intressant är vad som händer mellan dessa ytterligheter? Vilka interna förutsättningar för kunskapsproduktion etableras mellan dessa ytterligheter? Vad händer i friktionszonen mellan stabila och ostabila kunskapsflöden? Vad händer med olika kunskaper, kroppar, definitioner och conceptualiseringar? I enlighet med dessa tankegångar föreslår jag att förståelsen av stabila-ostabila flöden kan ha mycket större betydelse för hållbar inkludering i utbildningsorganisationer än de modeller baserade på av rätt och fel som relaterar till formella krav och etablerade undervisningsmodeller relaterade till olika utbildningsmiljöer.

Previous publications:

Editors: Kjell Härnqvist and Karl-Gustaf Stukát

1. KARL-GUSTAF STUKÁT *Lekskolans inverkan på barns utveckling*. Stockholm 1966
2. URBAN DAHLÖF *Skoldifferentiering och undervisningsförlopp*. Stockholm 1967
3. ERIK WALLIN *Spelling. Factorial and experimental studies*. Stockholm 1967
4. BENGT-ERIK ANDERSSON *Studies in adolescent behaviour. Project Yg, Youth in Göteborg*. Stockholm 1969
5. FERENCE MARTON *Structural dynamics of learning*. Stockholm 1970
6. ALLAN SVENSSON *Relative achievement. School performance in relation to intelligence, sex and home environment*. Stockholm 1971
7. GUNNI KÄRRBY *Child rearing and the development of moral structure*. Stockholm 1971

Editors: Urban Dahllöf, Kjell Härnqvist and Karl-Gustaf Stukát

8. ULF P. LUNDGREN *Frame factors and the teaching process. A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching*. Stockholm 1972
9. LENNART LEVIN *Comparative studies in foreign-language teaching*. Stockholm 1972
10. RODNEY ÅSBERG *Primary education and national development*. Stockholm 1973
11. BJÖRN SANDGREN *Kreativ utveckling*. Stockholm 1974
12. CHRISTER BRUSLING *Microteaching - A concept in development*. Stockholm 1974
13. KJELL RUBENSON *Rekrytering till vuxenutbildning. En studie av kortutbildade yngre män*. Göteborg 1975
14. ROGER SÄLJÖ *Qualitative differences in learning as a function of the learner's conception of the task*. Göteborg 1975
15. LARS OWE DAHLGREN *Qualitative differences in learning as a function of content-oriented guidance*. Göteborg 1975
16. MARIE MÅNSSON *Samarbete och samarbetsförmåga. En kritisk granskning*. Lund 1975
17. JAN-ERIC GUSTAFSSON *Verbal and figural aptitudes in relation to instructional methods. Studies in aptitude - treatment interactions*. Göteborg 1976
18. MATS EKHOLM *Social utveckling i skolan. Studier och diskussion*. Göteborg 1976

19. LENNART SVENSSON *Study skill and learning*. Göteborg 1976

20. BJÖRN ANDERSSON *Science teaching and the development of thinking*. Göteborg 1976

21. JAN-ERIK PERNEMAN *Medvetenhet genom utbildning*. Göteborg 1977

Editors: Kjell Härnqvist, Ference Marton and Karl-Gustaf Stukát

22. INGA WERNERSSON *Könsdifferentiering i grundskolan*. Göteborg 1977

23. BERT AGGESTEDT & ULLA TEBELIUS *Barns upplevelser av idrott*. Göteborg 1977

24. ANDERS FRÄNSSON *Att rädas prov och att vilja veta*. Göteborg 1978

25. ROLAND BJÖRKBERG *Föreställningar om arbete, utveckling och livsrytm*. Göteborg 1978

26. GUNILLA SVINGBY *Läroplaner som styrmedel för svensk obligatorisk skola. Teoretisk analys och ett empiriskt bidrag*. Göteborg 1978

27. INGA ANDERSSON *Tankestilar och hemmiljö*. Göteborg 1979

28. GUNNAR STANGVIK *Self-concept and school segregation*. Göteborg 1979

29. MARGARETA KRISTIANSSON *Matematikkunskaper Lgr 62, Lgr 69*. Göteborg 1979

30. BRITT JOHANSSON *Kunskapsbehov i omvårdnadsarbete och kunskapskrav i vårdutbildning*. Göteborg 1979

31. GÖRAN PATRIKSSON *Socialisation och involvering i idrott*. Göteborg 1979

32. PETER GILL *Moral judgments of violence among Irish and Swedish adolescents*. Göteborg 1979

33. TAGE LJUNGBLAD *Förskola - grundskola i samverkan. Förutsättningar och hinder*. Göteborg 1980

34. BERNER LINDSTRÖM *Forms of representation, content and learning*. Göteborg 1980

35. CLAES-GÖRAN WENESTAM *Qualitative differences in retention*. Göteborg 1980

36. BRITT JOHANSSON *Pedagogiska samtal i vårdutbildning. Innehåll och språkbruk*. Göteborg 1981

37. LEIF LYBECK *Arkimedes i klassen. En ämnespedagogisk berättelse*. Göteborg 1981

38. BJÖRN HASSELGREN *Ways of apprehending children at play. A study of pre-school student teachers' development*. Göteborg 1981

39. LENNART NILSSON *Yrkesutbildning i nutidshistoriskt perspektiv. Yrkesutbildningens utveckling från skräväsandets uppbörande 1846 till 1980-talet samt tankar om framtida inriktning*. Göteborg 1981
40. GUDRUN BALKE-AURELL *Changes in ability as related to educational and occupational experience*. Göteborg 1982
41. ROGER SÄLJÖ *Learning and understanding. A study of differences in constructing meaning from a text*. Göteborg 1982
42. ULLA MARKLUND *Droger och påverkan. Elevanalys som utgångspunkt för drogundervisning*. Göteborg 1983
43. SVEN SETTERLIND *Avslappningsstråning i skolan. Forskningsöversikt och empiriska studier*. Göteborg 1983
44. EGIL ANDERSSON & MARIA LAWENIUS *Lärares uppfattning av undervisning*. Göteborg 1983
45. JAN THEMAN *Uppfattningar av politisk makt*. Göteborg 1983
46. INGRID PRAMLING *The child's conception of learning*. Göteborg 1983
47. PER OLOF THÅNG *Vuxenlärares förhållningsätt till deltagarerbeter. En studie inom AMU*. Göteborg 1984
48. INGE JOHANSSON *Fritidspedagog på fritidsbarn. En yrkesgrupps syn på sitt arbete*. Göteborg 1984
49. GUNILLA SVANBERG *Medansvar i undervisning. Metoder för observation och kvalitativ analys*. Göteborg 1984
50. SVEN-ERIC REUTERBERG *Studiemedel och rekrytering till högskolan*. Göteborg 1984
51. GÖSTA DAHLGREN & LARS-ERIK OLSSON *Läsning i barnperspektiv*. Göteborg 1985
52. CHRISTINA KÄRRQVIST *Kunskapsutveckling genom experimentcenterade dialoger i ellära*. Göteborg 1985
53. CLAES ALEXANDERSSON *Stabilitet och förändring. En empirisk studie av förhållandet mellan skolkunskap och vardagsvetande*. Göteborg 1985
54. LILLEMOR JERNQVIST *Speech regulation of motor acts as used by cerebral palsied children. Observational and experimental studies of a key feature of conductive education*. Göteborg 1985
55. SOLVEIG HÄGGLUND *Sex-typing and development in an ecological perspective*. Göteborg 1986
56. INGRID CARLGREN *Lokalt utvecklingsarbete*. Göteborg 1986
57. LARSSON, ALEXANDERSSON, HELMSTAD & THÅNG *Arbetsupplevelse och utbildningssyn hos icke facklära. Göteborg 1986*
58. ELVI WALLDAL *Studier vid gymnasieskolans vårdlinje. Förväntad yrkesposition, rollpåverkan, självuppfattning*. Göteborg 1986
- Editors: Jan-Eric Gustafsson, Ference Marton and Karl-Gustaf Stukát
59. EIE ERICSSON *Foreign language teaching from the point of view of certain student activities*. Göteborg 1986
60. JAN HOLMER *Högre utbildning för lågutbildade i industrin*. Göteborg 1987
61. ANDERS HILL & TULLIE RABE *Psykiskt utvecklingsstörda i kommunal förskola*. Göteborg 1987
62. DAGMAR NEUMAN *The origin of arithmetic skills. A phenomenographic approach*. Göteborg 1987
63. TOMAS KROKSMARK *Fenomenografisk didaktik*. Göteborg 1987
64. ROLF LANDER *Utvärderingsforskning - till vilken nytta? Göteborg 1987*
65. TORGNY OTTOSSON *Map-reading and wayfinding*. Göteborg 1987
66. MAC MURRAY *Utbildningsexpansion, jämlikhet och avlänkning*. Göteborg 1988
67. ALBERTO NAGLE CAJES *Studievalet ur den välfjärdes perspektiv*. Göteborg 1988
68. GÖRAN LASSBO *Mamma - (Pappa) - barn. En utvecklingssekologisk studie av socialisation i olika familjetyper*. Göteborg 1988
69. LENA RENSTRÖM *Conceptions of matter. A phenomenographic approach*. Göteborg 1988
70. INGRID PRAMLING *Att lära barn lära*. Göteborg 1988
71. LARS FREDHOLM *Praktik som bärare av undervisnings innebäll och form. En förklaringsmodell för uppkomst av undervisningshandlingar inom en totalförsvarsorganisation*. Göteborg 1988
72. OLOF F. LUNDQUIST *Studiestöd för vuxna. Utveckling, utnyttjande, utfall*. Göteborg 1989
73. BO DAHLIN *Religionen, själen och livets mening. En fenomenografisk och existensfilosofisk studie av religionsundervisningens villkor*. Göteborg 1989
74. SUSANNE BJÖRKDAHL ORDELL *Socialarbetare. Bakgrund, utbildning och yrkesliv*. Göteborg 1990
75. EVA BJÖRCK-ÅKESSON *Measuring Sensation Seeking*. Göteborg 1990
76. ULLA-BRITT BLADINI *Från hjälpskolelärare till förändringsagent. Svensk speciallärautbildning 1921-1981 relaterad till specialundervisningens utveckling och förändringar i speciallärares yrkesuppgifter*. Göteborg 1990

77. ELISABET ÖHRN *Könsmönster i klassrumsinteraktion. En observations- och intervjustudie av högstadielärares lärarkontakter.* Göteborg 1991
78. TOMAS KROKSMARK *Pedagogikens vägar till dess första svenska professur.* Göteborg 1991

Editors: Ingemar Emanuelsson, Jan-Eric Gustafsson and Ference Marton

79. ELVI WALLDAL *Problembaserad inläring. Utvärdering av påbyggnadslinjen Utbildning i öppen hälso- och sjukvård.* Göteborg 1991
80. ULLA AXNER *Visuella perceptionsvärigheter i skolperspektiv. En longitudinell studie.* Göteborg 1991
81. BIRGITTA KULLBERG *Learning to learn to read.* Göteborg 1991
82. CLAESA ANNERSTEDT *Idrottslära och idrottsämnet. Utveckling, mål, kompetens - ett didaktiskt perspektiv.* Göteborg 1991
83. EWA PILHAMMAR ANDERSSON *Det är vi som är dom. Sjuksköterskestuderandes föreställningar och perspektiv under utbildningstiden.* Göteborg 1991
84. ELSA NORDIN *Kunskaper och uppfattningar om maten och dess funktioner i kroppen. Kombinerad enkät- och intervjustudie i grundskolans årskurser 3, 6 och 9.* Göteborg 1992
85. VALENTIN GONZÁLEZ *On human attitudes. Root metaphors in theoretical conceptions.* Göteborg 1992
86. JAN-ERIK JOHANSSON *Metodikämnet i förskollärautbildningen. Bidrag till en traditionsbestämning.* Göteborg 1992
87. ANN AHLBERG *Att möta matematiska problem. En besyning av barns lärande.* Göteborg 1992
88. ELLA DANIELSON *Omvårdnad och dess psykosociala inslag. Sjuksköterskestuderandes uppfattningar av centrala termer och reaktioner inför en omvårdnadssituation.* Göteborg 1992
89. SHIRLEY BOOTH *Learning to program. A phenomenographic perspective.* Göteborg 1992
90. EVA BJÖRCK-ÅKESON *Samspel mellan små barn med rörelsebehinder och talbandikapp och deras föräldrar - en longitudinell studie.* Göteborg 1992
91. KARIN DAHLBERG *Helhetsyn i vården. En uppgift för sjuksköterskeutbildningen.* 1992
92. RIGMOR ERIKSSON *Teaching Language Learning. In-service training for communicative teaching and self directed learning in English as a foreign language.* 1993
93. KJELL HÄRENSTAM *Skolboks-islam. Analys av bilden av islam i läroböcker i religionskunskap.* Göteborg 1993.

94. INGRID PRAMLING *Kunnamdets grunder. Prövning av en fenomenografisk ansats till att utveckla barns sätt att uppfatta sin omvärld.* Göteborg 1994.
95. MARIANNE HANSSON SCHERMAN *Att vägra vara sjuk. En longitudinell studie av förhållningssätt till astma/allergi.* Göteborg 1994
96. MIKAEL ALEXANDERSSON *Metod och medvetande.* Göteborg 1994
97. GUN UNENGE *Pappor i föräldrakooperativa daghem. En deskriptiv studie av pappors medverkan.* Göteborg 1994
98. BJÖRN SJÖSTRÖM *Assessing acute postoperative pain. Assessment strategies and quality in relation to clinical experience and professional role.* Göteborg 1995
99. MAJ ARVIDSSON *Lärares orsaks- och åtgärds tankar om elever med svårigheter.* Göteborg 1995
100. DENNIS BEACH *Making sense of the problems of change: An ethnographic study of a teacher education reform.* Göteborg 1995.
101. WOLMAR CHRISTENSSON *Subjektiv bedömning - som besluts och handlingsunderlag.* Göteborg 1995
102. SONJA KIHLMSTRÖM *Att vara förskollärare. Om yrkets pedagogiska innebörder.* Göteborg 1995
103. MARITA LINDAHL *Inläring och erfärande. Ettäringars möte med förskolans värld.* Göteborg. 1996
104. GÖRAN FOLKESTAD *Computer Based Creative Music Making - Young Peoples' Music in the Digital Age.* Göteborg 1996
105. EVA EKEBLAD *Children • Learning • Numbers. A phenomenographic excursion into first-grade children's arithmetic.* Göteborg 1996
106. HELGE STRÖMDAHL *On mole and amount of substance. A study of the dynamics of concept formation and concept attainment.* Göteborg 1996
107. MARGARETA HAMMARSTRÖM *Varför inte högskola? En longitudinell studie av olika faktorer betydelse för studiebegärade ungdomars utbildningskarriär.* Göteborg 1996
108. BJÖRN MÅRDÉN *Rektorers tänkande. En kritisk betraktelse av skolledarskap.* Göteborg 1996
109. GLORIA DALL'ALBA & BJÖRN HASSELGREN (EDS) *Reflections on Phenomenography - Toward a Methodology?* Göteborg 1996
110. ELISABETH HESSLEFORS ARKTOFT *I ord och handling. Innebörder av "att anknäta till elevers erfarenheter", uttryckta av lärare.* Göteborg 1996
111. BARBRO STRÖMBERG *Professionellt förhållningssätt hos läkare och sjuksköterskor. En studie av uppfattningar.* Göteborg 1997
112. HARRIET AXELSSON *Väga lära. Om lärare som förändrar sin miljöundervisning.* Göteborg 1997

113. ANN AHLBERG *Children's ways of handling and experiencing numbers*. Göteborg 1997
114. HUGO WIKSTRÖM *Att förstå förändring. Modellbyggande, simulering och gymnasielärares lärande*. Göteborg 1997
115. DORIS AXELSEN *Listening to recorded music. Habits and motivation among high-school students*. Göteborg 1997.
116. EWA PILHAMMAR ANDERSSON *Handledning av sjuksköterskestuderande i klinisk praktik*. Göteborg 1997
117. OWE STRÅHLMAN *Elitidrott, karriär och avslutning*. Göteborg 1997
118. AINA TULLBERG *Teaching the 'mole'. A phenomenographic inquiry into the didactics of chemistry*. Göteborg 1997.
119. DENNIS BEACH *Symbolic Control and Power Relay Learning in Higher Professional Education*. Göteborg 1997
120. HANS-ÅKE SCHERP *Utmanande eller utmanat ledarskap. Rektor, organisationen och förändrat undervisningsmönster i gymnasieskolan*. Göteborg 1998
121. STAFFAN STUKÁT *Lärares planering under och efter utbildningen*. Göteborg 1998
122. BIRGIT LENDAHLS ROSENDAHL *Examensarbetets innebörder. En studie av blivande lärares utsagor*. Göteborg 1998
123. ANN AHLBERG *Meeting Mathematics. Educational studies with young children*. Göteborg 1998
124. MONICA ROSÉN *Gender Differences in Patterns of Knowledge*. Göteborg 1998.
125. HANS BIRNIK *Lärare- elevrelationen. Ett relationistiskt perspektiv*. Göteborg 1998
126. MARGRETH HILL *Kompetent för "det nya arbetslivet"? Tre gymnasieklasser reflekterar över och diskuterar yrkesförberedande studier*. Göteborg 1998
127. LISBETH ÅBERG-BENGTSSON *Entering a Graphicate Society. Young Children Learning Graphs and Charts*. Göteborg 1998
128. MELVIN FEFER *The Conflict of Equals: A Constructionist View of Personality Development*. Göteborg 1999
129. ULLA RUNESSON *Variationens pedagogik. Skilda sätt att behandla ett matematiskt innehåll*. Göteborg 1999
130. SILWA CLAESSION *"Hur tänker du då?" Empiriska studier om relationen mellan forskning om elevuppfattningar och lärares undervisning*. Göteborg 1999
131. MONICA HANSEN *Yrkeskulturer i möte. Läraren, fritidspedagogen och samverkan*. Göteborg 1999
132. JAN THELIANDER *Att studera arbetets förändring under kapitalismen. Ure och Taylor i pedagogiskt perspektiv*. Göteborg 1999
133. TOMAS SAAR *Musikens dimensioner - en studie av unga musikerares lärande*. Göteborg 1999
134. GLEN HELMSTAD *Understanding of understanding. An inquiry concerning experiential conditions for developmental learning*. Göteborg 1999
135. MARGARETA HOLMEGAARD *Språkmedvetenhet och ordinläring. Lärare och inlärare reflekterar kring en betydelsefälsövning i svenska som andraspråk*. Göteborg 1999
136. ALYSON MCGEE *Investigating Language Anxiety through Action Inquiry: Developing Good Research Practices*. Göteborg 1999
137. EVA GANNERUD *Genusperspektiv på lärargärning. Om kvinnliga klasslärares liv och arbete*. Göteborg 1999
138. TELLERVO KOPARE *Att rida stormen ut. Förlösningberättelser i Finnmark och Sápmi*. Göteborg 1999
139. MAJA SÖDERBÄCK *Encountering Parents. Professional Action Styles among Nurses in Pediatric Care*. Göteborg 1999
140. AIRI ROVIO - JOHANSSON *Being Good at Teaching. Exploring different ways of handling the same subject in Higher Education*. Göteborg 1999
141. EVA JOHANSSON *Etik i små barns värld. Om värden och normer bland de yngsta barnen i förskolan*. Göteborg 1999
142. KENNERT ORLENIUS *Förståelsens paradox. Yrkeserfarenhetens betydelse när förskollärare blir grundskollärare*. Göteborg 1999.
143. BJÖRN MÅRDÉN *De nya hälsomissionärerna – rörelser i korsvägen mellan pedagogik och hälsopromotion*. Göteborg 1999
144. MARGARETA CARLÉN *Kunskapslyft eller avbytarbänk? Möten med industriarbetare om utbildning för arbete*. Göteborg 1999
145. MARIA NYSTRÖM *Allvarligt psykiskt störda människors vardagliga tillvaro*. Göteborg 1999
146. ANN-KATRIN JAKOBSSON *Motivation och inläring ur genusperspektiv. En studie av gymnasielärares på teoretiska linjer/program*. Göteborg 2000
147. JOANNA GIOTA *Adolescents' perceptions of school and reasons for learning*. Göteborg 2000
148. BERIT CARLSTEDT *Cognitive abilities – aspects of structure, process and measurement*. Göteborg 2000
149. MONICA REICHENBERG *Röst och kausalitet i lärobokstexter. En studie av elevernas förståelse av olika textverster*. Göteborg 2000

150. HELENA ÅBERG *Sustainable waste management in households – from international policy to everyday practice. Experiences from two Swedish field studies.* Göteborg 2000
151. BJÖRN SJÖSTRÖM & BRITT JOHANSSON *Ambulanssjukvård. Ambulanssjukvårdarens och läkares perspektiv.* Göteborg 2000
152. AGNETA NILSSON *Omvårdnadskompetens inom hemsjukvård – en deskriptiv studie.* Göteborg 2001
153. ULLA LÖFSTEDT *Förskolan som lärandekontext för barns bildskapande.* Göteborg 2001
154. JÖRGEN DIMENÄS *Innehåll och interaktion. Om elevers lärande i naturvetenskaplig undervisning.* Göteborg 2001
155. BRITT MARIE APELGREN *Foreign Language Teachers' Voices. Personal Theories and Experiences of Change in Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Sweden.* Göteborg 2001
156. CHRISTINA CLIFFORDSON *Assessing empathy: Measurement characteristics and interviewer effects.* Göteborg 2001
157. INGER BERGGREN *Identitet, kön och klass. Hur arbetarflickor formar sin identitet.* Göteborg 2001
158. CARINA FURÅKER *Styrning och visioner – sjuksköterskeutbildning i förändring.* Göteborg 2001
159. INGER BERNDTSSON *Förskjutna horisonter. Linsförändring och lärande i samband med synnedsättning eller blindhet.* Göteborg 2001
160. SONJA SHERIDAN *Pedagogical Quality in Preschool. An issue of perspectives.* Göteborg 2001
161. JAN BAHLENBERG *Den otroliga verkligheten sätter spår. Om Carlo Dekerks liv och konstpedagogiska gärning.* Göteborg 2001
162. FRANK BACH *Om ljuset i tillvaron. Ett undervisningsexperiment inom optik.* Göteborg 2001
163. PIA WILLIAMS *Barn lär av varandra. Samlärande i förskola och skola.* Göteborg 2001
164. VIGDIS GRANUM *Studentenes forestillinger om sykepleie som fag og funksjon.* Göteborg 2001
165. MARIT ALVESTAD *Den komplekse planlegginga. Førskolelærarar om pedagogisk planlegging og praksis.* Göteborg 2001
166. GIRMA BERHANU *Learning-In-Context. An Ethnographic Investigation of Mediated Learning Experiences among Ethiopian Jews in Israel.* Göteborg 2001.
167. OLLE ESKILSSON *En longitudinell studie av 10 – 12-åringars förståelse av materiens förändringar.* Göteborg 2001
168. JONAS EMANUELSSON *En fråga om frågor. Hur lärares frågor i klassrummet gör det möjligt att få reda på elevernas sätt att förstå det som undervisningen behandlar i matematik och naturvetenskap.* Göteborg 2001
169. BIRGITTA GEDDA *Den offentliga belysningen. En studie om sjuksköterskans pedagogiska funktion och kompetens i folkhälsoarbetet.* Göteborg 2001
170. FEBE FRIBERG *Pedagogiska möten mellan patienter och sjuksköterskor på en medicinsk vårdavdelning. Mot en värddidaktik på livsvärldsrund.* Göteborg 2001
171. MADELEINE BERGH *Medvetenhet om bemötande. En studie om sjuksköterskans pedagogiska funktion och kompetens i närståendeundervisning.* Göteborg 2002
172. HENRIK ERIKSSON *Den diplomatiska punkten – maskulinitet som kroppsligt identitetsskapande projekt i svensk sjuksköterskeutbildning.* Göteborg 2002
173. SOLVEIG LUNDGREN *I spåren av en bemanningsförändring. En studie av sjuksköterskors arbete på en kirurgisk vårdavdelning.* Göteborg 2002
174. BIRGITTA DAVIDSSON *Mellan soffan och katedern. En studie av hur förskollärare och grundskollärare utvecklar pedagogisk integration mellan förskola och skola.* Göteborg 2002
175. KARI SØNDENÅ *Tradisjon og Transcendens – ein fenomenologisk studie av refleksjon i norsk førskulelærarutdanning.* Göteborg 2002
176. CHRISTINE BENTLEY *The Roots of Variation of English-Teaching. A Phenomenographic Study Founded on an Alternative Basic Assumption.* Göteborg 2002
177. ÅSA MÄKITALO *Categorizing Work: Knowing, Arguing, and Social Dilemmas in Vocational Guidance.* Göteborg 2002
178. MARITA LINDAHL *VÅRDA – VÄGLEDA – LÄRA. Effekstudie av ett interventionsprogram för pedagogers lärande i förskolemiljön.* Göteborg 2002
179. CHRISTINA BERG *Influences on schoolchildren's dietary selection. Focus on fat and fibre at breakfast.* Göteborg 2002
180. MARGARETA ASP *Vila och lärande om vila. En studie på livsvärldsfenomenologisk grund.* Göteborg 2002
181. FERENC MARTON & PAUL MORRIS (EDS) *What matters? Discovering critical conditions of classroom learning.* Göteborg 2002
182. ROLAND SEVERIN *Dom vet vad dom talar om. En intervjustudie om elevers uppfattningar av begreppen makt och samballsförändring.* Göteborg 2002
- Editors: Björn Andersson, Jan Holmer and Ingrid Pramling Samuelsson
183. MARLÉNE JOHANSSON *Slöjdpraktik i skolan – hand, tanke, kommunikation och andra medierande redskap.* Göteborg 2002

184. INGRID SANDEROTH *Om lust att lära i skolan: En analys av dokument och klass 8j*. Göteborg 2002
185. INGA-LILL JAKOBSSON *Diagnos i skolan. En studie av skolsituationer för elever med syndromdiagnos*. Göteborg 2002
186. EVA-CARIN LINDGREN *Empowering Young Female Athletes – A Possible Challenge to the Male Hegemony in Sport. A Descriptive and Interventional Study*. Göteborg 2002
187. HANS RYSTEDT *Bridging practices. Simulations in education for the health-care professions*. Göteborg 2002
188. MARGARETA EKBORG *Naturvetenskaplig utbildning för hållbar utveckling? En longitudinell studie av hur studenter på grundskolläraprogrammet utvecklar för miljöundervisning relevanta kunskaper i naturkunskap*. Göteborg 2002
189. ANETTE SANDBERG *Vuxnas lekvärld. En studie om vuxnas erfarenheter av lek*. Göteborg 2002
190. GUNLÖG BREDÄNGE *Gränslös pedagog. Fyra studier om utländska lärare i svensk skola*. Göteborg 2003
191. PER-OLOF BENTLEY *Mathematics Teachers and Their Teaching. A Survey Study*. Göteborg 2003
192. KERSTIN NILSSON *MANDAT – MAKT – MANAGEMENT. En studie av hur värdenschefer ledarskap konstrueras*. Göteborg 2003
193. YANG YANG *Measuring Socioeconomic Status and its Effects at Individual and Collective Levels: A Cross-Country Comparison*. Göteborg 2003
194. KNUT VOLDEN *Mediekunskap som mediekritikk*. Göteborg 2003.
195. LOTTA LAGER-NYQVIST *Att göra det man kan – en longitudinell studie av hur sju lärarstudenter utvecklar sin undervisning och formar sin lärarroll i naturvetenskap*. Göteborg 2003
196. BRITT LINDAHL *Lust att lära naturvetenskap och teknik? En longitudinell studie om vägen till gymnasiet*. Göteborg 2003
197. ANN ZETTERQVIST *Ämnesdidaktisk kompetens i evolutionsbiologi. En intervjuundersökning med nio biologilärare*. Göteborg 2003
198. ELSIE ANDERBERG *Språkavvändningens funktion vid utveckling av kunskap om objekt*. Göteborg 2003.
199. JAN GUSTAFSSON *Integration som text, diskursiv och social praktik. En policyetnografisk fallstudie av mötet mellan skolan och förskoleklassen*. Göteborg 2003.
200. EVELYN HERMANSSON *Akademisering och professionalisering – barnmorskans utbildning i förändring*. Göteborg 2003
201. KERSTIN VON BRÖMSEN *Tolkningar, förhandlingar och tystnader. Elevers tal om religion i det mångkulturella och postkoloniala rummet*. Göteborg 2003
202. MARIANNE LINDBLAD FRIDH *Från allmänsjuksköterska till specialistsjuksköterska inom intensivvård. En studie av erfarenheter från specialistutbildningen och från den första yrkesverksamma tiden inom intensivvården*. Göteborg 2003
203. BARBRO CARLI *The Making and Breaking of a Female Culture: The History of Swedish Physical Education 'in a Different Voice'*. Göteborg 2003
204. ELISABETH DAHLBORG-LYCKHAGE *"Systers" konstruktion och mumifiering – i TV-serier och i studenters föreställningar*. Göteborg 2003
205. ULLA HELLSTRÖM MUHLI *Att överbygga perspektiv. En studie av behovsbedömningsamtal inom äldreinriktat socialt arbete*. Göteborg 2003
206. KRISTINA AHLBERG *Synvärdor. Universitetsstudenters berättelser om kvalitativa förändringar av sätt att erfara situationers mening under utbildningspraktik*. Göteborg 2004
207. JONAS IVARSSON *Renderings & Reasoning: Studying artifacts in human knowing*. Göteborg 2004
208. MADELEINE LÖWING *Matematikundervisningens konkreta gestaltning. En studie av kommunikationen lärare – elev och matematiklektionens didaktiska ramar*. Göteborg 2004
209. PIJA EKSTRÖM *Makten att definiera. En studie av hur beslutsfattare formulerar villkor för specialpedagogisk verksamhet*. Göteborg 2004
210. CARIN ROOS *Skriftspråkande döva barn. En studie om skriftspråkligt lärande i förskola och skola*. Göteborg 2004
211. JONAS LINDEROTH *Datorspelandets mening. Bortom idén om den interaktiva illusionen*. Göteborg 2004
212. ANITA WALLIN *Evolutionsteorin i klassrummet. På väg mot en ämnesdidaktisk teori för undervisning i biologisk evolution*. Göteborg 2004
213. EVA HJÖRNE *Excluding for inclusion? Negotiating school careers and identities in pupil welfare settings in the Swedish school*. Göteborg 2004
214. MARIE BLIDING *Inneslutandets och uteslutandets praktik. En studie av barns relationsarbete i skolan*. Göteborg 2004
215. LARS-ERIK JONSSON *Appropriating Technologies in Educational Practices. Studies in the Contexts of Compulsory Education, Higher Education, and Fighter Pilot Training*. Göteborg 2004
216. MIA KARLSSON *An ITiS Teacher Team as a Community of Practice*. Göteborg 2004
217. SILWA CLAESSON *Lärares levda kunskap*. Göteborg 2004
218. GUN-BRITT WÄRVIK *Ambitioner att förändra och artefaktens verkan. Gränsskapande och stabiliserande praktiker på produktionsgolvet*. Göteborg 2004

219. KARIN LUMSDEN WASS *Vuxenutbildning i omvandling. Kunskapslyftet som ett sätt att organisera förnyelse.* Göteborg 2004
220. LENA DAHL *Amningspraktikens villkor. En intervjustudie av en grupp kvinnors föreställningar på och erfarenheter av amning.* Göteborg 2004
221. ULRIC BJÖRCK *Distributed Problem-Based Learning. Studies of a Pedagogical Model in Practice.* Göteborg 2004
222. ANNEKA KNUTSSON "To the best of your knowledge and for the good of your neighbour". *A study of traditional birth attendants in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.* Göteborg 2004
223. MARIANNE DOVEMARK *Ansvar – flexibilitet – valfrihet. En etnografisk studie om en skola i förändring.* Göteborg 2004
224. BJÖRN HAGLUND *Traditioner i möte. En kvalitativ studie av fritidspedagogers arbete med samlingar i skolan.* Göteborg 2004
225. ANN-CHARLOTTE MÅRDSJÖ *Lärandets skiftande innebörder – uttryckta av förskollärare i vidareutbildning.* Göteborg 2005
226. INGRID GRUNDÉN *Att återerövra kroppen. En studie av livet efter en ryggmärgsskada.* Göteborg 2005
227. KARIN GUSTAFSSON & ELISABETH MELLGREN *Barns skriftspråkande – att bli en skrivande och läsande person.* Göteborg 2005
228. GUNNAR NILSSON *Att äga π. Praxisnära studier av lärarstudenters arbete med geometrilaborationer.* Göteborg 2005.
229. BENGT LINDGREN *Bild, visualitet och vetande. Diskussion om bild som ett kunskapsfält inom utbildning.* Göteborg 2005
230. PETRA ANGERVALL *Jämställdhetsarbetets pedagogik. Dilemman och paradoxer i arbetet med jämställdhet på ett företag och ett universitet.* Göteborg 2005
231. LENNART MAGNUSSON *Designing a responsive support service for family carers of frail older people using ICT.* Göteborg 2005
232. MONICA REICHENBERG *Gymnasieelever samtalar kring jacketexter. En studie av textsamtal med goda och svaga läsare.* Göteborg 2005
233. ULRICA WOLFF *Characteristics and varieties of poor readers.* Göteborg 2005
234. CECILIA NIELSEN *Mellan fakticitet och projekt. Läs- och skrivsvårigheter och strövan att övervinna dem.* Göteborg 2005.
235. BERITH HEDBERG *Decision Making and Communication in Nursing Practice. Aspects of Nursing Competence.* Göteborg 2005
236. MONICA ROSÉN, EVA MYRBERG & JAN-ERIC GUSTAFSSON *Läskompetens i skolår 3 och 4. Nationell rapport från PIRLS 2001 i Sverige. The IEA Progress in International Reading Literacy Study.* Göteborg 2005
237. INGRID HENNING LOEB *Utveckling och förändring i kommunal vuxenutbildning. En yrkeshistorisk ingång med berättelser om lärarbanor.* Göteborg 2006.
238. NIKLAS PRAMLING *Minding metaphors: Using figurative language in learning to represent.* Göteborg 2006
239. KONSTANTIN KOUGIOUMTZIS *Lärarkulturer och professionskoder. En komparativ studie av idrottslärare i Sverige och Grekland.* Göteborg 2006
240. STEN BÄTH *Kvalifikation och medborgarfostran. En analys av reformtexter avseende gymnasieskolans samhällsuppdrag.* Göteborg 2006.
241. EVA MYRBERG *Fristående skolor i Sverige – Effekter på 9-10-åriga elevers läsförståelse.* Göteborg 2006
242. MARY-ANNE HOLFVE-SABEL *Attitudes towards Swedish comprehensive school. Comparisons over time and between classrooms in grade 6.* Göteborg 2006
243. CAROLINE BERGGREN *Entering Higher Education – Gender and Class Perspectives.* Göteborg 2006
244. CRISTINA THORNELL & CARL OLIVESTAM *Kulturmöte i centralafrikansk kontext med kyrkan som arena.* Göteborg 2006
245. ARVID TREEKREM *Att leda som man lär. En arbetsmiljöpedagogisk studie av toppledares ideologier om ledarskapets taktiska potentialer.* Göteborg 2006
246. EVA GANNERUD & KARIN RÖNNERMAN *Innehåll och innebörd i lärares arbete i förskola och skola – en fallstudie ur ett genusperspektiv.* Göteborg 2006
247. JOHANNES LUNNEBLAD *Förskolan och mångfalden – en etnografisk studie på en förskola i ett multietniskt område.* Göteborg 2006
248. LISA ASP-ONSJÖ *Åtgärdsprogram – dokument eller verktyg? En fallstudie i en kommun.* Göteborg 2006
249. EVA JOHANSSON & INGRID PRAMLING SAMUELSSON *Lek och läroplan. Möten mellan barn och lärare i förskola och skola.* Göteborg 2006
250. INGER BJÖRNELOO *Innebörder av hållbar utveckling. En studie av lärares utsagor om undervisning.* Göteborg 2006
251. EVA JOHANSSON *Etiska överenskommelser i förskolebarns världar.* Göteborg 2006
252. MONICA PETERSSON *Att genuszappa på säker eller osäker mark. Hem- och konsumentkunskap ur ett könsperspektiv.* Göteborg 2007
253. INGELA OLSSON *Handlingskompetens eller inlärn hjälplöshet? Lärandeprocesser hos verkstadsindustriarbetare.* Göteborg 2007

254. HELENA PEDERSEN *The School and the Animal Other. An Ethnography of human-animal relations in education.* Göteborg 2007

255. ELIN ERIKSEN ØDEGAARD *Meningsskaping i barnehagen. Innhold og bruk av barns og voksnes samtalefortellinger.* Göteborg 2007

256. ANNA KLERFELT *Barns multimediala berättande. En länk mellan mediakultur och pedagogisk praktik.* Göteborg 2007

257. PETER ERLANDSSON *Docile bodies and imaginary minds: on Schön's reflection-in-action.* Göteborg 2007

258. SONJA SHERIDAN OCH PIA WILLIAMS *Dimensioner av konstruktiv konkurrens. Konstruktiva konkurrensformer i förskola, skola och gymnasium.* Göteborg 2007

259. INGELA ANDREASSON *Elevplanen som text - om identitet, genus, maket och styrning i skolans elverdokumentation.* Göteborg 2007

Editors: Jan-Eric Gustafsson, Annika Härenstam and Ingrid Pramling Samuelsson

260. ANN-SOFIE HOLM *Relationer i skolan. En studie av feminiteter och maskuliniteter i år 9.* Göteborg 2008

261. LARS-ERIK NILSSON *But can't you see they are lying: Student moral positions and ethical practices in the wake of technological change.* Göteborg 2008

262. JOHAN HÄGGSTRÖM *Teaching systems of linear equations in Sweden and China: What is made possible to learn?* Göteborg 2008

263. GUNILLA GRANATH *Milda makter! Utvecklingsamtal och loggböcker som disciplinerings tekniker.* Göteborg 2008

264. KARIN GRAHN *Flickor och pojkar i idrottens läromedel. Konstruktioner av genus i ungdomsträna utbildningen.* Göteborg 2008.

265. PER-OLOF BENTLEY *Mathematics Teachers and Their Conceptual Models. A New Field of Research.* Göteborg 2008

266. SUSANNE GUSTAVSSON *Motstånd och mening. Innebörd i blivande lärares seminareamtal.* Göteborg 2008

267. ANITA MATTSSON *Flexibel utbildning i praktiken. En fallstudie av pedagogiska processer i en distansutbildning med en öppen design för samarbetslärande.* Göteborg 2008

268. ANETTE EMILSON *Det önskvärda barnet. Fostran uttryckt i vardagliga kommunikationshandlingar mellan lärare och barn i förskolan.* Göteborg 2008

269. ALLI KLAPP LEKHOLM *Grades and grade assignment: effects of student and school characteristics.* Göteborg 2008

270. ELISABETH BJÖRKLUND *Att erövra litteracitet. Små barns kommunikativa möten med berättande, bilder, text och tecken i förskolan.* Göteborg 2008

271. EVA NYBERG *Om livets kontinuitet. Undervisning och lärande om växters och djurs livscykel - en fallstudie i årskurs 5.* Göteborg 2008

272. CANCELLED

273. ANITA NORLUND *Kritisk sakprosläsning i gymnasieskolan. Didaktiska perspektiv på läroböcker, lärare och nationella prov.* Göteborg 2009

274. AGNETA SIMEONSDOTTER SVENSSON *Den pedagogiska samlingen i förskoleklassen. Barns olika sätt att erfara och hantera svårigheter.* Göteborg 2009

275. ANITA ERIKSSON *Om teori och praktik i lärarutbildningen. En etnografisk och diskursanalytisk studie.* Göteborg 2009

276. MARIA HJALMARSSON *Lärarprofessionens genusordning. En studie av lärares uppfattningar om arbetsuppgifter, kompetens och förväntningar.* Göteborg 2009.

277. ANNE DRAGEMARK OSCARSON *Self-Assessment of Writing in Learning English as a Foreign Language. A Study at the Upper Secondary School Level.* Göteborg 2009

278. ANNIKA LANTZ-ANDERSSON *Framing in Educational Practices. Learning Activity, Digital Technology and the Logic of Situated Action.* Göteborg 2009

279. RAUNI KARLSSON *Demokratiska värden i förskolebarns vardag.* Göteborg 2009

280. ELISABETH FRANK *Läsförmågan bland 9-10-åringar. Betydelsen av skolklimat, hem- och skolsamverkan, lärarkompetens och elevers hembakgrund.* Göteborg 2009

281. MONICA JOHANSSON *Anpassning och motstånd. En etnografisk studie av gymnasieelevers institutionella identitetsskapande.* Göteborg 2009

282. MONA NILSEN *Food for Thought. Communication and the transformation of work experience in web-based in-service training.* Göteborg 2009

283. INGA WERNERSSON (RED) *Genus i förskola och skola. Förändringar i policy, perspektiv och praktik.* Göteborg 2009

284. SONJA SHERIDAN, INGRID PRAMLING SAMUELSSON & EVA JOHANSSON (RED) *Barns tidiga lärande. En tvärsnittstudie om förskolan som miljö för barns lärande.* Göteborg 2009

285. MARIE HJALMARSSON *Loyalitet och motstånd - anställdas agerande i ett föränderligt hemtjänstarbete.* Göteborg 2009.

286. ANETTE OLIN *Skolans mötespraktik - en studie om skolutveckling genom yrkesverksammas förståelse*. Göteborg 2009

287. MIRELLA FORSBERG AHLCRONA *Handdockans kommunikativa potential som medierande redskap i förskolan*. Göteborg 2009

288. CLAS OLANDER *Towards an interlanguage of biological evolution: Exploring students' talk and writing as an arena for sense-making*. Göteborg 2010

Editors: Jan-Eric Gustafsson, Åke Ingerman and Ingrid Pramling Samuelsson

289. PETER HASSELSKOG *Slöjdlärares förhållningsätt i undervisningen*. Göteborg 2010

290. HILLEVI PRELL *Promoting dietary change. Intervening in school and recognizing health messages in commercials*. Göteborg 2010

291. DAVOUD MASOUMI *Quality Within E-learning in a Cultural Context. The case of Iran*. Göteborg 2010

292. YLVA ODENBRING *Kramar, kategoriseringar och hjälpfröknar. Könskonstruktioner i interaktion i förskola, förskoleklass och skolar ett*. Göteborg 2010

293. ANGELIKA KULLBERG *What is taught and what is learned. Professional insights gained and shared by teachers of mathematics*. Göteborg 2010

294. TORGEIR ALVESTAD *Barnehagens relasjonelle verden - små barn som kompetente aktörer i produktive forhandlinger*. Göteborg 2010

295. SYLVI VIGMO *New spaces for Language Learning. A study of student interaction in media production in English*. Göteborg 2010

296. CAROLINE RUNESDOTTER *I otakt med tiden? Folkhögskolorna i ett föränderligt fält*. Göteborg 2010

297. BIRGITTA KULLBERG *En etnografisk studie i en thailändsk grundskola på en ö i södra Thailand. I sökandet efter en framtid då nnet har nog av sitt*. Göteborg 2010

298. GUSTAV LYMER *The work of critique in architectural education*. Göteborg 2010

299. ANETTE HELLMAN *Kan Batman vara rosa? Förhandlingar om pojkighet och normalitet på en förskola*. Göteborg 2010

300. ANNIKA BERGVIKEN-RENSFELDT *Opening higher education. Discursive transformations of distance and higher education government*. Göteborg 2010

301. GETAHUN YACOB ABRAHAM *Education for Democracy? Life Orientation: Lessons on Leadership Qualities and Voting in South African Comprehensive Schools*. Göteborg 2010

302. LENA SJÖBERG *Bäst i klassen? Lärare och elever i svenska och europeiska policytexter*. Göteborg 2011

303. ANNA POST *Nordic stakeholders and sustainable catering*. Göteborg 2011

304. CECILIA KILHAMN *Making Sense of Negative Numbers*. Göteborg 2011

305. ALLAN SVENSSON (RED) *Utvärdering Genom Uppföljning. Longitudinell individforskning under ett halvsekel*. Göteborg 2011

306. NADJA CARLSSON *I kamp med skriftspråket. Vuxenstuderande med läs- och skrivsvårigheter i ett livsvärldsperspektiv*. Göteborg 2011

307. AUD TORILL MELAND *Ansvar for egen læring. Intensjoner og realiteter ved en norsk videregående skole*. Göteborg 2011

308. EVA NYBERG *Folkebildung för demokrati. Colombianska kvinnors perspektiv på kunskap som förändringskraft*. Göteborg 2011

309. SUSANNE THULIN *Lärares tal och barns nyfikenhet. Kommunikation om naturvetenskapliga innehåll i förskolan*. Göteborg 2011

310. LENA FRIDLUND *Interkulturell undervisning – ett pedagogiskt dilemma. Talet om undervisning i svenska som andraspråk och i förberedelseklass*. Göteborg 2011

311. TARJA ALATALO *Skicklig läs- och skrivundervisning i åk 1-3. Om lärares möjligheter och hinder*. Göteborg 2011

312. LISE-LOTTE BJERVÅS *Samtal om barn och pedagogisk dokumentation som bedömningspraktik i förskolan. En diskursanalys*. Göteborg 2011

313. ÅSE HANSSON *Ansvar for matematiklärande. Effekter av undervisningsansvar i det flerspråkiga klassrummet*. Göteborg 2011

314. MARIA REIS *Att ordna, från ordning till ordning. Yngre förskolebarns matematiserande*. Göteborg 2011

315. BENIAMIN KNUTSSON *Curriculum in the Era of Global Development – Historical Legacies and Contemporary Approaches*. Göteborg 2011

316. EVA WEST *Undervisning och lärande i naturvetenskap. Elevers lärande i relation till en forskningsbaserad undervisning om ljud, hörsel och hälsa*. Göteborg 2011

317. SIGNILD RISENFORS *Gymnasieungdomars livstolkande*. Göteborg 2011

318. EVA JOHANSSON & DONNA BERTHELSEN (Ed.) *Spaces for Solidarity and Individualism in Educational Contexts*. Göteborg 2012

319. ALASTAIR HENRY *L3 Motivation*. Göteborg 2012

320. ANN PARINDER *Ungdomars matval – erfarenheter, visioner och miljöargument i eget hushåll*. Göteborg 2012

321. ANNE KULTTI *Flerspråkiga barn i förskolan: Villkor för deltagande och lärande*. Göteborg 2012

322. BO-LENNART EKSTRÖM *Kontroversen om D.A.M.P. En kontroversstudie av vetenskapligt gränsarbete och översättning mellan olika kunskapsparadigm.* Göteborg 2012
323. MUN LING LO *Variation Theory and the Improvement of Teaching and Learning.* Göteborg 2012
324. ULLA ANDRÉN *Self-awareness and self-knowledge in professions. Something we are or a skill we learn.* Göteborg 2012
325. KERSTIN SIGNERT *Variation and invariants i Maria Montessoris sinnestränande materiel.* Göteborg 2012
326. INGEMAR GERRBO *Idén om en skola för alla och specialpedagogisk organisering i praktiken.* Göteborg 2012
327. PATRIK LILJA *Contextualizing inquiry. Negotiations of tasks, tools and actions in an upper secondary classroom.* Göteborg 2012
328. STEFAN JOHANSSON *On the Validity of Reading Assessments: Relationships Between Teacher Judgements, External Tests and Pupil Self-assessments.* Göteborg 2013
329. STEFAN PETTERSSON *Nutrition in Olympic Combat Sports. Elite athletes' dietary intake, hydration status and experiences of weight regulation.* Göteborg 2013
330. LINDA BRADLEY *Language learning and technology – student activities in web-based environments.* Göteborg 2013
331. KALLE JONASSON *Sport Has Never Been Modern.* Göteborg 2013
332. MONICA HARALDSSON STRÄNG *Yngre elevers lärande om natur. En studie av kommunikation om modeller i institutionella kontexter.* Göteborg 2013
333. ANN VALENTIN KVIST *Immigrant Groups and Cognitive Tests – Validity Issues in Relation to Vocational Training.* Göteborg 2013
334. ULRICA BENNERSTEDT *Knowledge at play. Studies of games as members' matters.* Göteborg 2013
335. EVA ÄRLEMALM-HAGSÉR *Engagerade i världens bästa? Lärande för hållbarhet i förskolan.* Göteborg 2013
336. ANNA-KARIN WYNDHAMN *Tänka fritt, tänka rätt. En studie om värdeöverföring och kritiskt tänkande i gymnasieskolans undervisning.* Göteborg 2013
337. LENA TYRÉN *"Vi får ju inte riktigt förutsättningarna för att genomföra det som vi vill." En studie om lärarens möjligheter och hinder till förändring och förbättring i praktiken.* Göteborg 2013
338. ANNIKA LILJA *Förtroendefulla relationer mellan lärare och elev.* Göteborg 2013
339. MAGNUS LEVINSSON *Evidens och existens. Evidensbaserad undervisning i ljuset av lärarens erfarenheter.* Göteborg 2013
340. ANNELI SCHWARTZ *Pedagogik, plats och prestationer. En etnografisk studie om en skola i förorten.* Göteborg 2013
341. ELISABET ÖHRN och LISBETH LUNDAHL (red) *Kön och karriär i akademien. En studie inom det utbildningsvetenskapliga fältet.* Göteborg 2013
342. RICHARD BALDWIN *Changing practice by reform. The recontextualisation of the Bologna process in teacher education.* Göteborg 2013
343. AGNETA JONSSON *Att skapa läroplan för de yngsta barnen i förskolan. Barns perspektiv och nuets didaktik.* Göteborg 2013
344. MARIA MAGNUSSON *Skylta med kunskap. En studie av hur barn urskiljer grafiska symboler i hem och förskola.* Göteborg 2013
345. ANNA-LENA LILLIESTAM *Aktör och struktur i historieundervisning. Om utveckling av elevers historiska resonering.* Göteborg 2013
346. KRISTOFFER LARSSON *Kritiskt tänkande i grundskolans samhällskunskap. En fenomenografisk studie om manifesterat kritiskt tänkande i samhällskunskap hos elever i årskurs 9.* Göteborg 2013
347. INGA WERNERSSON och INGEMAR GERRBO (red) *Differentieringens janusansikte. En antologi från Institutionen för pedagogik och specialpedagogik vid Göteborgs universitet.* Göteborg 2013
348. LILL LANGELOTZ *Vad gör en skicklig lärare? En studie om kollegial handledning som utvecklingspraktik.* Göteborg 2014
349. STEINGERDUR OLAFSDOTTIR *Television and food in the lives of young children.* Göteborg 2014
350. ANNA-CARIN RAMSTEN *Kunskaper som byggde folkhemmet. En fallstudie av förutsättningar för lärande vid tekniskskiften inom processindustrin.* Göteborg 2014
351. ANNA-CARIN BREDMAR *Lärares arbetsglädje. Betydelsen av emotionell närvaro i det pedagogiska arbetet.* Göteborg 2014
352. ZAHRA BAYATI *"den Andre" i lärarutbildningen. En studie om den rasifierade svenska studentens villkor i globaliseringsens tid.* Göteborg 2014
353. ANDERS EKLÖF *Project work, independence and critical thinking.* Göteborg 2014
354. EVA WENNÄS BRANTE *Möte med multimodalt material. Vilken roll spelar dyslexi för uppfattandet av text och bild?* Göteborg 2014
355. MAGNUS FERRY *Idrottsprofilerad utbildning – i spåren av en avreglerad skola.* Göteborg 2014

Editors: Jan-Eric Gustafsson, Åke Ingerman and Pia Williams

- 356 CECILIA THORSEN *Dimensionality and Predictive validity of school grades: The relative influence of cognitive and social-behavioral aspects.* Göteborg 2014
- 357 ANN-MARIE ERIKSSON *Formulating knowledge. Engaging with issues of sustainable development through academic writing in engineering education.* Göteborg 2014
- 358 PÅR RYLANDER *Tränarens makt över spelare i lagidrotter. Sett ur French och Ravens maktbasteori.* Göteborg 2014
- 359 PERNILLA ANDERSSON VARGA *Skrivundervisning i gymnasieskolan. Svenskämnets roll i den sociala reproduktionen.* Göteborg 2014
- 360 GUNNAR HYLTEGREN *Vaghet och vanmakt - 20 år med kunskapskrav i den svenska skolan.* Göteborg 2014
- 361 MARIE HEDBERG *Idrotten sätter agendan. En studie av Riksidrottsgymnasietränarens handlande utifrån sitt dubbla uppdrag.* Göteborg 2014
- 362 KARI-ANNE JØRGENSEN *What is going on out there? - What does it mean for children's experiences when the kindergarten is moving their everyday activities into the nature - landscapes and its places?* Göteborg 2014
- 363 ELISABET ÖHRN och ANN-SOFIE HOLM (red) *Att hyckas i skolan. Om skolprestationer och kön i olika undervisningspraktiker.* Göteborg 2014
- 364 ILONA RINNE *Pedagogisk takt i betygssamtal. En fenomenologisk hermeneutisk studie av gymnasielärares och elevers förståelse av betyg.* Göteborg 2014
- 365 MIRANDA ROCKSÉN *Reasoning in a Science Classroom.* Göteborg 2015
- 366 ANN-CHARLOTTE BIVALL *Helpdeskning: Knowing and learning in IT support practices.* Göteborg 2015
- 367 BIRGITTA BERNE *Naturvetenskap möter etik. En klassrumsstudie av elevers diskussioner om samhällsfrågor relaterade till bioteknik.* Göteborg 2015
- 368 AIRI BIGSTEN *Fostran i förskolan.* Göteborg 2015
- 369 MARITA CRONQVIST *Yrkesetik i lärarutbildning - en balanskonst.* Göteborg 2015
- 370 MARITA LUNDSTRÖM *Förskolebarns strävanden att kommunicera matematik.* Göteborg 2015
- 371 KRISTINA LANÅ *Makt, kön och diskurser. En etnografisk studie om elevers aktörskap och positioneringar i undervisningen.* Göteborg 2015
- 372 MONICA NYVALLER *Pedagogisk utveckling genom kollegial granskning: Fallet Lärande Besök utifrån aktör-nätverksteori.* Göteborg 2015
- 373 GLENN ØVREVIK KJERLAND *Å lære å undervise i kroppsøving. Design for utvikling av teoribasert undervisning og kritisk refleksjon i kroppsøvingslærerutdanningen.* Göteborg 2015
- 374 CATARINA ECONOMOU *"I svenska två vågar jag prata mer och så". En didaktisk studie om skolämnet svenska som andraspråk.* Göteborg 2015
- 375 ANDREAS OTTEMO *Kön, kropp, begär och teknik: Passion og instrumentalitet på två tekniska høyskoleprogram.* Göteborg 2015
- 376 SHRUTI TANEJA JOHANSSON *Autism-in-context. An investigation of schooling of children with a diagnosis of autism in urban India.* Göteborg 2015
- 377 JAANA NEHEZ *Rektorers praktiker i møte med utvecklingsarbete. Möjligheter och hinder för planerad förändring.* Göteborg 2015
- 378 OSA LUNDBERG *Mind the Gap – Ethnography about cultural reproduction of difference and disadvantage in urban education.* Göteborg 2015
- 379 KARIN LAGER *I spänningsfältet mellan kontroll och utveckling. En polycystudie av systematiskt kvalitetsarbete i kommunen, förskolan och fritidsbarnet.* Göteborg 2015
- 380 MIKAELA ÅBERG *Doing Project Work. The Interactional Organization of Tasks, Resources, and Instructions.* Göteborg 2015
- 381 ANN-LOUISE LJUNGBLAD *Takt och hållning - en relationell studie om det oberoendeliga i matematikundervisningen.* Göteborg 2016
- 382 LINN HÅMAN *Extrem jakt på hälsa. En explorativ studie om ortorexia nervosa.* Göteborg 2016
- 383 EVA OLSSON *On the impact of extramural English and CLIL on productive vocabulary.* Göteborg 2016
- 384 JENNIE SIVENBRING *I den betraktades ögon. Ungdomar om bedömning i skolan.* Göteborg 2016
- 385 PERNILLA LAGERLÖF *Musical play. Children interacting with and around music technology.* Göteborg 2016
- 386 SUSANNE MECKBACH *Mästarcoacherna. Att bli, vara och utvecklas som tränare inom svensk elitfotboll.* Göteborg 2016
- 387 LISBETH GYLLANDER TORKILDSEN *Bedömning som gemensam angelägenhet – enkelt i retoriken, svårare i praktiken. Elevers och lärares förståelse och erfarenheter.* Göteborg 2016
- 388 cancelled
- 389 PERNILLA HEDSTRÖM *Hälsocoach i skolan. En utvärderande fallstudie av en hälsofrämjande intervention.* Göteborg 2016

Editors: Åke Ingerman, Pia Williams and
Elisabet Öhrn

390 JONNA LARSSON *När fysik blir lärområde i förskolan.* Göteborg 2016

391 EVA M JOHANSSON *Det motsägelsefulla bedömningsuppdraget. En etnografisk studie om bedömning i förskolekontext.* Göteborg 2016

392 MADELEINE LÖWING *Diamant – diagnoser i matematik. Ett kartläggningsmaterial baserat på didaktisk ämnesanalys.* Göteborg 2016

393 JAN BLOMGREN *Den svårångade motivationen: elever i en digitaliserad lärmiljö.* Göteborg 2016

394 DAVID CARLSSON *Vad är religionslärareskap? En diskursanalys av trepartssamtal i lärutbildningen.* Göteborg 2017

395 EMMA EDSTRAND *Learning to reason in environmental education: Digital tools, access points to knowledge and science literacy.* Göteborg 2017

396 KATHARINA DAHLBÄCK *Svenskämnets estetiska dimensioner - - i klassrum, kursplaner och lärares uppfattningar.* Göteborg 2017

397 K GABRIELLA THORELL *Framåt marsch! – Riddlärarollen från dåtid till samtid med perspektiv på framtid.* Göteborg 2017

398 RIMMA NYMAN *Interest and Engagement: Perspectives on Mathematics in the Classroom.* Göteborg 2017

399 ANNIKA HELLMAN *Visuella möjlighetsrum. Gymnasieelevers subjektsskapande i bild och medieundervisning.* Göteborg 2017

400 OLA STRANDLER *Performativa lärarpraktiker.* Göteborg 2017

401 AIMEE HALEY *Geographical Mobility of the Tertiary Educated – Perspectives from Education and Social Space.* Göteborg 2017

402 MALIN SVENSSON *Hoppet om en framtidsplats. Asylsökande barn i den svenska skolan.* Göteborg 2017

403 CATARINA ANDISHMAND *Fritidsbarn eller servicebarn? En etnografisk studie av fritidsbarn i tre socioekonomiskt skilda områden.* Göteborg 2017

404 MONICA VIKNER STAFBERG *Om lärarblivande. En livsvärldsfenomenologisk studie av bildningsgångar in i läraryrket.* Göteborg 2017

405 ANGELICA SIMONSSON *Sexualitet i klassrummet. Språkundervisning, elevsubjektivitet och heteronormativitet.* Göteborg 2017

406 ELIAS JOHANNESON *The Dynamic Development of Cognitive and Socioemotional Traits and Their Effects on School Grades and Risk of Unemployment.* Göteborg 2017

407 EVA BORGFELDT *"Det kan vara svårt att förklara på rader". Perspektiv på analys och bedömning av multimodal textproduktion i årskurs 3.* Göteborg 2017

408 GÉRALDINE FAUVILLE *Digital technologies as support for learning about the marine environment. Steps toward ocean literacy.* Göteborg 2018

409 CHARLOTT SELLBERG *Training to become a master mariner in a simulator-based environment: The instructors' contributions to professional learning.* Göteborg 2018

410 TUULA MAUNULA *Students' and Teachers' Jointly Constituted Learning Opportunities. The Case of Linear Equations.* Göteborg 2018

411 EMMALEE GISSLEVIK *Education for Sustainable Food Consumption in Home and Consumer Studies.* Göteborg 2018

412 FREDRIK ZIMMERMAN *Det tillåtande och det begränsande. En studie om pojkares syn på studier och ungdomars normer kring maskulinitet.* Göteborg 2018

413 CHRISTER MATTSSON *Extremisten i klassrummet. Perspektiv på skolans förväntade ansvar att förhindra framtida terrorism.* Göteborg 2018

414 HELENA WALLSTRÖM *Gymnasielärares mentorshandlingar. En verksamhetsteoretisk studie om lärararbete i förändring.* Göteborg 2018

415 LENA ECKERHOLM *Lärarperspektiv på läsförståelse. En interjurstudie om undervisning i årskurs 4-6.* Göteborg 2018

416 CHRISTOPHER HOLMBERG *Food, body weight, and health among adolescents in the digital age: An explorative study from a health promotion perspective.* Göteborg 2018

417 MAGNUS KARLSSON *Moraliskt arbete i förskolan. Regler och moralisk ordning i barn-barn och vuxen-barn interaktion.* Göteborg 2018

418 ANDREAS FRÖBERG *Physical Activity among Adolescents in a Swedish Multicultural Area. An Empowerment-Based Health Promotion School Intervention.* Göteborg 2018

419 EWA SKANTZ ÅBERG *Children's collaborative technology-mediated story making. Instructional challenges in early childhood education.* Göteborg 2018

420 PER NORDÉN *Regnbågsungar: Familj, utbildning, fritid.* Göteborg 2018

421 JENNY RENDAHL *Vem och vad kan man lita på? Ungdomars förhållningsätt till budskap om mat och ätande utifrån ett forskarinitierat rollspel.* Göteborg 2018

422 MARTINA WYSZYNSKA JOHANSSON *Student experience of vocational becoming in upper secondary vocational education and training. Navigating by feedback.* Göteborg 2018

423 MALIN NILSEN *Barns och lärares aktiviteter med datorplattor och appar i förskolan.* Göteborg 2018

- 424 LINDA BORGER *Investigating and Validating Spoken Interactional Competence – Rater Perspectives on a Swedish National Test of English*. Göteborg 2018
- 425 ANNA-MARIA FJELLMAN *School choice, space and the geography of marketization – Analyses of educational restructuring in upper secondary education in Sweden*. Göteborg 2019
- 426 ANNELI BERGNELL *Med kroppen som illustration: Hur förskolebarn prat-skapar naturvetenskap med hjälp av multimodala och kroppsförankrade förklaringar*. Göteborg 2019
- 427 ANNE SOLLI *Handling socio-scientific controversy: Students' reasoning through digital inquiry*. Göteborg 2019
- 428 MARTIN GÖTHBERG *Interacting - coordinating text understanding in a student theatre production*. Göteborg 2019
- 429 SUSANNE STRÖMBERG JÄMSVI *Unpacking dominant discourses in higher education language policy*. Göteborg 2019
- 430 KURT WICKE *Läroböcker, demokrati och medborgarskap. Konstruktioner i läroböcker i samhälls-kunskap för gymnasiet*. Göteborg 2019
- 431 KATARINA SAMUELSSON *Teachers' Work in Times of Restructuring. On Contextual Influences for Collegiality and Professionalism*. Göteborg 2019
- 432 HELÉNE BERGENTOFT *Lärande av rörelseförmåga i idrott och hälsa ur ett praktikutvecklande perspektiv*. Göteborg 2019
- 433 JANNA MEYER-BEINING *Assessing writers, assessing writing: a dialogical study of grade delivery in Swedish higher education*. Göteborg 2019
- 434 DAN FRANSSON *Game demands and fatigue profiles in elite football – an individual approach -Implications of training and recovery strategies*. Göteborg 2019
- 435 ELIN ARVIDSON *Physiological responses to acute physical and psychosocial stress – relation to aerobic capacity and exercise training*. Göteborg 2019
- 436 SUSANNE STAF *Skriva historia – literacyförväntningar och elevtexter i historieämnet på mellan- och högskolan*. Göteborg 2019
- 437 VERONICA SÜLAU *Vad bänder i lärares kollegiala samtalspraktik? En studie av mötet mellan en nationell kompetensutvecklingsinsats och en lokal fortbildningspraktik*. Göteborg 2019
- 438 MARIA OHLIN *How to Make Cycling Safer – Identification and Prevention of Serious Injuries among Bicyclists*. Göteborg 2019
- 439 LINUS JONSSON *An empowerment-based school physical activity intervention with adolescents in a disadvantaged community: A transformative mixed methods investigation*. Göteborg 2019
- 440 ELIN NORDENSTRÖM *Feedback and instructional guidance in healthcare simulation debriefings*. Göteborg 2019
- 441 KATEŘINA ČERNÁ *Nurses' work practice in chronic care: knowing and learning in the context of patients' self-monitoring data*. Göteborg 2019
- 442 MARGARETHA HÄGGSTRÖM *Estetiska erfarenheter i naturmötet. En fenomenologisk studie av upplevelser av skog, växtilighet och undervisning*. Göteborg 2020
- 443 PANAGIOTA NASIOPOULOU *The professional preschool teacher under conditions of change – competence and intentions in pedagogical practises*. Göteborg 2020
- 444 ANNA TOROPOVA *Teachers meeting the challenges of the Swedish school system. Agents within boundaries*. Göteborg 2020
- 446 ULF RYBERG *Att urskilja grafiska aspekter av derivata – hur elevernas möjligheter påverkas av innehållets behandling i undervisningen*. Göteborg 2020
- 447 KASSAHUN WELDEMARIAM *Reconfiguring Environmental Sustainability in Early Childhood Education: a Postanthropocentric Approach*. Göteborg 2020
- 448 ANNE KJELLSDOTTER *Didactical Considerations in the Digitalized Classroom*. Göteborg 2020
- 449 CARINA PETERSON *Val, omröstning, styrning. En etnografisk studie om intentioner med, villkor för och utfall av barns inflytande i förskolan*. Göteborg 2020
- 450 LOTTA WEDMAN *The concept concept in mathematics education: A concept analysis*. Göteborg 2020
- 451 MARLENE SJÖBERG *Samtal om undervisning i naturvetenskap. Ämnesdidaktisk kollegial utveckling i lärarutbildning och lärarprofession*. Göteborg 2020
- 452 LENNART SVENSSON *Kontextuell analys – En forskningsmetodologi och forskningsansats*. Göteborg 2020
- 453 JOHN DOHLSTEN *Vad möjliggör och begränsar en hållbar elitfräddrott? Aktionsforskning i elitidrottspraktiker inom Göteborgs fräddrottsförbund*. Göteborg 2020
- 454 LENA SÖTEVIK *Barbiebröllop och homobundar. Barn och barndomar i relation till queerhet och (betero)normativa linjeringar*. Göteborg 2020.
- 455 FRIDA SIEKKINEN *Att vara och inte vara. Eleypositioner(ingar) i spänningsfältet mellan svenska och svenska som andraspråk*. Göteborg 2021.

456 ANN-CHARLOTT WANK *Meningsskapande samtal. En studie om barns meningskapande med fokus på processer och innehåll relaterat till förskolans praktik.* Göteborg 2021.

457 ANDREAS LUNDBERG ZACHRISSON *Overuse injuries in Swedish elite athletics. Incidence, occurrence, athlete availability, and risk factors.* Göteborg 2021.

458 ANNA NORRSTRÖM *Samtal under lärarlagsmöten. Diskursorienteringar i den professionella praktiken.* Göteborg 2021.

459 JOHANNA MELLÉN *Stability and Change. Policy, options, and choice in Swedish upper secondary education.* Göteborg 2021.

460 JONATAN JUNGMA LM *Running-related injuries among recreational runners. How many, who, and why?* Göteborg 2021.

461 ELISABETH OHLSSON *Den synliggjorda vokabulären och praktiken. Gymnasieelevers akademiska skrivande på svenska.* Göteborg 2021.

462 VICTORIA ROLFE *Exploring socioeconomic inequality in educational opportunity and outcomes in Sweden and beyond.* Göteborg 2021.

463 JONAS LINDBÄCK *Vårsta bästa skolan. Om unga i förorten och segregationen i skolan.* Göteborg 2021.

Editors: Christel Larsson, Elisabeth Öhrn, Pia Williams

464 ANNE-MARIE CEDERQVIST *Seeing the parts, understanding the whole. A technology education perspective on teaching and learning in processes of analysing and designing programmed technological solutions.* Göteborg 2021.

465 MARIE GRICE *Epistemic beliefs and conceptions of competence in education for sustainable development.* Göteborg 2021.

466 KRISTINA HUNEHÄLL BERNDTSSON *Digitala sexuella trakasserier i skolan: Elevperspektiv på sexting, utsatthet och jämställdhet.* Göteborg 2022.

Editors: Christel Larsson, Elisabeth Öhrn, Pia Williams och Olof Franck

467 STINA JERDBORG *Learning Principalship: Becoming a Principal in a Swedish Context. A study of Principals in Education and Practice.* Göteborg 2022.

468 ALEXANDRA SÖDERMAN *Digital studentkultur – om slutna grupper på Facebook som icke-formell arena i högre utbildning.* Göteborg 2022.

469 OLA HENRICSSON *”Som att hålla tiden i sin hand” – Didaktiskt perspektiv på muntligt berättande.* Göteborg 2022.

470 ERIKA MAJOROS *Linking recent and older IEA studies on mathematics and science.* Göteborg 2022.

471 JENNY SVANTESON WESTER *Teaching and learning mathematics with integrated small-group discussions. A learning study about scaling geometric figures.* Göteborg 2022.

472 JASMINE BYLUND *Everyday Language Practices and the Interplay of Ideologies, Investment and Identities. Language Use and Dispositions among Young Adolescents in Multilingual Urban Settings in Sweden.* Göteborg 2022.

473 AGNETA PIHL *Children retelling stories. Responding, reshaping, and remembering in early childhood education and care.* Göteborg 2022.

474 KATARINA NILFYR *Interaktionsmönster, social anpassning och emotioner i förskolan – En mikrosociologisk studie av interaktion mellan förskollärare och barn i målorienterade aktiviteter.* Göteborg 2022

475 LEAH NATASHA GLASSOW *Teacher sorting and the opportunity gap. A cross-national investigation of institutional differentiation and educational equity.* Göteborg 2022

476 ÅSA ANDERSSON *Sustainable inclusion without sustainability. Working with equal participation and unforeseen movement in physical education, sports, and research* Göteborg 2023

Sustainable inclusion without sustainability

Working with equal participation and unforeseen movement in physical education, sports, and research

This thesis is a thinking text for anyone interested in inclusive physical education, sports, and research. It is important to note that this text refuse to be passively read. And, that there is a tangible risk that you will be challenged to rethink processes and purposes of participation. There is also a risk that you become involved in more creative and exciting practices that counteracts conformity.

The main objective is to introduce an approach where the path to inclusion encompasses more knowledges than our own. For me, it is a matter of equal creation. Working with more than one voice I loosen up the certainty and distinctness of various concepts (inclusion, participation, case-study, research interests, professionalism, ethics, quality, and educational organization) and fill them with other content. Among various things, this makes me create a terrain and a language of minor-case-studies, re-think the creation of research interests, discuss the importance of open-ended activities, and suggest an alteration regarding encounters between various claims of knowledge. The contribution of this thesis is not, however, planned beforehand. I simply do not know what effects it will give off and I sincerely invite you to travel with me and explore this further.



Åsa Andersson has a MSc in Sociology. Her main research interests concern participation and innovation within the field of physical education, sports, and research.

