How to expand the boundaries: feminist posthumanist elaborations on change in education

Karin Gunnarsson, Department of Education, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
Karin Gunnarsson, ORCid 0000-0001-7165-3891
Email: karin.gunnarsson@edu.su.se

Abstract

Change is a vital matter connecting to key educational concerns of teaching and learning and also involves questions of ethics. By deploying a feminist posthumanist framework, this paper elaborates change together with the notions of boundaries and responsibility. This is done by exploring moments from a collaborative research project conducted in a Swedish upper secondary school concerning a teaching unit focusing on equality and norms. The questions guiding the paper are: How is change enacted within the teaching? And, how to unfold the responsibilities the teaching entails? By working within the interplay of empirical enquiry and theoretical elaboration, the paper addresses how a multitude of encounters become involved in enactments of change. Further, it unfolds how change entails both unpredictability and responsibility for teaching and learning. In the concluding notes the ambiguities of change are stressed addressing the call within posthuman ethics of how to expand the boundaries.

Keywords: change, learning, feminist posthumanism, boundaries, responsibility, worlding

Introduction

This paper explores change as a messy and collective matter. To enter the exploration, I join the feminist posthumanist philosopher Rosi Braidotti's (2016, p. 26) articulation on posthuman ethics:

> *Posthuman ethics aims at enacting sustainable modes of relation with multiple human and nonhuman others that enhance one's ability to renew and expand the boundaries of what transversal and non-unitary subjects can become*.

This quotation highlights the responsibilities that come with our relations since they carry a vitality of producing ourselves as well as the world. Responsibility is articulated as creating relations that afford an ability to "renew and expand the boundaries" of what might become. This also implies a specific take on subjectivity and agency within the posthuman framework. Here, "an enlarged sense of inter-connection between self and other, including the non-human" (Braidotti, 2016, p. 25) is stressed making agency a temporary capacity contingent upon relational conditions rather than an individual trait.

Turning Braidotti's articulation of posthuman ethics towards education addresses the complexities of how teaching and learning are emergent processes of mattering where "different modes of being and knowing coexist and collide" (Taylor, 2020, p. 214). The question raised in this article, then, is how to put posthuman ethics to work in the sense of expanding the boundaries of what teaching, classroom and students can become. This question was elaborated in a collaborative research project that I conducted together with, among many others, a teacher in an upper secondary school in Sweden. The project addresses social science teaching of equality and norms – not as a value base or character education targeting the students' experiences, but rather as core knowledge content focusing on notions such as socialisation, intersectionality and power. In earlier articles analysing what took place in the project (Gunnarsson, 2020; 2021), it is highlighted how both stabilisations and transformations simultaneously are enacted and also the important but risky business this knowledge content entails. This raises many questions of how to engage with knowledge content about present conditions of injustice and violence in a way that allows for expanding the boundaries of teaching, students and society in more sustainable ways so as to create transformations towards social change.

Thus, this paper is about change. What I argue is that change is intertwined with the well discussed concept of learning. Learning is a highly significant but loaded and slippery concept, connected to questions about who or what is learning and how and when learning takes place. To explore change as interwoven with learning, I put to work the posthuman notions of boundaries and responsibility. Then, change becomes a matter with interwoven layers. It becomes both an empirical question that concerns how change is enacted in the teaching of equality and norms and a theoretical question about how to comprehend change in education within the posthuman framework. The aim of this paper is therefore to empirically and theoretically explore change as continuous movements entangled with learning. The questions guiding this paper are: How is

change enacted within the teaching? And, how to unfold the responsibilities the teaching entails?

In the first section of the paper, I outline the location of the study, which includes posthuman research on change and learning. Next, I elaborate on the posthuman framework focusing on the conceptions of change, including boundary, agency and responsibility, that I put to work in the analysis. I then describe the collaborative ethnographic methodology and analytical approach. In the following section, I explore empirical moments from the research project, addressing how encounters and responsibilities become involved in the enactment of change. To conclude the paper, I discuss how teaching and learning always matters by returning to the posthuman ethics of expanding the boundaries.

Background: educational posthumanism on change and learning

Over the last decade, a growing number of studies within education have put to work a posthuman framework, which reorients education by disrupting subject-centred conceptions of teaching and learning. These studies comprehend education as a set of transformative relations and doings that includes both humans and nonhumans. However, the educational posthuman framework is heterogeneous and includes a variety of approaches, which are situated within similar ontological groundings but differ in their conceptual threads and focal points. There are scholars who draw on actor-network theory (e.g. Fenwick & Edwards, 2013; Mulcahy, Clevland & Aberton, 2015), addressing the relation between space, materiality and learning with a sociomaterial approach. Others draw on Deleuze to address questions of learning and thinking (e.g. De Freitas & Palmer, 2016; Fendler, 2013; Lenz Taguchi, 2017; Young & Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles, 2020). For example, De Freitas and Palmer (2016, p. 1219) address how scientific concepts that students are intended to learn become "creative playmates" that participate in unruly ways in the teaching. In line with this, Young and Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles (2020, p. 30) in exploring climate change together with children and young people, regard learning as a "inquiry into the not-yet-known". By expanding learning, they strive to decentre the human to explore how assemblages with more-than-humans such as animals and rivers deterritorialise learning in unexpected ways.

Other scholars draw on the philosophers Barad and Haraway to reconsider how learning takes place within transformative entanglements (e.g. Ceder, 2019; Juelskjær, 2020). By employing the thinking of Haraway and her bag lady story-telling strategy, Taylor, Blaise and Guigni (2013) explore learning as becoming worldly and consider how response-ability is shared. Furthermore, they ask in whose interest and, on whose terms, does learning take place. Plauborg (2018, p. 335) argues, in line with Barad, that dominant learning theories have a "tendency to perceive change as either a question of adding more of the same or as breaking with existing knowledge" and that there is a given world for a given learner to explore. Instead, Plauborg seeks to comprehend learning as embodied processes "in which the subject and the world are constantly in a dynamic state of becoming" (2018, p. 324). With the concepts of material-discursive and spacetimematter, Plauborg highlights how learning involves the acquisition of things that we are also part of

producing.

In line with the abovementioned scholars, I argue that the posthuman reconception shifts the understanding of teaching and learning into ways that are relational and performative. Inspired by these scholars, this paper seeks to contribute to the literature by exploring learning and change as boundary works with ethical implications. This implies paying attention to subjectivity and agency since "giving to what touches us the power to make us imagine, think, and learn, is a particular, human way of participating in an ongoing, adventurous, unguaranteed but generative process of making sense in common" (Stengers, 2019, p. 18). Nonetheless, this means disrupting subject-object distinctions such as learner and learned and instead emphasising relations and enactments when addressing questions of learning (Juelskjær, 2020). I argue that, even though change is always taking place and learning is a messy feature, there are ethical considerations of how to expand the boundaries of what teaching, classroom and students can become.

Theory and methodology: working with worlding encounters

The theoretical approach of this study joins a relational ontology (Braidotti, 2016) within feminist posthumanist theories. I especially work with the posthuman notions of *boundaries, agency* and *responsibility*. In this framework, change is of great concern as a "faith in our collective capacity to endure and to transform" (Braidotti, 2010a, p 50). Building on the ontological postulation of how "world-making entanglements" (Haraway, 2008, p. 4), are constituted by human and nonhuman relationalities acknowledges how change is a collective matter taking place within encounters. Interdependently, encounters are what co-shape us, as well as the rest of the world including teachers-students-knowledge content-classroom. Such a worlding is not a matter of choice but a matter of encounters, "where *who* and *what are* is precisely what is at stake" (Haraway, 2008, p. 19). Since encounters are part of worlding processes, ethical implications come along. As Haraway notes, this "make[s] us responsible in unpredictable ways for which worlds take shape" (2008, p. 36).

Responsibility then implies creating a reworlding that affords pushing of boundaries in certain directions rather than others. This accentuates questions about how to comprehend boundaries as well as agency. Following Barad (2007, p. 214) agency is a matter of entanglements that make "iterative changes to particular practices" rather than an individual capacity or something fixed to entities such as subjects and objects. When addressing entanglements and practices rather than individuals, agency can be understood as taking place within continuous reworkings of boundaries. Boundaries are always in the making within mutually constitutive relations, producing the inside and outside of a specific practice such as teaching. Thus, the expansion of boundaries happens within encounters that transform the practice in destabilizing ways and create a "break in continuity" (Haraway, 2008, p. 243). These thoughts of agency and boundaries are based on a sense of relationality that entails ethical concerns for one's interconnections to human and nonhuman others. This requires attentiveness and accountability for our relations, because they are "what we depend upon" (Stengers, 2008, p. 57).

Working within this ontological grounding of worlding and the notions of boundaries, agency and responsibility helps me navigate the balancing act of decentring but still engaging with the expanded and becoming human subjects very much involved in teaching and learning. Moreover, this relational vision of the subject makes it possible to acknowledge how ethical relations affect encounters and connectivity which includes the interdependency of humans and non-humans. It also provides opportunities to explore change as a messy and collective matter that address questions of responsibility, agency, limits and possibilities, which are vital to education.

Methodology: collective transformations
The empirical examples in this paper are drawn from a research project conducted with a collaborative ethnographic approach. Collaboration entails engaging with the many participants and working together within the encounter of the different practices, in this case teaching in upper secondary school and doing research. Doing research then becomes a relational experiment with the messy co-becomings of researcher, teaching practice and theory.

The empirical material from the project was created through collaborative engagement, participant observation, and group and individual interviews. The engagement required that I especially worked together with a teacher, Johanna, for six months in the planning of a teaching unit. This meant that I was involved in both the planning and teaching of two classes in social studies in a middle class, predominantly White, suburban upper secondary school in Sweden. The teaching unit of which these classes were a part comprised six weekly 160-minute lessons. The two classes I was involved in consisted of 26 first-year students and most of them were 16 years old. My position in the teaching was primarily based on participant observation; however, I also engaged in numerous discussions with the students.

Throughout the collaboration with Johanna and during the teaching I made field notes. The notes are not considered as representations of the practice, but rather sediments that stuck within the relations of me as the researcher, theory and teaching (cf. Braidotti, 2010b). I entered the practice with the ambition to give to the situation the obligation to make me think and feel. Five 30-minute, semi-structured interviews with groups of three or four students, and a one-hour interview with Johanna when the teaching unit was completed were also conducted. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed for analysis.

Encountering the empirical material with a relational ontology means trying to create analytical conditions that can evoke the messiness of how change is enacted. In line with affirmative critique (Braidotti, 2010b), the analysis implied a critical and creative engagement with the material to allow it to modify thinking and relating. By carefully reading field notes and interview transcripts, the analysis implied to slow down the teaching practice and be attentive to moments of movements and change – not to identify what the change was, but to consider how it became enacted. The analysis, therefore, entailed mangling the empirical material theoretically to unfold the complexities and possibilities of change within the teaching practice. So, what follows are

some examples drawn from the material that became generative methodological and educational encounters engaging with change.

Empirical encounters with change

In this section, moments of change are explored with the posthuman framework. In relation to the research questions that guide this paper, I chart three intertwined threads. First, I consider how change became enacted in relations to the teaching and research project, highlighting the ambiguities of encounters. Secondly, I consider the distributed and moving character of change in relation to moments in the teaching. And lastly, I consider how transformative encounters with the knowledge content entailed questions of responsibility. Altogether, I address the collective character of change as a generative matter within teaching and learning.

Transformative encounters

The research project and collaborative engagement entered from my and Johanna's shared trouble of how to create a teaching unit that could experiment with and challenge excluding norms and inequalities. In weekly meetings and late-night email conversations we planned the teaching unit by exploring teaching materials, such as films, readings, pictures, and figures that in different ways concerned these issues (Gunnarsson, 2021). Together we asked what could take place in the encounters of different concepts, questions, teaching materials, students, and classroom. In the interview with Johanna, she described the collaboration and process of reworking the teaching unit as "difficult".

> Johanna: For the difficulty of creating a whole new teaching unit as I see it is that you don't really know where you are heading. When you have not done it before, we did not know where it would land and we were discussing the questions and planning all through the teaching unit. And I think the students, though they can't put words into it, they notice it.
> Karin: The uncertainty?
> Johanna: Yes, but there is no alternative, if you never like throw yourself out there, you do not know, you cannot go in the same lane just because everything is really safe and clear, then you miss something else.

Here, Johanna expressed the ambiguities of making a new teaching unit. Doing it for the first time as well as creating it along the way, produced a challenging situation moulded with uncertainties. Johanna described trying something new and altering the teaching in terms of "throwing yourself out there" – something that is done in relation to me, as a collaborative partner in the teaching. This highlighted how control and safety became part of creating the teaching practice, where standards and pre-set goals were emphasised in the curriculum. At the same time, Johanna stated that there was no other option – the teaching involved navigating the boundaries of routine and ordinary doings. But unsettling those boundaries became a risky business as the teaching was described by Johanna as more secure when it relied on repetition and well-known topics. This also involved questioning what was included in and excluded from the teaching when insecurity and

learning became vigorous for both teacher and students. Here, the teaching unit becomes fluid where the teaching affords to "play with plans and also be played with the plans in order to open up for the unexpected" (Gunnarsson, 2018a, p. 676). This put to the fore the entangled relations that were co-performing the teaching and their "emergent patterings" (Haraway, 2008, p. 229). This also took place within the collaboration with me as a researcher.

> *Johanna: The discussion in itself meant that the content became quite different compared to what I usually do. When you do it yourself, the risk is that you are a bit 'home blind'. It is not that you always do the same things, but you may have a certain way of thinking about the arrangement of the teaching.*
> *Karin: Yes, we have formed and carried out the teaching unit together. So, it has been a close collaboration even though we started without knowing each other.*

Here, Johanna addressed how the collaboration created changes in both her thinking and the teaching unit. By referring to "doing it yourself" and being "home blind" she was stating that the collaboration created alternative ways of thinking and doing. In the utterance, a tension of doing the "same thing" and transforming the teaching was highlighted. Even though there is not a simple repetition of the teaching, but always moving patterns, to push boundaries collaborations are key. As Haraway (2008, p. 219) points out, "contact zones are where the action is, and current interactions change interactions to follow". Accordingly, collaboration holds the potentiality for change since "nothing is passive to the action of another" (Haraway, 2008, p. 263). This is not to romanticise or idealise collaborative engagements, but to embrace the transformative powers of encounters that involves not only collaboration of the teacher and researcher, Johanna and me, but practices with no fixed inside or outside. Consequently, collaboration and change are never general matters, but relational and requires attentiveness to the entanglements of material and discursive conditions (Barad, 2007).

When Haraway writes about training agility with her dog, Cayenne, I discern the connections to the empirical moments above that address the impact of educational collaborations. Haraway (2008, p. 223) articulates how the training implies "the coming into being of something unexpected, […] something outside the rules of function and calculation, something not ruled by the logic of the reproduction of the same". In this sense, the training is characterized by a non-linear manner. Nevertheless, training and teaching are not things done by complete chance. As Haraway (2008, p. 223) continues, it "requires calculation, method, discipline, science" not in order to control what is achieved but for "opening up what is not known to be possible, but might be, for all the intra-acting partners". This is what change and learning is all about – ambiguities of not knowing where it's leading but creating space for what might take place in the encounter.

When opening up the teaching practice to unscripted doings, such as a teaching unit that is not already in place, there are possibilities for pushing the boundaries of what the teaching can become. This is not to suggest to avoid plans or not to be prepared, but opening up for sensitivity

within the unpredictable and "permeable sensorium of connectivity" (Taylor, 2020, p. 215). Slowing down, being open to doubts and surprises might be the most productive but also a difficult way to do it. Including acknowledging the reciprocal relation where all intra-acting partners, such as teacher, researcher, students and classroom, are involved in learning. Or, as in the words of Stengers (2019, p. 16), "allowing what touches you the power to modify the way you relate" not as a detached individual but within the relationality of the classroom and its specific conditions, which becomes a question of responsibility. It is to ask which responses are made possible and which are excluded for the teacher, students and researcher within the emerging boundaries at stake (cf. Juelskjær, 2020).

Paying attention

In the planning of the teaching unit, Johanna and I sought to stress the transformative character of norms in order to challenge and not reproduce them. This was done by including aspects about the historical, discursive and material features of norms and moreover how they were produced within the specific school. The questions we raised were how to address sexism, racism, classism, ableism, homophobia, and transphobia in ways that could create change towards diversity in education and in society as a whole. These urgent and difficult questions were raised in the actual teaching in order to work with theoretical concepts to analyse schooling and society. Hence, the multi-layered character of norms was not only highlighted but also influenced the teaching. This became apparent in one moment where the discussion turned towards the school organisation and staff.

> *Johanna asked groups of five to discuss for some minutes what norms dominated at the school. After discussions in groups, Johanna gathered the class to share what had been talked about. The students said that it was to be studious, middle class norms and whiteness norms. One of the students pointed to how it looked among the school staff, that there was a prevailing whiteness norm. Johanna said that it was varied among the whole staff but that there were differences among the various professions working at the school in line with the aspect of social class and explained it using the notion of intersectionality.*

The question raised and the discussion that followed in this moment were centred around the students and the norms that enclosed their doings and identities. However, the discussion suddenly switched towards how norms were also constructed in relation to the school as a whole and not limited to the students, which was the idea that dominated the opening of the discussion. Within this moment, we were forced to consider the complexity of normative structures and implied moving boundaries and responsibilities to include the specific school and its staff, among others Johanna and I. In other words, taken-for-granted boundaries of who or what was to be assigned as learner, as well as who or what was supposed to change, became destabilised by involving the school staff and school organisation. What this moment also addressed was how we all are part to the "conditions we are also critical of" (Braidotti, 2019, p. 157). This can be recognised as a moment of change and learning involving students, teacher, researcher as well as

school organisation, curricula, and society. Within mutual doings, conditions for learning were produced affording a moment of agility with specific possibilities to respond and react (Haraway, 2008; cf. Fendler, 2013).

When I talked to a group of students in the teaching, they raised the possibility of challenging destructive norms.

> *I asked if they took part in a setting where these norms were evident. One of the students, Simon, said that he played ice hockey and there it was. It became apparent through the rough language in the locker room, Simon told us. I asked if there was anything he could do to make a more inclusive climate there. Simon answered that he would not dare to speak up against the team members, but that parents and leaders that heard it usually said something, and that it was then possible for him to go and talk to them about it.*

In this moment, I joined a discussion and asked the students to consider everyday situations and complicities in discriminatory doings. Simon answered by telling us about the violent actions in the locker room of his ice hockey team. By engaging with the students, inventions of different arenas in life were produced. This created a moment of moving boundaries of school and leisure time activities, doings and spaces. However, change and learning, as embodied and embedded enactments, are arbitrary and takes place in relation to the specific encounters of different but entangled conditions that make the knowledge content travel into sports activities and locker rooms. Various practices become entangled and interdependently enable learning as mutual co-shaping (Taylor, et.al., 2013; Plauborg, 2018).

Furthermore, the moment opened up discussions about how to be co-responsible for the violent atmosphere in a locker room. It addressed the collective accountability that "entails an ongoing responsiveness to the entanglements of self and other, here and there, now and then" (Barad, 2007, p. 394). This also implies a sense of agency in terms of the relational possibilities of acting differently emphasising how responsibility entails "paying attention the best you can" (Stengers, 2005, p. 188) to the interferences of the practices you are part of. Nevertheless, the distributed character of responsibility makes it difficult to envisage all of the implications, since they tend to travel. This means to acknowledge how there is no fixed inside or outside of a practice but only iterative reworkings of boundaries.

"Now, it is up to us"
I will now turn to moments that accentuate how transformative encounters with the knowledge content entailed questions of responsibility and distress. The students articulated that, in the teaching, there were several marks of change and that it was an "eyeopener" but that it also created queries.

> *Felicia: We had an assignment to write about privileges. I had some trouble in the beginning but then when I thought about it there were several things […] Things that I had*

not thought about came up in the teaching.
Karin: By the questions being raised?
Felicia: Yes, because it's something I don't usually think of.
Alice: It becomes so obvious when you realise. This is what is going on in society, it was an eye opener.

Here, one of the assignments in the teaching concerning the notion of privilege is described as a challenging one that created new thoughts. The students expressed how, through the teaching, things became evident – things that were "going on" all along. This shows how the notion of privilege partakes and creates learning that both changes the way to comprehend society as well as society itself. Starting out with the trouble, the student explains how the assignment and the notion of privilege made thinking occur. Privilege becomes "vibrating with potentiality" (De Freitas & Palmer, 2016, p. 1208) carrying a capability to transform and to be transformed, within the entanglements of questions, material and corporeal dimensions of learning. This highlights how learning entails that "something becomes something else" and not a radical creation of something totally new (Plauborg, 2018, p. 332). Moreover, how something that is already there changes when learning takes place and it turns into something obvious and knowable. Movements occur as students engage with the knowledge content; the questions and notions push boundaries of what is possible to know and sense.

The students described their experience of the teaching unit as a creative provocation to realise, think and see in a different manner. Although it is difficult to say exactly what kind of learning the teaching afforded, it addressed some vital questions of equality in ways that not only changed the perspectives of the students but also as worldly doings. However, the students questioned whether this knowledge could really change the society.

> *Maja: I think our mindset may have changed but then I do not know how much it will actually mean. So, we want to change society and that's good because we are the young, the future, but the norms are something that really are like stuck in society and it is extremely hard to get rid of them.*
> *Therese: Yes, now it's up to us. Now we have talked a lot about what the norms are doing and why they are problematic then we must also know how to get rid of them. We have to act differently and actually do something, but how?*

These students described how the knowledge content concerning norms and their negative effects had changed their thinking. But still, they questioned with distress whether this knowledge would have any impact on society since norms are so difficult to change. Knowledge about norms is not enough, the students state, to also know how to act differently and change them are crucial. Since they were young, part of the future, the knowledge about norms carried a responsibility to do something. In this manner, students are impelled to sense that they are part in systems of injustice

by emphasising the "we", not putting the blame on someone else (Gunnarsson, 2020; Zembylas, 2018). But at the same time, there are boundary creations producing tensions regarding how change is enacted as an individual and relational capacity of transforming society.

What becomes apparent from these utterances is that the teaching and the knowledge content produced some kind of frustration when highlighting destructive norms and privileges. The teaching made the students start to question doings within different arenas in their lives but left them with queries about how to create transformation when norms are so "extremely hard" to change with no agenda on how to carry that out. Even though the teaching produced new ways of talking, thinking and feeling, the students did not know how to act differently. However, it is difficult to say whether this moment fixated the students in guilt or afforded change and pushing of boundaries. In other words, if this engagement could create a collective capacity out of the individual experience of distress (Gunnarsson, 2020; Zembylas, 2018)? Stressing the ways that normative structures work in society was not enough. It became crucial to "collectively construct conditions that transform and empower our capacity to act ethically" (Braidotti, 2019, p. 173).

This raises questions of how teaching could traverse feelings of distress and create movement and change that unsettles norms and injustices. Moreover, how to actively work with and modify distress and frustration into a generative propel with promise and hope for the future (Braidotti, 2010a; 2019). Stressing that "now it is up to us", and connecting this statement to Braidotti's articulation of posthuman ethics addresses a distributed responsibility. By reading this "us" within the relational framework stresses how teaching and learning are enactments of "becoming-world together" (Braidotti, 2016, p. 24). It directs attention to the ways that we, as teachers, students and researchers together with knowledge content, classrooms and teaching, are mutually implicated in constructing boundaries. Then, the ethical concerns involve creating relations that intervene in and unsettle boundaries through critical and creative engagement whereas we, in spite of current times, imagine other times (Braidotti, 2016). This could imply highlighting that seeing, thinking and feeling makes an important contribution, that every tiny move involves collective transformations.

Concluding notes: no matter what

In this paper, I have explored change as inherent to collective and messy accounts of learning, including dimensions of responsibility. By encountering empirical moments as reworldings, this exploration has raised questions about how knowledge content, teacher, students, and researcher became co-shaped entangled to the teaching practice. Furthermore, this meant considering change and learning as movements of expanding boundaries that take place within the specific encounters of the teaching. What this shows is that the teaching does matter. Or, in the words of Barad (2007, p. 380), "it matters to the world how the world comes to matter". No matter what we do in our teaching, change will always take place, though working with the ambition of expanding the boundaries towards socially just responses creates risky and unpredictable doings. How, then, to tackle the ambiguities at play when encountering change in education?

Exploring teaching and learning with the posthuman framework implies a transformative account towards the not-yet-known. Here, change turned out to be something always taking place within tiny movements of boundaries cultivated within the collective conditions of the teaching. The potentiality for expanding boundaries, then, lies on how the teaching affords involvement with multiple encounters. Change happens in "webs of encounters" (Braidotti, 2010b, p. 414) that allow for a learning process that transforms concept, student and society. This makes learning a certain kind of change – it becomes an elusive matter fostered within worlding practices. Even though both change and learning have unexpected characters, there is a distributed and relational sense of being capable of navigating their emergence. In other words, there are possibilities for teachers and researchers within collective conditions to interfere with how learning takes place and what kind of changes this implies. This gives a specific responsibility of creating movements of boundaries in sustainable directions.

These accounts raise a vital but difficult question about how to arrange conditions that impel movement towards social justice and equality. Such a question is not to be resolved, but iteratively considered. It carries the ambition to continually explore the various and ambiguous effects of the educative practice in order to expand contemporary conditions. Moreover, it can be regarded as a proposition that inform us as researchers and teachers to continually learn how to "enter the open of risking something new" (Haraway, 2008, p. 243). This is nothing simple, and it requires a multitude of affirmative encounters and collaborations in our everyday doings. Then there can be openings for a teaching practice that, returning to the quotation from Braidotti (2016, p. 26) that began this paper, supports "sustainable modes of relation". The posthuman framework teaches us that sustainable modes entail creative and affirmative collaborations. A proposition to achieve such conditions is by articulating shared problems, slowing down and experimenting, as a possible but risky affair of expanding the boundaries.

Acknowledgments

References

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128

Braidotti, R. (2010a). On putting the active back into activism. *New Formations*, 68(68), 42-57. https://doi.org/10.3898/newf.68.03.2009

Braidotti, R. (2010b). Nomadism: Against methodological nationalism. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(3–4), 408–418. https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.3.408

Braidotti, R. (2016). Posthuman critical theory. In Debashish B. & M. R. Paranjape (Eds.), *Critical posthumanism and planetary futures* (pp.13-32). New Delhi: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-3637-5_2

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.

Ceder, S. (2019). *Towards a Posthuman Theory of Educational Relationality: Cutting Through Water*.

Abingdon/New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351044196

De Freitas, E. & A. Palmer. (2016). How scientific concepts come to matter in early childhood curriculum: Rethinking the concept of force. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 11(4), 1201–1222. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-014-9652-6

Fendler, R. (2013). Becoming-learner: Coordinates for mapping the space and subject of nomadic pedagogy. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(10), 786–793. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413503797

Fenwick, T. & R. Edwards. (2013). Performative ontologies. Sociomaterial approaches to researching adult education and lifelong learning. *European journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 4(1), 49-63. https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela0104

Gunnarsson, K. (2018a). Potentiality for change? Revisiting an action research project with a sociomaterial approach. *Educational Action Research*, 26(5), 666–681. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2017.1417143

Gunnarsson, K. (2020). Ambiguous engagements: exploring affective qualities within the teaching of norms and equality. *Pedagogy, culture and society*, 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2020.1793380

Gunnarsson, K. (2021). In the middle of things: encountering questions about equality in social studies education, *Gender and Education*, 33(1), 33-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2019.1583321

Haraway, D. (2008). *When species meet*. University of Minnesota press.

Juelskjær, M. (2020). Mattering pedagogy in times of precarious (un)learning. *Matter: Journal of New Materialist Research*, 1(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1344/jnmr.v1i1.30067

Lenz Taguchi, H. (2017). "This is not a photograph of a fetus": A feminist reconfiguration of the concept of posthumanism as the ultrasoundfetusimage. *Qualitative inquiry*, 23(9), 699–710. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800417732644

Mulcahy, D., Cleveland, B. & H. Aberton. (2015). Learning spaces and pedagogic change: Envisioned, enacted and experienced. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 23(4), 575-595. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2015.1055128

Plauborg, H. (2018). Towards an agential realist concept of learning. *Subjectivity*, 11(4), 322–338. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41286-018-0059-9

Stengers, I. (2005). Introductory notes on an ecology of practices. *Cultural Studies Review*, 11(1), 183-196. https://doi.org/10.5130/csr.v11i1.3459

Stengers, I. (2008). Experimenting with refrains: Subjectivity and the challenge of escaping modern dualism. *Subjectivity*, 22(1), 38–59. https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2008.6

Stengers, I. (2019). Putting problematization to the test of our present. *Theory, culture & society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419848061

Taylor, A., Blaise, M. & M. Giugni. (2013). Haraway's 'bag lady story-telling': Relocating childhood and learning within a 'post-human landscape'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(1), 48-62. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.698863

Taylor, C. (2020). Reconceptualising the Subject-Citizen of Bildung in a Posthuman World: Rethinking the Promise of Higher Education. In T. Strand (Eds.), *Rethinking Ethical-Political Education* (pp. 209-222). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49524-4_14

Young, T., & A. Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles. (2020). Posthumanist Learning: Nature as Event. In A. Cutter-Mackenzie-Knowles et al. (Eds.), *Touchstones for Deterritorializing Socioecological Learning* (pp. 27-48). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-12212-6_2

Zembylas, M. (2018). Affect, race, and white discomfort in schooling: decolonial strategies for 'pedagogies of discomfort'. *Ethics and Education*, 13(1), 86-104.https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2018.1428714