What "what we know" does – a posthuman review methodology

Sofie Sauzet, Department of Education, University College Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
Email: sosa@kp.dk

Abstract

This article unfolds a case, an argument and methodology for a posthuman approach for doing reviews from the vantage point of knowledge-fields where educational politics and knowledge production are entangled. As case, the article draws on a review on the topic of 'social educators in schools', following a reform of the public school in Denmark. From this review, an analytical strategy for performing 'extendings', is developed. 'Extendings' are defined as the analytical performance of co-existing, contradictory, statements concerning the same object of knowledge, within and across publications. 'Extendings' are proposed as an empirically embedded concept, as posthuman reviewing is considered performative of what particular knowledge-political fields do to their objects of knowledge. A posthuman, performative review methodology, then, is suggested to afford a *change* in knowledge-claims. The change involves a move away from representations of "what we know", towards analytical performances of what "what we know does" to educational practice.

Keywords: review, knowledge-politics, agential realism, posthumanism, methodology

Introduction

Reviews are usually described as overviews or syntheses of research publications from shared knowledge-fields, and as such, they map "what we know" about particular objects of knowledge[1] (Jackson, 1980; Rhoades, 2011; Knopff, 2013). However, reviews can be more than a tool for the mapping of existing knowledges; reviews can also explore in which ways "what we know" impacts educational practice. As such, reviews can actually be performative of issues that emerge, when "what we know" is saturated with contradictions that complexify educational practice.

In this article, I unfold a review-methodology inspired by posthuman theorizing for exploring the ways in which "what we know" impacts educational practice. I work from a review on the topic of 'social educators in schools'[2], in developing the methodology. Centrally, I suggest approaching reviews as fieldwork. I doing this, the finding and selection of publications to include for reviews, and the attendant reading and analytical strategy developed, become attuned to the knowledge-field pertinent for the topic at hand. From my review, and the complexities that define the knowledge-field of 'social educators in schools', I unfold an analytical strategy for performing the, what I have termed, 'extendings[3]', that mark my knowledge-object. I propose the concept of 'extendings' as a posthuman analytical concept, that can attune reviews to the dynamic between co-existing, but contradictory, statements in publications that are enacted as part of knowledge-fields. The concept of 'extendings' emerged in working with publications pertaining to 'social educators in schools', but it might prove useful for other posthuman reviews.

In proposing a posthuman review-methodology, the article suggests a change in the knowledge-claims that reviews can make. I argue that reviewing is usually considered a representational endeavour, focused on manifesting "what we know". However, from a posthuman perspective, reviewing turns into fieldwork, that demands the development of empirically sensitive analytical frameworks, attuned to the doings and unheeded effects of specific knowledge-fields. I frame this

---

[1] I use the concept of object of knowledge (interchangeably with knowledge-object) as concept to point at 'the thing' reviews aim at creating overviews or synthesis of knowledge about. This 'thing' can be called different things in different reviews, like: best practice, topic, thematic, phenomenon, problem, area etc. Importantly, by sticking to 'object of knowledge' I refrain from defining 'the thing' but rather insist that this might take different forms through different review practices.

[2] Social educators (or pedagogues), are professionals who work in institutions for children, youth and adults, be they daycares, pre-schools, schools, after-school facilities, special needs institutions, palliative care facilities or centres for marginalised groups. Their core primary areas of activity are development and care, connected to pedagogical work.

[3] According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, extending is to arrange the parts of (something) over a wider area, or to make greater in size, amount, or number. Applied to the analysis of reiterated statements within and across publications, I will use it to point to co-existing, but contradictory statements concerning relations between social educators and other agentic components in school in the respective publications I included for the review. For our purposes, then, extendings refers to the analytical performance of contrasting co-existing, contradictory statements on objects of knowledge. As co-existing contradictions, extendings perform simultaneous, possibly incompatible, potential ways of being recognised as appropriate. The aim of performing extendings, then, is to manifest the unheeded effects for social educators in school, as knowledge-political fields aim at shaping and informing their professional practices in co-existing, contradictory ways.

as a move from a representationalist review-methodology to a posthuman review-methodology attuned to exploring the impact of "what we know" on their objects of knowledge.

For this reason, the article might seem two-sided. On the one hand, the article develops a posthuman methodology for doing reviews, whilst on the other hand being occupied with reviewing publications, knowledge-productive of the knowledge-object of 'social educators in schools'. However, in working from a posthuman framework, I argue that it is from these very empirical entanglements that it becomes possible to develop ideas that may - or may not - be able to travel to other reviews.

The fieldwork for the article consisted of finding and analysing eighty-three publications on 'social educators in schools'.[4] These are publications that emerged in the wake of a national reform of the Danish primary and lower-secondary school in 2013. A significant point of agreement of the reform, was that it should be followed by research (dubbed 'follow-up research') into the effects of the reform on educational practice (UVM, 2018). Through this agreement, the reform marked a defining moment for the governance of education, as it valued – normatively and financially – knowledge-production about the effects of political reforms on educational practice, to be used as input for further educational policies. In this sense, the reform entangled knowledge-production and educational politics, with regards to producing knowledges that were to inform and shape educational practice. Similar movements are reported from Norway and Sweden (Khamsi et al., 2020; Pettersson et al., 2017). As such, the Danish reform is an example of a wider trend, where educational policy is based on knowledge about the effects of educational reforms. With this trend, the boundaries between scientific knowledge and educational politics become blurred. In doing my review on 'social educators in schools', I found that this 'blurring' of boundaries had turned into an entanglement between knowledge-types and forms, and this raised issues for doing a review. In this article, then, I unfold a case, an argument and a methodology for another approach to doing reviews, from the vantage point of knowledge-fields where educational politics and knowledge production are entangled. The intent is to change the possible knowledge-claims reviews can make, as a seemingly necessary response to an increasing entanglement between educational policy and knowledge-production.

The aim of this article is to construct a posthuman and performative review-methodology, based on the process of reviewing publications on the topic of 'social educators in schools'. Through this, I aim at addressing the issues for educational practice that follow from knowledge-fields, where knowledge-production and educational policy is entangled. Following, the guiding questions for the article are:

What do knowledge-fields, where knowledge production and educational policy are entangled, do

---

[4] This article is part of a larger project concerning social educators in school (for more on this: Sauzet, 2019; Sauzet, 2020a; Sauzet, 2020b).

to their objects of knowledge? And how can a review methodology of publications be constructed, so as to address what knowledge-fields do to their objects of knowledge?

Overview of article

I begin by describing the reform as background for the article. The background-section elaborates on how the reform caused an entanglement of knowledge-production and educational politics, as a result of its aim to inform and shape educational practice. Following the background section, I proceed to describe the finding and selection of publications for inclusion in my review of publications on 'social educators in school' as fieldwork. From this methods section, I go on to discuss reviews as a genre, in arguing that reviews usually afford representational knowledge-claims. Following the discussion of reviews, I unfold a posthuman analytical strategy for a review attuned to the issues pertaining to specific knowledge-fields. From this posthuman framework, I proceed to unfold my analytical strategy of reviewing 'extendings' and I delve into an analysis of an extending within the publications included for my review. The analysis concludes with a discussion of the unheeded effects of the extending for 'social educators in schools'. I conclude the article by discussing the affordances of posthuman reviews.

Background – the reform and pedagogues in school

In this section, I describe the reform of the Danish primary and lower secondary school of 2013 as background for the article, and I elaborate on how the reform entangled knowledge-production and educational politics as a result of aiming to inform and shape educational practice. While the reform instigated an array of changes, I focus on how social educators became 'institutionalised' as part of the staff in schools.

The 2013 reform of the Danish primary and lower-secondary school system has been termed a 'learning-reform', in that it focused on improving pupils' learning-processes and learning-results, through the organisation of a more varied and motivating school day (UVM, 2012, pp. 7-8). To this aim, the reform lengthened the school days where teachers worked, whilst shortening the opening hours of the leisure-time centres where social educators worked. In the years following the reform, the number of social educators hired part-time in schools more than quadrupled (STIL, 2018). This was both to sustain their employment, as they could no longer be employed full time at the leisure-time centres, and to sustain the aims of the reform (EVA, 2017b). Until then, the schools had been the domain of teachers (Broström, 2015b). Due to this, the reform has been defined as a process of institutionalising social educators in school (Kampmann, 2015).

A knowledge-political field

'Social educators in schools' has since the reform become the knowledge-object of numerous publications as both policy, practice, research and professional programmes are keen to gain insights into the effects of the institutionalisation of social educators in schools for educational practice (Sauzet, 2019).

Multiple stakeholders, including the government, but also professional unions, "KL – Local Government Denmark",[5] evaluation and research institutions, private consultancy houses, universities, as well as professional educators and private researchers, have published and procured publications on 'social educators in schools', and continue to do so. These publications include scientific articles, handbooks, course-books, pamphlets, reports and so forth. The publications differ in their entanglements to educational policy, and here I will point to the main strands.

Some publications explicitly state that they are procured to sustain specific political agendas. For instance, one of the official aims for 'follow-up research' is: *"providing knowledge about how all actors in and around the schools can work for the realisation of the aims of the reform"* (UVM, 2018, pp. 1-2). These publications are directly funded through, and meant to sustain the aims of, the reform (e.g. EVA, 2017a/b; Flarup & Ejersbo, 2016). Additional publications reporting on 'social educators in schools' are partly funded by professional unions. The union for social educators in particular is active in publishing on issues related to this area of practice (e.g. BUPL, 2017). Other publications originate from universities (e.g. Broström, 2015a) and consultancy firms (e.g. Rambøll, 2012a; Væksthus for Ledelse, 2015). Finally, some publications are authored by educators and researchers from the university colleges' (UCs') departments of research and development. Of this lot I am myself part, as I am employed in the largest UC in Denmark (University College Capital). Publications from the UCs tell the story of a different entanglement between educational policy and knowledge-production. To be brief, the reform was followed by the development of a new specialisation for the social educators' professional bachelor-programme, called 'school and leisure-time pedagogy', in 2014. In parallel, the UCs received Frascati-funding[6], from 2013. The UCs were to use this funding for research and development into practice-areas pertinent to their professional programmes. The reform, and the subsequent specialisation for social educators, was followed by most UCs investing Frascati-funds into the commencement of research-projects on 'social educators in schools' – of which my research is part.

The plethora of knowledge-publishing stakeholders within the knowledge-field of 'social educators in schools' thus speaks of a simultaneous *scientification* of educational politics and *politicisation* of educational sciences. On the one hand, the politically financed and incentivised knowledge-production is part of the *scientification* of educational politics (Maasen & Weingart, 2005; Khamsi et al., 2020). That is, the processes through which educational politics produce and use science as base for political decision-making and negotiation. On the other hand, the scientification of educational politics also seems to have pushed for a *politicisation* of not only science, but of knowledge-production in general. That is, the processes through which knowledge-producing agents within education, including researchers, consultants and educators, become oriented

---

[5] The association of local governments in Denmark, Kommunernes Landsforening (KL).
[6] As defined by the OECD: https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm.

towards the funding possibilities and changes related to educational policies and reforms. Funding-structures within academia, in general, are also claimed to sustain more politically motivated research and development (Andersen, 2017). For the subject at hand, however, it is not only researchers who publish work on the knowledge-object of 'social educators in schools', but also consultants and educators. These processes entangle educational politics and knowledge-production into producing what I will refer to as knowledge-political fields, where science, knowledge-production and educational politics are increasingly entangled, and the boundaries between them followingly become blurred.

What makes knowledge-political fields important to study, is that they aim at shaping and informing educational practice; they make claims for best practice, they develop methods for professionals, they analyse problems and suggest issues that need improvement, and so on. In this sense, they suggest, recognise, and sustain particular practices as applaudable and appropriate. And in doing so, they call upon and recognise educational professionals as competent and relevant in specific ways. To this point, exploring what knowledge-political fields do to, and expect of, their objects of knowledge is an important way to understand, and address, how educational practice is governed in complex ways.

A post-qualitative approach to reviewing

The fieldwork for this article consisted of finding and selecting publications for inclusion in my review of 'social educators in school'. In this methods section, I consider the fieldwork through a post-qualitative lens. Post-qualitative approaches draw on tenets similar to those of post-human approaches, but focus on empirical studies, which I consider a helpful perspective for thinking reviewing through.

Post-qualitative fieldwork implies considering the researcher as part of the phenomenon studied, and considering both human and nonhuman components as active agents (Bodén & Gunnarsson, 2020). In drawing on a post-qualitative framework, then, my starting point was not to find and represent a knowledge-field 'out there', but rather to explore and perform the knowledge-field, as it emerged, *while* I was exploring it (St. Pierre, 2020). In other words, I wanted to be able to explore the doings of the knowledge-field in its complex entanglements. This included recognising organisations, publications and websites, as well as representatives from organisations and individual authors as active agents, while simultaneously considering the fieldwork as co-productive of the knowledge-field studied.

Finding publications

For the process of finding publications, I met with different school system stakeholders: the professional unions for teachers and social educators, KL and 'DSE', the association for students. I wanted to know what the stakeholders' concerns and ambitions were regarding 'social educators in schools', and what publications they would recommend that I read on the subject matter. The stakeholders pointed me towards research articles, books, statistics, evaluations, and reports.

They also gave me pamphlets they had published, whilst sharing what they thought was important for social educators to do and know, for the betterment of educational practice. At the UC where I work, I was recommended publications written by colleagues who teach the professional programme for social educators. Meanwhile, I was searching for publications in online library databases, going from 2012-2017[7], using the following search terms (in Danish): 'social educator' + 'school', 'social educator' + 'pupils, 'social educator' + 'school-reform'.

None of these sources gave me the exact same results, even though some publications would overlap. Some publications were easily accessible research-publications, or course books, stored and search-able in library databases. Other publications were only accessible on websites pertaining to public institutions and private organisations, some of which were undergoing re-structuring. In those cases, I was provided a contact person, who could e-mail me the publications (these were often evaluations, statistics and reports) that were not currently accessible online, but upon which, the stakeholders built their arguments for the development of the field.

Finding publications thus combined 'dialogues' with both human and nonhuman agents, by perusing on-line resources, meeting with representatives from various stakeholders, and corridor-talks with colleagues, whilst myself being part of the knowledge-field as researcher at a UC. From this, I compiled a list of eighty-three publications, which were either registered and identified via research databases, or enacted by stakeholders, as productive of knowledge on social educators in schools.

Selecting publications

Usually, reviews differentiate between research and non-research publications, in accordance with the standards of the bibliometric research indicator. In doing this, they demarcate the boundaries of, and create, knowledge-fields through re-iterations of knowledge-hierarchies. Some review types, such as the systematic review, even hierarchises between research-publications, in applying pre-defined quality-criteria for including and excluding publications (Murphy et al., 2020; Dansk Clearinghouse, 2013). The publications that I found, however, suggested that I needed a different approach, upon which I will elaborate here.

Having collected the eighty-three publications, I proceeded to read across them, to develop criteria that would enable me to select publications to include and exclude for the review. Amongst the publications was a review by the 'Danish evaluation institute' (EVA), that I had been repeatedly encouraged to read. It concerns interprofessional collaboration amongst social educators and teachers in schools, post-reform. It states thus in its introduction:

The publications (included in this review, and) shaping the basis for demarcating the identifying

---

[7] The search starts in 2012, as some of the state-funded publications were published as procured reports prior to the reform, and effectively served as the decision-making basis for the educational policies of the reform.

signifiers, include both studies based on quantitative measurements of the significance of professional collaboration on teaching, as well as more qualitative studies, which go in depth with different approaches to collaboration and how this benefits the well-being and learning processes of pupils. We have, in this respect, chosen not to differentiate between research, evaluations, reports and course books, as there is a need to integrate all these sources and angles in order to illuminate teachers' and social educators' collaboration, in a Danish context specifically. (EVA, 2017a, p. 3)

In the above quote, the 2017 EVA review voices an intentional 'all-inclusive' strategy towards including a variety of publications for their review. The argument being that all publications should be considered 'illuminative' of the object of knowledge. In choosing not to differentiate between publications from different genres, the 'all-inclusive' review collapses traditional boundaries between research and non-research publications. This positioning of all publications as 'illuminative' upon 'social educators in schools' proved to be a repeated practice across the eighty-three publications I found for my review. Research articles would quote procured reports, while reports with advice for best practice would quote course books (e.g. Broström, 2015a; Ebsen, 2017; EVA, 2017a, 2017b; Juhl, 2018). Rather than enacting some publications as more 'illuminative' than others, the knowledge-field thus manifested itself as entangled across genres and publication types.

In being occupied with exploring what the knowledge-field did, the entanglements made through quotations across genres and publication types made me decide on a knowledge-enactment inclusion criterion. Rather than selecting publications on the basis of their type (i.e. pamphlet, article, report) or genre (i.e. research, evaluation, best-practice description), or deeming all publications 'illuminative', I proceeded to include publications that enacted themselves, or were enacted by others via quotation-practices, as productive of knowledge about 'social educators in schools'.

Reading and analysing publications – A change from representation to posthuman performativity

From compiling the list of publications, I began reading literature on how to analyse publications included for reviewing. In this section, I will suggest that reviews usually afford *representational* knowledge-claims. The publications I included, however, called for an approach attentive to the contradictions that emerged as I began reading. Following a brief discussion of reviews, I will here unfold how a performative, posthuman approach to reviewing, in turn affords a change in the possible knowledge-claims of reviews. I will conclude this section by unfolding the analytical strategy I developed for my review of 'social educators in school'.

Publications on how to conduct reviews often argue that reviews can offer accounts of where we are now with the research, identify gaps in the research, or make it possible to position oneself within a discipline (Alexander, 2020; Jackson, 1980; Rosenthal, 2001; Burton, 2011; Rhoades,

2011; Knopf, 2013). In laying out the state of the art, reviews are thus supposed to work as mirrors, as they reflect the already reflected in the publications they report on, in mapping perspectives of "what we know". This approach suggests that reviewing is a *representational* endeavour, where reviews represent synthesised or cumulative insights from publications.[8] To this point, the systematic review may be the most debated review type, as it shares important features with evidence-based practice, and is designed to be able to present cumulative data about the effects of interventions (Evans & Benefield, 2001; Hammersley, 2001).[9]

In reading the publications included for my review, I was preoccupied with exploring what the knowledge-field did to its knowledge-object of 'social educators in schools'. I initiated my reading, thinking that I would explore whether I could position authors in relation to one another, and from that, draw a more or less stable map of (perhaps conflicting) positions in the knowledge-political field. However, this proved difficult, as 'authors' of publications could be individuals, groups, singular or even multiple co-authoring organisations. Moreover, the same 'author', depending on the project on which they published, could be positioned differently across different publications. This meant that an 'author', for this knowledge-field, was not a person with a singular perspective upon the knowledge-object of 'social educators in schools'. Further, in the same publications, contradictory statements could prevail. This would often be the case for non-research publications, or publications co-authored by several organisations, that were more open to a variety of ideals and ideas, than the peer-reviewed publications appeared to be (see e.g.: EVA, 2013, 2017a, 2017b). Thus, a mapping of stable 'author' positions within the knowledge-political field proved elusive, as the map kept changing whilst I was reading.

As I was reading across the publications, what instead emerged as repeated and through this iteration began stabilising my understanding of what the knowledge-political field did, were iterated contradictory statements on the relationality between 'social educators in schools' and other agentic components[10] in schools. For instance, most publications covered issues pertaining to social educators' collaborations with teachers in schools. In some publications, the social educators were stated as responsible for enabling a focus on teaching by producing a calm and focused classroom, so that the teacher could teach (Andersen & Christensen, 2016; Rambøll, 2012b; Bjørnholt et al, 2015; EVA, 2017b). Other statements were that social educators were, and

---

[8] There are different types of reviews, including meta-reviews, narrative reviews, state-of-the-art reviews, systematic reviews, conceptual reviews, critical reviews, and summative reviews (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006; Feak & Swales, 2009). While it is beyond the scope of this article to review review-types, what I found in the literature of reviews did not help me grasp the complexities and entanglements of my field, however – which is why I kept exploring for new ways of doing reviews.

[9] The systematic review is conducted according to a protocol, whereby the articles that are included are those that check boxes concerning transparency, systematicity, clarity and reliability (Murphy, et al., 2020; Dansk Clearinghouse, 2013).

[10] Agentic components can be both human and nonhuman, and are what constitutes phenomena (Barad, 2007, pp. 308-309, 316, 344)

should be, involved with the planning and dissemination of the teaching content (EVA, 2013, 2017b; Højholdt, 2017; Flarup & Ejersbo, 2016; Rambøll, 2012a, 2012b; Bjørnholt, 2015). Furthermore, this dissonance between producing a calm teaching environment or becoming involved in the planning and teaching, could occur within the same text (see e.g.: Bjørnholt, 2015; EVA, 2017b; Rambøll, 2012a, 2012b).

Repeated contradictory statements could be found across the eighty-three publications, and even within the same publications. What emerged as stabilising the knowledge-political field then, rather than the positions of 'authors', was the iteration of contradictory statements concerning what social educators could, should and did do in schools. And whilst reading, it seemed that these contradictory statements emerged as tangible agential forces, that by way of iteration, stabilised the knowledge-political field. These findings called for another review approach. An approach that could attune my review to the analysis of issues pertaining to the particularities of the knowledge-political field. A field where contradictory statements seemed to call for, and recognise, different ways of being an appropriate and competent social educator in schools.

A posthuman review approach as a change in knowledge-claims of reviews

Rather than focusing on the agency of 'authors', I became attuned to the agency of contradictory statements. To develop this further, I turn to agential realism (Barad, 2007), which is a posthuman theory of performativity. I use agential realism as framework for developing my review-methodology, that unfolds from issues pertaining to specific knowledge-fields, and the agencies that emerge from these. In drawing on agential realism, I will here unfold how a posthuman and performative review approach affords a change in the possible knowledge-claims of reviews.

First of all, agential realism departs from a decentering of human exceptionalism, in exploring agency as distributed across the human and the nonhuman alike, whilst investigating the material-discursive boundary-making practices that enact 'human' and 'nonhumanness' (Barad, 2007, pp. 92-93). In agential realism, then, agency is proposed as an enactment of iterative changes to practice, rather than as an attribute (Barad, 2007, p. 178, p. 235). This proposition draws attention to the ways in which agency emerges and stabilises, rather than pre-determining agency. In drawing on this point, a posthuman performative review is to acknowledge and consider agencies not depending on their (human/nonhuman) form, as agencies emerge through enactments of iterative changes to practice in knowledge-fields.

Agential realism further posits that we consider our smallest units of analysis as phenomena: "A phenomenon is a specific intra-action of an 'object' and the 'measuring agencies'; the object and the measuring agencies emerge from, rather than precede, the intra-action that produces them." (Barad, 2007, p. 128)

Phenomena refers to the inseparability between our objects of knowledge, and our ways of investigating these (Barad, 2007, p. 128). The concept of intra-action, unlike the notion of inter-action which presumes a prior existence of independent entities, denotes that phenomena, and

the components of which they are made, emerge through boundary-drawing practices (Barad, 2007, pp. 139-140). The central idea to draw from this is that "the thing" that "we" research, emerges in entanglement with "the way" in which we research it. To this point, every review should be considered an entangled and situated way of performing new knowledge-fields. The tenets of agential realism thus attune reviewing to entanglements particular to the specific knowledge-fields of interest, through which both the review and the knowledge-field emerge. Inspired by this, reviewing can be considered a performative exploration, where the review emerges from the boundary-drawing practices of finding, selecting, reading and analysing publications.

Agential realism insists that we change focus from questions of representation and correspondence between descriptions and reality (e.g. does the review mirror the publications) to matters of practices, doings and actions (Barad, 2007, p. 135). In this way, a posthuman performative review is to focus on what the knowledge-field emerges as doing. In considering reviews in this way, reviewing becomes more than representational – it becomes a situated and embedded doing, where the researcher is part of the knowledge-field that emerges through the review. The knowledge-claims that become possible through this perspective, do not answer "what we know", as a representational review would have it. The knowledge-claim of a performative, posthuman review rather performs, and thus addresses, the unheeded effects, or the doings of "what we know".

Analytical strategy – a review of extendings
In drawing on the above reading of agential realism, I became attuned to the agency of iterated contradictory statements, and how they seemed to stabilise the knowledge-political field. In this section, I will unfold how this led to the development of an analytical strategy.

Upon changing my analytical orientation from the positioning of 'authors' to the doings of statements, I noticed repeated contradictory statements concerning relations between social educators and other agentic components in school. Most of the publications covered the relations between social educators and pupils/children; social educators and teachers; social educators and interprofessional collaboration; social educators and the organization of schools; and social educators and leisure-time/school pedagogy, respectively. Interestingly, statements concerning these relations, across and within publications, would differ to the point where they would contradict each other, in drawing divergent conclusions. Concurrently, the statements were infused with contradictory expectations and appreciations of the practices and competences of 'social educators in schools'; some of the statements would even differ to the extent where they would be mutually incompatible if applied to the same situation. For instance, social educators would be described both as professionals whose responsibility it is to care for children's well-being in schools, and as professionals whose responsibility is to motivate pupils in their learning-processes in schools (statements on well-being were e.g. found in: Gulløv, 2017; Kamp, 2013; Rambøll 2012b, 2013, whilst statements on learning could be found in: Rambøll, 2013, 2012b;

Knudsen, 2015). In and of themselves, the statements seemed harmless, but if applied to the same situation, the statements would call upon, appreciate, and recognise different ways of, and aims for, working with children and being an appropriate 'social educator in school'. Hence, what my knowledge-political field seemed to do was to expect, recognise and appreciate contradictory, or even mutually incompatible, practices and competences of the social educators. It was from this empirical finding that the concept of 'extendings' grew.

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, extending is to arrange the parts of (something) over a wider area, or to make greater in size, amount, or number. Applied to the analysis of reiterated statements within and across publications, I will use it to point to co-existing, but contradictory statements concerning relations between social educators and other agentic components in school in the respective publications I included for the review. For the methodology, extendings refers to the analytical performance of contrasting co-existing, contradictory statements on objects of knowledge. As co-existing contradictions, extendings perform simultaneous, possibly incompatible, potential ways of being recognised as appropriate. The aim of performing one, or several, extendings, is to manifest the unheeded effects for social educators in school, as knowledge-political fields aim at shaping and informing their professional practices in co-existing, contradictory ways.

Placed between co-existing, contradictory statements, 'social educators in schools' emerge as extended, or drawn-out, in different directions simultaneously. The doings of the knowledge-political field, considered in this way, emerged as an extending of the social educators, between contradictory, co-existing expectations on how to perform their professionalism appropriately in schools. As such, extendings perform the unheeded co-existing, contradictory, or even incompatible, ways of recognising 'appropriateness'. By performing extendings it becomes possible to address the complexities of being a 'social educator in schools' as social educators are sought shaped and informed by knowledge-political fields.[11]

The performative, posthuman review of extendings is intended to afford analytical performances of contradictions between the most extreme co-existing, contradictory, or even incompatible, re-iterated statements in and across publications. The analytical performance of extendings hereby makes it possible to explore how knowledge-political fields stabilise. From this, it becomes possible to address what a knowledge-political field, that aims to inform and shape educational practice, does to its object of knowledge – here the 'social educators in schools'.

---

[11] With a performative, posthuman review, the processes of finding, selecting, reading and analysing publications, are highlighted as empirically close, and onto-epistemological processes, that are productive of new phenomena. On this point, it may be that the concept and approach of analysing extendings does not apply to other review-processes, where the fieldwork might suggest other, more important paths to go down.

The review of extendings was conducted through the two following analytical steps:

Mapping of iterated agentic components. Reading the publications, asking: *Which central agentic components are re-iteratively performed in the publications as important for the practices of 'social educators in schools'?* In drawing on Barad's notion of agency as iterative changes to practices, this question had the intent of locating which agencies were repeatedly performed as important, and through this repetition emerged as agentic components (possibly both human and nonhuman) that stabilised the knowledge-field.

Mapping extendings between statements about 'social educators in schools' and iterated agentic components. Reading the publications, asking: *How do the 'social educators in school' emerge as extended between co-existing, contradictory, statements in the publications?* This question attempts to hightlight the unheeded effects of the extendnings, for the practices of 'social educators in schools'. In this step, I established an analytical difference between different statements concerning the iterated agentic components, and their relations to 'social educators in schools'. These differences, when placed side-by-side, would produce extendings that could render visible the unheeded effects for the social educators, effects that emerged from co-existing contradictions or incompatibilities. The differences, once manifested, enabled discussions of simultaneously different ways of applauding and recognising different aspects of social educators in schools.

Analysis of an extending

In the following, I will unfold an analysis of an extending, amongst others that I performed, with the aim of performing what the knowledge-political field does to 'social educators in schools' and addressing which unheeded issues arise from this.

In the publications on 'social educators in schools', a reiterated central agentic component which is described as central to the practices of 'social educators in schools', is that of interprofessional collaboration between social educators and teachers. Interprofessional collaboration is considered as important for how social educators' practices can unfold, when teachers and social educators work together on shared tasks in schools. The publications, however, describe interprofessional collaboration in different ways.

In some of the publications, interprofessional collaboration is described as a practice demanding a clear division of roles and responsibilities between social educators and teachers before they work together with a group of children. The statement goes that when roles and responsibilities in working with children are pre-defined and distributed clearly, it becomes fruitful to have two professionals caring for the same group of children (EVA 2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b):

In the well-functioning collaborations, the roles are clear and well defined beforehand. In most cases this happens at weekly meetings, but also at the beginning of class, where the social educator and the teacher quickly exchange information about the program for the lesson at hand.

(EVA, 2017b, p. 45).

The statement relies on an explicit concern of wanting to put to good use the competencies of social educators in school. As such, it rests on an understanding of the professions as positions from which particular competencies can be foreseen and counted upon. In drawing on this stabilising understanding of the professions, the statement is concerned with both protecting the different domains of the professional groups, and strengthening their different competencies, whilst recognising that good interprofessional practice should be based on an equal status between the professions (Ankerstjerne & Stæhr, 2018; Ankerstjerne & Hannibal, 2015a; EVA 2013, 2014, 2017a, 2017b; Fisker, Jensen & Jørgensen, 2016; Flarup & Ejersbo, 2016; Rasmussen, 2014; Væksthus for Ledelse, 2015). Historically, the publications argue, there has been an unequal power dynamic between social educators and teachers in schools, based on salary differences, different senses of ownership with regard to the activities of the school, and hierarchies in knowledge-practices. A recurrent explanation is that this is largely because teachers are trained, and legally responsible, for teaching the different subjects around which the school system is organised, whilst social educators are new to teaching, and new to the schools.

At the same time, in some of the publications it is stated that interprofessional collaboration fundamentally transcends traditional professional orientations and boundaries between teachers and social educators. In these statements, it is argued that interprofessional collaboration can unify teachers' and social educators' work into a whole:

In the interprofessional collaboration, the professional identity and competencies is transcended, and ideally a new professional identity amongst the participating professions is developed. The professions take it upon themselves to identify with a common task. (Højholdt, 2013, pp. 59)

When transcendence of professional boundaries, orientations and identities is described as a fruitful and aspirational endeavour, there is a focus on the production of synthesis, shared theories, and shared didactics between professional groups. These statements rely on a more flexible understanding of the professions, through which the pushing of boundaries of what is traditionally expected of professionals, becomes possible. Drawing on this flexible understanding, an overcoming of differences between professional groups is thus made aspirational, as professional and personal competencies are considered equally important, and as innovation is highlighted, either as an implicit or explicit aim (Ankerstjerne, 2014; Ankerstjerne & Stæhr, 2017; Albrechtsen, 2013; Andersen & Christensen, 2016; Broström, 2015a; EVA, 2017b; Fisker, Jensen & Jørgensen, 2016; Hannibal & Ankerstjerne, 2015; Hedegaard et al., 2014; Højholdt, 2013, 2016; Pryds & Heinel, 2016). The 'art of collaboration', as some of the publications call it, entails more than defining roles and responsibilities. It means coming together to plan, teach and evaluate teaching, for the benefit of all pupils in a class (Hedegaard et al., 2014). Where professional transcendence is called upon, it entails a demand for context-sensitive competencies and forms of collaboration, rather than pre-defined professional areas of competence and responsibility

(Sauzet, 2020a, 2021).

Between these two statements, concerning the relations between interprofessional collaboration and social educators, social educators are described as appropriate, applaudable, competent and relevant in schools in quite different, and seemingly contradictory ways. On the one hand, social educators are to clearly define their competencies and areas of responsibility in relation to teachers, when working with the same group of children in a class. On the other hand, social educators are to destabilise and transcend their professional competencies and areas of expertise, in favour of becoming 'more-than social educators'. The respective sides of this extending describe a different vision of the appropriate areas of responsibility for the social educators in schools. The statements thus render incompatible manifestations of professional expertise visible and applaudable, albeit in mutually exclusive ways, if applied to the same situation. Between these opposites, social educators become extended, expected to enact and inhabit their professionalism in mutually incompatible ways. Seen from this vantage-point, social educators can be excellent practitioners both in practice, and in enunciations of what they know and what they can do. However, depending on through which statements within the extending, they are expected to manifest their competencies, different aspects of their aptitudes may be highlighted or occluded, recognised, or ignored, critiqued or applauded.

Which knowledge-claims can a performative, posthuman review of extendings make?

In performing differences between reiterated statements, rather than between author-positions, the review of extendings is occupied with performing the unheeded effects of relations between contradictory statements for objects of knowledge, across publications enacted as part of a knowledge-political field. This approach affords performances of unheeded issues for social educators in schools, that follow from extendings. The knowledge-claim possible, then, is not a representative knowledge-claim that points at something 'out there'. Rather, it is a knowledge-claim that performs a knowledge-political field, that was never intended to be assembled, compared or contrasted. And it is a knowledge-claim that vitalises statements, rather than authors, as agentic. Statements that are not able to reply to, or problematise the extendings performed. In this sense, the knowledge-claim made is a performance that forges connections, enacts contradictions and possible incompatibilities, and manifest agencies, with the intent of addressing issues for social educators, to be discussed with care and caution. Issues that generate complexities and difficulties for social educators, as they practice their professionalism in schools.

From the extending above, it becomes possible to ask: which understandings of the respective professions, their professional responsibilities and collaborative expectations the educational pratices are infused with? Through which expectations and understandings are social educators' practices in schools recognised, evaluated and appreciated? Might social educators be expected both to clearly define their competencies and areas of responsibility in relation to teachers, when working with the same group of children in a class, *and* destabilise and transcend their professional competencies and areas of expertise, in favour of becoming 'more than social

educators'? Or, might it be that in working with one teacher, they are expected to perform their professionalism in one way, only to be expected to work in a different way, when working with another? And so, do we expect of social educators that they become hyper-flexible, in adjusting to different expectations? Or should we reorganise spaces of possibility around them, so that they are not extended between co-existing, contradictory, or even incompatible, ways of being recognised and applauded, as appropriate professional practitioners?

What do extendings do to our objects of knowledge?

In this article, I have unfolded a case concerning publications on social educators in schools, an argument, that reviews are performative of their object of knowledge, and a posthuman performative methodology for doing reviews, from the vantage point of knowledge-fields where educational politics and knowledge production are entangled. A performative, posthuman review allows for performances of the unheeded issues that emerges through reviewing publications, enacted as parts of knowledge-fields. In this sense, reviewing can be considered an explorative performance of what knowledge-political fields do to their objects of knowledge. Considered in this way, a posthuman, performative review performs knowledge-claims about what "what we know" does to its objects of knowledge.

In this article, I have focused on the doings particular to knowledge-political fields, as they aim at shaping and informing educational practices. From this curiosity, the analytical concept of extendings emerged through my review on social educators in schools. However, a performative, posthuman review, attuned to the doings of knowledge-political fields, might not always find extendings to be a suited approach. Reviews could also look for the multiple, rather than the different ways in which an object of knowledge emerges in relation to central agentic components. Alternatively, reviews could look for the multiple ways in which a knowledge-object has been performed over time. In this sense, the analytical concept of extendings is of an empirically embedded kind.

When examining what knowledge-political fields, that inform and shape educational practice, *do*, I have argued that there is a need to address the unheeded effects of the complexities that emerge for objects of knowledge. In being neither dilemmas nor choices, extendings perform "what 'what we know' does" as entangled with contradictory understandings of what is appropriate and applaudable for 'social educators to do in schools'. In performing extendings, then, a performative, posthuman review can change the ways in which we may address the issues that are bound up within entangled knowledge-political fields.

A posthuman, performative review methodology, then, affords a *change* in knowledge-claims. The change involves a move away from representation of "what we know", towards an analytical performance of the unheeded effects of knowledge-political entanglements for educational practice. In this way, 'neutral' knowledges are problematised and viewed in the context of their knowledge-political entanglements. Within educational research, it is undoubtedly ever-more

critical that this be addressed, in that procuring, producing, and referring to "what we know" as the offset for political decision-making on matters of educational practice. Seen from this vantage point, performative, posthuman reviews might allow us to become more attuned to the unheeded effects of the knowledge-political entanglements that shape and inform educational practice, and they might enable us to better understand how extendings, or similar empirically situated unheeded effects, simultaneously highlight and occlude, applaud and criticise, recognise and ignore aspects of the practices of our objects of knowledge.

Literature

Albrechtsen, T. R. S. (2013). *Professionelle læringsfællesskaber: Teamsamarbejde og undervisningsudvikling*. Frederikshavn: Dafolo.

Alexander, P. A. (2020). Methodological Guidance Paper: The Art and Science of Quality Systematic Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*. 90(1), 6-23. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319854352

Andersen, C. & Christensen, O. (2016). To professioner om et fælles tredje – når lærere og pædagoger samarbejder. In: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring.* (Edt.) Broström, S.(85-99). Dafolo.

Andersen, H. (2017). *Forskningsfrihed. Ideal og virkelighed*. Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Ankerstjerne, T. (2014). Didaktikken og pædagogens rolle i skolen. In: *Pædagog i skole og fritid – perspektiver på tværprofessionelt samarbejde i skolen*. (Edt.) T. Ritchie & M. Tofteng (117-135). Billesøe og Baltzer.

Ankerstjerne, T. og Hannibal, S. (2015). Samarbejdet mellem lærere og pædagoger i indskolingen. I: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring.* (Edt.) S. Broström. (67-83). Dafolo.

Ankerstjerne, T. & Stæhr, M. (2017). Faglighed i samarbejdet mellem lærere og pædagoger. In: *Grundfaglig viden om profession og samfund*. (Edt.) (Edt.) B. Dumstrei m.fl. (139-158). Akademisk Forlag.

Ankerstjerne, T. & Stæhr, M. (2018). *Grundlaget for pædagogfaglighed i fritid og skole*. Undervisningsministeriet & BUPL.

Apple (1999) What Counts as Legitimate Knowledge? The Social Production and use of Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*. 69(4), 343-346. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543069004343

Barad, K. (2003). Posthuman Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society.* 28(3), 801-831. https://doi.org/10.1086/345321

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128

Barad, K. (2010). Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance: Dis/continuities, SpaceTime Enfoldings, and Justice-to-Come. *Derrida Today.* 3(2), 240–268. https://doi.org/10.3366/drt.2010.0206

Bjørnholt, B., Boye, S., Flarup, L.H. & Lemvigh, K. (2015) *Pædagogiske medarbejderes oplevelser og erfaringer i den nye folkeskole*. KORA.

BUPL (2017). *Pædagoger i skolen: Pædagoger og pædagogfaglige ledere i børns fritid og skole*. BUPL.

Burton, J. (2011). Book reviews: Literature reviewing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.07.003

Broström, S. (2015a). Udvikling af en fælles didaktik og et fælles læringsbegreb. *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring.*(11-35) Dafolo.

Broström, S. (2015b). Samarbejdet mellem pædagoger og lærere – historisk, aktuelt og i fremtiden. In: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring*. (Edt.) S. Broström. (37-50). Dafolo.

Dansk Clearinghouse (2013). *Konceptnotat*. Aarhus University.

Davies, P. (1999). What is evidence-based education? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8527.00106

Ebsen, R.O. (2017). Lærer-pædagog-samarbejdet kan bidrage til at løfte dannelsesopgaven i skolen. In: *Professionsdannelse på tværs. Samarbejde og faglighed i og omkring den nye folkeskole.* (Edt.) Hjermitslev, H.H., Albrechtsen, T.R.S & Rasmussen, M.b. (181-202) Jurist og Økonomforbundets Forlag.

EVA (2013). *Udfordringer og behov for viden. En kortlægning af centrale aktørers perspektiver på udfordringer i folkeskolen*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

EVA (2014). *Inspiration til arbejdet med skolereformen – de første erfaringer med en længere og mere varieret skoledag*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

EVA (2016). *Understøttende undervisning. 5 spørgsmål til det fortsatte arbejde med understøttende undervisning*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

EVA (2017a). *Kendetegn ved et velfungerende samarbejde mellem lærere og pædagoger*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

EVA (2017b). *Lærere og pædagogers samarbejde om undervisningen*. Danmarks Evalueringsinstitut.

Evans, J. & P. Benefield (2001). Systematic Reviews of Educational Research: does the medical model fit? *British Educational Research Journal* 27(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920120095717

Feak & Swales (2009). *Telling a Research Story: Writing a Literature Review*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.309338

Fisker, H., Jensen, H.G. & Jørgensen, L.T. (2016). *Pædagogen i skolen – en værktøjskasse i trivsel og læring*. Akademisk Forlag.

Flarup, L.H. & Ejersbo, J. (2016). *Inddragelse af pædagoger i skoledagen. De økonomiske overvejelser og konsekvenser*. VIVE.

Gulløv, C.D. (2017). Pædagogers samarbejde med lærerne – paradokser mellem skolepraksis og skolereformen. In: *Professionsdannelse på tværs. Samarbejde og faglighed i og omkring den nye folkeskole*. (Ed.t) H.H. Hjermitslev, T.R.S. Albrechtsen & M.B. Rasmussen. (123-140). Jurist og Økonomiforbundets Forlag,

Hannibal, S.S. & Ankerstjerne, T. (2015). Samarbejde mellem lærere og pædagoger i indskolingen. In: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen: Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring*. (Edt.) Broström, S. (67-84) Dafolo.

Hammersley, M. (2001). On 'Systematic' Reviews of Research Literature. A 'Narrative' Response to Evans & Benfield. *British Educational Research Journal*. 27(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920120095726

Hedegaard, J. H., Andersen, B. B., Højholdt, A., & Morin, A. (2014). *Afdækning af forskning og viden i relation til ressourcepersoner og teamsamarbejde*. Undervisningsministeriet.

Hedegaard-Sørensen, L. (2017). Pædagogens samarbejde med lærere i skolen – pædagogens faglighed. In: *Pædagogen som myndighedsperson. En grundbog* (Edt.) K.E. Pedersen & T. Erlandsen (305-320). Samfundslitteratur.

Højholdt, A. (2013). *Tværprofessionelt samarbejde i teori og praksis.* Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Højholdt, A. (2016). Tværprofessionelt samarbejde i et læringsperspektiv – med nye udfordringer for skoleledelserne. In: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring.* (Edt.) S. Broström (131-150). Dafolo.

Højholdt, A. (2017). *Co-teaching. Samarbejde om undervisning.* Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Jackson, G, B (1980). Methods for Integrative Reviews. *Review of Educational Research*. 50(3), 438-460. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543050003438

Juhl, P. (2018). Om at gribe bolden – betingelser for pædagogisk faglighed i skolen. In: *Konflikter om børns skoleliv*. (Edt.): Højholdt, C & Kousholt, D. (198-225). Dansk Psykologisk Forlag.

Kamp, M. (2013). Pædagoger styrker børn i skolen. *Børn og unge. Forskning*, (4-7) 18.

Kampmann, N.E.S. (2015). *Kampen om professionelt arbejde i folkeskolen – en styringsanalyse af lærere og pædagogers professionaliseringsbetingelser*. Ph.d.- dissertation. Roskilde School of Governance, Institut for Samfundsvidenskab og Erhverv, Roskilde Universitet.

Knopf, J. W. (2013). Doing a Literature Review. *Political Science and Politics* 39(1), 127-132. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096506060264

Knudsen, A. (2015). Det tværprofessionelle samarbejde i indskolingen. In: *De første år i skolen – efter reformen*. (Edt.) A. Knudsen & C. Jacobsen. (187-194). Værløse: Billesøe og Baltzer.

Maasen, S., and P. Weingart, (2005). *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-making.* New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3754-6

MacLure, M. (2005). Clarity bordering on stupidity: where's the quality in systematic review?, *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(4), 393-416. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500131801

Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics: A Word and Some questions. In: *Actor Network Theory and After.* (Edt.) Law, J & Hassard, J. (74-89). Oxford: Blackwell.

Mol, A. (2002). *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822384151-007

Mol, A. (2011). One, two, three: Cutting, Counting, and Eating. *Common Knowledge* 17(1), 111-116. https://doi.org/10.1215/0961754X-2010-042

Murphy, P.K; Dowd, A.C; Lloyd, M. G; List, A. (2020). Transparency in Literature Syntheses and Editorial Review: Introducing the Methodological Guidance Paper Series. *Review of Educational Research,* 90(1), 3-5. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319901128

Pettersson, D., T. S. Prøitz, and E. Forsberg. (2017). From Role Models to Nations in Need of Advice: Norway and Sweden under the OECD's Magnifying Glass. *Journal of Education Policy,* 32(6), 721–744. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1301557

Petticrew, M. & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*. Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887

Pryds, T.B. & Heinel, T.S. (2016). Udvikling af et fælles pædagogisk fundament – erfaringer fra praksis. In: *Pædagoger og lærere i skolen. Sammen om elevernes trivsel og læring*. (Edt.) S. Broström (99-116). Dafolo.

Rambøll (2012a). *Evaluering af heldagsskoler*. Rambøll.

Rambøll (2012b). *Evaluering af forsøg med skolestart – rapport*. Ministeriet for Børn og Undervisning.

Rasmussen, G.L. (2014). Pædagogen ind i klasseværelset – professionsidentitet og det tværprofessionelle samarbejde. In: *Pædagog i skole og fritid, perspektiver på tværprofessionelt samarbejde i skolen*. (Edt). T. Ritchie & D. Tofteng (98-113). Billesøe & Baltzer.

Rhoades, E.A. (2011). Commentary: Literature Reviews. *The Volta Review.* Reviews, 111(1), 61-67. https://doi.org/10.17955/tvr.111.1.677

Rosenthal, R. and DiMatteo, M. R. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 59-82. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.59

Sauzet, S. (2019). *Pædagogers faglighed i skolen – udspændtheder i litteratur og praksis.* Samfundslitteratur.

Sauzet, S (2020a). Fleksible skoleskemaers fleksibiliseringer. *Nordiske udkast*. 2, (2019), 30-46.

Sauzet, S (2020b). Passende pædagoger i det fleksible skoleskema. *Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift*. 4.

Sauzet, S (2021, forthcoming). Interdisciplinarity in the University Colleges: An interprofessional responsibility? In: *Configurations of interdisciplinarity Across the educational System. Danish experiences in a Global Educational Space*. (Edt.) Lindvig, K., Ryberg, M., Sauzet, S & Øland, T. Routledge.

Steiner-Khamsi, G.; Karseth, B. & Baek, C. (2020). From science to politics: commissioned reports and their political translation into White Papers, *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(1), 119-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1656289

STIL (2018) Styrelsen for It og Læring, https://www.stil.dk/uvm-dk/statistik

Thingstrup, H.L. & Schmidt, L.S.K (2016). Mellem læring, leg og dannelse. De pædagogiske medarbejdere og lærernes forhandlinger om formålet med skolen. *Unge Pædagoger*, 1, 43-51.

UVM (Undervisningsministeriet) (2012). *Gør en god skole bedre – et fagligt løft af folkeskolen.* Regeringen

UVM (Undervisningsministeriet) (2018). *Notat om følgeforskningsprogrammet til folkeskolen.*

Væksthus for Ledelse (2015). *Ledelse af samarbejdet om læring og trivsel i folkeskolen – mellem lærere og pædagoger og med det omgivende samfund*. Væksthus for Ledelse

Wendt, R.E (2016). *Systematiske reviews og kvalitativ forskning Inddragelse af kvalitativ forskning i systematiske reviews på uddannelsesområdet*. Ph.d. Dissertation. Danmarks institut for Pædagogik og Uddannelse, Aarhus Universitet. https://doi.org/10.7146/tfp.v13i24.96749