

Editorial

This collection of papers invites the reader to contemplate some uncomfortable questions about undertaking educational research. In various ways the authors insist that it is imperative that the mattering of language, the significance of researcher bodies, and the affective forces that are set in motion when we go about our scholarly pursuits must be taken seriously.

The issue begins with a paper from Riikka Hohti and Sarah Truman that focuses upon the ways in which affect and atmospheric ecologies work to situate the politics of academic language practices in time and place. They pose a series of provocations intended to activate a degree of discomfort in the reader and so open-up space for more careful approaches to the language practices that come to shape global academia. By exposing the dominance of English, and the linguistic privilege that shapes some academic subjectivities and marginalizes others, they offer a call to arms for educational researchers to think and act differently. They ask: *How can we see academic language practices as processes that are framed by an ethics of care and community? How can we acknowledge our own becoming-with and capacity as an academic through engaging with care-full language practices in the academy?* In their attempts to address these questions the authors urge that we intervene with the myriad material and bodily routines that shape contemporary academic life. They invite the reader to attune to tensions within academic atmospheres and so disrupt business as usual in academic conferencing, writing and publishing. By drawing on lively examples framed by care and humor they make visible new potentialities that can be found from a minor language. As editors of this journal, we take seriously the invitation offered by the authors to resist editing out 'awkward wording', rather we have attempted to take seriously 'what if' and 'what else' is unfolding through the practices and processes of managing an international journal such as *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*. The manuscript stresses the importance of pursuing more care-full practices in all aspects of academia, we thank the authors for agitating a pause in our editorial work to consider how we can bring their provocations to the heart of our everyday practices.

Anna Günther-Hanssen, Anna Jobér and Kristina Andersson, also engage with the mattering of language as lively, affective and affecting through a re-analysis of embodied research practice and a playful presentation of ideas. The authors stress the need to re-turn to data generated in a research project concerning science and gender in pre-school, that they hope might make some form of worldly difference. The work is framed by a diffractive methodology, which is claimed by Barad (2007:90) to be: *"a critical practice for making a difference in the world. It is a commitment*

to understanding which differences matter, how they matter and for whom. It is a critical practice of engagement, not a distance-learning practice of reflecting from afar". Like Hohti & Truman, this group of authors also push at 'what else' questions to pursue that which is not obvious. It is through following re-turns and diffraction patterns that they invite different ways to encounter gender norms, bodily becomings and narrative accounts about young children in routine playspaces. Bringing scientific concepts and gender theory together enables the authors to dwell upon repetitive bodily becomings that recognise gender as fragile, shifting and performative. They stress that responsibility lies with researchers to produce knowledge that can make a difference by making something accountable.

In the next paper, Gary Levy addresses some of the same issues raised in the previous papers albeit from a quite different onto-epistemological position. The potential of the Alexander Technique for educational research is explored by focusing upon embodied attunement, auto-ethology, psycho-physical habit, kinaesthesia and experience as experiment. Levy proposes that human experience can be conceptualized as open-ended, affective and radically experimental. He offers a series of prompts and questions that promote the 'self in process' as a way to reappraise habits of bodymind. He argues that it is by giving up something we know that we might encounter something different, unexpected and potentially useful. Like others in this issue, the author is at pains to stress the limitations of text and language to convey the feltness of embodied practices such as the Alexander Technique and post-qualitative research methodological techniques. It is Levy's contention that bringing the Alexander Technique to educational research holds potential for awakening something other than what we already know, think, sense and feel as living creatures who choose to undertake research that can make some sort of difference.

Next, we are offered a tale of grappling with performative duoethnography to expand methodological thinking as a bridge to pedagogy. The authors, Runa Hestad Jensen and Rose Martin perform their work as teacher-researcher-artists through a lively dialogue that exposes the uncertainties and challenges of pushing against dominant knowledge practices. They work with a range of feminist new materialist scholars and key exponents of duoethnography to illustrate how speculative, emergent and playful approaches to educational research – approaches that attend to generative impulses - can achieve pedagogical objectives.

Following on from the performative and pedagogical aspects of duoethnography, Elliot Kuecker's article considers citational politics in academic writing and how it matters. He attends to how decisions related to citation are fundamental to scholarly communication, with particular emphasis on qualitative research logics. Taking up the parlor metaphor offered by Burke he explores how decisions about citation implicate academics in complex rhetorical and ethical situations that impact materially on other scholars, students, and notions related to the very survival of ideas. He argues that the mattering of research is what keeps ethics at the soul of research and that it is crucial that educational researchers consider the pain that might be done to others if words, and citations are not chosen carefully enough. This echoes the demands for more

care-full scholarship and accountability that other authors in this issue have called for. The texts that academics produce matter—both as objects of care and material constructions in themselves. The paper turns to the animate capacities of text —texts are powerful and have the capacities to exert affective charges that are felt bodily. Levy's arguments were felt bodily by us as editors – like others in this issue, Levy poses difficult questions that any author, editor, translator should feel compelled to grapple with when the non-innocence of citation is taken up. For example, should we disregard everything bad people have written? Should we stop citing the abundantly-cited in order to save the almost-forgotten? Do established scholars have a responsibility to cite new scholars? How are the changes made by editors and translators to be judged? By exploring the theoretical and practical considerations for citation Kuecker concludes with an invitation to the reader to engage in a series of writing activities and to engage with writing artifacts from student author-participants to explore ways to play with citation in the classroom and research.

The issue concludes with a paper from Bosse Bergstedt that invites the reader to consider whether and how it might possible to think *with* the world in educational research. The question guiding his argument is: *How can thinking with the world generate knowledge about the becoming of phenomena?* A diffractive reading of selected texts from Niels Bohr, Karen Barad, Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, Donna Haraway, and Michel Serres aides the author in arriving at a set of provocations and possibilities that rest upon an internal principle of inner self-differentiation. Like other papers in this issue, this manuscript stresses that the researcher body is important to investigations of the becoming of phenomena with the world. Bergstedt develops the figure of the haptic sensorium as a means to visualize bodily affects and to recognize limit values to the world. The article concludes with a discussion about creating knowledge of this process as a rhizome which illustrates that thinking with the world holds possibilities to generate new knowledge and contribute to the development of educational research.

Collectively these papers provide the reader with much to think about, and through a series of invitations within the texts it is possible to consider how to become actively involved in doing educational research otherwise. The authors are intentionally provocative, and variously invite the reader to sit with the discomfort that is agitated by questioning conventional and readily recognizable approaches to various aspects of academic life, from Anglocentrism, citational politics, bodily affects to creative approaches to bridging research and pedagogy. Aligned to the aims and scope of this journal, these papers undertake important reconceptualist work that pushes debates and practices in the field of educational research in fresh directions.

Jayne Osgood
Camilla Andersen
Lotta Johansson
Ann Merete Otterstad