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Abstract

In this study I aim to contribute to the field of feminist corpomaterial intersectional pedagogies, which I understand as a part of the broader field of feminist postconstructionist pedagogies. Against the background of feminist postconstructionism I wish to overcome binary understandings of for example discourse/materiality, theory/practice, male/female and mind/body in pedagogies. To follow this through I have analysed how affects and emotions are present in a classroom by studying the possibility of taking a starting point in the body while rethinking the anti-oppressive and norm critical pedagogical idea of the self-reflective teacher. In order to challenge the idea of the teacher as a neutral, universal and rational knowledge producer, I have in this study analysed how one can affectively and emotionally situate teacher-bodies and participant-bodies in a classroom.

The analysis was carried out on the basis of empirical material collected at a workshop on corporeality and norm critical pedagogy organised in a teacher-training program at a Swedish university. The workshop was conducted as intra-active-research and the material consists of my field diary, eight written interviews, one oral interview and my experiences from leading the workshop. I argue in this study that teacher-bodies affectively and emotionally could be situated as both following a corporeal schema, an expected plan for how a teacher-body should act and move, and also as stepping away from and disrupting this schema. Further on I argue that teacher-bodies could be situated as memory banks and as working from memory. I stress how important it is in pedagogic situations to be aware of the ways in which bodies in a room affect and are affected by each other, in other words; how bodies “do not end at the skin”. This affective and emotional situatedness shows how it is possible to overcome the idea of teachers and students as bodily neutral. I also argue that it might be important to integrate workshops on corporealities in teacher training. This could be one possible way to start to think on one’s affectively and emotionally situatedness as teacher, something I claim as required if one aspires for a feminist intersectional corpomaterial pedagogy.

Keywords: Feminist postconstructionist perspectives, feminist intersectional corpomaterialism, pedagogies, didactics, methods, classrooms, assemblages, affects, emotions, intersectional critical pedagogy, anti-oppressive education, norm critical pedagogies.
My pulse increases, I feel like crying or leaving the room or lie myself down on the floor to feel the hard cold surface of the plastic mat towards my back and close my eyes. I feel angry, uncomfortable, sad and confused at the same time and I do not know what to do. Even though the insult is not directed towards my body this time, the memories of all of the similar situations of oppression I have experienced, that are written on and through my body, are making themselves reminded. It hurts and makes me frustrated.

My body is situated in a junior high school classroom. I am in the middle of an internship period within my teacher education and at the moment I am observing, sitting in the back of the classroom while my supervisor is lecturing. It’s this specific placement of my body in the back of the class that makes me perceive the phrase above. It comes from one of the pupils, who is whispering to another pupil. And now all of those contradictory emotions are filling my body, while I at the same time want to draw a line and react, right now.

This story originates from an internship period at the teacher-training program I graduated from in February 2011. I started working with education by lecturing on men’s violence against women in high schools in 2003 and for the last five years I have had an employment as educator. This job has meant developing and following through university courses, seminars, workshops and lectures and authoring training tutorials. Throughout my educational work I have had an endeavour to find ways to work with education and pedagogies, without reproducing oppression and power structures where white, male, heterosexual, ablebodied, middle- and upper-class and western perspectives, knowledge production and bodyminds are privileged. In this endeavour the field of intersectional critical pedagogy, such as anti-oppressive education and the Swedish version, norm critical pedagogy, has inspired me. However I have experienced how there isn’t much theorization on bodies, affect and emotion in the field of intersectional critical pedagogies. I will explain these thoughts further, by first presenting two parts of the field of intersectional critical pedagogy, anti-oppressive education and norm critical pedagogy, and then outline how I see the body, affects and emotions as missing and under-theorized.

Kevin Kumashiro describes the field of anti-oppressive education as consisting of both the development of an understanding of the complexity of oppression, and also the formulating of
ways to work against this oppression (Kumashiro 2000: 25). Kumashiro’s work has been occupied mainly by the interest of outlining the field of critical pedagogies and formulating hir own strategy of anti-oppressive education. Ze emphasizes that what in classrooms in general is presented as science or teaching is in fact never neutral, but always emerging from a particular position and a particular perspective. The creation of the idea of the neutral scientific truth often reproduces power structures and is involved in processes of privileging (2002: 50-54). I see anti-oppressive educational strategies for change as very much influencing the Swedish idea of norm critical pedagogy.

Norm critical pedagogy could briefly be described as grounded in an intersectional understanding and defined as an instrument to unveil how norms interact and distribute power in pedagogical practices and how one is able to create strategies to challenge these norms (Darj & Bromseth 2010: 13). Norm critical pedagogy is influenced by poststructural and queer feminist perspectives, for example in its inspiration by scholars such as Michel Foucault and Judith Butler. Further on, norm critical pedagogy stresses among other things the importance of language, deconstruction of privileges in education and the unveiling of the idea of the teacher as “neutral”. This is done for example by examining one’s own identity as a teacher, how one’s background and experience influence the norm production in teaching. Norm critical perspectives emphasize that teachers are always in the middle of, and a part of a norm producing process (2010: 39-41). I will zoom in on this idea of the self-reflective teacher in this study, though I will have another starting point, than the one formulated in norm critical pedagogies.

With its focus on power structures, deconstruction and language, I define anti-oppressive education and norm critical pedagogy as positioned within the field of gender de/constructionist perspectives. I aim to subscribe to the critique of gender de/constructionist perspectives formulated by Nina Lykke as postconstructionism. Hir problematization of gender de/constructionism is stating that the focus on socially constructed gender has had the unintended side effect of “reproduction of a dichotomous understanding of biological sex and sociocultural gender” (Lykke 2010: 107). In relation to this Lykke refers to Donna Haraway who stresses that one risk of gender de/constructionism is that the sexed body in analysis and feminist thinking and theorising is left out and seen only as “a blank page for social inscriptions” (ibid.). Further on, this study will follow the critique raised from a sexual difference perspective, claiming that a gender de/constructionist perspective could “neglect
the bodily irreducibility of sexual difference and the specificity of the female body” (2010: 108). This does not mean that I will define the female body and the male body as essentially different. Instead I am interested in examining what could be seen as the pre-discursive facticities of bodies.

On basis of the positioning of intersectional critical pedagogy within the field of gender de/constructionism I would like to, from a feminist postconstructionist perspective, claim a gap. I claim that materiality and the body seem to be rather under-theorized in this area and it is out of this gap that I aim to draw the study that will be presented in this thesis. I will study and analyse what it could mean to have a starting point in bodies and embodiment, instead of focusing on discursive practices. I will in particular focus on what this claimed gap could be defined as, when one is zooming in on the norm critical idea of the self-reflective teacher. I have chosen to centralise the analysis on the affects (the processes of forces) that move between bodies and emotions that are emerging through and amongst bodies. I will map out how these could be understood within the frame of the self-reflective teacher and how this could lead to an affective and emotional situatedness of a teacher-body.

With the claiming of the above stated gap, I do not want to argue that educators and teachers using norm critical pedagogies are unembodied or not including materiality and bodily situatedness in their work. As Malou Juelskjaer, Thomas Moser and Theresa Schilhab emphasize in the terminating chapter of the anthology Learning bodies (2008): “Only in theory can the body be ‘dispelled’, in actual life, the body is an imperative” (Juelskjaer, Moser, Schilhab 2008: 305). On the issue of theory as corporeal in itself, Haraway argues as well: “Theory is not about matters distant from the lived body; quite the opposite. Theory is anything but disembodied” (Haraway 2003: 68). With the awareness that the body always is present I will in this study focus on what it could implicate if one is having the body as a starting point also theoretically, or, what it already implicates in the ongoing embodied theoretical practice, without making clear distinctions between what should be defined as “theory” and “practice”.
Purpose and research questions
In this study I will put focus on the above-mentioned claimed gap within intersectional critical pedagogy in general and norm critical pedagogy in particular. I claim that the absence of feminist corpomaterial perspectives and the under-theorizing of the body tend to reproduce a gap between the body and mind. Hence I will in this study examine how one can think with intersectional critical perspectives, such as norm-critical pedagogy, and at the same time maintain a sensibility to the awareness of the entanglements and inseparability of social gender and biological sex, nature and culture, discourse and materiality, body and mind, femininity and masculinity and theory and practice.

I will here clarify my purpose by dividing it into three different dimensions. According to the overall onto-epistemology of this study I see theory and practice as inseparable and the below presented levels of aims and research questions are not to be seen as either theoretical or practical, but as different dimensions of the same problematisation. Hence the purpose of this thesis is threefold:

• My first aim is to make a contribution to the field of feminist intersectional corpomaterial pedagogy framed within a feminist postconstructionist understanding, by rethinking the field of intersectional critical pedagogies.

The research question related to this is formulated as follows:

• How can one rethink the area of intersectional critical pedagogy from corpomaterial and feminist postconstructionist perspectives?

To delimit my research interest and to answer to this question I am planning to focus on one important part of the norm critical practice, which is the idea of the self-reflective teacher/educator. This idea includes the emphasis on scrutinizing and stating one’s own position within a norm producing process. I will develop this idea with insights from feminist corpomaterialist perspectives and look for strategies and possible ways to affectively and emotionally situate the teacher-body. To follow this through I will analyse how one can think of the teacher-body, not only positioned through reflections upon one’s own norm producing position, but also how one can include bodily situatedness through affect and emotion.
• My second aim is to emotionally and affectively analyse the embeddedness and situatedness of the teacher-body in teaching situations.

The research question related to this is formulated as follows:

○ *How might narratives of an affectively and emotionally situated teacher-body work as a way to rethink intersectional critical pedagogy from feminist corpomaterial perspectives?*

I see the teacher education as one relevant platform where pedagogies and didactics are formulated and tried out and where teachers are trained. Hence I have chosen to concentrate on how the above mentioned aims and questions are possible or impossible to search an answer to by experimenting with how one is able to bring reflections of the bodily situatedness of teachers in to a teacher-training program.

○ My third aim is to create feminist intersectional corpomaterial pedagogical tools to work with in teacher training.

The research question related to this is formulated as follows:

• *How might a workshop, inspired by norm critical pedagogies and corpomaterial feminist perspectives, on imagined oppressive situations in educational work be understood as a way to create an affective and emotional self-reflective consideration of teacher’s bodily situatedness?*

The workshop that I will follow through within this thesis project could be a contribution to a field of pedagogical work, which might evoke the question of a wider attempt on whether the perspectives used are possible to integrate in teacher training in a broader sense.
Previous research
In the first part of this section I will map out some of the relevant research and theories that are forming what I interpret in general as intersectional gender pedagogy, proceeding from Lykke’s broad definition:

Intersectional gender pedagogy focuses on differences, power and inequalities in the classroom, based on an intersectional understanding of gender. Seen from an intersectional gender perspective, the classroom is populated by individuals doing gender, ethnicity, racialization, class, nationality, sexuality, dis/ability, age, etc. in many different ways. An intersectional gender pedagogy asks questions regarding the consequences of these differences for learning processes in the classroom. (Lykke in Werner and Lundberg 2013: 17)

I will here explore the part of intersectional gender pedagogy, which I define as intersectional critical pedagogy, with its origin in a critical thinking tradition. I see intersectional critical pedagogy as positioned within the frame of gender de/constructionist theory, in other words, the field where I have defined the above-described gap, which will form the starting point for this study. The scholars and ideas that will be presented in this section are chosen with regards to their relevance in a Swedish context and their influence on the current debates on critical pedagogy. In the context of Swedish contemporary feminist critical pedagogies based on gender de/constructionism I see Kevin Kumashiro’s research as a key inspiration, hence I see it as important to outline some of the main thoughts in hir work. Further on I will explain basic thoughts of norm critical pedagogy that are relevant for this study. I will in particular map out my interpretation of the idea of the self-reflective educator/teacher, which is the part of the norm critical field that I will focus on. Finally I will present a cartography of the field of postconstructionist pedagogies. In this cartography both perspectives defined as emerging from a feminist tradition and perspectives only focusing on materiality and bodies in general will be presented.

Anti-oppressive education
Kumashiro has defined four strands of strategies as operating in line with the idea of working for change in an educational context: Education for the Other, Education about the Other, Education that is Critical of Privileging and Othering and Education that Changes Students and Society (Kumashiro 2002: 25, 31). Kumashiro discusses and criticises the three first strands for example for reproducing a static definition of The Other, by their argumentation on separate groups in schools for Othered and extended curriculums, where The Other should be included (2002: 37, 39-42,44). “The Other” should in this case be understood as
individuals or groups that has been constructed as deviant throughout history or in contemporary social order (2002: 32). Instead of extended, Kumashiro points out that anti-oppressive education needs disruptive knowledge including a pedagogical approach, which communicate that some stories always will be “silent” (2002: 39-42,44). This is connected to the idea that what is adopted as “truth” and “science” is produced through “citational repetition”, meaning that harmful and oppressive statements are repeated throughout time and connected to dynamic processes of power (2002:50-51). Kumashiro calls for a post structural situated view on power, where oppression is defined as operating in relation to discourse and inequality is created when one discourse is privileged on behalf of another (2002: 48-51).

The fourth strand, Education that Changes Students and Society, could be seen as emerged through the discussions and critique of the first three approaches and this is the one Kumashiro pleads for. In practice, the fourth strand could indicate posing critical questions towards teaching material on what is included/excluded and from what perspective a material is produced (Kumashiro 2002: 62). The need for embracing resistance, and take into account that change rarely come easily and seldom can be based on rationality, is also emphasized. As a teacher one needs to create space for crisis, by for example creating opportunities in class for students to reflect upon processes they are involved in and the emotions connected to this (2002: 63). We do not know what new insights will mean for students and we cannot assume that knowledge on oppression will make them want to act for change (2002: 48-49). The fourth strand of anti-oppressive education states that, since oppression is dynamic and changing, there is no single strategy of educational practice that work in every situation. Kumashiro is referring to Marshall (1992) when ze points out the most important post structural thought in relation to pedagogical approaches: “the very ways in which we think are framed not only by what is said, but also by what is not said” (2002: 68).

Based on the above described field of anti-oppressive education, and mainly the last strand of strategies, I interpret Kumashiro’s work as positioned within the framework of what I have chosen to call intersectional critical pedagogies, and more in particular with it’s emphasize on critical perspectives, social power structures and the de/constructive view on identity I also interpret this approach as belonging to a theoretical framework of gender de/constructionism. The fourth strand of anti-oppressive education is the one I see as the most influential within the Swedish notion of norm critical pedagogy, which I will elaborate on more below.
**Norm critical pedagogy**

I see norm critical pedagogies in many ways as parallel to, and included in, the fourth strand of anti-oppressive education, *Education that Changes Students and Society*. What differs in my opinion is mainly the adjustment in norm critical pedagogies to a Swedish context and school system, and maybe a slightly more practical orientation, perhaps due to the background of the group of people formulating the concept of norm critical pedagogies (several are more practice oriented than academic). Central to the formulating of the concept of norm critical pedagogies and its spreading in Sweden is, according to me, the anthology *Normkritisk pedagogik – makt lärande och strategier för förändring* [Norm critical pedagogy – power learning and strategies for change] (Bromseth & Darj 2010), an anthology that Kumashiro also has been engaged in by providing it with a foreword. Below I will summarise what I see as the main points in the anthology. I will also include some arguments from the book *Skola i normer* [School in norms] (Martinsson & Reimers 2008) which also is closely related to Kumashiro’s fourth strand and norm critical pedagogy. I will begin with a definition of the concept of norm critical pedagogy and to be able to do that I will start off with a brief elaboration of the concept “norms”.

With inspiration from Foucault, Lena Martinsson and Eva Reimers define norms as profoundly connected to power and stress that norms both limit and enable us to, for example, talk, dress, write and act in different ways. Norms create expectations and tell us how we are supposed to be, based on categories such as “male”, “gay”, “deaf” etc. Those norms are making us think that we are separate and different from each other and at the same making us understand one another. Martinsson and Reimers underline that they critique norms, but do not plead for a society without norms. Instead they see it as if they are problematizing norms, unveiling how they are connected to power and how they sometimes limit and sometimes enable us (Martinsson & Reimers 2008: 18-20). Tiina Rosenberg argues that norms are based on two principals. The first one is the dichotomous thinking in categorical divisions between “us” and “them”, entailed to this the exclusion of the deviant, Other. The second principal is the idea of assimilation, where the one who is perceived as “deviant” is supposed to adjust and conform himself in to a normative system (Rosenberg 2002: 100-102). Martinsson and Reimers see the school as a place where norms both are challenged and repeated. They understand schools as arenas with a mission to “create good and honest citizens”, an idea which is attached to the construction of nations and the fostering of national citizens. To challenge those norms one needs to ask questions about which norms that are repeated in
different situations and what our expectations are towards both teachers and pupils. This entails a critique against the crude sectioning between “pupils” and “teachers” and “children” and “adults”. Martinsson and Reimers plead for a view on the pupil as a political subject (Martinsson & Reimers 2008: 26-29). Now, I will continue with a more vast description of the concept of norm critical pedagogy.

Janne Bromseth and Renita Sörensdotter state that norm critical pedagogy has its origin partly in critical and feminist pedagogies but foremost in queer pedagogies. The queer perspective provides a critical analysis of how norms in relation to gender and sexuality are produced within a school context. To broaden the critique, many scholars have been arguing for an intersectional approach. From this argumentation was the norm critical strand formulated, which includes a structural power critique on intersectional basis (Bromseth & Sörensdotter in Lundberg & Werner 2012: 47-48). During the early 2000’s several projects with a queer pedagogical starting point were active in Sweden, resulting in for example method tutorial books and research projects. One of those projects was a study circle consisting of about ten persons with shifting backgrounds (from for example academia, NGO’s, museums, high schools and governmental institutions). This group was interested in feminist critical pedagogy and queer pedagogy and in the introduction to the anthology Normkritisk pedagogik – makt lärande och strategier för förändring (2010) the editors Frida Darj and Janne Bromseth, describe the process of the formulating of the concept of norm critical pedagogy: “To be able to describe the intersectional power critical pedagogy that developed, we in the study circle coined the concept ‘norm critical pedagogy’. The concept has functioned as a tool to show how different norms interact and produce power imbalances within different pedagogical practices, and how one can challenge these norms” [my translation] (Bromseth & Darj 2010: 12-13). This is the definition of norm critical pedagogy that I will follow in this study.

Since I see the theoretical anchoring of norm critical pedagogy as very much running in parallel with Kumashiro’s forth strand I will only briefly explain this here. In the anthology the post structural perspective with focus on discourse is emphasized and with inspiration from Butler one stresses that identities always are socially constructed and negotiated. Power is understood in accordance with Foucault, as intertwined with production of knowledge and notions of truth and reason are seen as produced within and in relation to power structures operating within a certain discourse. This entails the production of certain norms in practice
Some examples of strategies to use as starting points in a norm critical pedagogy could be to reflect upon choice of material and how one reads and discusses material with pupils/students (Björkman in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 168-171), to reflect upon which language and words one is using in the classroom such as pronouns for example (Björkman in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 174; Josephson in Bromseth and Darj 200-201; Andersson in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 271) and to scrutinize concepts that are commonly used in a norm producing process and create new norm critical alternatives (Edemo in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 89-91). The last example of strategies I will elaborate on here is the idea of the self-reflective teacher, which I will describe a little bit more in-depth below.

**The self-reflective teacher/educator**

The norm critical pedagogical idea of the self-reflective teacher or educator is grounded in an understanding of the teacher as being in a position of power in the classroom, and that a teacher is a person with specific preferences. The argumentation is based on the idea that one’s experiences always influence the teaching and that a teacher is able to be neither objective nor neutral. One can only strive to be transparent (Björkman in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 155). Reimers points out that because of the impossibility to position oneself “outside” of the norms, one is always entangled and engaged in norm (re)producing processes. Though, even if it’s impossible to “step outside of” the norms it is possible to deconstruct them, by challenging and problematizing them (Reimers in Martinsson & Reimers 2008: 131). One way to examine and reflect upon this norm producing position is to ask oneself as a teacher about the composition of one’s own identity, what background one has and what norms that are entailed to this (Bromseth in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 41; Söremsdotter in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 139-140; Bromseth & Söremsdotter in Werner & Lundberg 2013: 28).

A practical instrument to help scrutinizing and make one’s norm position visible is the “Teflon test” developed by Louise Andersson. This is a self-assessment test to make visible in what areas one is usually privileged and in what areas one more often is experiencing discrimination or abuse. The test is constructed as a grid, where one is supposed to estimate how often (“often”, “sometimes” or “rarely”) one experiences “friction” within areas such as age, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, skin-color, functionality, confession of faith, class and body size. The aim is, Andersson stresses, not to identify deviant positions at a workplace for
example, but to examine one’s “Teflon-areas” (the areas were one rarely or never experience friction) and based on that recruit for example representatives that have different experiences and that are breaking or fulfilling other norms than oneself (Andersson in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 263-265). Even though Andersson puts emphasis on how the friction-areas in this test are changeable and varying, I see the test as a rather static instrument, which is mapping the position of a person out from stable categories that are added to each other. I also interpret the test as highlighting a discursive perspective, where no focus is put on processes of matter and/or affects.

To conclude, I have described the previous research, which could also be seen as the background of this study by describing the post structural, queer feminist and de/constructivist anchoring of anti-oppressive education and norm critical pedagogies. I have also unfolded the norm critical idea of the self-reflective teacher, which I will put focus on in this study. I will continue with mapping of the pedagogical approaches emerging from a postconstructionist perspective.

**Previous research of postconstructionist pedagogies**

Several researchers, pedagogues and teachers have been trying to overcome the distinction between the body and the mind in educational work, by researching within what I would define as a field of postconstructionist pedagogies. In this section I will give an introduction to some of the relevant scholars and the research they have produced within this field, which includes research both with a presence and an absence of feminist perspectives. Some of the research presented here will in question of concepts and perspectives leak into the *Theoretical thinking technologies* following this section.

The idea of the embodied teacher has been examined and highlighted by several researchers interested in pedagogies. One example is bell hooks, who has been, based on the ideas of Paulo Freire, formulating what ze calls an engaged pedagogy (hooks 1994: 13-22). Ze is emphasizing the importance of bringing in the body in teaching, and not be afraid of being passionate and embodied as a teacher. Ze formulates hir thoughts as follows:

> Trained in the philosophical context of Western metaphysical dualism, many of us have accepted the notion that there is a split between the body and the mind. Believing this, individuals enter the classroom to teach as though only the mind is present, and not the body. To call attention to the body is to betray the legacy of repression and denial that has been handed down to us by our professorial elders, who have been usually white and
male. (1994: 192)

Hence, hooks sees the embodied teacher not only as a teacher that is acknowledging the body but at the same time a teacher that challenges the white and male idea of what a teacher “should be”.

bell hooks published *Teaching to transgress* in 1994. Another anthology that is more contemporary and that gathers a lot of research of interest for my field is *Learning bodies* (2008). The editors argue in the terminating chapter of the anthology in the same spirit as hooks:

> Traditional western philosophy’s negative view on the body has been conceived prevalent. The body has been conceived of as incarnating animate, automatic, non-conscious and therefore mechanical processes in humans. In fact the body has been conceived of as vulgar, primitive and an undesirable appendix that tarnished the purity of the spirit. (Juelskjær, Moser, Schilhab 2008: 304)

I see this quote as symbolic for the overall perspective in the anthology, which focuses on embodiment and corporeality in pedagogies and in schools. Especially relevant for this study is Nina Rossholt’s chapter *Sweethearts – the body as learning subject* (2008), where ze analyses how gendering processes could be defined as bodily interactions in a preschool context (Rossholt in Juelskjaer, Moser, Schilhab 2008: 95). Rossholt stresses the relatedness between power, bodies and how boys and girls are reproducing femininity and masculinity. Ze also, which I see as particularly interesting, emphasizes the relevance of the “room”; how spatiality also shape bodies, and how different bodies are allowed to act and exist in different ways in different rooms (2008: 95). Another contribution to this anthology is the chapter *Movement analyses and identification of learning processes* (2008) by Mia Herskind. Herskind has been studying kindergarten contexts with focus on corporeality and movement but also emotions (Herskind in Juelskjaer Moser, Schilhab 2008: 269). The aim is to provide an “understanding of knowledge and emotions as embodied and embedded in time and space in relation to concrete cases” (2008: 282). I see this as similar to my aims and research questions in this study, with the difference that I am focusing on another context and also aim to formulate concrete methods for teachers to situate their own bodies emotionally.

Hillevi Lenz-Taguchi is a researcher that has been on a similar track as some of the scholars mentioned above. Ze has been focusing on bodies and materiality in relation to gender in a preschool context and argues that a feminist pedagogy needs to take materiality into account.
Ze is inspired by, for example, Karen Barad in hir perspective on how matter matters and explicitly connects hir perspectives with an aim to overcome distinctions between theory and practice, body and mind and similar binaries. Lenz-Taguchi has been analyzing how furniture is shaping preschool children’s bodies, and how materiality is an actor in pedagogies (Lenz-Taguchi 2009: 85-86; 2010: 20-21). Another research project, which Lenz-Taguchi has been involved in, is the collectively drawn out biography of memories of subjectification as girls in a school context, presented in the article *Becoming schoolgirls: the ambivalent project of subjectification* (2001). The article shows that the schoolgirl’s “knowledge of herself as acceptable depends on both a tight disciplining of the body, and a capacity to disattend the body and its needs” (Davies, Dormer, Gannon, Laws, Rocco, Lenz-Taguchi, Mccann 2001: 181-182). One of the main benefits of Lenz-Taguchi’s research in general in relation to this study, is hir ambition to combine feminist perspectives of materiality with education and pedagogies.

Malou Juelskjær (also editor of *Learning Bodies*) and Dorthe Staunæs, whom I see as connected to the work of Lenz-Taguchi, have both contributed to the field of educational research in relation to materiality and affect in various ways. Here I will shortly describe the article, *The return of the Freudian Couch: managing affectivity through technologies of comfort* (2013), which they wrote with Helene Ratner. The authors argue that matter, in this case a couch, could be seen as shaping the leadership and the meetings between principals, families and pupils in a school context. They combine Barad’s ideas of intra-activity with Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s perspectives on affect and affectivity, and use the concept of “psy-management” to describe the affective intensities of management in schools (Juelskjær, Staunæs, Ratner 2013: 1134).

Finally I will highlight the research in educational contexts that are informed by perspectives by Deleuze and Guattari. I will point out three examples relevant for the field of interest for this study. The first example is Alecia Youngblood Jackson’s ethnographic study on how the schoolgirl Jesse can be defined based on Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of “event” and becoming, and how one through this is able to analyse how “Jesse unfolds herself through micro-particular movements with her others” (Youngblood Jackson 2010: 580). The second example of educational research as I interpret as having a similar perspective is manifested in Jessica Ringrose’s article *Beyond Discourse? Using Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis to explore affective assemblages, heterosexually striated space, and lines of flight online and at*
school (2011). I find this article as in particular relevant in its use of the idea of the schools represented in the analysis as “affective assemblages”, described as consisting of various interactions between the entities that are active in the assemblage with diverse capacities to affect (Ringrose 2011: 602). The last scholar in this cluster that I will highlight is Megan Watkins who in her contribution to the anthology, The affect theory reader (2010) strives to combine Deleuzian perspectives of affect with pedagogical theories developed by Daniel Stern, Lev Vygotsky and Donald Winnicott. Watkins focuses on how learning is affective and argues that education should be theorized in relation to its transformative abilities, where one should understand power, as something that could be corporeal and with the ability to provide agency, instead of something that should be resisted (Watkins in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 270, 280, 284).

I have now mapped out some of the scholars and studies that I define as being part of the field of feminist postconstructionist pedagogies. As mentioned above, some of this previous research will also be a part of the theoretical thinking technologies that is the foundation for the analysis of this study, while some are merely mentioned to supportively frame the field of research where this study aim to contribute. Below I will continue to map out the theoretical thinking technologies of this study.

**Theoretical thinking technologies**
Here I will elaborate on some of the theoretical ideas, perspectives, concepts and processes that are relevant for my analysis. I subscribe to Haraway’s idea on theory: “The theory is meant to orient, to provide the roughest sketch for travel […]” (Haraway 2003: 63).

Following this, I will map out a theoretical cartography that will draw lines between the important perspectives of feminist postconstructionism and feminist corpomaterialism and the relevant processes of bodies, affects, emotions and assemblages. This cartography will then be the foundation of my analysis and this is from where hopefully new and interesting analytical adventures will be followed through.

**Feminist postconstructionism and feminist corpomaterialism**
To answer to the definition of my problematisation, my aims and research questions, I will use a feminist postconstructionist perspective as a frame for the analysis of this study. Lykke
defines feminist postconstructionist perspectives as “theories of gender/sex that manage to focus on the prediscursive facticities of sexed bodies without abandoning the insights of gender de/constructionism” (Lykke 2010: 106). My aspiration is to focus on prediscursive facticities, without actually making distinctions between what should be defined as discourse and pre-discourse. Instead I will try to see matter/body/practice as never separated from discourse/mind/theory. I will see these as if not totally the same, then as always connected, intertwined and part of the same event, which I will call an assemblage (further elaboration below). The insights of gender de/constructionism that are in particular relevant for my analysis are positioned within the field called intersectional critical pedagogies. The strands that I have highlighted here are anti-oppressive education and norm-critical pedagogies. I will use the theoretical frame of feminist postconstructionism as a broad foundation, but zoom in on what has been named feminist corpomaterialist perspectives.

Feminist corpomaterialist perspectives have a joint nodal point in their emphasis on materiality in relation to bodies and corporeality (Lykke 2010: 107). One feminist researcher that stresses the importance of having the body as entrance point in feminist analysis to overcome a dualist philosophical perspective, just as I do in this study, is Elisabeth Grosz. Ze is also engaged in the idea of not abandoning important insights produced within feminist de/constructionist perspectives, and compares the relation between the socio-cultural and the material body as the relation between the writing and the writing material when one is etching. Ze means that one needs to maintain a non-deterministic perspective, and at the same time take the specificity of the material into account (2010: 111-112). My theoretical direction in this thesis will follow this, but put a slightly bit more “matter into the matter”.

So what does the “materiality” in feminist corpomaterialism mean in this study? Matter will be, based on the writings of Karen Barad, Donna Haraway and Jasbir K. Puar, seen as an actor (Barad 2003: 810, 821-825, Haraway 1994: 3) and always in relation to other actors (Puar 2012: 57). Barad understands matter as a component, which is “intra-acting” with other components (Barad 2012: 31-32). In this study I will use Lenz-Taguchi’s Barad-inspired understanding of meaning and matter as inseparable and learning and knowing as taking place in an intra-activity of power, change and matter (Lenz-Taguchi 2010: 4-8). I will add to this Juelskjær, Moser and Schilhab’s view on matter as always intertwined with bodies and corporeality as a key to “provide the necessary experiences for change and development in a lifelong learning perspective” (Juelskjær, Moser, Schilhab 2008: 7). This means that I will
have an understanding of meaning, matter and bodies as being always connected, shaping each other, sometimes merging into each other and always affecting each other. I will narrow the frame for this examination into spatio-temporal assemblages, consisting of all of these, what I chose to call, same-different components. To formulate these as “same-different” is a quest to put into language how the components are both singularities and specificities in their own particular composition but at the same time always affected by and affecting other components, merging into them and sometimes making it impossible to separate them from other components. Bodies might be affected by other bodies, with such force that it might be that one cannot see where one body ends and the other begins.

**Bodies**

The processes of bodies will be very much present in this study, since the aim is to have bodies as starting point for the analysis. In reading and thinking on bodies in relation to postconstructionist feminist perspectives, a phrase from Spinoza, rephrased by Deleuze and Guattari, tend to be repeated. The phrase deals with how one can think of bodies not in relation to what they are, but in relation to what they can do. Spinoza stressed the fact that we do not yet know what a body can do (Ahmed 2006: 130; Braidotti 2002: 47; Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 256; Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 3; Grosz 1994: 165; Probyn 2004: 23). With inspiration from Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth’s introduction to the anthology *The affect theory reader* (2010) I would like to add two aspects to this. The first one is that in order to be able to examine what a body can do, one needs to scrutinize not only the body, but also the context of the body, the processes that the body is engaged in and the forces in play (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 3). To be able to do this I will think with Rosi Braidotti’s definition of the body as a place for contradictions and define the body as follows: “the complex interplay of highly constructed social and symbolic forces: it is not an essence, let alone a biological substance, but a play of forces, a surface of intensities, pure simulacra without originals. This ‘intensive’ redefinition of the body situates it within a complex interplay of social and affective forces” (Braidotti 2002: 21). Secondly Gregg and Seigworth emphasize a view on the body not as a general figure (which could describe any body), but as specificity, where one singular body is scrutinized in relation to how it is affected and how it affects (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 3). To be able to further understand this there is a need to a more precise definition of how ”affect” and ”affects” are defined in this study, but I will first
add to this that I also aim in this study to follow Sara Ahmed’s ideas on queer phenomenology, in relation to how bodies move and act.

According to Ahmed bodies tend to take courses that are “in line”, which is based on repeated earlier actions or situations and how some paths and orientations seems to be more ready to hand (closer and more available), than others, for certain bodies (Ahmed 2006: 21). Ahmed argues that the body follows a “corporeal schema” which is based on history of similar bodies. In other words, a white body dwells into places in another way than a black body is able to do (2006: 111). Different things and orientations seem ready to hand because of for example skin-color, sexuality, gender etc.

**Affect and affects**

Since the aim of this study is to contribute to the field of postconstructionist pedagogies, I see it as useful to “step into” the flow of what has been called “the affective turn”, which I interpret as at some points intertwined with feminist postconstructionist perspectives. I agree with Juelskjær, Staunæs and Ratner who propose that the inclusion of affectivity and materiality in what they call the affective and material turn can provide an expanded perspective to the analysis developed within the so called linguistic turn (Juelskjær, Staunæs, Ratner 2013: 1135). This is what I aspire for in this study. I define the linguistic turn as including the field of post structuralist de/constructionist perspectives which I see anti-oppressive education and norm critical pedagogy as inspired by.

Various scholars have during the past years been discussing the sameness or the distinction between the concepts/processes of “emotions” and “affects” and also in particular the definition of the concept/processes of affect/affects. Gregg and Seigworth describe two main understandings of affect: “affect as the prime ‘interest’ motivator that comes to put the drive in bodily drives (Tomkins); affect as an entire, vital, and modulating field of myriad becomings across human and nonhuman (Deleuze)” (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 6). Silvan Tomkins theoretical approach has been influencing for example Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s ideas of how affect and emotion are to be seen as nearly totally interchangeable (Sedgwick 2003: 24). I see these ideas as important, but since I am in interested in bodies and matter as actors I will mainly follow Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of affect as separate from emotions.
This doesn't mean that I won’t be focused on emotions as such. I will examine emotions as parts of how bodies are affected and affect.

Brian Massumi, who translated Deleuze and Guattari’s *A thousand Plateaus* (1987) into English, has given some notes on the translation of affect/affection. Ze stresses that this concept doesn’t describe emotions, but rather the “intensity” of a body’s passage “from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an argumentation or diminution in that body’s capacity to act” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: xvi). Deleuze and Guattari explain the idea of the body connected to affect as follows: “We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body.” (1987: 256) Claire Hemmings, who is referring to Deleuze and Guattari, suggests that affect consists of “the passage from one state to another, as an intensity characterized by an increase or decrease in power” (Hemmings 2006: 552). Ze also argues that Deleuze uses the idea of cartography to describe the intensity of the movement that happens between bodily locations and dislocations (2006: 553). This is also what will be my interest, to map out the situatedness of a body in a certain spatio-temporal assemblage, in relation to how it is affected and what affects that are in motion.

To be able to be even more substantial in relation to how I wish to use the ideas of affect in this study I will use Juelskjær, Staunæs and Ratner’s perspective on affectivity. They have been researching management in schools and point out for instance that affectivity not should be seen as the opposite of rationality but just as another way of seeing and living the world. They are, while referring to Pile, stating that affect is: “a transpersonal capacity; it draws in many bodies – it resides therefore both within and between bodies, connecting bodies by flowing between them” (Juelskjær, Staunæs, Ratner 2013: 1136). Though, they suggest, that if one is to use affect as an analytical tool in relation to humans, one needs to be more concrete and preferably use assemblages as ground for the analysis. Further on “affectivity must be grasped as a somatic, neutral, subjective, historical, social, and personal matter” (2013: 1137). Because of this Juelskjær, Staunæs and Ratner establish what they define as a new approach to affectivity and materiality where they, inspired by Barad’s idea of intra-activity, suggest the use of agential cuts. They describe it as follows:
prior to the intra-action and the agential cut, words and things are indeterminate. This is in parallel to the Massumian/Deleuzian idea that affectivity has to do with the moment before (the linguistic) confiscation of affect as a particular feeling/emotion. Intra-activity suggests an agential cut, i.e. a creative incision that does not preclude, but produces the division between words and things (Barad, 2007) and we may now add: emotions/feelings. Affective flows may be present in the intra-activity and draw in bodies (human and non-human) – they reside where words and things are indeterminate, and affectivity may be studied/analyzed as intensities are transformed through the agential cuts. (2013: 1137)

In this study, agential cuts will be produced in several cases. For example there is an agential cut in relation to what is included and excluded in the analysed assemblage. The use of language, words and papers in the workshop and in the study is another example of where an agential cut is made (see also Construction of cuts).

Affects are in this study to be seen as processes of intensities and forces, and the main focus of such a process will be emotions and feelings. Affect and emotion will be separated from each other, and at the same time parts of the same processes, defined by assemblages. I will first explain emotions a bit further and then go in to describing how assemblages are to be understood in this study.

**Emotions**

My interest in emotions in this study emerged through both a quest to focus on the teacher-body in an up until now rather neglected part of pedagogical theories, but also to scrutinize what traditionally has been defined as feminine, not rational and not professional, i.e. showing feelings, “being” emotional. This take is inspired by Braidotti’s argumentation that queer theory historically has had a phobia against the feminine and that this has to be problematized. Braidotti suggests, with inspiration from Luce Irigaray, a mimetic approach towards the feminine, which will allow for a refuguration of the feminine including unconscious processes. This is formulated in opposition to Butler’s ideas of social performativity (Braidotti 2002: 29,50). Here I will only state that I in this study will highlight the connections between emotions, the feminine and mimetic repetition. A further elaboration on mimetic strategies follows below.

Adding to this Ahmed’s argumentation on how some bodies are seen as emotional bodies and how some emotions are produced as being “high” or cultivated, while some emotions are
created as “low”. Ahmed stresses, the relevant point, that “[h]ardness is not the absence of emotion, but a different emotional orientation towards others” (Ahmed 2004: 4). This correlates, I think, with a postconstructionist feminist perspective on the politics of location. It also reflects the overall onto-epistemological perspective of this study, that no knowledge production and in particular no teacher-body (which often is expected to represent knowledge, truth and rationality) is objective and neutral. In the same sense, emotions are always present and also parts of contexts and assemblages that maybe at first sight are seen as “neutral” or non-emotional. Hence, feelings and emotions will in this study, as formulated by Herskind, be seen as “present in and colour every action and relation in which we participate” (Herskind in Juelskjær, Moser, Schilhab 2008: 281). There are no assemblages not consisting of emotions or feelings and those are at the same time parts of affective processes.

Based on this, I see the need of a more precise definition of what emotions actually will mean in this study. Ahmed emphasizes that emotions are always relational and ze sees them as social and cultural practices, moving between bodies and shaping what bodies can do. The importance is not, according to Ahmed, to create an overall theoretical understanding of emotions themselves, but to examine how emotions travel between bodies and how they stick to certain bodies (Ahmed 2004: 4-9). Ahmed uses the classroom as an example of a place where teachers can arrive with a feeling that will affect the atmosphere and the bodies who are parts of the room. Ze points out that it is common that we also get affected while entering the room, when we for example get the impression that the mood of the students is “bored” or “tired” (Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 37). In the same spirit Probyn argues that “affects displayed upon my body are contagious, and my students may catch them” (Probyn 2004: 37).

Ahmed argues that feminists could be described as “affect aliens” and as killjoys, as standing in the way of happiness, when “happiness is used to justify social norms as social goods” (Ahmed 2010: 3). The feminist killjoy both gets in the way, and is perceived as being in the way, being wilful and “ruining the atmosphere” only by hir presence, only by entering a room. The wilfulness is an effect of an invisibility, where the feminist, as for example woman, woman of colour or lesbian is repeatedly overlooked and needs to raise hir voice to get attention (2010: 6-7). Ahmed argues that feminists are “affect aliens”, whom are seen as killing happy feelings in their refusal to “share an orientation toward certain things as being good because she does not find the objects that promise happiness to be quite so promising”
(Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 39). This refusal is something that can create discomfort and feelings of awkwardness, which could make the awkwardness stick to the body that is interpreted as creating it. In other words, the body creating awkwardness is seen as award itself. This happens when bodies do not “go along” in order to maintain a public comfort (ibid.). I see this as in particular relevant for this analysis, since I see the creation of those “awkward situations” as in themselves an important part of teachers’ jobs. At the same time different teacher-bodies are perceived in different ways and therefore have different conditions to get stuck to that awkwardness.

In this study I will use the concepts of emotions and feelings almost as interchangeable. Though I aim to use “emotions” when I describe a more general emotional state, and “feelings” when I describe a more specific delimited emotional reaction, such as “feelings of anger”. I see both emotions and feelings as parts of affective processes and as relational, moving in, between and into bodies, getting stuck on some bodies and moving around others.

Affects and emotions in pedagogies
One scholar who has been stressing the relevance of recognizing affect and emotion in classrooms is Elspeth Probyn. I see hir article Teaching bodies: Affects in the Classroom (2004) as in particular interesting, since it applies thinking technologies connected to affect and emotion on a classroom assemblage. Probyn formulates a critique against the crude division between Tomkins’ and Deleuze’s approaches on affect and emotion. Ze stresses that there is no win in itself to maintain a “pure” approach to either of them. The importance is to have an aware attendance to the different approaches and how they move, in order to see that they often are connected to each other (Probyn 2004: 28). This is something I would like to bear in mind in the analysis of this study.

On the whole, Probyn argues that it is hard to neglect the complexity of affective response, and that these responses always are historical. We need to have an ethical understanding of how affective processes move in the classroom, for example by paying attention to student bodies that tend to be triggered affectively. (Probyn 2004: 29-30). Probyn also highlights the materiality of the processes of affects and takes the size of the classroom as one example, how different arenas (size of a lecture or seminar) affect the teaching differently. This is also in relation to the various student bodies that inhabit this arena or classroom, the various numbers
of them and how they affect and are affected by the teacher-body (2004: 36). Edyta Just is also pointing out the uniqueness of every student-body and stresses that the, as ze calls it, “memory bank” of every embodied subject contains its own experiences and hence its own affects. An affective response depends on how the body has been affected earlier and what history, what stories that tend to “stick” to this body. The embodied subject, i.e. in this case the student-body, is also, according to Just, always in a process of metamorphoses, always changing in its composition (Just 2012: 174). This is a perspective I see as fruitful to use in the analysis of this study and it also leads us into the questions of time, space and assemblages. Below I will define my idea of assemblages, which I see as relevant for my analysis in relation to my research questions and aims and then give a brief explanation of my view on time and space in relation to bodies.

**Assemblages**

I will now present my take on assemblages based on Puar and Grosz, who are both on a general level following Deleuze and Guattari’s ideas. Then I will contextualize what assemblages might mean in a classroom, by following Probyn.

I will start off by elaborating on a definition of assemblages formulated by Grosz, according to Deleuze and Guattari. Grosz defines assemblages as “[…] provisional linkages of elements, fragments, flows, of disparate status and substance: ideas, things – human, animate and inanimate – all have the same ontological status” (Grosz 1994: 167). I see this definition as relevant since it highlights the various forms of components that assemblages consist of. Since I am also interested in a feminist intersectional perspective of assemblages, which I see as a postconstructionist figuration, I will continue this elaboration by thinking with Puar’s reasoning on how to combine and/or relate intersectionality with ideas of assemblages.

Puar argues that an intersectional analysis needs to be accompanied and problematized by assemblages in order to maintain complicities, intensities, mobility, movements and processes in the analysis (Puar 2005: 137; 2007: 215, 220). Ze points out that the most important thing while examining assemblages is not to dwell on the question of what an assemblage is, but to put the energy in to realising what an assemblage does. Referring to Haraway, Puar also stresses that bodies not should be seen as entities that terminates at the skin, but that bodies are more than that, and that we are constantly living with other bodies inside of our own. Ze
exemplifies by bringing up the fact that bacteria are always alive in our bodies. Referring to Phillips (2006) ze also shows how the use of assemblages can put focus “not on content but on relations, relations of patterns” (Puar 2012: 50, 57). Another important point in Puar’s reasoning is how the idea of assemblages can make us think more on the forces that are active, than on categories. Ze criticises the use of intersectional analysis in how it tends to create stable grids and compare the different abilities of the concepts of intersectionality and assemblage as follows: “As opposed to an intersectional model of identity, which presumes that components – race, class, gender, sexuality, nation, age, religion are separable analytics and can thus be disassembled, an assemblage is more attuned to interwoven forces that merge and dissipate time, space and body against linearity, coherency and permanency.” (Puar 2007: 212) It is those interwoven forces that I aspire to put the glim on in the following analysis.

To contextualize the notion of assemblages in a pedagogical context I will follow Probyn’s statement that when seeing the classroom as an assemblage, a lot of things fall into place. Ze emphasizes that when putting the Deleuzian idea of never knowing what a body can do into the classroom it pretty much explains every second while teaching – you never know what will work or not work in a particular situation and you can never tell beforehand (Probyn 2004: 37). Just expands the application of assemblage thinking in the classroom by highlighting how every student-body can be recognized as a “composition of singularities” that “affirms difference, shares common elements with the other elements of an assemblage, enriches or alters its unique singular assemblage” (Just 2012: 174-175). To see all bodies in an assemblage as those singular compositions make us never being able to foretell what bodies can do in a classroom-assemblage. This contention will permeate my analysis and my interpretation of the bodies and assemblages that will be seen as the starting point of the analysis.

Spacetimebodyminds
I see assemblages as connected to the idea of bodies as “memory banks” that I defined above referring to Just. Apart from the already stated, I will here add Braidotti’s thoughts on “working from memory” as a central idea for this study. To “work from memory” in teaching could implicate not forgetting for example the history of minorities in society. This could be a difficult struggle, mirrored by Braidotti in the question “How to keep alive a past that is often not recognized by official institutional culture?” (Braidotti 2011: 228) Incorporated in this
memory work is also to remember “the wound, the pain, the injustice – bearing witness to the missing people – those who never managed to gain powers of discursive representation” (2011: 232). I interpret this kind of memory work as connected to representation in teaching; to teach other stories than the history of the white western heterosexual privileged male for example, and also to highlight the always present exclusion of voices. To connect this to affect and emotion, I would like to bring in Puar’s thoughts on memory and feelings. Ze asks: “If we feel that things are calm, what must we forget in order to inhabit such a restful feeling?” (Puar 2007: xviii) In order to feel calm, are we forgetting our history of being oppressed and being oppressors? Are we forgetting all of the pain and violence that is at this very moment present in the world? I will in this study follow the idea that ”refusing to forget” is a part of an embodied, emotional and affectively situated pedagogical work.

The other part of “working from memory”, stressed by Braidotti, I see as connected to the idea of situated knowledge (further explanation below). Here ze highlights an example from Deleuze’s work, where Deleuze used a specific method of analysis of movies. Ze wrote an analysis of some movies, without re-viewing them, but from memory. This way of thinking on memory is connected to the idea of seeing time as non-linear, in opposition to a linear, rational, progressive view on time. The example of Deleuze’s analysis represents, argues Braidotti, that “the truth’ of a text is somehow never really ‘written’” (Braidotti 2011:232). To put this in the context of pedagogical work, I see it as if one in general and always as a teacher is working from memory. One usually pick up something in teaching that one has read somewhere, or remembers from one’s education or maybe one remembers a lecture that one followed through two years ago and “repeats” it, from memory.

To further connect this to affects in classroom assemblages, I will refer to Probyn, who states: “What constitutes an affective response is hugely complex, and is in part the result of an embodied history to which and with which the body reacts […]” (Probyn 2004: 29). So, to put this in a pedagogical context one could say that the affective processes that are putting emotions in speed in a classroom, depends on the history and the memory of every body included in the assemblage.
**Situated partially objective knowledge**

Here I aim to approach the idea of the self-reflective teacher, which I see as a post structural de/constructionist idea emerged through anti-oppressive education and norm critical perspectives, from a feminist postconstructionist perspective of situatedness. To define what the idea of situated knowledge means in this study I will use Lykke’s argumentation of the concept in relation to Haraway and Barad. To this I will add Braidotti’s thoughts on locations as embodied and embedded.

Lykke stresses that Feminist Studies in general often are anchored in an epistemological understanding of knowledge production as situated, or as one also might say, located. This means that we are never able to, so to speak, “stand beside” our research or the knowledge we produce. Researchers are always a part of and shaping the studies that one follows through. In a postmodern context this idea often lands in an understanding of all science as being relative, consisting only of “different stories”. To transgress these relativistic theoretical perspectives, and at the same time not fall into old traditions of following the positivistic perspective on research as being neutral and told by the master’s voice, Haraway, in dialogue with several other feminist thinkers, has developed the idea of partially objective knowledge: “[…] the researcher, through a conscious reflection of her or his situatedness and her or his research technologies, can obtain a partially objective knowledge, that is, a knowledge of the specific part of reality that she or he can ‘see’ from the position in which she or he is materially discursively located in time, space, body and historical power relations” (Lykke 2010: 5). According to Lykke, Haraway also puts emphasize on what ze calls “accountability”, which is to be understood as the moral responsibility Haraway thinks that a researcher, or, as ze says, “knower”, (in this study: teacher) has (2010: 135).

Barad has a similar approach to objectivity in research as Haraway, but uses the idea of constructions of cuts between for example the researcher and the informant in a study. Barad sees the researcher, the “informant” and the on-going ambient materialdiscursive environment as interwoven. Therefore, there is a need to “cut” in this, in order to be able to produce knowledge within an academic field. Through the cuts the different actors in the research process are defined, in a local sense (Lykke 2010: 141-142). This is also something that could be applied on pedagogies, if one tries to transgress the view on teachers and pupils/students as universal and pre-determined.
The last thinking technology I will be inspired by in relation to situated knowledge is Braidotti’s understanding of accountability in relation to one’s “embodied and embedded locations” which ze present as based on relational “memory and narratives” (Braidotti 2011: 216). This idea on situated partial objective knowledge is, beside the above-mentioned explorations on these processes by Haraway and Barad through Lykke, crucial to this study.

I aspire in my analysis to create an idea of a partially objective teacher-body, by working with the idea of situated partial objective knowledge in a classroom and examine the situatedness with a starting point in the body. I see the body as always intertwined with power relations, time, space and matter, and I see all of these factors as influencing the body and the processes within the body assemblages that consists of emotions and affects, which I have chosen to put focus on.

**Mimetic repetition as strategy**

As mentioned, I am in this study interested in focusing on affect, feelings and emotions and I define this focus as a mimetic strategy, in other words, an affirmative repetition of the feminine in order to “work through” and repossess for example the idea of emotions. As the final part of the presentation of the theoretical thinking technologies I will elaborate on the idea of mimesis and mimetic strategies.

According to Braidotti, sexual difference theory, as I see as included in the feminist postconstructionist field, aim to challenge the idea of the rational subject by picking apart the imagined idea of subjectivity as being equal to consciousness. Braidotti emphasizes the feminist view on the subject as multiple, and explains “mimesis” as a way to work towards this view in order to challenge old traditions of identification and renegotiate the substance of the female identity. Mimesis is, according to Braidotti “a sort of inner erosion of the feminine by women who are aware of their own implication with that which they attempt to deconstruct” (Braidotti 1997: 35). Femininity is not seen here as the opposite of the masculinity, but as if those are having a non-symmetric relationship. Braidotti stresses the affirmative nature of mimesis, and refers to Irigaray’s ideas on how destabilising identities requires the “sex-specific connotations” and “sex-specific strategies” if one is going to be able to repossess “the images and representations of Woman as they have been coded in language, culture, science, knowledge and discourse and consequently internalized in the heart, mind,
body and lived experience of women” (Braidotti 2002: 25-26). I see these images in language, culture etc. as including the conception of being emotional. As Ahmed argues, emotions are everywhere, and between all bodies, but not all bodies are perceived as emotional, emotions move and “stick” to certain bodies. Women have been through time associated to emotions and Ahmed connects this to ideas on evolution by Darwin who sees emotions as belonging in a past, defined as primitive (Ahmed 2004: 3-4).

Since I interpret affective processes, hence emotions, as partly being patterns of relations between bodies, bodies/affects/emotions are in this study seen as entangled to each other. Following Lykke, who is referring to Grosz, I see this outset in corporealities, with its focus on body, the feminine and irrationality (Lykke 2010: 111) (as I see emotions as often described as) as a mimetic repetition and strategy. This is anchored in Braidotti’s epistemological perspective, explained by Lykke as both a Deleuzian quest for overcoming binary understandings of for example logos and emotions/corporeality, and also an Irigiray and Freud-inspired endeavour to “work through” for example the idea of Woman and Emotion. This allows for a feminine starting point in knowledge production, while one at the same time refuses to divide the notions of femininity and masculinity, but see those as always moving, changing. The idea of “working through” illustrates this process, where one consciously, instead of unconsciously, repeats femininity and emotions (2010: 138-139). This is a perspective permeating this study in whole, where I see the explicit focus on affects and emotions, as “working through” those ideas.

Drawing on hooks ideas, I see “the professional teacher” as being perceived and recognized as a “teacher-mind”, never a “teacher-body”. hooks argues that the body is to be erased and invisible if the teacher is to be seen as a teacher. Feelings and passions should be saved for later moments and not be shown while teaching (hooks 1994: 191-193,198). I am in this study interested in what happens if one instead of erasing the body, passion and emotions work through and repossess them, as a mimetic repetition of the feminine.

I have now mapped out the cartography of theoretical thinking technologies that will lie as a foundation for this study. Before I follow through the analysis I will present the methodologies and empirical material, from which the analysis will be formulated. I will also present an ethical discussion in relation to how the study was formed and followed through.
Methodologies, methods, empirical material and ethics
I will start off this section with an onto-epistemological ethical discussion together with a mapping of the methodological cartography that frame this study. Then I will present the methodologies and methods used in this study, including a presentation and discussion of the workshop as the main material. I will round off this section with a presentation and a discussion on accountability for each method and the empirical material that were collected.

Since this study in whole is emerging from the feminist postconstructionist field, so are the methodological choices, the methods that are used to collect the empirical material and the ethical considerations entailing these. In order to challenge dichotomous separations between for example mind/body and discourse/materiality, this study is anchored in a postconstructionist understanding where ontology and epistemology are seen as inseparable. In accordance with Lykke, who is referring to Barad, I define this as an “onto-epistemology”. I will build the methodological foundation on an understanding of not only ontology and epistemology as entangled, but with the belief that this also includes methodologies and methods. Those are all a part of, and shaping each other (Lykke 2010: 140, 144-145).

Onto-epistemological ethical thinking technologies
Here I wish to present a framework of the ethical considerations of this study. I will both map out the main connections between the onto-epistemological anchoring and the ethics that lay the foundation for this study in general, and also show how this is followed through in this research process in particular.

Feminist postconstructionist methodologies and ethics
For Braidotti, inspired by Irigaray, ethics and epistemology are profoundly interconnected. I will follow the ethical methodological thinking formulated by Braidotti, who is thinking with Deleuze, paraphrased by Lykke as “an epistemological position that consciously and reflectively transgresses the borders between logos, on the one hand, and emotions, passions, desire and corporeality, on the other” (Lykke 2010: 138). In order to do this, Braidotti pleads for a scientific endeavour, not towards objectivity, but towards what Lykke defines as a “poetic truth”. This poetic truth is defined by Lykke based on Hywel D. Lewis' writings, as the new perspective that can be produced through for example art, music and literature (2010: 139, 174). It is my aim that the outcome of this study will be an affective poetic truth, where
the reader, the body in which the study is experienced, will see an “old” issue from a “new” perspective, and feel and be affected by the study in ways that evoke the experience of having a new “true” insight.

In the endeavour towards a poetic truth, I will use a various set of methodologies, methods and analytical tools. One example of this is that I will apply the combined thinking of Braidotti and Irigaray to critically work with mimetic strategies; “to ‘work through’ the relationship of traditional science and philosophy to notions such as ‘Woman’, ‘Body’ and ‘Emotions’” (Lykke 2010: 139). The ‘working through’ is referring to a Freudian psychoanalytical idea of processing one’s experiences instead of unconsciously re-living them over and over again. According to Braidotti (paraphrased by Lykke) the use of emotions in science is required both in order to overcome the exclusion of female, in this case bodily, experiences, in production of knowledge and to transgress the binary relation between female/male, body/ mind and emotion/ rationality (ibid.) One possible way to “work through” emotions, femininity and bodies in this study is that the perspective on knowledge as partial and situated is saturating the study in whole.

Both Haraway and Barad stress the importance of overcoming the postmodern idea of relativity. They argue that it is possible to create partial objective knowledge as an embodied and embedded scientific starting point, separate from the positivistic “neutral and rational” research subject (see also Theoretical thinking technologies/ Situated partially objective knowledge) (Lykke 2010:140, 135). Haraway’s methodological thinking technologies could be seen as positioned in a postconstructionist field (2010: 116). This position allows for a view on knowledge as a material practice, and as always emerging from locations, of humans and nonhumans. Haraway states: “Knowledge is embedded in project; knowledge is always for, in many senses, some things and not others, and knowers are always formed by their projects, just as they shape what they can do.” (Haraway 2004: 199-200) I see this as in particular relevant for this study, where I aim to investigate materiality and corporeality manifested through bodily emotions, and where I as a researcher am very much in various ways explicitly shaping the outcome of the study. The transparency of the formulation of this situated location is a part of the accountability one as a researcher must argue for in relation to the effects of one’s study, including a moral responsibility towards the consequences of one’s research (Lykke 2010:140, 135). I see this accountability as permeating this study in whole,
but also explicitly formulated for example by the use of agential realism and the construction of cuts outlined below.

Haraway’s ideas presented above are closely related to Barad’s thinking on how it is impossible to conduct research without the construction of cuts, between for example “researcher” (knower) and “researched” (known) (Lykke 2010: 140-141). As argued, I aim to in the analysis follow Barad’s thoughts on agential realism, where matter is seen as an actor and where material-discursive intra-actions could be defined as phenomena, which are “entanglements of spacetimemattering, not in the colloquial sense of a connection or intertwining of individual entities, but rather in the technical sense of ‘quantum entanglements’” (Barad 2012: 32). In this case these quantum entanglements could be defined as for example existing between me as researcher-body, the body’s affectivity, the other bodies of the study affecting the researcher-body and components outside of the research process affecting the outcome. All of these multiple, quantum affects are producing a messy though creative mass that requires the construction of cuts, in order to produce a study. The agential cut is according to Barad, unlike the “Cartesian cut”, a conscious construction, where one creates a distinction between a subject and an object (ibid.). Instead of taking this distinction for granted and as something that is universal and essential to a research process, one is creating a provisional temporal distinction (Lykke 2010: 151). Below I will make myself accountable for the agential cuts made in this study – at first in relation to the objects and subjects of the study, but this will also saturate the following discussion and presentation of the choices of methods.

Construction of cuts

Through the following section I will, referring to Lykke who paraphrases Haraway, outline the “sighting” of the study, i.e. the situatedness of me as a researcher (Lykke 2010:152). I will define the construction of cuts between the ones who traditionally would have been seen as the researched, the informants, the objects of the study and the researcher of this study – myself.

I see the participants of the workshop as both objects and subjects of the research process. I have chosen to define them as “participants” mainly due to two reasons. First I see them not as students or audience in the workshop but as co-constructing the workshop in itself. Without them, there would be no workshop. They are at many levels involved in, and affecting the
outcome of the workshop. But at the same time, I as the workshop leader am guiding them and in some sense also their reactions. The other reason why I chose the definition “participants” is that I see them as participating in the research process. Each one of their individual bodily presences and each one as a part of the classroom assemblage is crucial to the outcome of the study. Based on this, I think that “participants” is as close to an adequate definition that you can find, of the ones who participated in the workshop and shared their thoughts, bodily experiences and emotions in the written and oral interviews. Further on, I see the participant-bodies, in general not only as participants, even though this will be the concept I will use. I also see them as teachers. Even though not all of them were teacher-training students I think they could be seen as teacher-bodies with regard to their positions at the university and their experiences with teaching.

In relation to the research process of this study, I see myself both as an intra-active-researcher-body and a workshop-leader-body. I will explain the intra-activity of the research further below; here I will only mention that I see this as one way of mapping the researcher-body’s location in relation to Haraway’s ideas on how a researcher always shapes its project (Haraway 2004: 199-200). In this case, the shaping of the study is very explicit, by the position of the researcher-body as both researcher and workshop leader. Even though I could not control the participant-bodies in the workshop and even though I was technically on many levels in an intersectional grid-definition of power, in a “lower” position than others in the room (in relation to for example age and experience), I see it as if I was in a position of power when I inherited the “lecturer-body”. In a university context there is an expectation and a promise incorporated in the room, where one expect the one who lead the workshop to be The leader, the one who provide “new” insights and “new” knowledge. I see these expectations and promises as something that one cannot choose or ignore. One only deals with them in various ways.

It follows that the discussed intra-active-researcher- and workshop-leader-body always also are carrying other bodies, both “invisible” and “more visible” ones. Those are the body of long experience of education (I have been educating in various ways for about twelve years), the ablebodymind (who are able to walk through the room, concentrate and grasp other bodies’ speech for example), the white body, the cis-woman body, the lesbian body, the body with experience from therapy, the activist body, the middleclass body, the body with Swedish-citizenship, etc. I see all of these bodies as affecting and being affected by the
research process. I also see it as impossible to control how these bodies (or other bodies that I am not yet aware of but that are also composing this body) are making themselves exposed in the process. My strategy to deal with these different bodies is to try to keep an awareness of how they are affecting the study, but also to say that I know that it is impossible to control and predict them at all times, since they are always changing, affecting and being affected in their compositions.

In order to be able to focus on the intra-active-researcher-body and the workshop-leader-body as the most prominent in this study, but at the same time create an awareness of the various affecting and affected bodies built in these two, I have chosen to insert a work of art as a background of this publication. It consists of a picture of me, processed through a photo-application, which displaced the face a little bit, as a reminder of how the intra-active-researcher-body is affected by the research process. I have combined this with another photo of the pictures of the animals used in the workshop. I see these as representing the emotions affecting the workshop, and the material grounding of the study. I inserted colours and what I would like to call “rhizomatic patterns” in both photos. These are to be seen as symbols for the intra-activity of the study and a constant reminder of how the researcher-body is affecting and being affected by the study, by the agency of the matter and the participant-bodies.

The inserting of the photos is also a way of saying that I see it partly as a paradox to scrutinize affects (which is what I intend to do in this study), i.e. what usually comes “before words”, what are not yet formulated in language (Juelskjær, Staunæs, Ratner 2013: 1137) by actually using language. I aim to challenge the, by Braidotti, formulated binary between content and form that seems to be dominant in scientific knowledge production. In Braidotti’s case this challenging is followed through by the choice of “nomadic writing”, a writing form that is associative instead of schematic (Braidotti 2002: 8). I aspire instead to transgress these paradoxes by the use of agential cuts (Barad 2012: 32) that are made in order to provide an academic text (other alternatives could have been to throw cold water on the “reader”, hug my opponent or make a song to play on the defence of this thesis). As a construction of cuts, I choose to use language and words and a linear structure of this thesis in order to answer to the academic standards of a master thesis, though I believe that we need to find new ways of communication in academic research, or find ways to put the pre-discursive into language in a way that make us constantly aware of the corporeality of words. To insert a work of art as a background of the text and to start off the theoretical analysis with a poem, I see as one way
to experiment with this, in a strive towards a poetic truth, and a more coherent knowledge production, where content and form are affecting and merging into each other. I see this as a way to think in other directions than the logocentric ideas of order and rationality, which I see as reproduced through black letters on the usually perceived as “neutral” white paper.

In line with Ahmed’s argumentation on orientations I also hope that the inserting of the photos could make other than academic bodies orientate (Ahmed 2010: 50-53) towards the thesis and maybe just by experiencing the photos be affected. My hope in general is that this will affect the bodies that come in contact with the text and, following Braidotti, also in some ways challenge the binary ideas of readers and writers (Braidotti 2002: 9). After all, I can never know, what “the reader-bodies” will do. Hence the inserting of the photos as a background I see as an effect of the overall onto-epistemological foundation of this study.

**Methodologies and methods**

Adding to the above mapped ‘sighting’ of this study I will, in the following section, referring to Lykke who paraphrase Haraway, also provide a map of the “siting”, i.e. a presentation and discussion of the technologies (the methods) used to follow through this study (Lykke 2010:152). To be able to collect material relevant to scrutinize the above-presented research questions, I planned and followed through a workshop at a teacher-training programme at a Swedish university in March 2014. I see the workshop as the main material of this study. I will start off by presenting why I chose to use a workshop as a method to construct the material. Then I will explain how it was followed through, beginning with the preparations and how the workshop was introduced in the teacher-training programme at the university.

**The workshop as method**

In the choice of methods for this study I aim to follow Lykke’s double strategy for methods used in feminist research. The first part of the strategy is grounded in the use of various experimental radical creative methods and the other part consists of combining this creativity with “a rigorous, scholarly endeavour to seek partial objectivity and moral accountability” (Lykke 2010: 161). I see the workshop as emerged through both of these parts. It is both a creative method, built on experimenting and unfaithfulness to the traditional scientific ideas of reason and neutrality. On the other hand, the workshop is grounded in a feminist postconstructionist knowledge production, both in relation to its content but also in relation to
its composition, how it was followed through. The composition is grounded in a feminist corpomaterial view on pedagogies, where as many as possible of the components that form the assemblage of the classroom is taken into account, for example: the furniture, the bodily needs of hunger and energy in the participant-bodies and the use of the pictures of the animals to facilitate formulations of emotional bodily experiences.

On the basis of this I see various reasons to why I have chosen to use a workshop as the main material for this study. The first reason is that I, in relation to the quest in this study to analyse bodies in classrooms and situate them, see it as if the empirical material required to be created in a learning context, preferably in a classroom, where this could be scrutinized. Other alternatives could have been for example to interview students or teachers on their bodily experiences in classrooms. But since I am interested in bodily sensations and emotions that tend to be momentary, I made the assessment that the access to the descriptions would be more detailed when made in direct relation to the experience. Another alternative could have been for me to auscultate on another teacher’s class. But since I also see the workshop as a possibility to (for example by the imagined oppressive situation, that will be presented below) induce and simulate emotions and reactions, it was a better option to create a workshop of my own. Connected to this is that my own intra-active-researcher-body was to be an important part of the material (further discussion below). The final reason that I chose to create a workshop to follow through at a teacher-training programme is that this study aims to contribute to the development of pedagogies in practice, methods and didactics. Hence I see it as useful to “try out” new tools and methods in practice, which might be useful in a teacher-training program.

How the workshop was prepared
Here I will give a chronological as possible description of the research process in relation to how the empirical material was collected, and what it consists of.

In late February I talked on the phone for the first time with the head of the part of the teacher-training programme where I perhaps would be able to follow through the workshop. After the conversation I was both feeling hopeful – ze seemed really interested in the workshop – and with a feeling of censuring myself, in relation to the “bodily part” of the workshop. In my field diary I reflected on this and came to the conclusion that I was dependent on this person for my whole project and maybe that was why I kind of “played
down” some parts (mainly the ones on corporealties) in the conversation. The experience of leaving the body out came back when I started to formulate the questions I planned to pose to the participants. With help from my supervisor, I detected how I kept trying to keep the body, emotion and affect away from my project even though this was what I was supposed to focus on.

Eventually I was approved to follow through the workshop and a date was set. I made a workshop-presentation that was published on the students’ university web-portal. At several moments in this process I was feeling worried and nervous. I was asking myself what would happen if no one attended, if the teacher’s found my presentation too theoretical etc. Since the workshop was voluntary the students needed to make a notification. The date was unfortunately too close to an exam deadline and not enough students showed interest. In collaboration with the head of the program and the teacher that was mentoring this specific class, we set a new date and seven students applied.

**The workshop plan**

Here I will briefly present how I planned the workshop to be followed through. How it was actually followed through will be presented in the analysis. A more detailed description of the workshop is to be found in Appendix 1.

The workshop, which was divided into three parts, had a starting point in the question: *What can an embodied norm critical pedagogy implicate in teacher’s work?* The first part of the workshop was the introduction where I introduced the master thesis project and myself. We also followed through an introduction exercise where we used pictures of animals to describe our “feelings of the day” and introduce ourselves to each other. The second part proceeded from the question: *What are intersectionality and norm critical pedagogies?* Those two concepts were described and the participants reflected upon their own norm-position in the terminating exercise before the break.

The third part meant to answer the question: *How is it possible to have a bodily awareness in norm critical teacher work?* This part was focused on bodies and emotions and explained how one can see what those do in a classroom. We did an exercise where the participants imagined being teachers in oppressive situations in a school context, and then reflected upon their
feelings in relation to the oppressive situation. They used pictures of animals to facilitate talking on how they felt. This part of the workshop also included the two written interviews.

**Choice of workshop content**
I will not reflect upon all of the components of the workshop, but concentrate on two parts, which I see as relevant to discuss in relation to the overall onto-epistemological perspective of this study. First I will discuss the choice of using oppressive situations in the exercise in the second part of the workshop. Then I will make a reflection on the use of pictures of animals, both in the introduction exercise and in the exercise in the end.

The aim of the exercise containing the oppressive situations is not to “find a solution” to the situations, but to examine the emotional reactions and situatedness connected to being a teacher and starting to formulate a corporeal awareness of educational work. I do not believe that it is necessary to merely think with feminist intersectional postconstructionist perspectives in pedagogies and education when problematic situations occur. On the contrary I think that these ideas need to permeate every aspect of an educational work. The reason I have chosen problematic oppressive situations to work with in this workshop, is that I find it likely to believe that thinking about these situations will facilitate for the participants to bodily situate themselves faster and more effectively than if there were examples of more vague situations. I also believe that these situations are situations that the students will find themselves in and that it is necessary to prepare and find ways to handle them, without reproducing the same structures that are creating them. Acknowledging one’s emotional reactions could be a part of this.

The choice of the pictures of animals as a tool in the workshop could be seen as problematic in various ways, in relation to the onto-epistemological view of this study on how humans and nonhumans are to be seen as part of the same messy reality, and that one should put attention to the agency of all bodies. Turning to Braidotti, “‘we’ are in this together” (Braidotti 2011: 222). I am aware that the use of the photos of the animals is an anthropomorphic process, an assigning of human emotions and feelings to our, referring to Haraway, companion species (Haraway 2004: 301-302). The pictures are used as projection screen of human feelings. I want to emphasize here that I do not believe that animals exist in order to serve humans. I do not believe in retention and eating companion species, and I do not see such violations as being in line with the thinking technologies that are building this study. But in this case it was
not the animals themselves that were used in the workshop, but pictures of animals downloaded from the Internet, and (as far as I know) no animals were harmed in this process.

But why did I use the pictures? One reason that I chose the pictures of animals as a tool for the workshop is that I see it as a mimetic repetition. I see it as if animals, and especially photos and pictures of animals, such as posters of cute cats, or gif:s or photos on social media, often in a Western context as connected to femininity and softness. To bring those pictures into a workshop at the university could be a way to challenge a hegemonic masculine discourse of “neutrality”. Another reason why I chose the animals is that I have used them before with good outcome. I have an experience of how they in an easy way brightens the mood in a classroom, and how participants who do not know each other before, suddenly laugh and talk to each other without obstacles. Finally I also want to state that I do not see the pictures as objects and merely as tools in the workshop, I also see them as matter with agency. Which was very clear in the workshop, where the pictures facilitated the formulation of emotions, and affected the participant-bodies in various ways.

In order to emphasize the agency of the pictures of the animals I have inserted a photo of some of them as a background of this text, symbolising how they are shaping the outcome of the study, and now also affecting the perception of the text and the reader.

The empirical material
Here I will present the material that was collected through the workshop. The empirical material consists of four parts: intra-active research participation, field diary, one oral interview and eight written interviews, each divided into two parts. In the presentation of each component of the material I will argue for the use of that specific method.

Intra-active research participation
The first part of the material consists of the intra-active research participation that I followed through before, during and after the workshop. The intra-activity consists of my participation in the workshop, but also how I, as the leader and creator of the workshop, was able to outline it and impact the outcome of it. My body was a body that was active, consciously affecting the other bodies.
That is to say the intra-active research participation consists of the affects and emotions that were put to speed by my lecturer/leader/researcher-body in the workshop and the experiences and memories that wrote themselves in and on my body in the workshop assemblage. This is also the reason that I chose this as one of the methodologies to collect material. I believe that in order to do research in general, and to analyse corporeality, bodies and embodiment in particular, it is crucial to start with your own embodiment as researcher, to see your entanglement and involvement in the research process. Here I was bodily engaged and “in” the study, creating the empirical material together with the participant-bodies, the room, the furniture, the PowerPoint, the whiteboard, the photos of the animals etc.

In this case it was also an important part of the research process to scrutinize my own emotional states while “being” the workshop-leader-body. Since most emotions and feelings (or the naming of experiences as emotional) are usually seen as “low” and not correct in a university context, I think the use of my own body/ies in this case gained access to material that I would not get access to otherwise, while putting my own body in the middle of the affective processes of emotions in a classroom assemblage.

**Field diary**

The field diary consists of my own written experiences of the research process, my bodily and emotional states and reflections on how my on-going life (relations, work, spatial conditions etc.) impacts the research process and also how the research process saturates every part of my life. The document is stored in my computer and is about six pages long. The most intensive writing was made in close relation to the workshop, the days before and the days after. In the analysis I will refer to the field diary as (F.d. [date]).

The reason I chose to use field diary as one component of the empirical material was that I earlier in life had experienced how emotional states tend to change when time pass. To “catch” my feelings and my bodily sensations when they were still consciously experienced in my body was one important part of preventing to repress unpleasant feelings in retrospect. I also see the field diary as an important tool for discovering the multiple and never static processes of a research project, and how it is impossible to be “strictly” and only a researcher. One is always many bodies, flowing in and out of each other, and those are also pushing each other in different directions, away and closer to certain thoughts and analysis.
Eight written interviews in two parts each
Written interviews were followed through twice during the end of workshop. In the beginning of the workshop I told the participants that I would use the written interviews in my master project and said that they would be anonymous. I would only mention that the workshop was followed through at a teacher-training program at a Swedish university.

The first interview treated the exercise on the imagined oppressive situations (see Appendix 2). The other one treated the workshop in whole (see Appendix 3). I told the participants that it was voluntary to hand in their answers and just before they handed them in I asked them to look through them again, making sure that they wanted to share them with me, to be a part of my study. I told them not to write their names on their answers. The interviews were written on different papers. This resulted in eight written interviews, each divided into two parts. I did not know (besides from the cases where the handwriting was striking) which answers came from the same person. I wrote the interviews in the computer and named them according to a system where the answers to interview one were numbered 1:A-1:H. and the answers to the second interview were numbered 2:A-2:H, hence in the analysis I will refer to the written interviews as (W.i. [the first or second one]:[which of the ones A-H I am referring to][if it is a quote, which quote in Swedish it represents]). The quotes in Swedish are to be found in Appendix 5.

The reasons I chose to do written interviews during the workshop are several. Since emotions and feelings, in a Swedish context, often are seen as private, maybe shameful, I thought that anonymous written interviews could be one way to get access to that kind of reflections. I also see it as important that the participants have the opportunity to reflect upon their bodily experiences of the workshop, while still being “in” the workshop when the emotional responses and affects may be still present and active. Finally I thought that it would be a good idea to implement interviews during the workshop since it would not require more engagement from the participants, outside of this already voluntary activity.

One oral interview
I called for participants to take part in oral interviews first in the presentation at the web-portal, then before and after the workshop. One participant showed interest in participating in an oral interview. The interview was followed through on Skype a couple of days after the workshop, the 24th of March. It was a semi-structured interview, where I had prepared some
questions (See Appendix 4), but where the conversation also developed through the participant’s answers. I informed the interviewee that all questions were voluntary to answer and that ze had the opportunity to call off the interview at any time. The interview took about twenty-four minutes and I recorded it on my iPhone. Afterwards I transcribed the interview and emailed it to the participant. Ze had the opportunity to protest against single formulations and quotes and also to say that I wasn’t allowed to use the material at all. Ze approved to the transcription in whole. In the analysis I will refer to the oral interview as (O.i.: [if it is a quote, which quote in Swedish it represents]). The quotes in Swedish are to be found in Appendix 6.

From the beginning I had a plan of doing several interviews, but since only one participant was interested in participating I followed through with only one. The reason I wanted to use oral interviews was to follow up the written ones. The questions were similar, but I had the ability to dig deeper and ask supplementary questions. Based on this, I see it as if I in the oral interview got access to material that was impossible to get in the shorter, written interviews.

Analysis
In this section I will analyse the parts of the material that I find relevant in relation to my research questions and aims. I will start off by doing a so-called “thick description” of the workshop. What a researcher is faced with in field work is according to Clifford Geertz: “a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit, and which he [sic!] must contrive somehow first to grasp and then to render” (Geertz 1973: 10). A thick description is according to Geertz, who is inspired by Gilbert Ryle, in contradiction to a “thin description”, which is superficial and one-dimensional, an ethnographic description including interpretations of multiplicities. It brings in and analyses what sometimes could be perceived as details, with a starting point in a perspective, which acknowledge the researcher as always constructing the material (1973: 5-11).

The thick description in this study will include a story of the workshop and a thematic analysis. On background of the portrait of the workshop I will divide the overall material including the intra-active research, the field diary the oral and the written interviews into
themes. Finally I will approach the material from a theoretical analytical perspective, connecting to the overall aims and research questions of this study.

The story about the workshop
I will now describe the workshop, mainly based on the intra-active research and my field diary, but I will also bring in material form the written interviews and the one oral interview. I will of course be informed by the theoretical thinking technologies that I aim to think with in this study, but I will not explicitly bring them in at this point but mainly focus on the material itself. I will even tough I in this study in general see time as non linear try to present the workshop in a linear form, this so that I can make a fair description for my readers to follow. I see this, when thinking with Barad’s ideas on agential cuts (Barad 2012: 32), as a way to make a conscious decision in order to facilitate for the readers.

I will start off by a short description of some of the preparations of the workshop and the day the workshop took place, then I will describe the workshop itself and finally I am going to briefly describe what happened after the workshop

Before the workshop
I did two “workshop-rehersals” before the actual workshop. The first one took place at my apartment and I had invited two friends, whom were also my peers at the teacher education. We tried out the final exercise of the workshop with the oppressive situations. I was nervous while following this through, and described it in the field diary as feeling “naked” without the classroom-context, though the outcome was really good (F.d. 2014-03-12). I realised during the practice that not having the opportunity to act in the oppressive situations could entail a very depressing feeling. So after this practice and in dialogue with my supervisor, who stressed the importance of processes instead of static endings, I added a part where I gave the participants the ability to act.

The second time I tried out the workshop I did it in whole, with my partner and one of my best friends. This was the day before the workshop-day, and I described it in my field diary like “I felt SO unprepared” (F.d. 2014-03-21). Even though the second practice entailed feelings of frustration and disappointment with myself I think it was really helpful to do the
workshop in whole, as “real” as it could get, with audience that was taking part in the exercises.

The day the workshop was about to take place, and the day before the workshop my nervousness increased. On my way to the workshop I wrote: “Yesterday I had a fight with my partner just because I was so nervous about today.” (2014-03-21) The tense feelings were permeating my whole being so to speak, all of me and the ones coming in contact with me. I tried to control the feelings of worry in several ways: “I have done my rituals. I have noticed that I have those. Depending on the size of a lecture or seminar, the rituals seems to be more or less extensive. […] So yesterday I picked out shoes, shirt and pants to wear today. I did something I rarely do. I ironed. A part of the ritual.” (F.d. 2014-03-21) In the end of the field diary note I wrote on my way to the university I tried to imagine myself as brave, though it was hard:

I have besides my bag with the computer and books and the bag with my shoes brought fruit and candy. And I feel a little bit stupid about that too. What if no one comes? Then I will be standing there, prepared and silly as someone having a birthday-party where no one shows up. Sad, so sad. Ok, well, I throw myself out there and then we will see where I land. Skydiving. (F.d. 2014-03-21)

I see the bringing of fruit and candy as a feminist corpomaterial didactical approach, where I brought in the bodily needs of food and energy while processing sometimes demanding ways to think.

The workshop
So, then I went “skydiving”. I came early to the classroom where the workshop was about to take place. I looked at the students that were sitting outside and tried to figure out if they were supposed to participate or if they were just sitting there for other reasons. Finally came the one who was supposed to meet up with me, the head of the part of the teacher’s programme where this class was belonging. We introduced ourselves and then we realised that we had problems getting into the classroom. Ze went for help and after some time a person finally let us in to the classroom. By that time the other person employed by the university who would attend the workshop arrived. We did some small talk and I said “hi” to the students who were sitting outside identified as being teacher-training students. The university employee went with me into the classroom and we started to refurnish. I wanted the chairs in a “half-moon” and the benches on the sides or at the back of the class. I see the refurnishing as a part of a corpomaterial feminist pedagogy. With inspiration from Juelskjaer, Staunæs and Ratner
(2013) and Ahmed I figured that the furniture also shape what bodies can do: “Furniture too is an orientation device, a way of directing life by deciding what we do with what an were, in the very gesture toward comfort […]” (Ahmed 2006: 168). In this case I wanted furniture that affected bodies towards dialogue and reflection.

There was a connection missing between my computer and the projector that was supposed to show my power point presentation, the head of the program was trying to fix it. I was sweating. This was not how I had planned the whole thing. We were already running late. Though it wasn’t all set the students started to enter the classroom. The university caretaker was going in and out of the room looking for a specific electrical cord. With shaky hands I served up the fruit and the candy I had brought, telling the students that we were just going to wait a little bit more. Now we were about ten minutes late and I felt as if everything was getting out of control. There were six students, the head of the program and the other university-employee present. I decided to start even though my power point was not ready yet. I described the beginning of the workshop in my field diary as follows:

So, then we started with the introduction exercise with the animals. I was still a little bit nervous but since I knew this exercise and had used it several times before, I felt a little bit more “at home” while we started with it. The participants seemed to have no problems with going along with the pictures of the animals. Then they talked to each other about their feelings of the day and introduced themselves to one another. It started to feel a little bit more fun to me. We did a round where everyone said their name and something about their picture. I memorised their names. By writing them on their bodies. A technique I have developed during the last couple of years. I love the feeling of knowing the students names. It makes me feel comfortable and like a pro, like the teacher I would like to be.

(F.d. 2014-03-21)

After this introduction I started to use the now working power point presentation. I explained the context of the workshop as a part of my master thesis project. I then introduced by reading the case I also use in the introduction of this study. The case describes me sitting in the back of the class when one pupil is calling another pupil “fucking whore”. I connected this to gender and my own position. It was relevant not only by the connection between body/power/emotion/affect/classrooms etc. but also in relation to that the students participating in the workshop were about to start an internship period within their programme and the text described an experience I had as an intern.

We continued with an association exercise, with the aim of starting to think about issues related to intersectionality. I projected the word MAKT (POWER in Swedish) on the power point and told the participants to talk to each other in pairs and reflect upon the first
associations they got while seeing the word, without considering if it their associations were “right” or “wrong”. I described this in the field diary: “It went really well I think and the participants started to talk between themselves and then I wrote on the white board. I felt confident. I had done this before, maybe 20-30 times. I [...] felt as if I was in control.” (F.d. 2014-03-21) I continued with a short lecture:

Then I started to explain intersectionality. I felt as if this went really well too. Since I had done that as well several times before I had the words “in me”. It felt as if it was running through me like water and I even felt confident enough to make a little joke here and there. Then we came to the part with norm critical pedagogies. (F.d. 2014-03-21)

Before the break I did the exercise with the students where they were supposed to reflect upon their own position in a norm context and think about what kind of norms they are fulfilling or breaking in different situations. I described this exercise in the filed diary as follows:

We ended the first session with the writing exercise, which I also felt kind of confident with, since I tried it several times. Though, since it in my exercising yesterday went kind of bad (my experiment-participants did not get it at all), I felt a little bit more worried now than I had felt before while doing it. After they had written they talked in pairs and then they had a dialogue on whether they thought it was difficult or easy to do the exercise. (F.d. 2014-03-21)

After this, we had a break; the participants ate fruit and candy and made toilet-visits. I looked through my notes and the next part of the workshop. The second part treated the issue of the body and what a focus on emotions and affect in a classroom could imply.

I remember feeling more nervous about this part, since I had not done it before. I have the experience from before that I usually do a lecture best after about five times, even better after about ten. Then I know how I should formulate myself. I have read the students’ feedback and heard usual questions enough times to adjust my lecture to it. Now I only had one call. One hour to make it right. We started to associate on the word “KÄNSLOR” (FEELINGS). It was quiet. Damnit. I got scared. What if it wouldn't work? I think I unconsciously was staring at them, so by habit, since I know it can work, from other experiences, I said again, talk to each other on what you think when you see this word. Then I turned to the right and looked in another direction [...] Liberating enough they slowly started to talk. Phew. (F.d. 2014-03-21)

The memories I have from the “lecture-part” of the second section of the workshop are kind of fragmented. I think this is due to the fact that it was the first time I did it. I also got a difficult question from one of the participants during this part of the lecture, which made me a little bit confused. The question came from a person in the group that I interpreted as older and more experienced than myself and I see this as influencing the feelings entailing the question; confusion, shame and that I felt stupid. I wrote in the reflections I noted during the workshop: “It was difficult to answer the question that was posed. I started to doubt my
competence and my whole project.” And later on: “Who am I in all of this? Who am I to come here and say things, my god. Excuse me, what the hell am I doing?”

I do remember the last exercise. I handed out the papers with the oppressive situations to each participant and I asked them to close their eyes or look at nothing in particular. I guided them through their situations, and when I did I think I felt a little bit calmer, finally. The participants reflected upon this moment in the workshop in the written interviews. Some of their thoughts were formulated as follows: “It felt as if I was really good at imagining my case in my head.” (W.i. 1:F:1) “I prepared to get angry, because I knew what was about to happen and when I saw the case I understood how I would react.” (W.i. 1:A:2) Several participants also described, both in the written interviews and the oral interview that they started to think about similar situations they had been involved in before and this both helped them and/or made them feel more helpless or hopeless about the situation. According to the written interviews, imagining the oppressive situations also evokes several different feelings and emotions. Some of them are described as: “Tiredness, irritation” (W.i. 1:B:3), “[…] sad, disappointed and angry” (W.i. 1:C:4), “uncomfortable” (W.i. 1:D:5) and “helpless” (W.i. 1:H:6). When the participants had opened their eyes they went to a table in the back of the class and picked out a picture of an animal. Then I told them to go back to their chairs where they could end the oppressive situation in their heads and try to find a solution, if they wanted to. I realised when I did the oral interview that everyone obviously did not get this part of the exercise (Interview 2014-03-24).

The next thing that happened was the first part of the written interviews. The questions were projected on the PowerPoint. When the participants were writing I also wrote a reflection: “[I] feel a little bit stressed out. Will we finish in time? Will I get the last interviews? I have a headache – as I usually have when the tension is letting go. […] Now some of them are finished. I tell them to talk to each other. Maybe we will make it in time. Maybe!!” (F.d. 2014-03-21) When everyone had finished their writing I asked them to talk in pairs about their oppressive situations and about the photos of the animals they chose.

When I saw that some of the groups finished talking I asked if they needed more time to round off but they all seemed fine to continue. I presented the last questions, the second part of the written interviews. During this part I felt a little bit more relieved and happy. I wrote in the field diary afterwards: ”They were actually writing! They were there and they were
writing! The crazy bizarre ideas I had come up with on my little writing chamber were now out in the loose and it actually looked, in some way as if it worked.” (F.d. 2014-03-21)

When the participants had finished the last written interview I gathered them in the half-moon again. Then we followed through a final round where everyone could share a reflection from the day. I said some last words on how I still was interested in doing oral interviews and asked them to look through their writings again before handing them in to me. They were still able to keep them for themselves if they wanted to. We were able to finish at 1 pm sharp and I felt content about that.

**After the workshop**

When we finished the workshop, one participant offered that they could help to refurnish, which made me really grateful. Then I finished in the classroom by myself, gathered my stuff and went to the bus. I was at the same time happy and also so tired that I was almost not able to feel anything.

In the evening I wrote in the field diary:

> I am lying in bed. I feel totally exhausted. I thought I would be able to write on the train. But since I hadn’t eaten anything since 6:30 in the morning and I got on the train 14:00 I was feeling very sick. I also had a terrible headache. I think I have had such a tense towards the workshop that my body now, when it was over, let go, and relaxed and the tension disappeared but left its traces in the body. All of my anxiety and worries had filled up all of me for several days, and now when it disappeared a painful hole was created inside of me. The hole didn't want me to write. (F.d. 2014-03-21)

Now I have described the workshop based on the intra-active research, the field diary and some of the interviews. I have been having my own experience as starting point and described the workshop chronologically and in detail. Below I will continue the thick description of the workshop by analysing the material from themes and bring in more material from the written interviews and the oral interview.

**Thematic interpretation**

In the following section I will organise the material in order to show some of the themes that I found in the empirical material as being relevant for my research interest and which I interpret as repeated and standing out. Still I know that all kind of organising of the material also will be an imagination. The affective processes will, even how hard I try to control them, keep their messiness and the emotions will keep flowing through time and from bodies to bodies to
matters and material bodies, bumping, sticking, flying etc. With this in mind I would like to make an attempt to examine some parts of the material more in-depth by dividing them into themes.

First I want to put attention to the multiple levels of the affective processes and emotions that will be described in this section and the following theoretical analysis. I have followed through a workshop focusing on emotions and feelings and I am partly analysing the workshop as any classroom assemblage, but I am also analysing how the participants and myself felt about talking about and putting attention to these feelings. Further on, several of the affective processes in the workshop are processes that have emerged through the second exercise, an exercise with the aim of evoking feelings. The descriptions of those emotional reactions will in the analysis mainly be found in the accounting referring to the written interview one, and the oral interview. There will also be descriptions of affects that are more general in relation to the workshop and those will mainly be found while referring to the written interview two, and the oral interview. In whole I see these affective processes as impossible to totally separate, but I will indicate when I interpret them as related to specific components of the workshop. I will refer to if the feelings were described as rising from a particular exercise, as for example the exercise on the oppressive situations, or if the feelings are related to the workshop in general and the bodies present at the workshop. For example if the participant is angry with other participants or with imagined bodies in the exercise.

**Anger and irritation**

I interpret anger and irritation as repeatedly described in the interviews as present in relation to the exercise with the oppressive situations. All of the first written interviews mention anger or irritation as present feelings. Several also mention anger or irritation in the same sentence as disappointment or sadness. Those seem rather related. One participant shares the experience of having an expectation of anger when beginning the exercise with the oppressive situations (W.i. 1:A). Another participant shares the feeling of how the anger that were felt in relation to the imagined oppressive situation in the exercise requires a physical bodily action and relates this to the picture of the animal ze chose: “Because actually I would like to scream right out that you do not say like that, releasing to show a picture instead of doing that.” (W.i. 1:B:7)
In the oral interview a bidirectional anger is described: “Partly I was maybe a little bit angry with myself because I wouldn’t do so much and at the same time angry at the others on background of what they are saying. And angry with them because they are putting me in a situation I don’t want to be in.” (O.i.:1) “The others” in this narrative refers to the teachers who in the imagined oppressive situation were having a sexist dialogue about one pupil.

Two participants described feelings of anger in the second written interview. One of them wrote: “I got a little bit angry and upset about the case I got, but it let go pretty soon.” (W.i. 2:D:8). The other participant described how the different exercises had influenced hir mood. “Here I noticed an elation in one exercise and the situation in the other was more causing irritation.” (W.i. 2:E:9)

To summarise, anger and irritation were feelings that were in particular described in relation to the exercise where the participants were imagining oppressive situations and the participants mainly brought up those feelings in the first interview. Yet, those feelings were also described in the second, more general interview, which I see even though they were described as related to the “case-exercise”, as having an impact on the overall emotional states and mood that the participants experienced during the workshop.

**Sadness**
Sadness and resignation (as I see as a feeling closely related to sadness) is also frequently described especially in the written interviews in relation to the exercise with the oppressive situations. I will bring up some concrete examples here.

One quote from the written interviews shows clearly how sadness and anger are closely related in their absence of joy. The participant describes the two pictures of animals ze chose in the exercise on oppressive situations as follows: “One angry, dejected monkey and one sad, with dog-eyes, dog. They represent the feelings I felt. No happiness anywhere.” (W.i. 1:C:10) One participant describes hir feelings of sadness as rising from the imagined pupils behaviours and formulates it as this: “Sad because ‘my’ pupils are saying this to their comrades, anger and disappointment that it happens.” (W.i. 1:B:11) Another participant wrote “[I]rritated, disappointed, sad and caring” (W.i. 1:E:12) when reflecting upon which feelings were present when ze had imagined the oppressive situation. Ze added to this a feeling that ze describes as “’we’ll fix it together’” (W.i. 1:E:13), which I see as a feeling rising from the
other feelings described, but with a will to act in collaboration with the pupils or other persons present in the situation.

Hence, sadness is a described feeling in several of the written interviews, often mentioned in relation to resignation. Below I will continue to develop the theme which came up in the last reviewed quote, the so-called “will to act”.

**A will to act and feelings of wanting to hide**

Often connected to the feelings of anger or sadness described in relation to the imagined oppressive situations, follows a description of a feeling on how one wanted to “do something”, a will to act. Yet some participants describe this in a more complex way, where the feeling of wanting to hide or run away also is present.

One participant answers the question “Did anything in particular happened in your body when you imagined the situation?” with the introducing statement: “A will to act […]” (W.i. 1:H:14). Another one describes the situation as follows: “The acting felt hard, but needed.” (W.i. 1:C:15) I think the will to act also is described by another participant when ze describes how ze felt a need to not explicitly act, but to help the pupil that was exposed in the imagined situation (W.i. 1:G).

In comparison with the participants describing a will to act, there are also participants describing what one could define as maybe the opposite. Several mention how they just wanted to disappear in the imagined situation. One example is described as this: “Feelings of not wanting to be seen, but still being seen.” (W.i. 1:D:16) In the oral interview the participant is even more clear in this and describes it in relation to the picture ze chose in the exercise, a cat that were wound in a paper roll:

> […] it felt as if that cat maybe hid a little bit, and that is how I also have felt in that kind of situations, that maybe I had wished that I did not hear what happened so that I wouldn’t need to pretend that I was visible. That can be the most acute feeling anyway. Preferably I would have wanted not to be there, I would have wanted to get off the hook.
> And I think the cat described that, it had crept in there. (O.i.: 2)

One participant describes conflicting feelings of both wanting to act and wanting to hide at the same time, while imagining the oppressive situation: “I would rather pretend as if nothing happened, but I don’t do like that, I get feelings of guilt and I know that nothing gets better by
putting your head in the sand.” (W.i. 1:C:17) This is a reflection that I connect to what happens after one acts, or decides not to act, which I will dig a little bit deeper into below.

**Feelings entailing the acting/non-acting**

The feelings of guilt mentioned in the case above is one description of how it could feel if one did not act in the imagined oppressive situation. Several participants describe that it feels difficult and hard to imagine to act in the oppressive situation. “The hard part is to grasp the situation and interfere yourself.” (W.i. 1:H:18) One other feeling, which I interpret as fear, is described in the oral interview as not wanting to be the one killing the good atmosphere:

I feel as if it is in general hard to confront conflicts, and at the same time it is often as if comments like that, well this case was on the other hand not jokingly in any way, though in many cases one claim that things are said in a cheerful way and one does not want to be boring and a killjoy and say something when people later on says: ‘But well I was only joking’. (O.i.:3)

The same conversation continued like this a bit later on:

E: If you imagine that you would act, as you wanted to act, if you made a point as you now described, do you have any idea on how you would feel?
P: Afterwards I think I would feel pretty content… And in the moment, well… presumably rather uncomfortable. (O.i.:4)

This Janus-faced description of feelings of both satisfaction and discomfort in relation to the imagined acting in the oppressive situation is also described in two of the written interviews: “When I acted in the situation I felt both relief and discomfort. It is often/sometimes difficult to do the right thing.” (W.i. 1:H:19) and “When I talked to the pupils about the situation it felt tense and then eased […]” (W.i. 1:B:20).

Others describe more explicit feelings of satisfaction and feelings of braveness when they imagined themselves taking a stand and acting in the oppressive situations. One participant writes: “When I finally acted it was a feeling of success.” (W.i. 1:F:21) Another one describes it as follows: “Felt strong and brave when I really wanted to speak up.” (W.i. 1:A:22) Turning to the second interview, there is one participant who relates the feelings entailing the acting in the oppressive situation to hir mood in the workshop in general: “I went into a problem difficult to solve, which I handled with help from a solution which required courage. Therefor I experienced myself as brave during the end of the workshop.” (W.i. 2:E:23)

To conclude, the feelings following the imagined acting in the oppressive situations are mostly described as if the participants felt brave, content, strong and successful. The feelings
emerged from imagining oneself not daring to act are described as feelings of guilt and fear and feelings of not wanting to be the killjoy.

**Discomfort and (fear of) failure**

Often related to the decision of acting or not acting in the oppressive situations are feelings of discomfort and inconvenience (W.i. 1:D). In the oral interview the participant answers how ze felt during the exercise while imagining the oppressive situation: “uncomfortable in various ways” (O.i.:5). Another participant describes how ze first felt angry in the situation, but then landed in more of a dejected feeling “[…] I as a teacher had failed to build a nice group.” (W.i. 1:F:24) This participant connected to the imagined situation hir overall imagined role as a teacher.

Fear of failure is something I would like to relate to the nervousness described in my field diary before I followed through the workshop. I had feelings of inconvenience several times during the preparations for the workshop and it even affected my personal life. I felt nervous and was afraid that no one would show up (F.d. 2014-03-21). I see this as a fear of failure and a feeling of shame. Shamefulness of that I expected someone to attend and shame when imagining that no one did.

Another feeling as I interpret as connected to feelings of failure is described by a participant in the second interview, where ze is referring to hir overall impression and experience of the workshop. First ze describes how ze feels proud that ze went to the workshop but then adds: “But I also felt bad sometimes because I strengthen some things that should not be strengthened.” (W.i. 2:G:25) I see this description in the light of the workshop as if the participant is trying to explain how ze sees hirself as reproducing norms and power structures, maybe connected to the oppressive situation, or the exercise where the participants reflected upon their own norm position.

**“Positive” and happy feelings**

Even though I in this study aim to problematize the crude division between bad and good, and positive and negative feelings, there were several descriptions in the second written interview that could be seen as “good”. There were described feelings of happiness and something as the participants named as “positive” feelings. Here follows some: “It felt good, maybe there could have been some more people from the class, but that was nothing that you could have done anything about.” (W.i. 2:A:26) “The experience of the workshop was really positive.”
“[…]
I was proud that I came here and that I had an opportunity to discuss those important issues. […] The feeling now is that I am very satisfied and happy about the things you and us have talked about.” (W.i. 2:G:28) One of the participants answers the question “Did your emotional experience change during the workshop?” like this: “No, I feel as happy and positive as when I arrived!” (W.i. 2:H:29) Another participant answers this question by explaining that it first felt a little bit boring to attend the workshop, but that ze after a while, since the workshop was so much about feelings, felt more positive (W.i. 2:F).

In relation to my own experience, there were also “positive” feelings and feelings of happiness that emerged during the workshop: “In the end during the written interviews I felt kind of good anyway. I felt happy that they were writing something!” (F.d. 2014-03-21) Another situation was at the train: “[…] I couldn't help myself, I needed to look through the written interviews. Some of what I read made me really happy, some made me shameful, some made me eager to get to my writing and my analysis and some made me worried and sad that I wouldn't have enough for the analysis. Some made me content.” (F.d. 2014-03-21) I think at the moment that I was so “messed up” from the workshop and the early morning and the anxiety relief that I felt as if all of these feelings were “equal”, “lining up” beside each other, but when I recall this moment I think that the “positive” feelings of happiness and satisfaction are the ones that were distinguishing the experience.

Engagement

Related to happy and “positive” feelings are the feelings of engagement and the feelings of being inspired that were described by several participants, mainly in the second written interview in relation to their overall impression of the workshop. Here follows some examples: “I felt inspired and sufficiently challenged” (W.i.2:E:30), “Egged to think differently about the body […]” (W.i. 2:C:31) and “I was surprised that I lived myself into the case as much as I actually did” (W.i. 2:D:32). One participant answered the question on which bodily sensations that were present during the workshop as: “Mostly positive, engaging and interested” (W.i. 2:F:33). I see these quotes as describing an engagement that emerged through the particular assemblage that formed the workshop. There are some participants that are describing this even more explicit: “The different components (lecture, discussions, pictures and associations) that were varied between each other kept the tempo and interest up.” (W.i. 2:F:34) and “Your challenging exercises gave varying impressions with feelings of engagement in the situations we were offered.” (W.i. 2:E:35) One participant describes it as if
it was more comfortable and relaxed in the last exercise when the frames of the workshop were a bit more loose and informal (W.i. 2:B).

Finally I would like to highlight the fact that eight participants showed up for the workshop, that no one left during the workshop, that everyone participated in every exercise and the written interviews. I interpret this as an engagement in itself. Through the presentation at the web-portal and the teacher-training teacher’s advertising of the workshop, these participants showed up, and through the composition of the classroom assemblage, the workshop-leader-body, the other participant-bodies, the plan of the workshop and the way it was followed through, feelings of engagement, commitment and inspiration emerged.

**Feelings that can not be formulated**

One thematic discovery that was not that vast, but nevertheless striking was the expressions of not being able to formulate what kind of feelings that the participants were experiencing. I see this as closely related to both the formulated feelings, which are elaborated on above, and the bodily sensations described, which I will elaborate more on below. Nevertheless I wanted to make a particular section for “the things” that were not possible to describe in words. In general in the workshop I think the pictures of the animals worked as a way to “describe the indescribable”. The participants got the opportunity to choose a picture (or some chose two pictures), which they could use as a support in describing their feelings. Besides the effect that the pictures could help to formulate words, I also see them as a tool helping to describe what is not possible to put into words, where the one who is listening to a description of an emotional state, beside the description gets hir own idea on how the other person feels, through experiencing the picture.

These “indescribable” feelings are formulated in one of the written interviews when the participant answers the question on what happened in the body while imagining the oppressive situation. Ze answered that there were many confused feelings, but that ze were not able to formulate any (W.i. 1:E). I can only assume that other participants might have had the same confused feelings, but that they were not able to formulate these into words, or maybe had the impression that it was not relevant to describe these in the interview. I interpret these indescribable feelings as affects, processes that are not yet crystallized into particular emotions and words.
**Bodily sensations**

In the first written interview I posed the question: “Was it something in particular that happened in the body when you imagined the situation?” One participant shares the story on feeling relaxed while imagining the oppressive situation (W.i. 1:F). A similar description is found in the oral interview: “E: […] did you notice, did anything happen in the body during this exercise? P: Yes, but that is a little bit on the contrary to how it felt, I think I relaxed quite a bit. One could relax, sit down and close one’s eyes, so it was a calmness in it at the same time as it was a discomfort.” (O.i.:6) Earlier in the interview the participant describes the bodily sensation as running in parallel with the feelings: “The stiff feeling I think, is for me, both a mental stiffness and a bodily. I sit kind of still and crouched. […] So it’s kind of sliding for me, what feels as a feeling and what feels like more of a bodily sensation.” (O.i.:7) One participant describes inconvenience and connects this to the bodily experience of “itching & getting warm and tense” (W.i. 1:D:36). Another one writes: “What happened in the body was increasing pulse, my shoulders were raised and the body made itself ready for action.” (W.i. 1:G:37)

In the second written interview I asked “What sensations were you experiencing in your body during the workshop?” In relation to this question two participants share their experiences of bodily sensations. The first one writes: “Stiffness and dry mouth” (W.i. 2:B:38). The other one describes it more in general: “The sensations in the body was perhaps not that widely-spread. But I definitely felt variations,” (W.i. 2:E:39)

My own bodily sensations during and after the workshop were more outspoken and clear. I remember feeling expectant, elate and tense before the workshop. This usually expresses itself by short kind of “spasms” in the body where I (only when I am alone or very discrete) make a grimace, where my whole face gets both happy and scared at the same time. Maybe this could be seen as kind of a tick? In the written reflection I did during the workshop I described a headache. Which was increasing after the workshop, something I usually experience while nervousness is released. Finally when I got home I described my bodily sensations as follows: “I don’t want to write, just sleep.” (F.d. 2014-03-21) I felt the traces of the tension several days after.

Besides the descriptions of bodily sensations in the written interviews, there are participants who don’t elaborate on the question at all and also those who perhaps don’t understand the
question. One merely writes: “Sensations?” (W.i. 2:A:40) Another one is expressing himself in a similar way: “Sensations? Of what I was thinking – well, okey. Of the climate in the room – safe, stabile. Of the lecturer – interesting, memorable. Of the participants – nice, open.” (W.i. 2:H:41) I have some difficulties interpreting these described “sensations” but tend to see it as if the participant doesn’t understand the question on “bodily sensations”, which also is implicated in the first question mark. Maybe I should have formulated the question differently or been giving examples of what sensations in the body could implicate.

In brief, there are both precise descriptions of bodily sensations in the participants’ stories on the workshop and in the field diary. Then there are also statements in the written interviews that implicate that the participants did not really comprehend the question on bodily sensations.

**Memory and memories**

I have chosen to use both the concept of “memory” as in remembrance and “memories”, as in several memories that are making themselves reminded, to define the following thematic interpretation. Both of these are present in the field diary. I refer several times to earlier occasions, for example, when describing the first part of the workshop I formulated it as if I “had the words in me” and linked this to the experiences of following through similar exercises and lectures before. In this case the memory of the earlier experiences evoke feelings of security. Later on while following through the exercise were the students were supposed to reflect upon their own position in relation to norms, I had the very recent memory of practicing the workshop the day before, where I had some difficulties explaining that specific exercise. This memory made me insecure even though I had other memories of being able to handle the exercise. Hence both of these memories affected the emotions and the bodily sensations that emerged during this exercise.

I find memories as playing a crucial part also in the second part of the workshop, when I am lecturing about embodiment and emotions and get a difficult question from a person in the group which I interpret as being older and more experienced than myself. This reaction from my side I see as very much emerged through memories of being reprimanded and told what to do by people older than me. Adding to this I am kind of short and often recognized as younger than my actual age, so maybe did also memories of being interpreted as not as old as I am made themselves reminded.
The participants highlight memories in the written interviews when they describe their emotional reactions towards the oppressive situations they are facing in the last exercise. Several participants recalled similar situations they experienced earlier, when they were imagining the oppressive situations. One participant writes: “I felt uncomfortable, mostly with myself and it felt as a situation I have been experiencing before and whish I would have dared to act in differently. [...] I remembered concrete and actual situations which are similar to the one in the case and I feel as if it tells me something about myself that I don’t like.” (W.i. 1:D:42) Another participant explains: “When I opened my eyes […] memories form a similar situation made ‘the answer’ to the solution seem clear, but personally difficult to dare to follow through.” (W.i. 1:H:43) Hence, the memories from earlier situations could both evoke feelings that made it easier to handle the situation and feelings of not liking oneself. Another participant interpreted the oppressive situation ze was facing as a conflict of loyalty: “The memories were there from earlier situations of making choices when loyalties become conflicting” and later on “[w]hy I feel like this is probably because I often are put in situations of loyalty conflicts.” (W.i. 1:G:44) I see these quotes as showing how present memory and memories are in the affective processes of emotions and feelings.

Memory/memories are also present in the participants’ descriptions of their expectations of the workshop. The participant describes in the oral interview:

P: I get a little bit nervous in uncomfortable situations. But also I think that I think of a workshop, that it is supposed to be role-play, forum theatre and like, exiting, but a little bit scary to follow through.
E: So the concept in itself carries expectations in some way?
P: Yes and neither less with that background, if it’s about gender and intersectionality then I think like that.
E: You have that experience from before?
P: Yes, something like that.
E: Workshop intersectionality gender forum theatre.
P: Yes, some kind of chain of association there. (O.i.:8)

Other participants shared similar, though shorter reflections in the second written interview, where they answered a question on their general impression of the workshop. One participant writes: “It [the workshop] was well planned, could have been more exercises with the body (I expected that).” (W.i. 2:A:45) Another writes: “I felt open for more suggestions and maybe I had hoped for even more classroom-situations to discuss.” (W.i. 2:D:46) I interpret “hopes” and “expectations” as also connected to memory/memories. What one has experienced or maybe just “heard of” before is profoundly entangled to what one expects or hopes for. If one
hope or expect something in particular to happen, one might be affected in directions of disappointment, if that specific thing does not happen. Expectations and memories shape affective processes and put them to speed and from these processes emotional responses emerge.

The unexpected/uncontrolled
In general I see almost everything that happens in a classroom as uncontrolled, but some things that happened in the workshop stand out and entails the feeling that it was more or less expected or unexpected. I will give two examples of when I experienced something unexpected or uncontrolled in relation to the workshop.

The first example is when we were about to finish up and have a last “round” where everyone had the ability to share their impression of the workshop. I projected a PowerPoint-picture with the word “Final round” that was formed as a circle and we also had a round in the beginning of the workshop where the word was divided between the participants according to how they sat. The one who started to speak, spoke first, then the one sitting next to that person, then the one sitting next to that person etc. But in the final round one person started to talk, when ze finished another person who was not sitting next to the first person continued. I remember feeling for a moment as if I “lost control” when that happened. And I remember having, maybe even an unconscious conversation with myself in a hundredth of a second whether I should say something about it, and correct the students so that the round really went “round”. I decided not to. I found it unnecessary and the group was also so small so I could remember in the end who did not say anything, and then ask them if they wanted to add something.

The second example occurred when I read the participants answers to the written interviews for the first time. During the workshop I asked the participants several times to talk to each other in pairs. The first two times I told them to talk to the person next to them and the third time I told them to talk to someone new. I usually do this and the purpose is that the participants should get new insights or dialogues while talking to another person, and also that if they in the beginning sit beside someone they aren’t comfortable with, they will have the opportunity to talk to someone else. I have always seen this “change” of small groups as a positive thing while lecturing or leading workshops. Though I detected that one of the participants had another experience of this: “To change place and talk to someone one I did
not know made me more withdrawn and quiet, got less out of that exercise than before.” (W.i. 2:A:47) To me this is unexpected. I have never heard a similar experience from any students or participants before during my classes and it made me feel as if I wasn’t in control of what happened.

In this section of my analysis I have, on basis of what I see as relevant for the research interest of this study, outlined some themes from the empirical material. I will continue the analysis by bringing in the theoretical thinking technologies to further explore the material.

**Analysing the material with theoretical thinking technologies**

To be able to scrutinize my research questions more in-depth I will now analyse the material, presented above in the thick description, with the theoretical thinking technologies of this study, which are sprung from the aims and research questions. I have chosen to divide the theoretical analysis into different sections, though the sections tend to flow into and out of each other, influencing and affecting each other.

**Poetic interpretation of described affects and emotions**

I will introduce this theoretical analysis with a poem. In order to be able to analyse affects and in particular emotions as active forces in these processes, I have chosen to combine an aim for rhizomatic research and the use of the method “writing as a method of inquiry” with a mimetic strategy of écriture féminine.

Rhizomatic methods in intersectional analysis is described by Lykke, referring to Braidotti, as an aim to create new undiscovered connections, away from the grid-like intersectional analysis that tend to appear when one is strictly sticking to intersectional categories and questions formulated as ‘So what does this say about race?’ or ‘What can I find in my material that tells me something about sexuality?’ (Lykke in in Lutz, Herrera, Maria & Supik 2011: 211-212). In the same spirit I am also inspired by Haraway’s argumentation on how writing can be a process that surprises you, evoking new insights and lead you to places you never thought you would find or inhabit (Haraway 2003: 332-333).

I will follow through the idea of rhizomatic thinking by inspiration from Laurel Richardson’s “writing as a method of inquiry”. Richardson argues that one in a research process should try
various approaches and that writing poems could be one way to find new entrances to the empirical material and at the same time “feel” the material in new ways (Richardson in Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 974). I have chosen to formulate a poem, composed by extracts from the material in an endeavour to look upon the material in a way that I hope creates new connections where I maybe initially found nothing relevant. I also see the poem as a quest to feel and experience the material in an embodied way, hopefully contributing to an affect of poetic truth.

Further on I see the use of poetry in an academic study as a mimetic strategy, inspired by Hélène Cixous who points out that the history of writing is a part of a “phallocentric tradition” and built upon the foundation of “reason” (Cixous 1976: 879). Lykke positions Cixous’ work under the umbrella term “écriture féminine”, which could be described as “women’s writing”, in a tradition that see the notion of “woman” as non-deterministic but where the feminine is seen as written in and on the body (Lykke 2010: 102). I agree with Cixous when ze stresses that one way to embody text could be to experiment with ways to write the body into the text (2010: 179). I see the use of a poem as a similar experimentation and as a quest to conduct a study within a feminist postconstructionist tradition, with focus on bodies and emotions. I interpret poems as being traditionally perceived as “soft” and “unreasonable” ways of writing associated with emotions and not so much associated with “science” or “truths”.

In the poem I have included material from both the two written interviews that were followed through during the workshop and also material form my own field diary that I wrote during the workshop. All of this material is flowing through and being interpreted by my body (both interpreted from Swedish to English by my body in a profound connection to Google translate and also interpreted in the sense that I am choosing which parts to highlight in the material, and how to present them), at this specific time and place where I am sitting, in a cottage in the woods in the south of Sweden, having a cold, feeling a little bit stressed, a sunny Saturday morning in late March.
To begin with I felt direct anger, irritated, disappointed, sad, caring.
Disappointed, tiredness, irritation.
I felt irresolution.
I also felt a little bit angry.

An angry dejected monkey and a sad with dog eyes dog.

No happiness anywhere.
Pretty helpless but then lightly irritated and blank in relation to now I was supposed to handle the situation.

When I finally acted it was a feeling of success.
I would rather pretend as nothing happened.

 feel feelings of guilt.

I was wrong.

I have had so great feelings of success raising pulse, my shoulders raised and my body prepared for action.

Raising pulse, my shoulders raised and my body prepared for action.

I feel nervous now.

Two penguins that are holding each other.

I feel ashamed that there during the last part was so much focus on my master project.

I felt bad for the one who was written.

Declared failed, feeling care because I had not done what was asked of me.

I felt relaxed.

I felt the answer to the solution seemed clear.

I started to doubt my own competence and my whole project.

I prepared to be angry.

I felt angry, disappointed and on my way into some kind of defensive position.

I started to think.

I felt strong and brave.

I felt open for suggestions.

I got a little bit surprised over myself.
This poem is to be seen as a theoretical analysis of some of the affective processes that according to Gregg and Seigworth are defined as “the intensities that pass body to body (human, nonhuman, part-body and otherwise), in those resonances that circulate about, between and sometimes stick to bodies and worlds and in the very passages or variations between those intensities and resonances themselves” (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 1). The poem is unfolding the idea of bodies, emotions and affect as parts of the same flow, the same process. To see and feel those descriptions beside and close to each other make the connections clearer between the bodily experiences. I also think the poem shows that the present bodies were affected by the content of the workshop in various ways. Following the
ideas of matter as actors (Lenz-Taguchi 2010: 4), the poem shows how the words written on the paper that described the oppressive situation, my voice speaking to the participants while they had their eyes closed, the chairs they were sitting on and the pictures of the animals they chose were all routing the affects i.e. the forces and hence the emotions and feelings in various speeds and directions during the workshop.

Finally I think the poem itself and the photos inserted as a background to the poem unfold the spatio-temporal assemblage of the workshop and at the same time, it also reminds of the refusal to adjust to time as linear. One of the photos was taken right after the workshop, when the participants still were leaving the room, for me it represents relief and also how the matter of the classroom still act and affect the material. The other photo was taken this morning, the 29th of March, and it shows the view from the bedroom window in the cottage I am currently staying, representing the spatio-temporal situatedness of my bodymind connected to “the past” and “the future” in various ways while writing this analysis.

To conclude, writing a poem to analytically approach the empirical material of this study could be seen as a mimetic strategy and it unfolds some of the affective processes that were taking speed in the classroom assemblage at the time of the workshop. At the same time it challenges the idea of time as linear. Below I will continue to develop the analysis outlined in the poem combined with the analysis that emerged in the thick description.

The dispelling of the body while “having a starting point in the body”

One striking discovery in the material was what I have chosen to call “the dispelling of the body”. In relation to my first research question on how it is possible to have the body as starting point in corpomaterial feminist pedagogies I find it interesting and remarkable how very dominant the processes of dividing the body and the mind and making the body invisible seem to be. So dominate that they even permeate this study, with the aim of focusing on corporeality.

The first sign of the dispelling of the body in the research process was when my supervisor made me attentive to the fact that I left the body out in the questions I was planning to ask the participants. I was surprised that I actually had “forgotten” the body in the questions, since that was supposed to be the focus. Another discovery in the field diary is when I talked to the person in charge of one part of the teacher education and had the feeling of “censuring”
myself. I see this as both related to questions of censuring the issues of feminism in general but also in particular the censuring of the stickiness, the fleshiness of the body, which seem to entail feelings of shame only while trying to illuminate and talk about it.

I would like to theorize this “dispelling of the body” by defining my body, the student-researcher-academic-teacher-body, at this above described point in the master thesis process, as not being “in line” (Ahmed 2006:15) with the common idea of a student/researcher/academic/teacher-body. Ahmed argues that bodies are organised into moving in certain collective directions, where a body as a member of for example a community is “directed in some ways more than others” (2006:15). I will add to this Gregg & Seigworth’s ideas on how a body needs to be analysed in relation to what it does and where it is situated, hence how it is affected and how it affects in relation to the processes it is involved in (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 3). In this case I claim that my body at this point were already, but also becoming, a member of a research/academic community. Even though my specific body is what I would define as “in line” with how bodies are “supposed” to act, look like and move in a gender studies context, my gender-studies-body and the focus on the body in my study is very much facing another direction than a general hegemonic student/academic/research/teacher-body-community. I would like to argue that my body at this point was affected by other academic/researcher bodies and the community of bodies in this context, the bodies that has been here before me which has formulated, defined and stated what research is and should be, mainly based and focused on (masculine) reason, not sticky itchy messy (female) embodiment and matter.

This “dispelling of the body” is also something that can be identified in the written interviews. Two of the participants explicitly reflected upon bodily sensations experienced during the workshop, though the majority did not, even thought there was a particular question on this. This question included the expression “sensations” in relation to bodies. I see two possible ways of interpreting these absent reflections on bodily sensations. First, it could be a sign of that the participants did not comprehend the concept “sensation” in relation to bodies. “Sensations” is a rarely used word in Swedish, and I should in retrospect maybe have used another formulation, or been giving examples in relation to this. Another interpretation of the absence could be to see it as a sign of the rarity of illuminating the body in the way that was done in the workshop in a classroom assemblage. Maybe this was the first time that the participants thought of the body in this way in this context. Following Gregg and Seigworth’s
ideas of how one always needs to hold the context of the body in mind, to be able to analyse what a body can do (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 3), I see it as if the participant-bodies were affected by the expectations and memories (more on memories below) they had from earlier workshops and lectures that they had attended at the university, where the body rarely is in focus.

To conclude, what a body can do, in this case if the body is able to put focus on and grasp the idea of what a bodily sensation could be or not, could be affected by the ability to comprehend the word “sensation” but could also be seen as affected by the classroom assemblage and the forces in play in this specific context, which is built on an academic tradition of reason, mind, theory and masculinity. If there is a resistance towards bringing in the fleshiness, embodiment and corporealities in these university assemblages, this could be seen as a possible obstacle in an endeavour to situate teacher-student-bodies affectively and emotionally.

**Bodies in a classroom assemblage as memory banks/workers**

Here I will argue that the teacher-bodies and participant-bodies that were present at the workshop could be affectively and emotionally situated as memory banks/workers. I will analytically discuss this by following theoretical thinking technologies on memories, memory work and memory banks developed by Just, Braidotti and Ahmed.

I will start off by paraphrasing some to this topic related parts of my field diary. The first example refers to my experience of the first exercise with the pictures of animals in the workshop and the lecture on intersectionality. During the exercise and the lecture I felt a little bit more secure than I had felt up until then. I connected this to the fact that I had followed through these activities several times before, I “had the words in me” (F.d. 2014-03-21). I think this example highlights the fact that emotions emerge from memories, which are affecting the teaching. While seeing the teacher-body as a memory worker one is able to see how the memories actually are affecting the teaching. I felt confident in these situations on basis of the memory of earlier lectures and exercises as I experienced as positive. This feeling also influenced the teaching in practice, I was able to “make a little joke”, which I have heard students before describe as a positive thing, something that make them “stay awake and alert” during a lecture. Hence one could guess that the affected by memory emerged feelings in the teacher-body could be affecting the other present bodies. I interpret
this as connected to Braidotti’s ideas of “working from memory” (Braidotti 2011:232), which I see as one possible way to affectively situate the teacher-body. All educational work could be seen as “flowing through” the teacher-body, shaped and produced through the body’s memory bank.

Another example from my field diary describes how I memorised the names of the participants, which made me “feel comfortable and like a pro” (F.d. 2014-03-21). This puts light on another way of seeing teachers as memory workers. What teachers remember in relation to the classroom assemblage also matter. To learn students’ names is something that hooks defines as something that makes connections to students stronger, that makes teaching easier and the relation to students more effectively developing (hooks 1994: 204). For me this is a highly embodied process since I use a technique of “writing” the names of the participants “on their bodies”. If a student’s name is Josephine, I quickly for instance “find” something on hir body that “looks like” a “J” (J for Josephine). This can be a lock of hair or a necklace. (Clearly this gets complicated when students tend to wear different clothes to class, or cut their hair, still I find it a useful technique.) I see this memory work as both affecting the participants and the relations and patterns of processes in the classroom assemblage, but also as directly affecting the teacher-body. In this case feelings of being professional emerged, which affected my body in various complex directions; both in the direct teaching situation but also perhaps in a more expanded process.

Yet another way of seeing teacher-bodies as memory workers is by following Braidotti’s thoughts on how “refusing to forget” could be a way to work from memory, where one as a teacher is remembering for example the history of minorities in teaching history (Braidotti 2011: 232). Puar is in the same spirit stating that one who feels calm is maybe one who has forgotten something (Puar 2007: xviii). One could connect this to being a teacher practicing feminist intersectional corporeal pedagogies, where one includes other perspectives than the ones communicated by a hegemonic discourse. Recalling the feelings and bodily sensations I as a teacher felt in relation to the workshop: terribly nervous, tense, having a headache, being overexcited, being troubled, exhausted, worried and also censuring myself in relation to the teacher’s education department, one could clearly say that calmness was one of the last things I felt. This was not merely of course because I was teaching with what I would call feminist intersectional corporeal pedagogical approaches but I do believe that this was a part of it. If one is trying to challenge a hegemonic discourse, one rarely feels entirely and exclusively
calm and satisfied, and this is also a part of a memory work, to refuse to forget the memories that have been marginalized by a hegemonic discourse.

To conclude, the teacher- (in this case workshop-leader) body in a classroom assemblage could be interpreted as a memory worker or a memory bank through pointing out how ze works from memory in teaching and how this could affect the classroom assemblage. I will now reason on whether the participant-bodies in the workshop could be interpreted in a similar way.

One of the participants describes feelings of being in a loyalty conflict when imagining the oppressive situation and explained this on basis of the memory of similar situations (W.i. 1:G). Another participant describes how memories from a similar situation made it easy to see how to act in the situation (W.i. 1:H). In the oral interview the participant describes the experience of imagining the oppressive situation:

   But after a while I experienced the ability to imagine the situation that was described in my case. And that is maybe also because, maybe not in exactly in the same way, but that it remembered me of real situations. It was kind of easy to find a way back to how, how it has felt then and how I think it would feel if it happened again. (O.i.:9)

Later on in the oral interview the participant told me that how ze thought ze would act in a similar situation was based on earlier experienced similar situations (O.i.).

I interpret these descriptions as supporting the idea that the notion of time in a classroom assemblage could be seen as non-linear. According to Braidotti “‘working from memory’ implies respecting the specific, nonlinear temporality [of an] […] intensive process of thinking” (Braidotti 2011: 233). Even though the participants had not experienced the “exact” same situation before, it reminded them of similar situations, which affected their emotional reactions. This also implicates that the bodies in the workshop not merely were affected by the memories, but that the memories in practice also affected the imagined physical action of the body, how the body kept holding back, talked or moved in the situation, which implies that time in this case could be seen not only as a progressing activity, but that time moves in several directions, cycling, flowing back and forth.

Here I would also like to bring in Ahmed’s argumentation on how bodies tend to take courses that are “in line” and following a “corporeal schema” (Ahmed 2006: 21, 111). The bodily memories described by the participants are of course, memories of their own bodies. Though
these memories could also be affected by other bodies’ memories, and the histories of bodies that one consciously does not remember, but that “the body remembers”. The teacher-body can be perceived likewise. It has the possibility to move, act and affect on behalf of what is perceived as ready to hand for the body. The body’s gender, mindbodily dis/ability, race, class etc shape what is ready to hand. But the teacher-body is also, when one is thinking with Ahmed’s ideas of queer phenomenology, a teacher-body that is standing in a line of teacher-bodies that has been there before. The body’s corporeal schema is dependent on what the bodies that “were there before” did, what they looked like, what they said, in which directions they moved in the room etc.

To conclude, on basis on the argumentation above I state that teacher-bodies and participant-bodies in the classroom assemblage of the workshop could be affectively and emotionally situated as memory workers/banks. The bodies are banks of both their own bodily memories and also of other bodies’ memories. The bodies are also always “working from memory” where they recall earlier situations (both their own but also earlier or on-going processes of for example marginalisation), knowledge and experiences, which imply that time, could be seen as non-linear processes in a classroom assemblage. The memories are the foundation of how the bodies in the assemblage feel and act in various situations, in which directions the affects are headed and how the emotions get stuck or move.

**What the classroom assemblage can do and how bodies are affected**

In this section I will analyse some of the affective forces I interpret as taking speed and evoking certain emotions in the classroom assemblage of the workshop. I will follow Just’s ideas on how assemblages are always changing in their compositions and that all bodies in a classroom assemblage is constantly affected in various ways (Just 2012: 176). Below I will map out what I see as two relevant examples of how affective processes of emotions were in motion in the classroom assemblage of the workshop.

The first example is connected to the above-scrutinized situatedness of bodies as memory workers/banks. I write in the field diary that remembering the participants’ names make me feel like a professional teacher and that it entailed feelings of security and comfort (F.d. 2013-03-21). It is likely to think that these feelings were stating themselves through my bodily appearance during the workshop, for example through my voice and through my bodily posture and that “feeling like a pro” also made me act “in line” (Ahmed 2006: 21) with what
is expected by a “professional teacher-body” for example to walk, talk and move like a body who “knows what it is doing”. Hence the idea of how a professional body should act, which is embedded in the expectations of the classroom assemblage and my feelings of “being professional”, were affecting the classroom assemblage through my bodily appearance.

I found one explicitly described emotional and bodily experience which I interpret as a description of how those above outlined emotional components of the teacher-body were affecting the assemblage while taking speed in direction towards the participant-bodies. The example is from the second written interview, in relation to the overall experience of the workshop: “First appeared a tension in relation to how your message were about to be presented and perceived by the students that had arrived. Later appeared a relief that you were professional in your performance [...].” (W.i. 2:E:48) Following Puar who defines the focus on assemblage as a focus on relations and patterns that occurs out from relations (Puar 2012: 57), I interpret these emotional and bodily experiences that were described by the participant as results of the affective forces in play in the classroom assemblage. The relations in this case could be mapped out as existing in the connections between the bodily affects, i.e. the teacher-body’s feelings of “being a pro” which made the teacher-body perform the “professional body”, the relief in the participant-body when the teacher-body “seemed to be professional” and the ideas of how professionalism is composed, through memories of the notion of the professional teacher-body in earlier classroom assemblages.

This could be further elaborated on by following Ahmed’s and Probyn’s ideas on how affects that are emerging through a teacher-body might be contagious towards the participants/students and how this works also the other way around (Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 37; Probyn 2004: 36-37). At the same time as the teacher-body affects the participant-bodies; the participant-bodies affect the teacher-body. In this case I would like to argue that the participant-bodies affect and shape the teacher-body’s capacity to “feel like pro”. By sitting still and behaving in line with what one can expect from participant-bodies in a classroom assemblage, space is created and affecting the teacher-body in directions towards “the feelings of being professional”.

I interpret the above-mentioned example of an affective force as in line with the directions one could expect that emotions would take in a classroom assemblage, they could be foreseen.
But what about the more unexpected affective forces activated in a classroom assemblage? I will continue by bringing in what I interpret as more of an unexpected emotional reaction.

One frequently repeated element in the exercises in the workshop was that the participants were asked to talk to each other in pairs. On basis of the experience that conversations could be more fruitful I told them after a while to change dialogue partner and talk to someone else. One student shared a description of a feeling of being more quiet and withdrawn when talking to a new person (W.i. 2:A). This emotional response in the participant-body could be understood, if one is following Puar, as an embodied testimony that “[w]e cannot know assemblages in advance” (Puar 2007: 222). Probyn relates ideas on the unpredictability of assemblages to teaching and discusses how an understanding of a classroom assemblage, which cannot be predicted on beforehand explains the frequently troubles teachers are facing of for example how “the same” lectures can have totally different effect on students (Probyn 2004).

Another example of this impossibility of knowing what bodies and assemblages can do is what happened in the final round, when the participants didn’t talk in order. I see this as an unexpected affective process of the spatiotemporal classroom assemblage. This could by following Probyn be understood as: “The magic or chemistry that seems so elusive to any systematization may well be the necessary result of the moving arrangement of particles, histories and affects that are the bodies of teaching and learning” (Probyn 2004: 37). This relates to seeing teacher- and participant-bodies as memory banks and shows how different particles, such as a participant-body’s earlier history (in its singularity but also in its communities) of affectively capacity of social interaction, could affect the classroom assemblage. Further on, this unexpected affective outcome, the “magic or chemistry” could also be interpreted as if the participant-bodies were inspired by the workshop and eager to talk and share their impressions, as soon as possible.

To further analyse the unexpected response to the teacher-body’s instructions on changing pairs, I will argue that this could be seen as a manifestation of the instability of bodies. In other words, these sounds that emerged from the teacher-body, which were received in the participant-body as a call to talk to someone else, is affecting the participant-body in the sense that emotions of being withdrawn are evoked and bodily corporeal schemas of being quiet are played out. This also shows I think how the teacher-body does not, as Puar formulates it,
while referring to Haraway, “ends at the skin” (Puar 2012: 57). The teacher-body expands into the singular participant-body in its affects and in the spatiotemporal moment of the classroom assemblage it is impossible to know what it is going to do. While thinking on participant-bodies as singularities this could indicate that the body could bear all sorts of capacities such as capacities to talk or not to talk to unfamiliar other bodies.

In one last notion on the topic of what assemblages do, I will make a brief elaboration on how it is not always possible to outline how affects are composed. Since affects per se are prediscursive they can be difficult to describe in for example a written interview, which requires the formulation of words. I think one of the participants of the workshop describes this state of not being able to put the forces of emotions in affective processes in to words. While answering the question: “Was it something in particular that happened in the body when you imagined the situation?”, ze answered: “A will to act and adding to that so many other confused feelings were swishing around, but none really got a hold.” (W.i. 1:H:49) I see this as a description of what Seigworth and Gregg formulate as the “not yet” of an affected body (Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 4). We do “not yet” know how an assemblage will affect and what a body can do in relation to these affects. I see the participant’s description of the “swishing around” as a promise of “something”, but what that something will crystallize itself into, we cannot yet know.

To conclude, what matter, affects, emotions, memories, bodies, forces, processes and the classroom assemblage consisting of all of those spacetime matters do is both expected and unexpected. Teacher-bodies and participant-bodies affect each other through memories and what appears to be “in line” in a classroom assemblage. Further on, one cannot expect that the bodies inhabiting a classroom assemblage “end at the skin”. In particular relevant for feminist intersectional corpomaterial pedagogies is for the teacher-body to maintain, as Just formulates it, a “sensibility and flexibility” towards the fact that one does not know what the classroom assemblage can do, and that one does not know how the “singular compositions of students” will be affected (Just 2012: 175-176). With help from this sensibility and flexibility I believe on basis of the argumentation above that it is possible to practice intersectional feminist corpomaterial pedagogies while having a constant awareness of that bodies are affecting each other in a classroom assemblage and that one does not know what assemblages and bodies can do, but that what they do is depending on the affective processes based on corporeal schemas and the specificity of the singular bodies composing an assemblage.
Teacher-bodies situated both as affect aliens and as “in line”

In this section I will argue that teacher-bodies could be affectively and emotionally situated as affect aliens. Ahmed defines for example feminists as “affect aliens” (Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 39) and states that they are “the one who converts good feelings into bad” (Ahmed 2010: 49). I will show how teacher-bodies instead of being “neutral” and “professional” both could perceive themselves, and could be perceived by others as killjoys and as bearing promises of anger, irritation, nervousness, shame and “bad feelings”. Besides this I will also argue that teacher-bodies at the same time could be interpreted as acting and moving “in line” (Ahmed 2006: 12-20) with the expected path of a teacher-body.

I will start off the argumentation of the teacher-body as an affect alien by recalling the feelings I, as a teacher-body, had while preparing the workshop. I experienced repeated emotional states of nervousness and also compared myself with a person who was about to throw a party that no one would attend, describing it as: “Sad, so sad.” (F.d. 2014-03-21) I interpret these feelings of fear of failure as connected to shame. I relate the teacher-body’s (and at this specific moment also student/researcher-body) feelings to what Probyn defines as the shame of having a very precise interest and not being able to communicate it to others. Probyn describes those feelings in relation to writing (which I see as very similar to teaching in its aspiration to explain and communicate) and ze argues that this kind of shame and fear could be perceived as threatening if one cares about what oneself or others think about oneself (Probyn in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 72). I cared at this spacetime moment very much about what I thought of myself, what I feared that the participants would think of me and in the long run, what the readers of this thesis would think of me.

Since teachers rarely are described as shameful, nervous or frightened, I see my teacher-body as an affect alien at these described moments before the workshop. It is not “in line” with how a professional and neutral teacher-body should act and be. If these feelings had been bodily manifested in the classroom, if I had been visibly sweating, throwing up, shivering, hesitating or running out of class, I most likely had been perceived as an affect alien by the participants. Perhaps it would had been seen with more forgiving eyes since I also was a researcher/student-body in this situation. But if I was just an “ordinary” teacher-body at the university or in high school, I see it as if those bodily sensations would block smooth conversation and disrupt and turn “good” feelings in to bad. In this case, “good” feelings of neutrality, of what is expected in a classroom, how a teacher-body should act. The teacher-
body would have been an affect alien from where affective processes of “bad” feelings were put to speed, towards the participants. Though, in this case, the teacher-body in the classroom assemblage stayed “in line”, in “control”. However, I see the manifestation and explicitly of the nervousness in this thesis as a formulation in itself of the teacher-body as an affect alien, which might be contagious and might make the reader nervous or uncomfortable. To conclude, I interpret the teacher-body, in this case, the workshop-leader-body as both an affect alien and as “in-line” in relation to these examples.

Another example of how feelings of shame were present was when I felt that I censured the ideas of my master thesis. I interpret this as connected to Probyn’s ideas on shame while not being able to convey one’s thinking to others, but I also connect this to Ahmed’s ideas of the feminist killjoy. Since the theories informing the workshop and this master thesis project are built on feminist theoretical thinking technologies, my body communicating these, is always in relation to the promises of the word “feminist”. Ahmed defines these promises as expectations of “unhappiness” and states: “The feminist killjoy ‘spoils’ the happiness of others; she is a spoilsport because she refuses to convene, to assemble, or to meet up over happiness.” (Ahmed 2010: 65) Hence the censuring and shame in this case could be seen as related to how my body possibly was perceived as a killjoy-body. The idea of the feminist killjoy affected the intra-active-researcher-body in the sense that it made it shameful and affected it to be quiet about some of the ideas of the project, the ones which could be perceived as not in line with happy promises.

Another example of how the imagined teacher-body, in relation to the exercise on oppressive situations, felt shame and fear is described in the oral interview. The participant explains that ze usually does not act and take a stand in oppressive situations, because they usually are described as “jokes”. The participant does not want to be the one killing the good atmosphere (O.i.). I interpret this in accordance with Ahmed as a will to “get along”. According to Ahmed “[s]ome bodies become blockage points, points where smooth communication stops” (Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 39). I see this participant’s choice not to act and speak up as shaped in relation to avoiding becoming that blockage point and not wanting to be the affect alien, where bad feelings get stuck. Hence this rejection of being the blockage point affected the teacher-body in the imagined situation so it did not act, but were quiet and went along with the oppressive situation.
Other participants describe how they in the imagined oppressive situations felt discomfort and as if it was difficult and hard to get involved and speak up in the situation (W.i. 1:H; 1:C). This could also be related to Ahmed’s ideas on how bad feelings tend to stick to the bodies that are creating them (Ahmed in Gregg & Seigworth 2010: 39). Nevertheless several participants in the workshop describe how they, regardless of the risk of bad feelings sticking to their bodies, chose to act in the imagined oppressive situations. They describe how they would speak up and “do the right thing” in the situation. I interpret these actions in the light of Ahmed’s idea of the corporeal schema, (Ahmed 2006: 111) as if the acting in oppressive situations already is a part of the teacher-body’s corporeal schema in a school assemblage. The participants were to think of themselves as practicing teachers in the exercise on the oppressive situations. The fact that several of them describe how they don’t hesitate to act in the oppressive situations could be interpreted as if they are following what is “in line” (2006: 16) for a teacher-body, i.e. what has been repeated by teacher-bodies through time. Since this was an imagined situation, one should also bear in mind that the participants descriptions also could be interpreted it as if they were describing what they thought they should do in the oppressive situation, hence how they imagined the teacher-body’s corporeal schema, or how they imagined what I as the workshop leader wanted them to act in the situation.

Finally I will think with Ahmed on how those, as one could perceive as “bad” or “negative” feelings such as anger, discomfort, sadness and irritation that emerged through the imagined oppressive situation, the participant-bodies, the papers with the written cases, the workshop-leader-body and the pictures of the animal should be seen as needed to put attention to. Ahmed states: “We might need to attend to bad feelings not in order to overcome them but to learn by how we are affected by what comes near, which means achieving a different relationship to all our wanted and unwanted feelings as an ethical resource.” (Ahmed 2010: 216) Ahmed argues on the importance of acknowledging “bad” feelings instead of focusing on how to “overcome” them, in order not to spread the bad feelings towards others, who don’t have the possibility to overcome unhappiness (ibid.). In other words: “Happiness for some involves persecution for others; it is not simply that this happiness produces a social wrong, but it might even be dependent upon it.” (Ahmed 2006: 105) In this case I would say that the imagined teacher-bodies, by putting attention to the unhappiness of feeling sad, uncomfortable, irritated or angry, they are able to act in order not to put the, in the imagined case, oppressed body in direction towards unhappiness. Perhaps could this also in the long run implicate that the imagined bodies that were oppressing in the case, that were putting affects
of emotions of shame and sadness and affects of violence towards the bodies that they oppressed, maybe those bodies could also be affected by the teacher-body’s attention to bad feelings, if this was a “real” situation.

**Commitment and inspiration**

I am in this study following Ahmed’s ideas on how it is impossible to separate “good” and “bad” feelings. Negative feelings are often described as being backwards and closed and good feelings as open and making subjects move forward (Ahmed in Gregg and Seigworth 2010: 50). In my quest towards transgressing binaries I also see this as an important dichotomy to aspire to overcome. Since I, besides from formulated emotions and feelings, am analysing affective processes I also see it as in practice impossible to distinct what would be “bad” and “good”, since I see affects as forces and processes that are impossible to squeeze into such categorisations. With this said I aim in this section of my study to analyse the emotional states of engagement, commitment and inspiration that were detected in the empirical material, trying not to categorize these as either good or bad.

I see the fact that eight participant-bodies showed up at the workshop in itself as a sign of commitment. Those bodies were affected by the presentation published at the web-portal or by the teacher’s advertising of the workshop. The affects put their bodies in motion, towards the workshop. The workshop was voluntary and the participating students just had an exam deadline, they might as well been for example resting, but they were there, attending the workshop. Still, there were also potential participant-bodies not attending the workshop. One possible explanation to why certain bodies attended and not others is that some bodies were, referring to Ahmed, oriented towards the workshop. Some bodies might, from the presentation, perceive the path towards the workshop as available, familiar and “in line” for their bodies (Ahmed 2006: 14, 20). Reasons that bodies might not be oriented towards the workshop could be that are not feeling familiar with the theoretical abstraction that were drawn out in the presentation, or that they aren’t “able” to attend a three-hour workshop (for example a body with an attention-disorder) or bodies that have other, more urgent objects to be oriented towards.

This is not to say that the bodies that attended the workshop need to be bodies that feel merely familiar or oriented towards the workshop. As Probyn argues, referring to Tomkins, “the fear-terror affect is closely related to the interest-excitement and the startle-surprise affect
systems” (Probyn 2004: 36). It is likely to think that the content of the workshop presented on the web-portal, such as intersectionality and emotions could be perceived as frightening. The participant in the oral interview shares the expectation of the workshop as both exciting and scary (O.i.). Further on, Probyn suggests that one should see student-bodies (in this case participant-bodies) not as entities but as divided into particles, in their capacity to affect and to be affected. This perspective might lead us into an understanding of how some parts of a body connect or do not connect, in this case to a presentation of a workshop, or to a content or experience of a classroom assemblage (Probyn 2004: 37). It is impossible to in whole map out these particles; they could be built up by previous experiences, memory, ideas (conscious or unconscious) etc. Though it is likely to believe that those particles are enabling a capacity to be or not to be affected.

Some particles of the participant-bodies that enabled affects were particles that allowed for the participant-bodies to be inspired and engaged by the workshop. There are several descriptions of this in the interviews. A number of participants share how this inspiration and engagement emerged through the composition of the workshop, the combination of lectures and exercises. Some also tell how they after the workshop in general and after the second exercises on the oppressive situations in particular felt strong and brave, feelings that were parts of affects put to speed by the workshop. Probyn advocates for a teaching on abstract theories with an embodied starting point. Ze argues that one, in particular in what ze calls “women studies” needs to acknowledge affects that rise from for example texts, and then work from that acknowledgement (Probyn 2004: 29). I think the workshop beds for these kind of embodied acknowledgements.

Another perspective on this is in relation to the engagement of the teacher-body, in this case the workshop-leader body. I express at several occasions in the field diary how much I love this project; I express the passion and excitement that emerged in the assemblage of my research project, in the relations of patterns between the researcher-body and the literature, the supervisor, the university, the workshop etc. As Probyn argues, the teacher-body’s affects might be contagious, ze states: “my students may catch them” (2004: 37). This might be what happened in the workshop, that the workshop-leader, intra-active-researcher-body with its engagement affected the participant-bodies.
To conclude, commitment, engagement and inspiration were affective processes active in the classroom assemblage, which could be seen as emotionally locations of the teacher- and participant-bodies. Those affects were moving in various directions, for example through the teacher-body towards the participant-bodies, through the content of the workshop to the participant-bodies and back towards the teacher-body.

**Affectively and emotionally situated bodies**

Finally I will discuss how the workshop might be a pedagogical and didactical method (without making clear distinctions between these) to affectively and emotionally situate bodies in a classroom assemblage. In this study I aim to transgress the norm critical idea of the self-reflective teacher from postconstructionist feminist perspectives on the body. One way to follow this through has been to think with ideas of situatedness and while turning to Braidotti, the politics of location. Braidotti explains this location as an “embodied and embedded location” regularly related to power positions and “memory and narratives”, that often are so close to us that we cannot acknowledge them ourselves. Further on, we could create an awareness of them by an increasing attentiveness to other bodies’ locations, which possibly could “transform our knowledge of ourselves and of the world” (Braidotti 2002: 12-13). This process of self-reflection is, according to Braidotti not individual, but it happens in relation to others (ibid.). Using the terminology of Barad, I would like to call it a process of intra-activity. I see this, by Braidotti mentioned, transformation as manifested in several of the participants descriptions of their experiences of the workshop. Two participants formulate their general impressions of the workshop: “Interesting, one does not think of the body in that way, an eye-opener” (W.i. 2:C:50) and “It [the workshop] provided some new ways to think” (W.i. 2:H:51). Yet another participant shares the experience of “feeling bad” because, ze acknowledges how ze “strengthens” some things (W.i. 2:G). I interpret this as if ze got aware of a privileged location of hir own body, in relation to other not so privileged locations.

Haraway states, in a discussion on how it can be narrowing to think with categories and classifications, that categories aren’t static and that we never entirely as researcher knows what is going on: “The world is more lively than that, including us, and there are always more things going on than you thought; maybe less than there should be, but more than you thought!” (Lykke, Markussen, Olesen 2008: 35) Ze continues, while referring to Marilyn Strathern that “[i]t matters which categories you use to think other categories with” (ibid.). In
the process towards an affective and emotional situatedness of the participant- and teacher-bodies in the workshop-assemblage I see this as a relevant point of departure. I can think the category of the workshop-leader-body with the categories of the other bodies that are included in this body, the white-lesbian-female-body etc. Those other non-static-bodies are pushing the workshop-leader-body in different directions and towards certain affective processes, hence emotional responses. Perhaps would for example the lesbian-workshop-leader-body be affected in a certain way if one of the participant-bodies told a heterosexist joke in the break, likewise would the female-workshop-leader-body be affected in a certain way if all of the participant-bodies were to be perceived as male-bodies. The in this case female-workshop-leader body could be directed into affective processes of fear or inconvenience if ze felt the inherited submissiveness of the female body in relation to the male bodies. This argumentation in itself calls for an understanding of affectively and emotionally situatedness of bodies in a classroom as multiple and unstable. One can never know what a body can do and one can never know how bodies get affected, yet those affects and bodies are acting in particular directions depending on certain particles of the singular bodies, at the same time always in relation to the certain assemblage and the agency of the matter, the body.

I see the workshop as a potential beginning of a thinking process of how to affectively and emotionally situate a teacher-body in the middle of a knowledge producing process, in order to, turning to Haraway, challenge the idea of knowledge as “neutral” and “universal” (Lykke 2010: 5). The workshop exercise including reflections upon one’s own norm producing position could be one way to start to think with deconstructionist ideas on self-reflexivity. Further on, the exercise on the imagined oppressive situation could be one way to raise an awareness of affective processes and emotional reactions included in teaching work. The first exercise could, combined with the second exercise, awake awareness on how affects and emotions are connected to memories and narratives, based upon earlier spatio-temporal locations of the body and corporeal schemas. For example if one’s teacher-body also is a male-body, a heterosexual-body and a white-body, one might get an idea that a classroom assemblage might affect the body in a specific way, hence the emotional reactions could differ from a female-black-lesbian-teacher-body’s emotional reaction. Those bodies could differ in their particles, hence could their capacity to affect and be affected differ in various spatiotemporalities.
To conclude, I see the workshop as a potential beginning of a thinking process, which could ambiguously affectively and emotionally situate teacher-bodies and participant-bodies in a spatio-temporal classroom assemblage. I want to emphasize that the situatedness always is momentary, though I find those thinking processes necessary in order to practice a feminist corpomaterial pedagogy.

**Conclusion**

**Summary**

In this study I have argued that in order to be able to rethink the area of norm critical pedagogy from a postconstructionist perspective with a point of departure in feminist intersectional corpomaterialist ideas of the body, one must transgress the grid-like thinking of norm positions, which tend to lead to static ideas of oppression. The focus in norm critical pedagogy on discourse tends to reproduce dichotomous understandings of the body and the mind. In order to overcome this, I have suggested putting a focus on and work through embodiment, corporeality and bodies in pedagogies. This could be done by directing focus towards affective processes, in particular processes consisting of emotions and feelings, by analysing what classroom assemblages and the bodies included in those can do.

In order to challenge the idea of the teacher as rational, neutral and universal knowledge producer, I have analysed how one can affectively and emotionally situate teacher-bodies and participant-bodies in classrooms. I have also challenged the idea of these two as separate from each other and discussed how bodies do not end at the skin, but constantly affect each other. I have shown that by scrutinizing one’s own norm-producing process one could make oneself attentive to some of the locations that the body inherits but that it is necessary, if one strive to transgress the binaries of body/mind, female/male and theory/practice to have a starting point in the body. One possible way to formulate this starting point is to put focus on affects and emotions as components of affective processes. I have argued that one way to start to think of and analyse affective processes could be to interpret stories on emotional experiences from a classroom assemblage in a poem. This could be seen as a mimetic strategy, where “écriture féminine” is combined with rhizomatic thinking and “writing as a method of inquiry”.

I have in this study argued that teacher/participant-bodies could be situated as memory
banks/workers. They always “work from memory” and those memories are affecting the bodies towards certain emotions. I have discussed how teacher-bodies could be situated both “in line” with a corporeal schema of a teacher-body, and at the same time as affect aliens and killjoys, who are interfering with joy and smooth conversations. I have shown how the emotions in classrooms could be contagious. Further on, how the awareness of “bad feelings” in teacher-bodies could implicate a prevention of putting participant-bodies in directions of unhappiness. I have analysed how it is impossible to predict what teacher/participant-bodies and classroom assemblages can do. This is always dependent on the various particles of each singular body and those particles’ capacities to affect and to be affected. This requires an ever-present reflexivity and sensibility in the teacher-body.

Finally I have provided an argumentation on how a workshop in a teacher-training programme could be one way to start to think on processes of how to affectively and emotionally situate bodies in a classroom assemblage. I have discussed how situatedness always is temporal and momentary, though necessary, in order to practice feminist corpomaterial pedagogies. While situating one’s own position in a norm-producing process from affects and emotions one could yearn for teaching as a mimetic repetition, where focus is on working through, what traditionally has been seen as female and irrational.

Foremost I hope that this study will affect the ones who are experiencing it with me in a direction of new insights on how affects and emotions saturate and move in every particle of bodies in all assemblages. Yet I want to suggest what these, hopefully poetic truths could implicate in a wider perspective. What would happen if teachers started to put attention to the body in general and what would happen if teacher-bodies were perceived and experienced not as rational, neutral minds, but as affective, emotional, fleshy, sweating, shaking, puking, running, stuttering, crying, loving, screaming, laughing, irritating, passionate bodies? What if these bodily sensations and emotions were celebrated or even recognized instead of repressed? And what if hardness, and “neutrality” also were recognized as emotional states? What would have happened if I in the introductory story of this thesis would have lied myself down on the floor, recognizing all of the oppressive affects that were written on and through my body, and cried? What would this reaction, instead of a harsh reprimand indicate in a wider perspective? What would the pupil-body do, how would it be affected?
**Epilogue**

Work environment surveys from 2010 and 2011 show that 5% of the female and 7% of the male teachers, 9% of the female and 15% of the male pupils were objected to violence in the last year, in a school environment. 7-9% of both pupils and teachers had received death treats. (This study did not mention transgender teachers’ or pupils’ exposure to violence, though other surveys indicate that transgender youth is more frequently objected to violence than cis-gender youth.) In May 2014 were the first indications of a new survey, from the Swedish Work Environment Authority published. 500 schools had been scrutinized and the authority had promulgated for example 1500 requirements of improvement of the systemized preventing work environment activities, 400 requirements of improvement on preventing violence and threat and 300 requirements of improvement when it comes to preventing stress and work load. In other words, 300 actions are needed if teachers are not going to be sick of stress due to workload (Arbetsmiljöverket 2013; Delin 2014).

I think these digits speak for themselves. Emotional reactions as parts of affective processes are put to speed by a system that merely see teachers as rational minds instead of acknowledging them as vulnerable and strong bodies. So what would happen if teachers were to be seen as teacher-bodies, as irrational and emotional, and as if it was impossible to separate the “private” body from the “neutral” “professional” body? In the actual teacher-bodies, this is already the case. 60% of them have difficulties not thinking about work on their free time (Arbetsmiljöverket 2014). The “professional” body affects the “private” body. This is something rarely recognized and highlighted by principals, municipalities and enterprises operating schools. So, what would happen if teachers started to take affect and emotion seriously themselves, when the masculine, productive, effective capitalist hegemonic school-discourse does not? What if all of these stressed out, desperate and tired teacher-bodies instead of trying to control their emotional responses to increasing workload and increasing amounts of pupils would express them? What would happen if hundreds of burned-out crying teachers would walk through Stockholm towards the Swedish parliament, emotional and vulnerable, demanding a focus on something that has been perceived as weak, insufficient and feminine, i.e. bodies and emotions?
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Appendix 1

Workshop plan

What can an embodied norm critical pedagogy implicate in teacher’s work?

Introduction
- Introducing my master thesis project and myself.
- Explaining that participating in the workshop and the exercises is voluntary and that anyone can stop participating whenever they want.
- A brief explanation of how the workshop will be followed through.
- I spread photos of animals on a table. I ask the students to pick one photo that describe how they feel this day. I also say that there are no rights or wrongs, they should just pick an animal, which they feel “connected to”, think is cute or feel represent their mood of the day.
- Then I ask them to talk in pairs for five minutes about their photo and their feelings of the day. We round off the introduction with a quick round where everyone say their name and if they want to, something about their photo.

Part 1: What is intersectionality and what is norm critical pedagogies?
- An “association”-exercise, where the participants brainstorm, first in pairs and then in the class in whole on the word “power”. I write their associations on the white board.
- A short lecture on how intersectional perspectives can be understood in a teaching context. I define the concepts of intersectionality and norm critical pedagogies.
- An exercise formulated with inspiration from the “Teflon-test” (Andersson in Bromseth & Darj 2010: 263-265) (described under Previous research). I ask the participants to write down for themselves their reflections on the following questions: “Which norms am I fulfilling?” “Which norms am I breaking against?” “In which situations?” For “support” they have the categorisations: sex/gender, sexuality, class, age, dis/ability, skin-color, language, health/sickness, family, religion and others lined up beside the questions.
- A reflection in pairs on how it was to think about one’s own norm position.

Break – a 10-15 minutes break
Part 2: How is it possible to have a bodily awareness in norm critical teacher work?

- An “association”-exercise, where the participants brainstorm, first in pairs and then in the class in whole on the word “emotions”. I write their associations on the white board.

- A short lecture on how emotions could be understood as emerging through and between bodies and how emotions can help us to create a bodily awareness. Followed by a reflection on what bodies can do in classrooms.

- An exercise connected to the question of, if and how it is possible to have the body as starting point in a self-reflecting norm critical teaching work. I ask everyone to be quiet and then I give every person a written case. The cases consist of briefly described situations, where the participants are to imagine themselves as practicing teachers. For example: “You are about to leave the school for the day, you walk through the hallway when you hear one pupil say ‘stupid faggot’ to another pupil.” or “You are guarding a test when you see one pupil throw a small piece of paper that lands on another pupils desk. You walk over there and read the note, it says: ‘everyone thinks you are ugly and retarded’.” I ask them to close their eyes and imagine the situation the case consists of. I ask them to imagine what kind of clothes they are wearing, what happens just before the situation in the case occur, if they are hungry, stressed out, happy or if they are occupied in their minds with something in particular. Then I ask them to “play” their case in their head and stop just at the last thing that happens. I ask them to open their eyes, still quiet and pick a picture of an animal (that I have spread out on a table) that they think represent the emotions and thoughts that they are having right now, in the imaginary situation. I ask them to talk in pairs about their picture and what it represents. If they want to they can share their feelings and thoughts on the case they just read.

- The first written interview is followed through. (See appendix 1)

- The participants talk in pairs for some minutes, reflecting upon the exercise (if it was difficult, how they felt).

- We finish the workshop with a round where everyone has the opportunity to share something from their experience in the workshop, if they want to.

- The second written interview is followed through (See appendix 2). This will take 15 minutes (included in the workshop).
Appendix 2

Frågor som låg till grund för den första skriftliga intervjun

Intervju 1

Reflektera skriftligt över frågorna:

- Hur kände du när du spelat upp caset för dig själv?
- Vilka känslor och/eller minnen var närvarande när du öppnade ögonen första gången? Varför kände du så, tror du?
- Var det något särskilt som hände i kroppen när du levde dig in i situationen?
- Vilket djur har du valt (beskriv kort hur det ser ut)?
- Varför valde du just den bilden? Vilka känslor representerar den för dig?
- Hur kände du när du agerade i situationen?

Questions that outlined the first written interview

Interview 1

Reflect upon these questions in written:

- How did you feel when you imagined the case?
- What feelings and/or memories were present when you opened your eyes the first time? Why do you think you felt like you did?
- Was it anything in particular that happened in your body when you imagined the situation?
- Which animal did you chose (make a short description of it)?
- Why did you chose that picture in particular? What feelings does it represent for you?
- How did you feel when you acted in the situation?
Appendix 3

Frågor som låg till grund för den andra skriftliga intervjun

Intervju 2

Skriftlig intervju 10-15 minuter

• Hur var din upplevelse av workshopen i sin helhet?
• Hur kände du under workshopen?
• Vilka sensationer kände du i kroppen under workshopen?
• Ändrades din känslomässiga upplevelse (tex humör) under workshopen, i sådana fall hur? Var det i sådana fall något särskilt som fick dig att känna annorlunda?

Questions that outlined the second written interview

Interview 2

Written interview 10-15 minutes

• What was your experience of the workshop in general?
• How did you feel during the workshop?
• Which sensations did you feel in your body during the workshop?
• Did your emotional state change (for example your mood) during the workshop, in that case, how? Was it anything in particular that made you feel different?
Appendix 4

Underlag som låg till grund för den muntliga intervjun

Jag började med att förklara för intervjudeltagaren att det är helt frivilligt att svara på frågorna och att hen kan avbryta intervjun när som helst. Jag förklarade att jag kommer anonymisera henom i uppsatsen genom att inte ange hens namn. Jag informerade också om att hen kommer att få möjlighet att läsa de delar av intervjun som jag transkriberat om hen vill och då har möjlighet att redigera citat om hen känner sig felciterad och/eller säga att jag inte får använda materialet. Dock kommer jag inte ha möjlighet att ge hen tid att läsa exakt de citat och/eller referaten jag väljer att använda i min uppsats. Jag informerade också om att det kan vara så att jag inte citerar eller refererar alla intervjuer, dock så bidrar allt material till att informera uppsatsen. Slutligen sa jag också att det självklart inte finns några rätt eller fel svar på frågorna som jag kommer att ställa. Det jag är intresserad av är deltagarens upplevelser.

Frågeunderlag för intervju:

Inledande etablerande frågor
- Hur ser din akademiska bakgrund ut?
- Vilka erfarenheter har du av att undervisa?
- Varför var du intresserad av att delta i workshopen?

Om workshopen i sin helhet
- Vad tyckte du om workshopen i sin helhet?
- Vilka känslor kände du under workshopen?
- Ändrades ditt humor eller känsloläge under eftermiddagen? I sådana fall på vilket sätt?
- Upptäckte du några särskilda sensationer i kroppen under workshopen?

Om den sista övningen:
- Vad tyckte du om den sista övningen med den förtryckande situationen?
- Vilka känslor dök upp under övningen?
- Vilka sensationer kände du i kroppen?
- Vilket case fick du i övningen?
- Vad kände du när du spelade upp caset för dig själv?
- Vilken bild valde du för att representera ditt känsloläge efter caset?
- Vill du berätta lite mer om varför du valde den här bilden?
- Vad representerar bilden för dig?

Avslutande
- Är det något du vill tillägga?
- Vilket namn vill du att jag använder om dig i min uppsats?
- Får jag kontakta dig om jag har några ytterligare frågor? Kan jag i sådana fall få din mailadress?

Tusen tack för ditt deltagande!
Outline for the oral interview

I started by explaining to the interviewee that it is totally optional to answer the questions and that ze is able to call off the interview at any time. I explained that ze will be anonymized in the thesis, thus I will not use hir name. I also informed hir that ze will have the opportunity to read the parts of the interview that I transcribe if ze wants and that ze has the ability to edit quotes if ze feels that ze is misquoted. Ze also has the ability to say that I am not allowed to use the material. I also informed hir that the situation might occur that I wont quote or paraphrase all of the interviews, but that the entire material still is informing the thesis. Finally I told hir that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions I will pose in the interviews. What I am interested in is the participant’s experiences.

Question surface:

Initial establishing questions:
- What does your academic background look like?
- What are your experiences with teaching?
- Why were you interested in participating in this workshop?

About the workshop in general:
- What did you think of the workshop in general?
- Which emotions did you feel during the workshop?
- Did your mood or emotional state change during the workshop? In that case, in which way?
- Did you discover any sensations in particular in your body during the workshop?

About the last exercise:
- What did you think of the last exercise, which included the oppressive situation?
- Which emotions appeared during the exercise?
- Which sensations did you feel in your body?
- Which case did you get in the exercise?
- What did you feel when you imagined the case?
- Which picture did you choose in order to represent your emotional state after the case?
- Do you want to tell a little bit more of why you chose that picture?
- What does the picture represent for you?

Concluding
- Is it anything you want to add?
- Which name do you want me to use of you in my thesis?
- Can I contact you if there are any further questions? Can I in that case have your email-address?

Thank you very much for participating!
Appendix 5

Quotes from the written interviews in Swedish

1. “Det kändes att jag var väldigt bra på att fantisera ihop mitt case i huvudet.” (W.i. 1:F)

2. “Jag förberedde mig på att bli arg, för jag visste vad som skulle hända och direkt när jag såg caset förstod jag hur jag skulle reagera.” (W.i. 1:A)

3. “Trötthet, irritation” (W.i. 1:B)

4. “[…] leden, besviken och arg” (W.i. 1:C)

5. “obekväm” (W.i. 1:D)

6. “hjälplös” (W.i. 1:H)

7. “För att egentligen skulle jag vilja skrika rakt ut att så säger man inte, skönt att visa en bild istället för att göra så.” (W.i. 1:B)

8. “Blev lite arg och upprörd över det case jag fick men det släppte rätt så snart. (W.i. 2:D)

9. “Här märkte jag upprymdhet i en övning och situationen i den andra var mer irritationsframkallande.” (W.i. 2:E)


11. “Ledsen för att ”mina” elever säger så till sina kamrater, ilska &besvikelse att det förekommer.” (W.i. 1:B)

12. “[I]rriterad, besviken, sorgsen, omhändertagande” (W.i. 1:E)

13. “’vi fixar det tillsammans’” (W.i. 1:E)

14. “En vilja att agera […]” (W.i. 1:H)

15. “Agerandet kändes jobbigt men med behov.” [sic!] (W.i. 1:C)

16. “Känslor av att inte vilja synas, men ändå göra det” (W.i. 1:D)

17. “Skulle hellre låtsas som ingenting, men så gör inte jag för jag vet att det är fel, får skuldkänslor och vet att inget blir bättre av att stoppa huvudet i sanden.” (W.i. 1:C)

18. “Det svåra kommer av att ta tag i situationen och blanda in sig själv.” (W.i. 1:H)

20. “När jag pratade med eleverna om situationen kändes det spånt och sedan lättat […]”. (W.i. 1:B)

21. “När jag väl agerade var det en känsla av att lyckas.” (W.i. 1:F)

22. “Kände mig stark och modig då jag verkligen ville säga ifrån.” (W.i. 1:A)

23. “Jag försattes i ett svårlösligt problem som jag tog mig ur med hjälp av en lösning som krävde mod. Därmed upplevde jag mig modig under slutet av workshopen.” (W.i. 2:E)

24. “[…] jag som lärare hade misslyckats att bygga en trevlig grupp.” (W.i. 1:F)

25. “Men jag kände mig också dålig ibland för att jag stärker vissa saker som inte borde stärkas.” (W.i. 2:G)

26. “Det kändes bra, vi kunde kanske ha varit några fler från klassen men det kan ju inte du hjälpa.” (W.i. 2:A)

27. “Upplevelsen av workshopen var riktigt positiv.” (W.i. 2:E)

28. “[…] Känslorna under workshopen var bland annat att jag var stolt över att jag fick hit och diskutera dessa viktiga ämnen. […]Känslan nu är att jag är nöjd och glad över det du och vi har pratat om.” (W.i. 2:G)

29. “Nej känner mig lika glad och positiv som när jag kom!”(W.i. 2:H)

30. “Jag kände mig inspirerad och lagom utmanad.” (W.i.2:E)

31. “Eggad, att tänka annorlunda på kroppen […]” (W.i. 2:C)

32. “Blev lite förvånad över mig själv att jag levde mig in det case vi fick så mycket som jag faktiskt gjorde.” (W.i. 2:D)

33. “För det mesta positiva, engagerande och intresserande.” (W.i. 2:F)

34. “De olika momenten (föreläsning, diskussioner, bilder och associationer) som varierades om varandra höll ett bra tempo och intresset uppe.” (W.i. 2:F)

35. “Dina utmanande övningar gav förändrande intryck med känslor av inlevelse i de situationer vi erbjuds.” (W.i. 2:E)

36. “klar & blir varm och spänd” (W.i. 1:D)

37. “Vad som hände i kroppen var stigande puls, axlarna höjdes och kroppen gjorde sig beredd att handla.” (W.i. 1:G)

38. “Stelhet och muntorhett.” (W.i. 2:B)

39. “Sensationerna i kroppen var kanske inte så stora. Men jag kände definitivt variationer.” (W.i. 2:E)
40. “Sensationer?” (W.i. 2:A)


42. “Jag kände mig obekväm, mest med mig själv, och det kändes som en situation där jag varit i förr och önskat att jag vågat göra på något annat sätt. […] Jag mindes konkreta och faktiska situationer som liknar den i caset och jag kände att den berättar något om mig själv som jag inte tycker om. ” (W.i. 1:D)

43. “När jag öppnade ögonen […] minnen från en likartad situation gjorde att ”svaret” på lösningen verkade klar, men svår att personligen våga genomföra.” (W.i. 1:H)

44. “Varför jag kände så här är nog för att jag ofta står i lojalitetskonflikter. (W.i. 1:G)

45. “Bra upplagd, kunde ha varit lite mer övningar med kroppen (hade förväntat mig det).” (W.i. 2:A)

46. “Kände mig öppen för mer förslag och hade kanske hoppats på ännu mer klassrumssituationer att diskutera runt.” (W.i. 2:D)

47. “Att byta plats och prata med någon man inte kände gjorde mig mer tillbakadragen och tyst, fick ut mindre av den övningen än innan.” (W.i. 2:A)

48. “Först infann sig anspänning hur ditt budskap skulle presenteras och tas emot av de studenter som kommit. Sedan infann sig en lättnad över att du var proffsig i ditt framförande […]” (W.i. 2:E)

49. “En vilja att agera plus så många andra förvirrade känslor susade runt, men ingen riktigt grabbade tag.” (W.i. 1:H)

50. “intressant, man tänker inte på kroppen på det sättet, tankeställare (W.i. 2:C)

51. “Den gav lite nya sätt att tänka på.” (W.i. 2:H)
Appendix 6

Quotes from the oral interview in Swedish

1. ”Dels kanske lite arg på mig själv för att jag inte skulle göra så mycket och samtidigt arg på de andra för vad de säger. Och arg på dom för att dom sätter mig i en situation som jag inte vill vara i.”

2. ” […] det kändes som att den där katten kanske gömde sig lite, och det är väl lite så jag också kanske har känt i den typen av situationer, att kanske jag hade önskat att jag inte hade hört vad som hade hänt så att jag inte hade behövt låtsas att jag syntes. Som kan vara den akuta känslan i alla fall. Helst vill jag inte vara där, utan slippa undan det där. Och då tror jag den katten beskrev det på något sätt, den hade krupit in där.”

3. ”Jag tycker det är allmänt jobbigt att ta konflikter, och samtidigt så är det ofta sådana där kommentarer, det där caset var ju i och för sig inte det minsta skämtsamt, i många fall så hävdas det ju att saker sägs på ett skämtsamt sätt och man vill inte vara liksom tråkig och glädjedöande och komma och säga någonting när folk säger sen att ’Ja men jag skojade bara’.”

P: Efteråt skulle jag känna mig ganska nöjd tror jag… och i stunden så, ja… gissningsvis ganska obekväm tror jag.”

5. “obekväm på många sätt”

6. “E: […] märkte du, hände det något i kroppen under den här övningen. P: Ja men på ett sätt men det är lite i motsats till hur det kändes så tror jag att jag ändå slappnade av ganska mycket. Man kunde slappna av, sitta och blunda, så att det var ett lugn i det på samma gång som det var ett obehag.”

7. ”Känslan av stelhet tror jag, för mig, är både en mental stelhet och kroppslig. Jag sitter ganska stilla och ihopkrupen sådär […] Så det är nog lite glidande, för mig, vad som känns som en känsla och vad som känns som en mer kroppslig förnimmelse liksom.”

8. ”P: Jag blir väl lite nervös i obekväma samma hang. Men också tror jag att jag tänker workshop, att det ska vara såhär rollspel och forumteater och såhär, spännande i sig men lite läskigt att göra.
E: Så själva ordet har en del förväntningar i sig på något sätt?
P: Ja och inte minst med den bakgrunden om det handlar om genus och intersektionalitet så tänker nog jag att ja då kan det nog bli forumteater tänker nog jag.
E: Att du har haft den erfarenheten tidigare med?
P: Ja men lite så ja.
E: Workshop intersektionalitet genus forumteater.
P: Ja men någons lags associationskedja där i alla fall.”

9. ”Men efterhand upplevde jag att jag kunde sätta mig in i den situationen som beskrevs i mitt case. Och det är väl kanske också för att, kanske inte exakt på det sättet, men att den
påminde om verkliga situationer. Det var ganska lätt att hitta tillbaka till hur, hur det har känts då och hur jag tror att det skulle känna om det händer igen.”
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