# Border Rioting and Crossings Between Disciplines and Professions, Countries and Cultures, Science and Society: An Assemblage of Autoethnographic Stories From the High North

Anne B. Reinertsen[1] (iD), Kirsten Elisabeth Stien[2], Elena Merzliakova[2], Valerii Chernik[3], Julia Afonkina[3], Herbert Zoglowek[2], and Tatiana Kuzmicheva[3]

## Abstract

We are seven experienced academics and researchers from the high north. All within the field of education. We represent different disciplines, countries, and cultures. What we have in common is a wish to cross borders, collaborate, and learn: make space for storied experiences. Our stories are open ended—we start and end in complexities, and embedded in some sort of post- or trans- perspective be it modernisms, -structuralisms, -humanisms, -colonialisms, -feminisms . . . No conclusions or commonalities are necessary. Rather, we want to draw attention to the metatextualities and freedoms of our storying and the inseparability of opposites. We are learning academics beginning where we are. We are learning academics wanting lives of becoming rather than copying or reinforcing what is already there.

## Keywords

autoethnography, ethnographies, methodologies, online ethnography, writing as method of inquiry, methods of inquiry, qualitative research & education, qualitative research, politics and culture

## Introduction

Writing autoethnography is a form of activisms and aesthetics, expanding the empirical basis we perform research *with*. It is a performative practice of thinking from within swirling together ontology, epistemology, political perspectives and ethics. Autoethnography hence being a form of self-reflecting and writing, exploring writers' own experiences with/in wider cultural, political, and social contexts (Ellis, 2004). Pelias (2013) suggests that writing is "a performative act, a material manifestation of a writer's labor and ideology" (p. 560). It is a writing therefore that enables critical reflection which allows for being/thinking other, hence not a practice of fixed meaning making but a strategy that possibilizes "alternative social constructions and practices" (p. 561). Highlighting the entangled relational contours of our situativity, or rather unpacking the ways in which our relative locations and historicized, accepted ways of being and knowing conceive, enact, and normalize knowledges, practices and even so-called "quality."

All situativity theory refers to theoretical frameworks which argue that knowledge, thinking, and learning are situated (or located) in experience. Autoethnography hence enabling us to attend to border rioting and crossings between discipline and profession, countries and cultures, science and society differently than other theories and methods might. But to be clear, there is no writing that can determine other peoples' positions and what they might want or need to do. Autoethnography is not any sort of self-indulgent narcissism, nor any type of therapeutic technique or claim of being authentic. Rather, it is a move from matter to becoming materially identifiable subjects for one another, a constitution of subjectivity producing some sort of agency. Autoethnographic writing is therefore not unbiased. Its power lies in asking about the values we build on and coming to terms with values we want: the power in asking what value paradigms we are heading against (Reinertsen, 2022).

[1]Ostfold University College, Halden, Norway
[2]Archtic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway
[3]Murmansk State Pedagogical University, Russian Federation

**Corresponding Author:**
Anne B. Reinertsen, Ostfold University College, BRA Veien 4, 1757 Halden, Norway.
Email: annebre@hiof.no

We are seven experienced researchers within the field of education. We represent different disciplines, countries and cultures. What we have in common is a wish to cross borders, collaborate, and learn: make space for storied experiences. Our stories are open ended—we start and end in complexities, and embedded in some sort of post- or trans- perspective be it modernisms, -structuralisms, -humanisms, -colonialisms, -feminisms . . . No conclusions or common- alities are necessary. Rather, we want to draw attention to the metatextualities and freedoms of our storying and the inseparability of opposites, learning transmigrating through- out the eons of time.

## Becoming Technologist; Between Analogue and Virtual Foresight in Research

*Anne B. Reinertsen, Professor of Pedagogy, Østfold University College, Norway.*

### The Romance

I was supervising one of my PhD students the other day. She writes about sustainability. I said, Nature does not imi- tate us back. It is its own purpose. Try to write a language that expresses unity with nature: Nature-Culture reconfigu- rations inhabiting the interface between.

### The Imitation Game Not

I was writing on one of my articles the other day. I wrote about technology, becoming technologist. I said to myself: Technology imitates us back. I am its purpose. It has a force of its own capable of creating existential displacements between me and the/a medium. I live eye to eye with my digital twin. Having purchased yarn online to knit a sweater it seems I am bombarded with offers to buy more yarn as if I need 20 new sweaters. My selves, my identities, my lan- guages and skills have turned algorithmic. To imitate back I click on, e.g., sewing, art, and handicraft to level out and expand the scope of the machine.

Imitation or mimesis is not a feeling. It surfaces and shows itself in situations with others and is therefore basi- cally social. That includes the social of the social media. Neither seen nor experienced in itself, feelings subsequent opinions nevertheless come to the fore as they surface. There is fear, anger, envy, admiration, resentment etc. Or as Deleuze and Guattari (1994) put it, There are *insults and confrontations of world views* (p. 146). Comparisons are made so easily online. Powers are gathered in few hands. My vulnerability is increased. I try not to write a language that expresses unity with technology: Man–machine recon- figurations inhabiting the interface between. But I must. My agency is at stake here.

To become technologist, I think mimesis or imitation is the important word to rework because it has the potential to put ethics of coding and the human algorithmic condition in play. Ethics being a question of how can *I be worthy of the events that await me, how can I enter into events that sweep me up, pre-exist me, or that I cannot control?* (Grosz, 2017, p. 151). Offering the concept of mimesis therefore neither a subject nor an object hence trying to do away with *both the problem and the solution* (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 90 italics in original), it (mimesis) turns out to become labor in essence, productive, and actualizable through usage only, an affirmative vital force. The human algorithmic condition and becoming technologist thus reconceptualized as a lin- guistic (re)design process and poetics. Mimesis as that of writing a *refrain* perhaps, that I can sing again and again to remind me of me other, ultimately turning mimesis into a philosophical concept and method. As concept, it thus pos- sibilizes its own border crossings and liberation between algorithms and heuristics, the analogue and the virtual, the personal and the political. My agency is a constant ongoing reconfigurings of the world, analogue and virtual, not linked to meanings, opinions or attributes, but to what I can do. Deleuze and Guattari (1994) write,

> The concept is a form or a force; in no possible sense is it ever a function. In short there are only philosophical concepts on the plane of immanence, and scientific functions or logical propositions are not concepts. (p. 144)

### Fabulating Antagonistic Ethics Trying to go Beyond the Discussion of Cheese

Turning mimesis into labor, I become that of a fabulating ethical antagonist and *conceptual personae* going *beyond the discussion of cheese* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 146) asking what kind of relations to establish between different parts of the machinery remembering and trying to think other. *The other*- being—*the existence of the encompassed possible.* Furthermore, that- *language is the reality of the possible as such.* And the self is- *the development and the explication of what is possible, the process of its realiza- tion in the actual* (Deleuze, 2004, p. 347). Every man– machine encounter or conversations is thus turned from being cases to events, from being nouns to verbs, from sub- stances to processes. Mimesis, then, understood as simulta- neously productive and unresolvable, orienting me toward sameness and difference at once, toward a new vitality but also toward new dangers and impasses. I choose the con- cept of the fabulating antagonist because the tensions and the heat created by border crossing is (still) on in the world today. Mimesis hence a fabulation on sociality itself. Otherness prompting, mobilizing, and allowing for flows of affirmation of values and forces which are not yet sus- tained by current conditions. I create a political channel and (non)relational web to speak through, possibilizing myself. My writing thinks itself in me and I produce its

consciousness. *Round Midnight* and Ella Fitzgerald sings Thelonious Monk (1943):

> It begins to tell,
> 'Round Midnight, midnight.
> . . .
> Let our hearts take wings'
> 'Round Midnight, midnight
> . . .
> Let the angels sing,
> Round . . . Round . . . Round . . . Mid . . . night . . .
> That point of nonstyle
> . . .
> a moment of quiet restlessness
> . . .
> producing a sovereign freedom, a pure necessity in which one enjoys a moment of grace between life and death, and in which all the parts of the machine come together to send into the future a feature that cuts across all ages. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 1–2)

### Undertaking Linguistic Participatory Design Projects Exploring the Broader Effects of Digitalization; the Sense of an Emergent Self

Mimesis as labor hence pure becoming implies a *paradox enacting the genesis of contradiction and inclusion in the propositions stripped of signification* (Deleuze, 2004, p. 81). Methodologically, this view of mimesis has two consequences. First, it demands attention to questions of frames, of the boundary work through which a given entity is delineated as such. The first premise is therefore that units of analysis are made not given. Second, that it is an obligation to constantly expand frames to wider views that at once acknowledge *the magic of the effects created while explicating the hidden labors and unruly contingencies that exceed its bounds* (Suchman, 2009, pp. 283–284). Here, materialized as an im/possible unpacking of algorithms in everyday life.

Subsequently, hence the second consequence, is therefore the obligation of undertaking material linguistic participatory design projects. Ultimately, allowing life's inflections work directly on our bodies, bringing us to the place of sensations when we sense; allowing infinite sums of minute perceptions that destabilize macro perceptions that are already there while preparing the following one. Giving events, that is, the importance they invoke to keep conceptualization of concepts open for what more it is possible to think. It is a poetics of conceptual redesign or rework making algorithms accountable through the (re) design of their surfaces: the forms and shapes of appearance, documentation, signs, symbols, and tangible devices accompanying their use.

It seems to me however, that there is an emptiness and a shortage of ideas and—in my opinion, a rather dangerous fatigue with what is often conceived of as indeterminable discourses. Mouffe (2015) suggests that we need to recognize the *ambivalence of human social nature and the fact that interdependency and hostility cannot be separated* (p. 9). Some say that the only thing that can stop a mad man with a gun is a good man with a gun. Is it really so that the only thing that can stop analogue and virtual dictatorships and injustice is a hope that dictators are good?

I speak of agency again. I need to recognize a good paradox when I encounter it. Deleuze (2004) writes: *Today's task is to make the empty square circulate and to make pre-individual and nonpersonal singularities speak—in short, to produce sense* (p. 84). I am my own purpose with you and you cannot imitate me back. I claim my subjectivity and agency for myself through showing the play between my inner individuality and the /my public outer. Becoming technologist through possibilizing enfolding algorithms moving without a program, a plan or task to achieve: my Man-Machine reconfigurations inhabiting the interface between.

## Some Activist Moments During my Working Days the Autumn of 2022

*Kirsten Elisabeth Stien, associate professor in pedagogy, department of teacher education and pedagogy, UiT The arctic university of Norway*

On a Friday, a few hours before leaving the office, I accidentally ran into a person from the blue-collar staff. A young and communicative person, ready to take actions when needed but without a particularly pleasing attitude. I felt a kind of joy when meeting him and said without thinking: "Good afternoon"—then he replied: "It is not quite the afternoon yet." I thought for a while, recognizing this mild correction, and said: "Well, it is getting darker because of the seasonal changes, so soon it will be dark." Why this kind of correction? My "Good afternoon" was performed in a stereotypical way of how some ethnical groups in this region are supposed to perform greetings. It might however contain a slightly mocking element if you may look for such.

I knew the second the sentence left my lips, that this could be misunderstood, and I was happy that we had passed each other without having to look each other in the eyes. This physical distance opened a room to renegotiate, and the possibility was given by the inviting phrasing of the answer: It is not *quite afternoon yet.* There and then I could therefore find a remark that both acknowledged the mild correction but also put me in a position of being an actor in the conversation.

On a Tuesday, while meeting a large group of professionals from municipality services concerning the cooperation around the conditions of a child being in difficult

situations, I totally lost my ability of hearing. I held a monologue and was not capable of listening to the different comments from the audience. The listeners uttered something to me in more and more clear feedback, but the response from me did not appear. In the beginning, I think they tried get through to me with mild corrections, but my inner dialogue was not flexible enough to cope with what was happening. The theme for this meeting was the mental health of pupils, and even if I have a story of being bullied from the age of 8 till 10, I like to think that this story no longer is an active part(ner) in my inner life.

Arguing with Arendt's concept of the mind as two-in-one (Arendt, 1978), I would like to make an analytic remark to the situations outlined above. Arendt puts forward an understanding that human beings are embedded in speaking and hearing more than one voice, as this is our de facto survival position, so to speak. We simply cannot live without this predisposition to hear more than one voice, whether we talk about our inner or outer conversations. Thinking is a solitary, however, not lonely process, and Arendt speaks of this as a *duality* of myself with myself because I both ask and answer. She is clear that the evaluation criterion of the mental dialogue is not that of truth, but that of being "consistent with oneself" (1978, p. 186). That is, when being consistent with the inner speech with oneself, it is possible to speak against oneself, but the two-in-one become one when the outside world intrudes the thinking process. Because of this, I would say that thinking with myself is possible, however not always an option when the outside world disturbs the inner part. We are therefore imperfect and vulnerable, challenged by disruptions and disconcertments inside and between the worlds we mentally are acting. In the situation with the municipality group, this can be understood as an intrusive element from the outside that I was not able to make room for in the ongoing inner speech with myself. A difference too different, and ahead of any interrelations between the group and me, at that particular moment.

The concept of *searvelatnja;* shared rooms, was first used by Sara (2004) to describe a traditional knowledge setting in a Sámi context of upbringing. Balto and Østmo (2012) bring the concept into an educational setting using it for a group context when students talk about experiences of being in Sámi and Norwegian areas. Searvelatnja means rooms for different stories, in different languages and from different places, and become a vital element in the situation of doing differences together. A concept taken from one knowledge practice to another, but still having the quality of being a relevant concept of interrelations through moments of shared, but different, experiences. The collaborative aspect of being inside and outside, doing inner and outer conversations, makes the voices continuing in/as fluent dialogues. To bring forth the moment of activism, this will occur if we are able to create a searvelatnja for the municipality group and myself. For the first incident, I think the quality of searvelatnja is already realized, as the flow of an inner dialogue at that moment communicated with the outer dialogue.

## I Would Have Liked Science to be Interpreted Objectively . . . and My PhD in a Different Situation

*Elena Merzliakova: university lecturer in pedagogy, department of teacher education and pedagogy, UiT The arctic university of Norway.*

I have just finished my PhD thesis and was about to submit it for approval. The thesis was about how kindergarten teacher training can facilitate student mobility in a better way. I have argued passionately about bilateral cooperation between kindergarten teacher training courses as I believe it will benefit everyone, both students and institutions. I have used experiences from a concrete collaboration between my institution in Norway and a teacher training institution in Murmansk, Russia. Over 10 years, we have built a collaboration where we gradually tried to involve more and more participants, and finally, bachelor's and master's students. I have therefore tried to understand how dialogue can be created and maintained over time between two kindergarten teacher training education programs from two different countries.

The project has been inspired by the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin's understanding of dialogue both in the method and the methodology. Bakhtin's idea of response was central. The collaborative project between two specific educational institutions was organized and carried out as a chain of responses that the participants gave each other. Data from this project would provide answers to how the students' ideas about learning in kindergarten are constructed in a chain of responses to practices in kindergartens in another country. Everything was going well. The thesis was finally ready for submission.

And then, in February 2022, Russia invaded Ukraine. The world was turned upside down. Suddenly, within a few days, Norway stops all cooperation with Russia. Russian athletes were not allowed to participate in skiing competitions on Norwegian soil; they were sent home. All, absolutely all official cooperation broke down. The same thing happened in Russia. I became uncertain and had to ask my supervisors and managers if I was allowed to defend a thesis about Russia as an employee at a Norwegian educational institution. I became unsure whether such a disputation was politically correct in the new political situation? I became uncertain whether the knowledge I had acquired had any value in this "new" world. Why however, should the question of my dissertation's value come up? Is it so hat the value of knowledge that is "packaged" in the form of a doctoral thesis is dependent on the political context? How long does knowledge last? When does it expire? Is there eternal knowledge? What characterizes this knowledge?

I began looking for answers from him, who inspired me for the project, my "spiritual" father, Bakhtin. According to Bakhtin, knowledge is constructed by concrete individuals in response to the context they have lived. He believes that all knowledge is temporary and is created again and again through new responses in continued changed contexts. The goal of knowledge is to provoke new responses. But what response could I give to and get from my Russian colleagues in the new political situation?

Throughout our collaboration, we gave each other responses not only as professional teacher educators but also as people, as friends. Ì according to Bakhtin, every individual is simultaneously holistic, unique, and universal (Bakhtin, 1979). Every "Me" depends on "the Other" to act and to create meaning about "Myself." In another word, "Me" creates "The other." "The other," in turn, creates "Me" (Bakhtin, 1979). It is only through ethical actions with a response to each other that it is possible to understand (poznat) both the Other and Myself. We thus became each other's colleagues, acquaintances, and friends. This collaboration allowed us to be holistic, unique, and universal individuals, which led to the experience of meaningfulness and satisfaction.

In the new political situation, researchers became political. These political parts of us shadowed the professional. "Researcher," "college" has stepped aside. There were suddenly new pages about "us" and "the others" that became more important to respond to. We could respond to each other as members of NATO, those who are for the war, or those who are against it. During the war, we write occasional messages to each other, agreeing that we should not lose sight of each other.

Almost half a year after the war started, the collegial aspects of our collaboration gradually started to emerge more and more. This text is the first attempt to include each other as colleagues in the dialogue, to respond to each other (again) as teacher educators and researchers to regain the feeling of meaningfulness and create us as holistic and unique simultaneously.

I think the answer to the question "how long does knowledge last," will be that all knowledge is temporary. There is no eternal knowledge. Yes, there are classics (as for example Bakhtin), but their "classical" knowledge gains value through interaction with concrete people in concrete historical situations. We use their "classical" knowledge to create our own meaning in our own time. Without us doing so, the "classical" knowledge is worthless. But to do that, we must recognize each other as individuals, friends, and researchers, as unique and holistic "you" and "me."

## It can be Found in History . . .

*Chernik Valerii, PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Head of the Chair of Pedagogics, Murmansk Arctic State University, Russia.*

In the context of the title of the article, I cannot help but ask myself: "Can I be considered as a native of the North?"

Especially if the phrase that everybody comes from childhood is true. I began my life way in the small town of Akhaltsikhe, in Georgia, in the Caucasus, where my father, who was originally from Belarus, was a military man. The Armenian and Georgian nurses helped my mother and me when I was newborn. There was this small town of Akhalkalaki, where everyone lived, rejoiced, endured difficulties nearby, together—Georgians, Russians, Armenians, Jews, Turkmens, Ukrainians . . . And there was no doubt: we were the family.

Having moved to Murmansk already in 1967, I felt acutely the impossibility of living "alone." I listened to the song:

> You and me and all of us,
> You and me and all of us,
> It's really great to have friends,
> If we lived apart from each other,
> There planet would be another
> Not the Earth and not our native lands.

At my school in Murmansk, I've heard the word "KID" and learned that it was not a sea monster (in Russian language the abbreviation KID means the International Friendship Club. It sounds like the "Whale" in Russian—"Kit"). KID was the union of teenagers, schoolchildren who sought to learn more about peers from different countries, connect countries and continents, bridging a planet of friendship . . . Probably we were naive. But very sincere. Our souls were not callous, and we were not calculous.

My strong remembrance is connected also with the war in Vietnam at that time. It was very long—from 1955 to 1975. I knew that the U.S. Army was bombing the territory of Vietnam. During the time I was in the seventh grade of school, from 1966 to 1973, the Americans dropped about 14 million napalm bombs on Vietnam. From my grandparents, mom and dad, I knew about the horrors of war. They had already felt all the horrors of bombing and artillery shelling, hunger and scurvy, the loss of loved people.

My mother told me that when Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union, she ended up in an orphanage. Without parents, the children of the orphanage were evacuated from the front line—away from Murmansk, where she was at that time. The train with children began to be shelled and bombed by fascist planes. In an effort to escape, the children ran away from the cars and tried to hide among the little northern birches. And planes with Nazi pilots flew low and fired machine guns at children—at everyone indiscriminately. And something seemed to strike my mother's leg: it turned out that it was a bullet that wounded her. And a girl, one of her friends, was killed.

Of course, nobody wanted people to die again, to shed blood—no matter who they were! And we were very sympathetic to our peers from Vietnam, far away from us. We collected so-called "Friendship bags," which were filled

with sweets, condensed milk with sugar, notebooks, pencils and paints, and other items that could be pleasant and useful for the children of Vietnam.

I remember very well how my classmates, friends at school and all of us were shocked by the news of the atrocities in September Santiago, when the Pinochet junta came to power in 1973. We immediately organized a protest rally against the atrocities that began in Chile, collecting signatures. We hoped it would help save the life of the Chilean composer and performer, anti-fascist Victor Jara, and other prisoners at the terrible stadium-prison—National de Chile Stadium. Signatures were collected demanding the release from prison of well-known anti-fascists, supporters of democratic transformations in their countries, Luis Corvalan (Chile, *Operation Lucho*), Antonio Maidana (Paraguay, *Operation Cebracho*), etc.

"There is no such thing as someone else's misfortune!"-these words were confirmed by my peers from all schools in the Murmansk region. The action "Little cranes for Sadako Sasaki" held at that time is indicative in this regard. When it became known that in distant Japan, in the Hiroshima city park at the monument to Sadako Sasaki, all the paper cranes that she made in the hope of gaining health after the deadly explosion of the American atomic bomb burned down, schoolchildren of the Murmansk region decided to make a lot of such cranes. It was a protest against the plans of the militarists to increase the arms race, as well as a tribute to those who suffered from the atomic bombings.

All the international friendship clubs of Murmansk schools participated in the Calotte movement. Already in the 3rd or 4th grade of school, I knew that "calotte" comes from the French word calotte—"hat." If you look at the map of Europe, you can easily see that the territories of Norway, Finland, Sweden located north of the Arctic Circle, as well as the Russian Murmansk Region, form like a "cap" of Europe. The desire of the population of these territories to live in peace and cooperation is very important. I'd call it the people's diplomacy movement. And it became especially noticeable in the year when the Caribbean crisis arose. The fervor of the inhabitants of the Caribbean region seemed to balance the soundness and wisdom of the inhabitants of Northern Europe. It was in 1962 that the very first meeting for peace in the North of Europe was held in the city of Kemi. Twin cities began to appear. And for me, the twin cities of Murmansk in Norway—Tromsø, Vadsø; in Finland—Rovaniemi; in Sweden—Luleå are forever in my memory. Meeting with peers who were growing up with me, we talked about the desire to live in peace, to stage performances together, share cooking secrets, etc. We grew up to be adults and many things have changed. But the desire to live in peace and cooperation remained. I remember very well how the Bird-Barents Festival was held in Murmansk in 2015, and within the framework of this festival there was a big concert of choirs from Sweden, Norway,

Finland and, of course, Russia. I never forget the words uttered by one of the choirmasters: "It is better to sing together than to fight with each other!"

I have been training future teachers for many years. I really want them to know the words "Song of Northern Friends":

They say Northern people are severe,
It's a fiction, I must tell you the truth!
Don't look at their appearance,
Try to guess the inner worlds of the Northen.
Ask me why?
Oh! Because if your friend is near to you,

Even North will be warmer than South.
Our common ocean is:
It doesn't have a minute of peace.
There is ice on the surface,
And the Gulf Stream is under the ice.

We should meet, we should talk all together,
Like the water mur-murs in the fiords.
We should be like Nothern mountains and the rivers are pleasant,
Like the friends that we are glad to see.

Of course, words can be learned quickly, firmly. But it is much more important to feel the power of friendship, the joy of meeting, the satisfaction of many years of cooperation. My life gave me this opportunity, and I value everyone who is connected with me by lines of fate and friendship.

## Inclusiveness Again and Again . . .

*Afonkina Iulia, Doctor of Sociology, PhD in psychology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Psychology and Correctional Pedagogy, Murmansk Arctic State University, Russia.*

The principle of sustainable development of modern society is to ensure the equality of rights and freedoms of all citizens without exception. In this respect, the most important social changes are determined by the development of processes of social inclusion, reflecting the recognition and respect for differences within society. The way society perceives differences, what it does to maintain diversity, in modern conditions is an indicator of its progressiveness and development.

Broad public support for inclusion is associated with the social need to overcome social contradictions and obstacles that are created by a kind of "destruction of the social fabric." Today there is no doubt that only an inclusive society that includes all individuals in a single social organism can develop sustainably. Such a society helps a person, by providing for his basic needs, both universal and special, to become a part of the social globe, Inclusion ensures the accumulation of social resources, which steadily improves

the quality of life of different population categories, increasing the potential for diversity. Thus, the imbalance between the social needs of individuals and non-adaptive ways of satisfying them, often characteristic of a modern social order, can be overcome, which ultimately leads to greater stability of the social system itself.

Nowadays, theoretical images and practical models of inclusion, social tools for assessing and managing this process are being actively developed. However, in a conceptual manner, the category of inclusion seems to be rather vague. The fact that inclusion still does not have rigid conceptual boundaries opens wide possibilities for its comprehension and categorization, demonstrating the phenomenological complexity and ambiguity of inclusion. To date, sometimes contradictory approaches to its understanding have developed, there are no clearly defined essential characteristics of it. In my opinion, it is necessary to seek to achieve uniformity in the interpretation, because any truth is unattainable, the process of moving toward it is important.

Significant contradictions in the interpretations of inclusion are manifested in the interpretation of its associations with the concepts of inequality and loneliness. Generally, inclusion is understood as a process against loneliness, a discriminatory factor associated with exclusion. However, loneliness can be a positive part of inclusive subjectivity—a person's activity aimed at inclusion, allowing a person to become aware of himself and his needs, to acquire motivation for inclusion. In addition, I note that inclusion is not the same as overcoming inequality, since exclusion can be voluntary and uneven. A person can be included in some social groups and excluded from others. He may seek to isolate himself from society as a whole or from individual social groups, realizing himself outside the collective self.

Inclusion is connected not only with the fact that the social perception of a person who is different from others as "alien" is overcome, but also with overcoming the dysfunction of social institutions that, for one reason or another, do not perform or insufficiently perform their duties of ensuring equality of opportunity, but not providing equality of participation. Consequently, inclusion is not only the "reconciliation" of society with otherness, but also the restoration and expansion of institutional duties.

It is also important to emphasize that social inclusion is not equal to the erasure of differences, the equalization of needs, but reflects the diversity of conditions for their satisfaction. It supports rather than averages individuality. Social ties that provide a person with social recognition and a worthy social status are able to counteract exclusion, which means that they can be understood as a mechanism of inclusion.

In general, the conceptual differences between the interpretations of inclusion and integration in the most global social sense are defined as follows: the one who integrates is introduced into society, while with inclusion all members

of society, without any exception, are considered from the very beginning as equal re rights, regardless of differences.

The uniqueness and value for society of each person is fixed in the concept of "human dignity," which is inclusive in its essence and, in my opinion, enriches the understanding and possible impact of inclusion. Dignity is expressed in the fact that a person, protects his uniqueness and at the same time focuses on universal human values. Having dignity, he not only makes his claims to society, but also transforms social practices, showing inclusive subjectivity. Society, in return, recognizes the importance of universal human values and rights for all people without exception, seeks and finds new ways, forms of their self-realization in the social space, also ensuring its own self-development.

## Reflecting and (Re)thinking Bildung . . .

*Herbert Zoglowek, Professor Emeritus in Sports Pedagogy, UiT—The Arctic University of Norway, School of Sport Sciences*

Since the Enlightenment and finally since the "programmatic turn" by Wilhelm von Humboldt, the concept of Bildung has been one, not to say *the* central concept in (German-speaking) pedagogy. For just as long, however, the term has also been the subject of sometimes heated debates. Controversial opinions about the Bildung-ideal to strive for and its realization still dominate the discussion today; in addition to becoming human and developing personality are Bildung-standards, school structure, purposelessness, or usability the most frequently used buzzwords in this discourse. General Bildung is supposed to serve character building, while special Bildung is based on specialized knowledge and skills. Both approaches have the aim "humanistic Bildung" or "life-Bildung." But what constitutes humanistic Bildung? Is a humanistic Bildung fit for the demands of the modern global, technical, and increasingly digital world?

Bildung-ideals are strongly linked to cultural and educational policy goals. These can be determined from different points of view and with different perspectives, within the poles of individual-oriented and society-oriented. Therefore, Bildung must always be reflected upon and rethought. Rethought with reference to traditions and experiences of the past world and with visions toward a future world (cf. Hastedt, 2012; Lederer, 2013, 2015; Liessmann, 2017; von Hentig, 1993, 1999).

For to gain Bildung human beings need a world outside of themselves, that is, an environment and a society in which they live. Humboldt has described Bildung as the deepest linking of our ego with the world, in general and free interaction. By encountering of individual dispositions with social circumstances, conditions and requirements, the individual human being can educate him- or herself. With other words, Bildung must be always self-Bildung. And this self-Bildung must occur from within, "from within the

soul" (von Humboldt, 1809). Thus, Bildung is impressive and expressive at the same time: it goes from an outside impulse to the inside, for example when the self is formed by an external impression or experience, but then again from the inside back to the outside, as for instance by producing a (cultural) work. It is exactly this interplay of inside and outside that characterizes Bildung of the human being.

### . . . Humanistic Bildung . . .

Humboldt's "classical" or "humanistic" ideal of education has been misunderstood or misinterpreted repeatedly over the course of time. His ideal was always that of a purpose-free education, the purely self-referential becoming of man. In this sense, he created the tripartite educational system, which was supposed to consider age and inclinations.

From the beginning, however, there was a polarization between special school-Bildung geared to social utility and practical usability and general Bildung, free of purpose. The (natural) sciences developed into an important and trend-setting social, and thus also cultural and educational policy factor, which also influenced the understanding of Bildung. Humboldt already saw these problems and he admonished about that Bildung of the individual must not be hijacked too early or one-sidedly by economic interests and social powers, since otherwise people will be alienated from themselves. Therefore, it is also necessary for each person to keep all his opportunities of Bildung open as far as possible and to promote them.

With this warning, Humboldt was already far ahead of his time, but this assessment is reflected today. The increasingly market-society and competition-strategic oriented Bildung-system sees primarily the utilitarian usefulness of the educated person. Knowledge, (key) qualifications, competencies try to displace Bildung as a guiding concept, not least because these terms are easier to define, to quantify and to evaluate. Certainly, knowledge plays a paramount role for Bildung. It is right, Bildung cannot do without knowledge, but these terms are not synonymous. Only the reflection and understanding of a deeper meaning or of meaningful connections show the way out of a "half-Bildung" (Adorno, 1959; cf. also Liessmann, 2008) to an educated person.

### . . . School Bildung . . .

When at the beginning of the 18th century Humboldt raised Bildung to the general school program and thus placed it under state interests, he proclaimed Bildung for all. In all social strata of the population, special-Bildung should provide knowledge and skills, while general-Bildung serves the forming of the individual personality. He explained his understanding and intention that there is a certain general knowledge and even more mind-set and character that no

one should lack. Everyone can only be a skilled professional, when he or she is also a good and decent person and citizen, enlightened according to his or her status (von Humboldt, 1809).

More than hundred years later, the concept of general Bildung in school was elaborated by the German Pedagogue Wolfgang Klafki. He emphasizes three levels of meaning: first, general-Bildung is Bildung for all, thus, to be understood as a civil right; second, general-Bildung means all-round Bildung, that is, personality development encompassing all developmental dimensions; and third, general-Bildung points to the perspective of the generally and jointly binding, that is, that Bildung makes possible the mastering of all those "epochal" problems humanity is facing (Klafki, 1991).

Klafki labels his theory of Bildung "critical-constructive" to point out socio-critical and system-critical as well as contemporary aspects. Bildung always takes place in a social, historical, and political context. General-Bildung must be understood as Bildung for all for the ability of self-determination, co-determination, and solidarity. Klafki's theory of general Bildung is a successful attempt to transfer von Humboldt's thoughts to modern times and to offer school education didactic-methodical principles that can stimulate the Bildung-process. What is more, that his considerations can also claim general educational validity.

### . . . Bildung Today: Experiential Bildung and Bildung-Experiences

In view of the increasing instrumentalization and commodification of Bildung, a return to the humanistic core seems to be appropriate for the times. But a mere return to the historical idealized Bildung-humanism would not only be obsolete, but also impossible. Humanistic Bildung must discussed and redefined in the context of contemporary society.

Returning to the original sense of the word, humanistic Bildung could be considered as a counter-design to the purposefulness, to the formation of human capital or to "employability." Humanistic Bildung shows itself both in *humanity*, that is, in virtues relating to others such as empathy and tolerance, and in *humanitas*, that is, in one's own searching and fathoming of being. The constant striving to understand the world and oneself in this world. Therefore, the Bildung-theory of positivism, oriented toward securing individual existence, and oriented toward external determination, usability, and rationalization, should be countered again by the Bildung-ideal that puts the human being back in the center. The social conditions for this are more favorable than ever before. And indeed, favorable since the experience got a high value in the society.

It is not only since the individualization of life forms that experience has been attributed an increasing social

significance. Already more than a 100 years ago, Simmel (1910) and Weber (1919) interpreted the behavior of modern people as an incessant hunt for experiences, Dilthey (1919) and subsequently other reform pedagogues described the potential of experiences for learning processes.

For decades, modern Western society has been described as an experience society (Schulze, 2005), in which Bildung also occupies a relevant place. According to Schulze, Bildung has lost its significance as a distinguishing feature, but it continues to be an important attribute of differentiation within various social milieus. Bildung is more than just a criterion for social classification since it qualifies people not only for work but also for non-work. And it is precisely the time of non-work that opens the other side of life, the possibilities of experience. Belonging to a certain milieu is less dependent on possessing a certain Bildung-canon, wealth, and values, but on the individual choice, based on a certain Bildung, of how and with what one is willing to commit oneself to the beautiful, the good, the true in one's philosophy of life. The former Bildung-ideal has dissolved in favor of a individually patterned Bildung-patchwork. Bildung as participation in culture has become more a matter of the individual, and one can even say: an opportunity for the individual. Namely, the individual's chance to find his or her place in the world through initiative and perseverance, through Bildung.

# Normal Needs as Special Needs Education . . .

*Kuzmicheva Tatiana, Doctor of Pedagogy, Associate Professor, Director of Psychological and Pedagogic Institute, Murmansk Arctic State University, Russia.*

Diversity as a global trend of modern society, the basis of its progress, is a dynamic phenomenon; one of its features is variability. In the diversity studies, attention is drawn both to the uniqueness of any object, and to the large number of its features similar to other objects. Accepting diversity as a value and using it as an advantage lies at the core of the idea of convergent inclusion in research, which we consider a new method for interdisciplinary professional dialogue.

The development of intercultural dialogue is not at all hindered by intercultural and interdisciplinary differences, quite the contrary. Dialogue based on convergent inclusion does not seek to reach consensus as soon as possible. It creates a vector of movement toward consensus. After all, consensus is not only agreement, sympathy, unanimity, which requires a process of convergence of difference, at times, concensus is living conflicting views and understanding similarities, and what we can give to each other due to our professional and personal distinctions.

Built on an interdisciplinary professional dialogue, research work is interesting because it allows each of us to look at problems from different new angles and overcome the usual boundaries and stereotypes between different sciences and subject areas. The direction and retention of the vector of collective mental movement toward mutual understanding and professional trust on a dialectical basis, when, first, the object of study is studied in its development and relationships with other objects, and, second, its research interpretations are developed in an interdisciplinary paradigm, constitutes an inclusive path to new knowledge based on convergence. Always however preliminary.

## Promoting Convergent Inclusion in Research

Implementing a professional interdisciplinary dialogue on understanding the essence of diversity in our international research team, we highlight several stages of promoting the idea of convergent inclusion in the research.

First, this is a brief outline of the subject of the dialogue—what the subject is, where the point of intersection of the participants' research interests in the dialogue are. For example, let me consider a dialogue between a psychologist and a teacher using the observation method, the subject is the educational needs of the child. Both the teacher and the psychologist observe the same child in the same situation. However, they notice and interpret what they see in different ways. And the participants in the dialogue—both the teacher and the psychologist agree on common concepts. A collegial conceptual field of reflection is being created. It is important to answer the questions: "What does everyone mean when they use this or that professional term?," "Where is its conceptual boundaries?" As a result, a common mental field of discussion is formed, which makes it possible to enrich the conceptual apparatus and expand the boundaries of what is being discussed at the expense of various interdisciplinary interpretations.

Further, in the discussions, different points of view clash, prompting a refinement of the observed facts and their interpretations. The task of the dialogue is to adjust the perception of the other and show their thoughts, expand their research position and beliefs in the discussion. Here, it is important to search and verbalize the argumentation of the participants' positions in the dialogue; the research experience of each is updated, confirmed by professional observations and examples. Everyone comprehends each other's examples and includes them in new contexts.

Then, during the discussions, often long and emotionally intense, intersections of research positions are discovered, which illuminate for each previously obscure aspects of the discussion subject. The clash of the research positions makes it possible to detect intersections and create new knowledge. The result is a collective mental insight. It brings together the positions of all participants in the dialogue in the subject field and allows us to make a breakthrough in understanding the problem chosen for the dialogue.

Furthermore, understanding each other well, the development of a dialogue is ensured when we move on to an interdisciplinary collegial interpretation of the new knowledge that has arisen in the dialogue. It acquires a clear form and content, resulting in joint research projects.

However, different points of view, different views on what is happening in the interdisciplinary dialogue do not a hinder but help professional interaction. This is convergent inclusion in research, when ideas about how simple at the same time complicated everything is, are transformed into ideas about the essential interconnectedness of subjects, objects, events in their interdisciplinary interpretation. It is important to understand that the promotion of convergent inclusion is a long way of joint search, analysis, comprehension, generalization of information is associated with the pleasure of interaction. The possibility and desire for interdisciplinary interaction makes our work challenging. However, the new will not be so productive if the acquired new knowledge is not continued in the joint research work.

Such a dialogue is of research value, and the ability to conduct it is an important part of convergent inclusion that grows on the basis of comparative interdisciplinary research, reflection and practice.

## Searvelatnja—There are Ways

We are seven learning academics. We write seven different types of texts and takes on dialogue and border crossings. Dialogue without the word. Dialogue therefore as a word to rework, being in essence labor and a kind of force. We are seven fabulating antagonists in a shared room of quiet restlessness and moments of activisms. Yes, how long does knowledge last? And isn't all research political? Listen to Camus (2018):

> The way ahead of us is long. Yet if war does not come and mingle everything in its hideous confusion, we shall have time at least to give a form to the justice and freedom we need. (p. 53)

There is this wisdom of people throughout history in the East and the West, the North and the South. It makes a difference. It is difference. The importance of inclusion and the love of contrary aspects creating tools for communication. Diversity as research method creating terminologies for change, words to frame conflict. The beautiful, the good, the true.

## Declaration of Conflicting Interests

## Funding

## ORCID iD

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

## References

Adorno, T.W. (1959). Theorie der Halbbildung [Theory of half-formation]. In T. W. Adorno (Ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften. Bd. 8: Soziologische Schriften 1* [Collected works. Bd. 8: Sociology Texts]. Suhrkamp Verlag.

Arendt, H. (1978). *The life of the mind*. Harcourt.

Bakhtin, M. (1979). *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva (Esthetics)*. Isskustvo. http://teatr-lib.ru/Library/Bahtin/esthetic/#_Toc225599055

Balto, A., & Østmo, L. (2012). Multicultural studies from a Sámi perspective: Bridging traditions and challenges in an indigenous setting. *Issues in Educational Research*, *22*(1), 1–17.

Camus, A. (2018/). 1957). *Create dangerously*. Penguin Classics.

Deleuze, G. (2004). *The logic of sense*. Bloomsbury.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* Columbia University Press.

Dilthey, W. (1919). *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*. Teubner.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. AltaMira Press.

Grosz, E. (2017). *The incorporeal; Ontology, ethics, and the limitations of materialism*. Columbia University Press.

Hastedt, H. (2012). *Was ist Bildung? Eine Textanthologie*. Reclam.

Klafki, W. (1991). *Neue Studien zur Bildungstheorie und Didaktik. Zeitgemäße Allgemeinbildung und kritisch-konstruktive Didaktik* (2. wesentlich erweiterte und überarbeitete Auflage). Beltz.

Lederer, B. (2015). *Was bedeutet eigentlich „Bildung"? Mündiger Mensch oder nützlicher Idiot?*. tredition GmbH.

Lederer, B. (Hg.). (2013). *„Bildung": Was sie war, ist, sein sollte*. Schneider Verlag.

Liessmann, K. P. (2008). *Theorie der Unbildung. Die Irrtümer der Wissensgesellschaft*. Piper.

Liessmann, K. P. (2017). *Bildung als Provokation*. Paul Zsolnay Verlag.

Monk, T. (1943). *Round Midnight*. Jazz standard.

Mouffe, C. (2015). *Om det Politiske [About the political]*. Cappelens Upopulære Skrifter.

Pelias, R. J. (2013). Writing into position: Strategies for composition and evaluation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. SAGE.

Reinertsen, A. B. (2022). Storying other than the neoliberal criticism—Cause I have a hunch of something being wrong here. In C. Blyth & T. K. Aslanian (Eds.), *Children and the power of stories: Posthuman and autoethnographic perspectives in early childhood education*. Springer.

Sara, M. N. (2004). Tradisjonell samisk kunnskap i grunnskolen. In V. Hirvonen (Red.), *Samisk skole I plan og praksis* (s. 114–131). CallidLágádus.

Schulze, G. (2005). *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart*. Campus Verlag.

Simmel, G. (1910). Philosophie des Abenteuers. In: Der Tag. Moderne illustrierte Zeitung Nr. 2 (7.6.1910). Berlin/Philosophy of adventure. In: Der Tag. Modern illustrated Newspaper.

Suchman, L. A. (2009). *Human-machine reconfigurations, plans and situated actions*. Cambridge University Press.

von Hentig, H. (1993). *Die Schule neu denken*. Hanser.

von Hentig, H. (1999). *Bildung*. Beltz.

von Humboldt, W. (1809). *Der Königsberger und der Litauische Schulplan*. German History Intersections. https://germanhistory-intersections.org/de/wissen-und-bildung/ghis:document-7

Weber, M. (1919). *Wissenschaft als Beruf*. Dunker & Humblot.

## Author Biographies

**Anne B. Reinertsen** is a professor in philosophy of education (PhD in Pedagogy), qualitative research methodologies, and knowledge of practice. She has worked as a teacher, teacher educator, and leader. Her research interests are subjective professionalism, leadership, materiality of language, new configurations of research methodologies, and slow scholarships. She has been a visiting scholar at Stanford University and University of Illinois, USA. Her publications include national and international books, journals and book chapters, and she has guest edited several special issue journals.

**Kirsten Elisabeth Stien** is an associate professor in pedagogy. She teaches and supervises students in teacher training education. Her special interests are in school organization, societal aspects and perspectives on knowledge, and methodological questions.

**Elena Merzliakova** works as a lecturer in pedagogy at UiT—The Arctic University of Norway, where she is currently pursuing her first Ph.D. in Internationalization in higher education. Her other research interest is found in understanding the different teaching concepts that are used in the world today and finding ways to create a dialogue between them, to find the best practices to teach children. https://uit.no/ansatte/elena.merzliakova

**Valerii Chernik** is a candidate of pedagogical sciences (PhD in pedagogy), associate professor, head of the chair of pedagogy of the Murmansk Arctic State University. He has worked as a teacher, organizer of children's leisure, dean of the faculty, pro-rector of the university for extracurricular activities. His research interests are history of pedagogy and education, hidden education, the formation of personal learning style, and pedagogical subcultures.

**Julia Afonkina** is a candidate of psychological sciences (PhD in psychology), associate professor, head of the chair of psychology, and correctional pedagogy of Murmansk Arctic State University. She has worked as a teacher, psychologist, teacher educator, and leader. Her research interests are peculiarities of childhood development, inclusive education, inclusive processes in education of persons with disabilities, and modern approaches to the study of training teachers to work in an inclusive education.

**Herbert Zoglowek** (PhD in pedagogy) is a professor emeritus at the School of Sport Sciences at the University of Tromsø. His working and research fields are movement development and primary education, teacher professionalization, Bildung and outdoor education.

**Tatiana Kuzmicheva** is a doctor of pedagogy, associate professor, director of psychological pedagogy at the institute of Murmansk Arctic State University. She has worked as a teacher, teacher educator, and leader. Her research interests are primary education, correctional pedagogy, speech therapy, professional education of persons with disabilities, and modern approaches to the study of training teachers to work in an inclusive education.