Teaching postqualitatively
Abstract

The purpose of this article is to explore how teachers, scholars, and mentors teach postqualitatively in diverse ways. Teaching postqualitatively does not easily conform with the delivery of set learning outcomes nor does it seek to measure learner progress or teaching quality in prescriptive and traditional ways. Rather this kind of teaching could be seen as the task of the impossible and calls for the curious seeker and infinite learner, resembling art, craft, and creation. The more we attempt to describe and articulate how we have in the past, through literature and collective experiences, and how we could teach postqualitative research in the future, the more the inquiry practices and learning assemblages escape and disappear. We wonder what collective affects and practices are associated with teaching and learning postqualitatively and what speculative postqualitative practices of the futures may produce.
Introduction

The purpose of this article is to explore how teachers, scholars, and mentors teach postqualitatively. Since many postqualitative practices and pedagogies are immanent and continuously emerging, teaching postqualitative research as such may not be teachable in scripted ways: it does not easily conform with the delivery of set outcomes nor does it seek to measure learner progress or teaching quality in prescriptive ways. Teaching postqualitative inquiry and research could be seen as the task of the impossible and call of the curious seeker and infinite learner. For this reason, we argue that much of what we do when teaching postqualitatively resembles an art, craft, or creation. The more we attempt to describe and articulate how we have and could teach postqualitative research, the more the inquiry practices and learning assemblages escape and disappear. Can teaching postqualitatively be conceptualized as how we teach (pedagogy) and/or what we teach (curriculum), or are these practices irrelevant? How might one engage with teaching postqualitatively? What affects and feelings are associated with teaching and learning postqualitatively? And what did postqualitative practices produce? There lies our task.

Postqualitative inquiry may function as different and more contemporary forms of qualitative inquiry that focus on process, non-linearity, and situatedness. For example, some forms of postqualitative inquiry build on ‘rawness’ and reject the use of fixed methods and build

---

1 This review was supported by the Postqualitative Research Collective (PQRC), an international collective that focuses on advancing the field of postqualitative inquiry, initially funded by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (2020-2023), and still continuing. See: https://postqualitativeresearch.com/. We would also like to thank Georgia Rowley for all their help and work as research assistant.
on methodologies without methodologies (see Koro-Ljungberg et. al, 2015; Koro, 2016; Nordstrom, 2018). Other practices associated with postqualitative research recognize the entanglements between epistemology and ontology (St. Pierre, 2021).

Postqualitative inquiry can also leave scholars with more questions than answers (Flint et al., 2022; Guyotte et al., 2020). Using the act of cooking as a metaphor for postqualitative inquiry, postqualitative scholars are asked to “put aside the recipe and experiment with the ingredients” (Lyle, 2018, p. 266). Even what counts as an ingredient is up for the question. Focusing on what postqualitative inquiry is not maybe easier than focusing on what it is since qualitative inquiry has traditionally been bounded by constraints (St. Pierre, 2022).

This paper explores how teaching postqualitatively has been described in the literature, how postqualitative pedagogies have been documented, and how postqualitative learning occurs. It is important to note that not all authors we have cited have adopted the label of postqualitative in their work even though their practices are resembling postqualitative possibilities. We also expand and stretch how we conceptualize a literature review and practice producing a review collectively. To resist an either/or logic of doing a literature review or not, how might we engage in a both/and logic and follow multiple lines of thought simultaneously? Thus, this
collectively crafted literature review combines the affects of diverse geographical situatedness of collective ‘we,’ reading and thinking across languages, and processing materials and texts through a variety of local histories and culturally situated knowledges and positionalities. Furthermore, this literature review does not clearly separate existing literature and documented experiences from the current and speculative affective and situational emotions associated with doing work in the Global South, living one’s life as an immigrant woman, petting a cat, smelling the dusty desert air, marking student assignments, preparing dinner, attending to a conference call at 10 P.M. local time when preparing this paper and more. Similarly, our perspectives and voices are not univocal or always necessarily coherent and focused. Rather, through our asides, inserts, and images we bring our shared and singular otherness and layered social and ecological complexities to this text. We wonder what could happen if there isn’t a procedural step-by-step, quick recipe for how to do a literature review. What if our notes are more emergent, tentacular, unpredictable, and more about opening-up ways of thinking and doing differently rather than finding a gap in the literature or problem to solve? How might you enter this literature review on postqualitative practices as an invitation, an encounter and an exercise of thinking-doing-feeling?

A voice from a mentor:

Thinking about your question on ways to write a postqual literature review, the idea of using fragments came to mind… So instead of a linear review which represents and explains the sources to the reader, the readers are a part of continuous intra-activity including fragments of the texts, maybe selected by the writer because they see them as having differences and similarities which matter.

A literature review.
Apparently the thing that all doctoral students and serious scholars have to do
To demonstrate their ‘location’ in ongoing debates
To provide a ‘foundation’ for their own inquiries.
The phrase itself is an occasion to pause:
Why is it called a literature review?
What constitutes ‘literature’?
And what does a ‘review’ mean?
What does it look like?
What does it aspire to?
Literature reviews are sticky with authority.
They have the ability to present themselves as authorized versions
Merely by existing
Merely by presenting themselves in particular ways
Merely because of the selection of ‘these’ articles’ by ‘these’ scholars.
Authority confers legitimacy
Perhaps unwarranted, perhaps not, but always worth questioning.
How to un/do the traditional literature review?
What can a post-qualitative imagining of a literature produce?
What would a multispecies literature review look like?

Troubling the ‘I’/‘we’/authors/writers/pedagogues/researchers of this paper

In this section we collectively trouble the individual ‘I’/s, ‘we’, and authors of this paper.

Am I, are we, writing this? How does ‘I’ work in ‘our’ research practices? Who or what is the
‘I’/‘we’ reading this? After we discuss the plural relations shaping this work, we will elaborate
on the affective elements and forces of our relations.

In qualitative research practices, it is not the capital ‘I’ (for the human subject) that
centers our research practices, but the ‘ii’. The neologism ‘ii’ (Murris, 2016) expresses the self in
context or relation with the other (e.g., the environment, other humans). The ‘other’ here is
understood as a separate autonomous entity (ontologically). Categories of self-in-relation are
‘nested’ within each other like Russian dolls. This kind of research separates the
researcher/writer/reader ontologically from her ‘context’. Similarly, in postqualitative research,
‘the’ posthuman self is an assemblage or (intra-active) phenomenon. iii have been playing with
the neologism ‘iii’ for a while to articulate this materially in my writings (Murris, 2016, 2022).
The posthuman subject ‘iii’ (printed materially in lighter ink to show its un/boundedness) is
always already in relation, a porous, ‘unzipped’ watery body consisting of nonhuman matter,
drinking, leaking, weeping, pooing and always already connected with the other (Neimanis,
2017). Where does this leave ‘me’ and ‘us’ as writers/researchers/pedagogues? Un/settling (differently)...

Situated within the discourses and practices of agential realism (a particular kind of posthumanism), the ‘nesting’ relationships between ‘I’ and ‘other/s’ are intra-actively produced through one another. In **intra-acting** there is no distance between the “I” and “the world.” There is no “I” that acts from the outside; rather, it is intra-actively constituted through practices of sense-making (Barad & Gandorfer, 2021, p.30; our emphasis). It would be incorrect to assume that there is an “I” that decides on choosing where to make a cut. Wyatt et al. (2011) use collective biography to listen and tell stories within just-thisness and within this collective writing and remembering event. “Each listener is registering those multiple intensities, now closely linked and overlapping with their own intensities, their own memories, has become someone other than themselves, whose co-implication in the lives of others has become visible” (Wyatt et al., 2011, p.9)

In this challenging task of careful listening and troubling the troubled subject (Haraway, 2016) the self is always deeply implicated in exclusionary boundary-making practices. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987) say, consciousness is not singular, but a pack of wolves (p. 32-33), and “each ‘individual’ is always already a crowd (and not merely in a psychological sense)” (Barad & Gandorfer, 2021, p. 60).² An individual is not more than one because of how they feel or sense it (e.g., psychologically), but because their existence is such that relations have brought them intra-actively into existence. But not as an origin story. There are no beginnings, nor

__________________________________________
² But it does not imply that I cannot speak in the first person, according to Barad: “After all the notion of an individual needs to be taken seriously – very seriously these days, because, for one thing, it is a very potent notion at the center of the action of neoliberal forces. At the same time, it’s crucial to raise the question of how ‘the individual’, including any particular individual, is iteratively (re)constituted.” (Barad in interview in Juelskjaer and Schwennesen, 2012, p.11).
endings. Our relations with this text are not personal. Rather, “the thoughts are already happening within life that is much bigger than our separate selves. What we have done, is to open ourselves to seeing what happens to ourselves alongside those thoughts, to seeing where being enveloped in those thoughts might take us, separately and together” (Wyatt et al., 2011, p.133-134).

سلام، من روایا، دانشجوی دکترای ایرانی-آمریکایی نسل دوم در آمریکا هستم. این مقاله از نخستین نوشته‌های "رسمی" یا قابل انتشار من در این مسير تحصیلی است.

از اینکه فرصت بودن در این مسير به من داده شده، سپاسگزارم، گرچه فشار انتشار مقاله و آثار خود را در این مسير بسیار احساس می‌کنم. نیروی نتلیبرالیسم با وزن سنتگینی بر من فشار می‌آورد. انشالله، روزی از چندالان آزاد شده و تجربی آزادی واقعی را خواهیم داشت.

Yksi suomalainen Nokialta.
Candace a becoming mother-teacher-researcher-administrator-wife-daughter-inquirer-writer-and…and…and.. 
with...with...with 
Ania w procesie stawania się pomiędzy częściami i całością. 

Our various ‘we’s’ come together in a multiplicity of ways in this review as it (continues to) mutate(s) in the ongoingness of its writing and reading. The article-as-written materializes a critique of the self-centeredness of traditional modes of academic authorship, instead working with an activation of post/authorship (Benozzo et al., 2016) which brings to the page (here-and-now) ‘textual possibilities … unfurling becomings with no origins or end … im/possibilities and im/probabilities’ (Taylor & Benozzo, 2023, p. 919). 

**Affective practices**

*Let ‘us’ be.*

Postqualitative inquiry moves away from sterile and neutral normative research practices toward affective spaces. To affect and be affected enables teachers, learners and scholars to focus on action and living. Drawing from intra-actions (Barad, 2007) and relationalities all human, nonhuman, and ideological bodies have the potential to affect and be affected (Guyotte et al., 2020).

Pedagogies that enact intra-action have been referred to as intra-active pedagogies (Lenz Taguchi, 2010; Murris, 2016). Intra-active pedagogies embrace the complex variabilities of who students are and how they learn while promoting the collaborative process of learning to challenge the potentiality of knowing (Lenz Taguchi, 2010). These pedagogies take into consideration various elements of the environments in which one learns and recognizes the capability of living and non-living organisms to affect (Lenz Taguchi, 2010).
Minkälaisia nyansseja voidaan havaita ja tuottaa vastavuoroisessa vuorovaikutuksessa?


Intra-active pedagogies are used in a variety of different ways in higher education classrooms. While a qualitative inquiry course on poststructural theory documented by Hancock and Fontanella-Nothom (2020) held “typical distinctions- a syllabus, a classroom, assignments, assigned readings, an academic calendar, and so on” (p. 82), the intra-active pedagogies they engage in challenge the implications of what those classroom distinctions do. In an introductory postqualitative inquiry course, Kuby et al. (2016) asks their students to move away from solely establishing meanings when reading and instead focus on how they are affected by the words. Other scholars encourage researchers and students not to determine what they learn from their educational experiences or what particular provocations mean, and instead focus on what they do (Evans et al., 2022; Guyotte et al., 2020) and how concepts work in, for example, diffractive childlike and childing methodologies in higher education (Murris, 2022; Murris & Borcherds, 2019). Taylor’s (2019) work on diffracting the curriculum engages with the question raised above: Is teaching

Theresa: Knowing is or is related to being and so draws attention to the changes that occur in participants or ‘parts’ of the intra-active pedagogy. So learning is about becoming different through this experience of being affected and affecting... Putting ‘self’ at risk comes from Barad’s reworking of Kyoto Hayashi’s travel-hopping scribe. There is something about this that suggests the change in self-effected by pedagogy.
postqualitatively about how we teach (pedagogy) and/or what we teach (curriculum)? to illuminate how Barad’s (2007) agential realism may deploy in designing and enacting curriculum as a creative, emergent, material practice and as a pedagogical means to give students greater voice in curriculum design. Like others working with intra-active pedagogies, this orients towards opening up higher education spaces to innovative learning, teaching and assessment practices and to engaging students in new ways of producing knowledge via activities of creative interference (e.g., diffractive journaling; Murris, 2016).

Further examples of intra-active pedagogies used by postqualitative practitioners include engaging in outdoor activities (Hancock & Fontanella-Nothom, 2020) or creating art (Hickey-Moody & Page, 2015). However, Kuby and Christ (2020) caution that using intra-active pedagogies is more than just incorporating art supplies into a course, it is a philosophical practice rooted in post-philosophies. Mentoring emerging scholars of postqualitative inquiry necessitates the recognition that by doing and being, we come to know (Kuby & Christ, 2018a). Therefore, opportunities should be provided for students to experiment with new ways of being, knowing, and doing by engaging in discursive-material relationships (Kuby & Christ, 2018a). However,
educators of postqualitative inquiry may be challenged or feel uncomfortable by not knowing what will become of these intra-actions (Kuby & Christ, 2020).

Pedagogies of discomfort (Zembylas & Boler, 2002) offer postqualitative educators ways to navigate the uncomfortable with students as uncertainties and difficult topics arise. Instead of moving away from the discomfort, Millner (2023) encourages us to hone in to what they term affective interruptions through an act of pausing. In this practice anyone can stop the class discussions or activities to request that each person take the tiiiiiiiime to present, reflect, and journal their thoughts and emotions at that particular moment. With this, Tyler et al. (2022)
reminds us that “we never truly arrive at the destination of ‘expert’” and that “we continue to use our journeys as entry points to connect with our students and model continual processes of (un/re)learning and becoming” (p. 12).

**Relational practices**

*let ‘us’ live.*

Many postqualitative teaching practices foreground relationality and relational ecologies. In this, they take Bennett’s (2010) call for extended awareness of our intra-involvements and intra-dependencies seriously. “The political goal of a vital materialism is not the perfect equality of actants, but a polity with more channels of communications between members” (Bennett, 2010, p. 104). Stengers (2013) encourages the creation and facilitation of ecologies of partial connections. These partial connections require learning from others, being and becoming transformed, and acknowledging “our debt to this transformative experience as we explore its problematizing impacts in our own terms” (Stengers, 2013, p. 127). Relationality extends beyond the human. Tachine et al. (2022) invite us to connect with different ways of knowing, beings, ghosts, unborn babies, ancestors, the land and more. Dis/embodying relationality also involves being empathetic (without assuming bodily boundaries) and exploring connections through engaging in **collective** responsibility and by considering environmental ethics. Enacting response-ability in teaching postqualitatively and in post-qualitative inquiry more broadly serves as an important ethical practice (Taylor, 2018) given that, as Barad reminds us, each intra-action matters.

One potential materialization of relationality has been using rhizomatic inquiry (Kuby et al., 2016), rhizomatic learning (Johansson, 2016), and rhizomatic reflection (Evans et al., 2022). Kuby et al. (2016) use metaphors (or ‘matterphors’; Barad & Gandorfer, 2021) that embody
rhizomatic inquiry such as smooth and striated spaces (see Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). To guide their thinking of rhizomatic inquiry, the authors equate smooth spaces to the desert or sea: “open, expansive, and full of possible directions” (Kuby et al., 2016, p. 143). They then compare striated spaces to a city, where structures and buildings force you to go one way or another. Thinking with smooth and striated spaces may prompt consideration of pedagogical moves in teaching/learning.

Another example of how relationality has been materialized through a rhizomatic learning experience proposed by Lenz Taguchi (2010) in which teacher candidates experiment with a lump of clay. Students are asked to transform their clay into a figure as big as their hand, standing on one leg, and eventually are asked to return the figure back into a lump of clay. Intraacting with clay provokes students to take notes on how clay responds to the warmth of hands, the oxygen in the air, or the water provided. What arises from this experiment is the recognition of the infinite creations that can be made from the clay since the matters involved (clay, participants, directions, context, etc.) are all in relation, including ‘themselves’.

Relationality is also materialized through the creation of cartographies, maps, or webs. In Sidebottom’s (2019) class, students create a cartographic genealogy by incorporating mixed mediums onto a large sheet of paper to map out influential moments, places, events, humans and non-humans who are ‘entangled’ with their learning journeys. Strom and Lupinacci’s (2019) study students’ learnings “to create cartographies that map out their own geo-political locations and explore other material discursive flows that could possibly shape their future research projects and eventual impact that might have” (p. 12). Cartographic thinking is also useful for students in Guyotte et al. (2020) as the “cartography of meanwhile,” helps students understand “what happens next” by mapping ideas from the class to create new possibilities through art
while embracing uselessness, slowness, and the unanticipated (p. 111). In Niccolini et al.’s (2018) study, students are invited to “bring meaningful ‘affective-material’ objects relating to gender to share with the class” (p. 325). Using yarn in various colors, students are asked to identify and then physically make connections between their objects. Hetherington (2020) deploy the creative process of ‘netting’ to connect ‘glow moment’ quotes and images with string and clips on a large sheet of paper to answer one of their research questions related to how/where/when do objects/subjects of inquiry matter.

Relationality values the intra-connectedness of ideas, thoughts, and practices without giving ownership to specific disciplines. Inspired by Deleuze and Guattari, Evans et al. (2022) focus on the order-words of pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment and how these common terms used in the field of education could be transferred to as pass-words. Order-words are described as words that have “privileged and authoritative positions in teaching and learning (and teacher learning)” and pass-words are described as words that can “transform the compositions of order into components of passage” (Evans et al., 2022, p. 790). Regarding pedagogy, the authors propose to focus more on pedagogy of concepts (see also Lenz Taguchi & St. Pierre, 2017) instead of pedagogy tied to specific disciplines, suggesting that concepts act as pass-words “that open-up passages of thought which cannot be claimed or contained under the rubric of an individual identity, or the subject/object division” (p. 792).
The practice of relationality also asks practitioners to be empathetic and explore connections through engaging in collective responsibility and by considering environmental ethics. One way this may be achieved is through engaging in dialogue that involves different perspectives. Through an online webinar, Mitchell et al. (2023) point to unexpected and vulnerable conversations as helpful to their scholarship. The students believe that the webinar and their own reading group foster ways to collaboratively work together exchange WhatsApp messages with other colleagues which enables them to form closer connections in safe environments. Flint et al. (2022) state that they guest lecture in each other's courses and encourage students to use their course as an “opportunity to think in tensions” and use “other data encounters” to “explore these tensions in a way that makes sense” for them (p. 8). Tensions, contradictions, wonderings, different forms of questioning, and troubling can assist scholars to think critically and creatively about their inquiry processes and the relational worlds that they build.
Teachers who teach post-qualitatively and those who are directly drawing from critical pedagogy, may also assign readings and assignments that challenge students to think about oppression, privilege, and power (Guyotte & Flint, 2021; Gachago & Stewart, 2020; Müller, 2019). Niccolini et al. (2018) demonstrate one possibility for postqualitative inquiry in proposing that we experiment with various ways of making-together such as co-writing, co-theorizing, and/or co-storytelling. They do this by materializing Haraway’s (2016) idea of making kin through the pedagogy of “kinshipping” which may “shift pedagogical imaginaries of relations, affects, bodies, and materialities, times and things, in the classroom, and engage different ways of recognizing subjectivity and difference” (p. 325).

Another way to promote empathy and explore connections through collective responsibility and considering environmental ethics is through encounters with oddness, ultimate and virtual difference, and obscenity. Misiaszek (2020) emphasizes the importance of awe in education, claiming that it is “important for transformation” (p. 7), echoing MacLure's (2013) notion of wonder. Allen (2018) discusses this idea further explaining that “when a stimulus exceeds our expectations in some way, it can provoke an attempt to change the mental structures that we use to understand the world” (p. 3). Wolgemuth et al. (2020) uses fictional/empirical narrative monologues to provoke the use of obscenity as a pedagogical practice in the classroom. Recognizing that there are no guarantees in the success of using obscenity in educational spaces, they indicate how obscenity surrounds us in our day-to-day lives. Wolgemuth et al. (2020) argue that obscenity may “move scholars away from purified and sanitized discourses and practices, enabling educators to consider and generate critical class-room spaces that travel a delicate line between offense, discomfort, safety, and learning” (p. 37).
Charteris and Nye (2019) utilize poetry to recall the affective choreography that took place in 2017 at *The Australian Research in Education Conference*. For their conference presentation, the authors use comments, articles, and images from an incident where a website published non-consensual sexually provocative images of young women. Recognising these topics are uncomfortable for many, and presenting them in the conference space, pushes audience members to engage in critical dialogue. Like Wolgemuth et al. (2020), Charteris and Nye (2019) caution that “there is risk: in venturing into dangerous spaces: in speaking out of turn; in being misheard; or even worse, in perpetuating pain” (p. 341). Using Haraway’s (2016) concept of *response-ability* as a pedagogical praxis is one way in which we may be responsive to the myriad of differences that “move and entangle in classrooms” (p. 336).

**Play/movement practices**

*Let ‘us’ rest.*

Postqualitative pedagogic practices that center play/movement use play and movement to *slow down*,

rest in and become mindful of the present moment. These forms of teaching postqualitatively encourage teachers/learners to be creative and think and do the unthinkable; they embrace playfulness to experiment with fracturing the logic of traditional scientific inquiry to expand our insights. Play/movement can be materialized by interacting with different beings and becomings in alternative ways outside of traditional academic settings. These types of movements and practices further extend the notion of intra-active pedagogies (Guyotte et al., 2020; also see above).

An instance of play/movement is shown in Hancock and Fontanella-Nothom (2020) where students engage in a group activity by walking along “tree-lined pathways” while
engaging “with-concepts and theories through talk, movement, and contemplation” (p. 82).

Poetry and poetic reflections can become another way that postqualitative scholars engage with play/movement. The use of poetry assists scholars in sparking conversation about how to write collective biographies (Flint et al., 2022), recall memories (Charteris & Nye, 2019), explore relationships (Misiaszek, 2020), and find “wholeness” (Lyle & Cassie, 2021, p. 225). Misiaszek (2020) explains how they provide students with an opportunity to pause and reflect by writing poetry at the end of their course as a form of “slow work” (p. 6). Slow work and scholarship are important to practices of teaching postqualitatively in that they are ways of combatting the individualizing, competitive and performative pressures of neoliberalism in academia by taaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaakiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiime to sloooooooow down with our research endeavors (Ulmer, 2017).

Engaging with art is another way that scholars can exemplify play/movement. Researchers in arts, however, tend to think of movement and artistic practice in a semiotic way. It is hard to avoid the feeling that arts and creativity must mean something or must be useful to fit into academic knowledge (see e.g., Minton & Faber, 2016; Bresler, 2007). Postqualitative inquiry, in this sense, disrupts this tendency and advocates for an otherwise way of play, movement and creativity in the classroom. In Pindyck’s (2018) article, frottage is seen as an artistic process of discovery through erasure of words or images that can combat capitalist by slowing “perception and production,” and encourages to linger “too long over a material, waiting for the ‘right’ images to hover,” and embrace “the chaos of the “ (p. 15). Hammoor (2019) advocates for taking tiiiiiiiiiime to play using a “posthuman praxis” and illuminates this through a specific pedagogic event which took place in both her undergraduate and graduate philosophy courses (p. 281). In this playful exercise influenced by
Augusto Boal’s theater exercise entitled *Great Game of Power*, students are invited to move a large plastic water bottle and three chairs in a way that creates an image that portrays the water bottle in an ultimate position of power. Each student is allowed to move the objects as many times as they felt necessary, but the final arrangement of the objects needed everyone’s approval. The students are encouraged to adjust their position in relation to the objects to get a different viewpoint. Hammoor (2019) proposes that teaching postqualitatively can be about working with provocations that exhibit an alternative to using language to learn and host “potential sites for discovery” (p. 286). These types of intra-actions with human and non-human bodies, objects, and concepts allow students and scholars alike to move away from the traditional classroom space, slow-down, and become present.

**More than human encounters and de/centering human practices**

*Let ‘us’ relate.*

Some postqualitative scholars are concerned about anthropocentrism and the ontological privilege given to human subjects as knowers, doers, and creators of meanings. With ‘human’ often meant as the *adult* human, the *western* adult human (Murris, 2021). More than human materials/elements (such as water, rocks, clay, snow) are foregrounded in many postqualitative inquiries especially highlighting the role of companion species and kin (Haraway, 2003) and relational practices such as diffraction (Barad, 2007, 2014). For example, McKnight (2016) focuses on the idea of diffraction in teaching postqualitative inquiry and decentering the human by emphasizing Barad’s (2007) forms of relationality in their book *Meeting the universe halfway*. One way we can practice this is through enacting the diffractive methodology (Murris & Bozalek, 2019, 2023). Sidebottom (2019) shares how her students are encouraged to share stories and images of their non-human companions and explain how they shape their learning journeys
through discussions and activities both online and in the classroom. One scholar in Strom and Lupinacci’s (2019) creates an instructional unit with the notion of who is known as *the teacher*.

Thinking haptically through-with materials-as-kin to unveil entanglements in generating and sensemaking of research can contribute to knowledge-making, albeit it is challenging in practice to decenter the human, e.g., using textiles as this image articulates. Memory objects can be another way that educators of postqualitative inquiry incorporate the *more than human* in their teaching. In one pedagogical experience, Müller (2019) invites educators to bring an object that trigger memories of educational oppression and or change, stating that these types of objects can highlight educators’ subjectivities, identities, and experiences relating to social justice. Besides objects, experiences can also help scholars decenter the human. In Snake-Beings’ (2017) example the visual/audio performance event *Bingodisiac* is used “as a case study to examine various ways in which we can learn to move beyond the constraints of totalising structures” (p. 38). The Bingodisiac Orchestra became “an interactive performance that attempts to break down the structures of musical form so that the raw materials of sound become participatory elements” (Snake-Beings, 2017, p. 41). Snake-Beings (2017) argues that by focusing on engaging with
non-totalising environments such as the Bingodisiac Orchestra or the internet, knowledge may emerge from the engagement with instruments or technology.

Ontological practices

*let ‘us’ believe.*

The ontological spaces in postqualitative inquiry call educators to live and teach and live teaching, drawing from relational ontologies. Relational ontologies enable learners and scholars to resist dogmas, binaries, and stable hierarchies and identities while simultaneously embracing complexities, indeterminacies, relational subjectivities, incompleteness, and the unknown. Within this mode of inquiry, binaries are deconstructed, hierarchies are troubled, and reality could seem conditional while using experimentation to reach new possibilities and to be(com)e differently. Postqualitative inquiry asks research to shift away from human-centered meaning towards living in complex systems (St. Pierre, 2022).

St. Pierre (2022) believes that post-structuralism and the ontology of immanence should guide the way researchers approach post-qualitative inquiry. Johansson (2016) mentions how the plugging-ins (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) within the focus group result in the concept of confabulative conversations. Plugging-in is described as “entanglements of processes” where
“theory, method, practice, etc. plug into each other, making it impossible to define distinctions between components and to decide when something begins or ends” (Johannson, 2016, p. 457). Using this idea, *confabulative conversations* became present when *plugging-in* creates smooth spaces for new *lines of flight* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) and new possibilities (Johannson, 2016). Guyotte et al. (2020) use Braidotti’s (2014) figuration of a *nomad* to personify postqualitative inquiry as a journey with no predetermined process, guide, or destination, while Taylor (2016, 2019a) activates the concept of cacophony and figurations of human-nonhuman conspirators to gesture to the open-ended ontological multiplicities of postqualitative inquiry.

Kuby et al.’s (2016) postqualitative inquiry course pushes students to rethink and unlearn traditional ways of thinking. These authors believe that normalized practices prevent academics from wanting to learn more. Kuby et al. (2016) did not wish to label their experiences as the postqualitative manual or a how-to guide. Instead, they hope that by sharing their experiences their writing could open the door to the possibilities of teaching and learning postqualitative inquiry for others. Similarly, Strom and Lupinacci (2019) warn against “the creation of new binaries in posthumanism between those who are posthuman and those who are not” (p. 120). Although, postqualitative theory refrains from establishing boundaries, Evans et al. (2022) identify the need to produce [NOT PRODUCE] “minor grammar and vocabulary that is sensitive to how education is lived through movement, a collective project that is necessarily speculative, social, and open-ended in nature” (p. 800). Embracing the unknown has proved to be difficult for those who engage in postqualitative inquiry. Hancock and Fontanella-Nothom (2020) introduce *Pedagogies of Sustainment (POSt)* to foster sustainable intra-active pedagogies. Hancock and Fontanella-Nothom (2020) describe POSt as a “means to trust and sustain the nourishment of the ‘classroom’ that allowed us to trust the discomfort of the unknown” (p. 83).
Inspired by Barad’s agential realism and Deleuze and Guattari’s writings, Lenz Taguchi (2010) proposes that binary ways of thinking illustrate the problems of the theory/practice and discourse/matter divide. The author emphasizes that a binary way of thinking leads us to value “one side over the other” and “inhibits constructive change” making us “hold on to an either-or way of thinking” (p. 23). Drawing on Barad, Lenz Taguchi (2010) explains how being and knowing are also not binary, but one. However, this one is not a singular one but one of many, a plural one where differences and multiplicities are always embedded into the one; more than one but less than many.

Another way that scholars embrace complexities and incompleteness is using timescape practices. Adam (1998) explains how timescapes allow scholars and participants to use our senses and imagination to see “phenomena as complex temporal, contextually specific wholes” (pp. 54–55). For example, Misiaszek (2020) uses timescapes as an “interdisciplinary, post-qualitative, pedagogical methodological practice” (p. 13) to explore a twenty-year mentoring relationship. McKnight (2016) also believes that timescape practices such as poetry can provide us with another way to think differently about post-qualitative pedagogies as it “does not necessarily know or anticipate its end” (p. 198).

In a more provocative and haunting pedagogical event, Pedersen (2013) utilizes thick descriptions to convey the zooethnographic experience of participants in a Swedish veterinary education program visit to various animal farms and slaughterhouses in rural Sweden. The author described this as an “edutainment” experience noting that “the pedagogical choreographies we were part of, together with but materially distinctly separated from the animals, constituted an experience somewhat resembling a guided tour through what could be called an animal production zoo” (p. 720). A “shift of character” arises as students depart “from the detached
discussions of animal protection measures and productivity figures” and enter “physical experience with the animals going to their slaughter” (p. 723).

McKnight et al. (2017) provide an exemplar of postqualitative experimentation by attempting to create curricular experiences “transversally with matter” through intra-action in a curriculum design workshop (p. 636). The workshop began by refraining from the accustomed presenter-audience dichotomy. Rather than having a presenter on stage, there was only an envelope placed upon a chair that read, “open me when it feels necessary” (p. 637). This envelope includes passages that give context to the workshop. At the end of the ninety-minute workshop, nobody budged to leave, people were still fully engaged, and are discussed how they could continue these conversations online, beyond the workshop. Using the “invisible hand” analogy, the authors explain how these experiences could not be replicated in a digital space, declaring that “invisible hands” will be “tap-stabbing at the dilemma that we struggle to think or plan outside humanism” (p. 651). Although some scholars note the difficulties in engaging in these practices within the academy, they hope future generations of researchers will continue to push the boundaries of what research can be(come).

**Reimagining practices**

*Let ‘us’ dream.*

Bringing ourselves, as teachers and scholars, into our inquiries serves as one important tenet of reimagining research and what constitutes research (Misiaszek, 2020). This idea echoes the call for inquiry to use intensive and situated over extensive and widely generalized concepts. More specifically, rather than engaging with well-known and legitimized research methods, scholars call for the use of concepts that are inspired by the situated inquiries (Colebrook, 2017; Evans et al., 2022).
Kuby et al. (2016) allows students to create projects based on their own research interests throughout the course while reading post-philosophies, some for the first time. The invitation was not to solely focus on knowing and meaning making, but rather on what the readings in relation to their research inquiries produce. Other scholars share fragmented and emerging stories. For example, Müller (2019) uses a collaborative arts-based autobiographical narrative to explain that “working towards social justice and social change in education must leave room for our past experiences to emerge in the present” (p.67).

Teaching postqualitatively could be experienced as “mutually constitutive” and “central and productive” (Kuby et al., 2016, p. 140) drawing from feminist new materialism. Strom and Lupinacci (2019) also foreground relationality by using a jigsaw activity that includes an original fictional narrative entitled The Parable of the Three Scholar Practitioners. In this fictional story, the three scholars are considering how to address the achievement gap in schools but approach the problem in different ways. Students then use their learnings “to create cartographies that map out their own geo-political locations and explore other material discursive flows that could possibly shape their future research projects and eventual impact that might have” (p. 12).

Many autobiographies and auto-ethnography generate situated practices. Specifically, scholars may use autobiographical writing to reflect on their practice (Hammoor, 2019) and find wholeness (Lyle, 2018). Collective memory work is yet another strategy to bring living and remembering into scholarship. Memory work can involve an analysis of stories told by individuals in their own research (Davies & Gannon, 2006). For Flint et al. (2022) memory work was used to assist scholars in writing a collective biography over the span of two years. During this time, they use “artful methods” such as reading poetry and creating collages to “spark ongoing conversations and entangle” their memories together (Flint et al., 2022, p. 4).
Using divergent sources of data is another way we can reimagine research. During an “intra-vention,” (Sidebottom, 2019, p. 220) students visit an art gallery to spark the creative process and connect with materials that relate to them in that particular moment while Lyle and Caissie (2021) utilize the idea of teaching as a co-constructed praxis, believing that students and educators serve as “critical data sites” whose “experiences offer a window into behaviors and actions that contribute to education as a profoundly human endeavor” (p. 226). Kuby et al. (2016) also promotes this idea by encouraging learning about theories with “co-produced data” [NOT PRODUCED] such as memories, student artifacts, and notes (p. 142). Hogarth et al. (2022) uses the notion of ‘volcanic irruptions’ to illuminate how postqualitative inquiry aims to keep data on the move, enabling it to proliferate in rhizomatic, nomadic, and unforeseen ways via different, ongoing experimentations and the processual research practices of knowledge-ing. As such, postqualitative inquiry can reimagine research in a variety of different ways by pushing the boundaries of what research can be and become.

**Theoretical and political practices**

*Let ‘us’ speak.*

Teaching postqualitatively often utilizes theory in diverse ways. For example, some scholars think with theory (Jackson and Mazzei, 2012), use theories as methodologies (Kuby et al., 2016), and foreground methodologies without methodologies (Koro, 2016). Nxumalo et al. (2020) explain that by featuring theory in their qualitative course, a space is created to “activate attunement to the more-than human within racialized, gendered, and colonial human/more-than-human worlds” (p. 32). More specifically, in teaching postqualitative courses, some instructors encourage their students to read as much as they can (St. Pierre, 2022) and engage with theoretical writings early in qualitative courses (Kuby & Christ, 2020; Nxumalo et al., 2020).
Furthermore, some scholars (Guyotte et al., 2020; Kuby et al., 2016; St. Pierre, 2022) discuss the use of texts situated in specific paradigms such as poststructural, posthuman, new materialist for their qualitative courses. Others incorporate specific philosophers and topics. For example, Hancock and Fontanella-Nothom (2020) encourage students to read the work of Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, Butler, Spivak, and Barad and discuss the ideas of *thinking-with-theory* (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012) and (re)presentation.

Postqualitative inquiries recognize that **everything is political** and **human and nonhuman elements are continuously affected by histories and power structures** (Franklin-Phipps, 2017a, 2017b; Gerrard et al., 2017). Postqualitative scholars may use politics to promote inquiry in their classrooms by discussing emotionally charged topics (Gachago & Stewart, 2020; Charteris & Nye, 2019; Pedersen, 2013), using obscenity (Wolgemuth et al., 2020), and by learning from divergent points of view (Guyotte & Flint, 2021; Kuby & Christ, 2020; Mitchell et al., 2023; Müller, 2019; Sidebottom, 2019). Additionally, engaging with postqualitative inquiry is posed as a way to challenge the neoliberal demands of academia. Kuby et al. (2016) explains how qualitative research did not have wide support and infrastructures in their college and a grassroots effort was necessary for more qualitative research and even postqualitative courses to be offered.

Ethical research involves slllllooooooow, creative and artful tiiiiiiiiiiiiime to entangle *with* rather than act *on* our inquiries (Flint et al., 2022). However, due to neoliberal pressures, many scholars feel that they do not have this tiiiiiiiiiiiiime to adequately engage in postqualitative inquiry (Mitchell et al., 2023; Stewart et al., 2021; Kuby & Christ, 2020; Misiaszek, 2020). This sense of overwhelm particularly affects early and mid-career scholars working in this space (Franklin-Phipps, 2024; Van Cleave, 2024). To combat these obstacles, several scholars of postqualitative
inquiry offer different solutions to the problem of time. Through timescape encounters such as poetry and language studies, Misiaszek (2020) believes that time is ‘made’ to examine ourselves, make-meaning, and relate to others. Technology also allows scholars more time to engage with postqualitative inquiry. Recordings of a postqualitative webinar in Mitchell et al. (2023) allow participants to view recordings of the webinars on their own time, and they are able to engage with renowned scholars from around the world without the financial burden.

Furthermore, while wishing to “transgress” towards postqualitative inquiry, students in Kuby et al.’s (2016) example believe that they are pushed back towards “traditional” ways of inquiry due to difficulties in meeting institutional, employer, and/or journal policies and expectations (p. 145). McKnight (2016) also faces this challenge as they explain their desire to write an article that was nothing but poems, however reviewers view it as "too radical” (p. 199).

Feeling the pressure outside and within ourselves to know, understand, and make sense are other political barriers to engaging with postqualitative inquiry. Some scholars describe their own tensions with teaching postqualitative inquiry by sharing that students and even colleagues expect them to teach specific procedures and logistics (Flint et al., 2022). Others state that they feel pressured to represent their research in ways that “might ‘make sense’ for others” (Hancock & Fontanella-Nothom, 2020, p. 85). However, making one’s work accessible to others can also invite more learners and scholars to use postqualitative inquiry in their work.

Provocative dialogue (Charteris & Nye, 2019) and personal reflexivity (Misiaszek, 2020) related to politics can assist in promoting inquiry for postqualitative scholars. Misiaszek (2020) notes that deepening our understanding of the “always-unfolding relationship(s) across time and spaces” challenges the “results-oriented" and “exploitative teaching/mentoring relationships” that
result from neoliberalism (p. 14). Yet, it is essential to ensure that these conversations take place in nurturing and safe spaces which also may include a sense of discomfort and unfamiliarity.

**Moving forward**

Researchers and educators propose that teaching postqualitative inquiry requires incorporating, reinventing and reimagining a variety of theories, approaches, techniques, and processes. Engaging in mixed media artful methods (Flint et al., 2022), such as bodymind mapping (Murris, 2016), collaging (Flint et al., 2022; Müller, 2019; Sidebottom, 2019), mapping (Evans et al., 2022; Guyotte et al., 2020; Niccolini et al., 2018; Strom & Lupinacci, 2019), creating zines (Mitchell et al., 2023) are other ways scholars may engage with postqualitative inquiry. By engaging with these sorts of artistic practices, opportunities are presented for inquirers to explore the intricacies of human and non-human elements in more holistic ways than using traditional research methods alone (Flint et al., 2022).

In addition, using figurative language such as figurations (Murris, 2016), metaphors and poetry (Johansson, 2016; Kuby et al., 2016; McKnight et al., 2017; McKnight, 2016) can also help us with materializing postqualitative inquiry. While using metaphors can serve to connect abstract concepts to lived experiences (Jamrozik et al., 2016) engaging with poetry welcomes fluidity and the discussion of ideas in a non-hierarchical and non-linear structure (Leavy, 2015; McKnight, 2016). Finally, journaling (Evans et al., 2022; Guyotte & Flint, 2021), practicing memory-work (Flint et al., 2022), and writing letters (Strom & Lupinacci, 2019) present opportunities for inquirers to create new connections (Evans et al., 2022) and recognize how personal experiences hold the potential to affect both themselves and other elements in the world around them (Barad 2007; Guyotte et al., 2020).
We propose that postqualitative pedagogies should continuously stay on the move and transform themselves. While scholars are challenged by movement, hesitation, and open-endedness, they also find these practices intriguing and motivating. Postqualitative scholars recognize the importance of not only questioning traditional ways of doing research but traditional ways of teaching and learning. Maybe only learning by doing. Maybe by activating theory as embodied practices. Maybe increased utilization and practices of relational teaching and pedagogy. Maybe more flexible and creative assignments. Maybe just simply continuously reinventing pedagogical practices and processes until they cannot recognize themselves and discourses that create them. Maybe.
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