Article

Is It Possible to Think Physical Education Forward and Dismantle Ourselves—in a Quantum Space?

Åsa Andersson[1] , Peter Korp[1], and Anne B. Reinertsen[2]

Abstract

This paper invites readers to an encounter of novel learning in the school subject physical education, and specifically swimming training. In collaboration with Deleuze's immanent philosophy and creative observations in a case-assemblage, I speculate about productive experiences and educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. Troubling situations of a standardized model of swimming training is combined with a quantum space where multiple divergent ideas, forces, and feelings interact and produce unforeseen learnings, values, and qualities. Frictions between segmented spaces and quantum spaces orient/reorient the student's/ swimming instructor's/my/your? learning, values, and qualities. Finally, I emphasize quantum spaces as the heart of educational movement and the importance of creating open educational systems to perhaps think physical education forward.

Keywords

quantum space, thresholds of consciousness, novel learning, open system, quality, ontology of becoming, physical education

[1]Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden
[2]Østfold University College, Halden, Norway

Corresponding Author:
Åsa Andersson, Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science, University of Gothenburg, Box 320, 405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.
Email: asa.andersson.2@gu.se

Introduction

The first time I met them was at a stand close to a swimming pool. Unusual/nonunusual girls from Gothenburg. They were 11 years old and deeply worried about their forthcoming grades in the school subject physical education. In Sweden, swimming is a part of the curriculum of physical education in elementary school, and the children are expected to pass swimming ability tests when they are 12 respectively 16 years old. I know this because the girls told me that they really needed to learn to swim this semester. They did not know how though, but while the consequences of failure was evident, they described the opportunities to succeed as almost utopian. The exercises simply contained too many elements they could not imagine themselves to perform. To let go of the edge of the pool, dip their heads in the water, and float without any help. However, at the stand there were others who were more confident about how the girls would learn to swim, namely the swimming instructors. To a large extent, their conviction was based on a carefully developed ten-stage model where the girls first had to pass level one in order to advance to level two, and so on. Each level contained specific parts that needed to be completed before they could move up to the next level, and the swimming instructors had clear instructions on which exercises each part would contain. In short, the ten-stage model of the swimming education was modeled entirely upon steps of solution that required conscious actions from the girls. The swimming instructors informed the girls what to do, and the girls were supposed to follow the order and reproduce the movements in the water. It was a static body of facts expected to enabling solutions on the public health-related problem that a significant number of 16 year olds in Gothenburg cannot swim 200 meters, and thus not get grades in physical education when they finish elementary school.

This is a serious problem. There are areas in Gothenburg where only 14% of the residents have postsecondary education, and across the city there are clear links between both educational level and the level of income, and differences in health. For a number of years now, the City of Gothenburg has been pushing for a more equal and sustainable Gothenburg (The City of Gothenburg, 2018). Briefly, this means that there is a desire to reduce differences in living conditions, and, among other things, increased swimming skills are seen as an important part of that effort. By offering all children standardized swimming training at school, there is a strong belief that the risk of drowning accidents will be reduced and that more children can become physically active and participate in more social activities close to the water. There is also a belief that more students will have the opportunity to get approved grades in physical education, and thus have the opportunity to continue to higher education. And these expectations are far from unique. In terms of educational policy, resembling assumptions that certain training activities will entail particular effects have become increasingly prevalent (Au, 2013; Barrett, 2009; Pickup, 2020, p. 6). What works to produce a specific outcome seems to be a constantly recurring issue that in turn encourages technical rationality, top-down management, measures, and quantification of performance. Several researchers (e.g., Apple, 2006; Baez, 2014; Gray, 2007; Zeichner, 2010)

therefore claim that education is involved in a societal system where "institutions are recast as markets rather than deliberatively democratic systems" (Hursh, 2007, p. 493–494), and where achievement of predetermined goals is absolutely crucial for further trustworthiness.

Hence, this article is about educational (swimming) events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. But, before I go on talking about educational processes and movements in various directions, I want you to meet someone, and perhaps get an insight into the process of becoming a person who floats in the water. I do not remember at what level, but at some stage in the aforementioned ten-stage model one of the girls would learn to float. I think her name was Amira. Or maybe she was called something else. I am not sure anymore, but she appeared to be quite afraid of the water and seemed to do everything in her power to keep her head up while the swimming instructor habitually held her hands under her shoulders and told her to act like she was sleeping. After a short moment of panic and fear, Amira placed her hands on the swimming instructor's arms and as a response to that movement, the instructor moved her whole body closer to Amira's shoulders. At the same time as they had increased physical contact, Amira seemed to start to trust the instructor, herself, and the water. She relaxed and let her head rest in the water, and learned to float. Can you feel the unexpected relief in her body, in the swimming instructor's body, in my body, in your body?

To me, the temporary exchange between Amira's body and the swimming instructor's body determined a threshold of consciousness where their creative and spontaneous acts were adjusted to their perceptions of the relations, and as a result they provided an improvised solution to the problem of floating. In this sense, learning to float was momentary, situated, and full of infinite surprises. The increased body contact and skin-to-skin practice was an element of nature/culture that affected our minds without us being aware of it. Our learning took place in and through our unconsciousness, and established what Deleuze (1994, p. 214) perhaps would call "the bond of profound complicity between nature and mind." I have research notes about this on a piece of paper. Notes from "creative-observations" (Andersson Andersson et al., in review) within a "case-assemblage" (Andersson Andersson et al., in review) in this swimming event in elementary school in Gothenburg, Sweden conducted by myself and a colleague in 2018–2019. Notes that I have read and re-read several times by now. Sometimes they provoke new thoughts, and sometimes they do not.

Practice of Inquiry

Letting research notes provoke new thoughts is in tune with how Amira and I interacted, or to be more precise intra-acted, and at best surrendered to each other and released each other's energy to move around and transform both the inquiry and our understandings of what was going on in the swimming event. To elaborate a bit, creative-observations are processes of negotiations where the volatile images of learning I have managed to catch are created in collaboration with Amira. And

case-assemblage is the milieu of connections and productions within which a vast network of processes and forces continuously shaped our collaboration. A collaboration that to a large extent was and still is felt (Andersson Andersson et al., in review), and expresses dispersion, change, and instability. In both creative observations and case-assemblages as well as in my reading of research notes, Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of immanence is a pivotal principle for the (ontological) establishment of unstable situations. Immanence means the condition of being entirely within something/someone, and signifies very small units and properties that exist on scales above, below, and beyond specific activities of both the swimming event and the inquiry. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 47) would perhaps call this milieu a plane where various processes sometimes meet, take effect, and become extended. As a plane, immanence is immanent in itself and cannot be defined as something or in relation to anything. Yet, the plane of immanence is full of potentialities in each moment and spreads out endless opportunities for action and movement in various directions. I would say that the plane of immanence is a virtuality that includes other virtualities as well as processes of actualizations that make possible consistencies in both the swimming event and the inquiry. Being a virtual also leads us further when it comes to establishment of the internal conditions of thinking—that is, infinite movement. Infinite movement is also what has to be handled by our thoughts when they take solid forms into specific concepts. However, concepts do not only respond to specific thoughts, but they also make possible various elaborations of our thoughts. The philosophy of immanence simply requires us to let go of dogmatic images of thought where our thinking consists of processes of recognitions and representations of the already known (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 37–38). Simultaneously, it enables us to replace this kind of thinking with a more genuine thinking where our thoughts are not predetermined by common sense (Deleuze, 1994, p. xvi). Hence, this inquiry is not a milieu of predetermined knowledge but that of infinite learning. Learning, then, means composing singular points of our own bodies with components of other bodies, to crack into pieces and be driven forward into the unknown (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 251–252). For Deleuze, these processes are intensive events that may consist of various series like bodies/thoughts and words/things. Within immanent milieus of creative observations and case-assemblage, bodies (human and nonhuman) are always products of intense encounters with other bodies. And, within these encounters it is not that interesting what bodies really are. What is interesting is how they change and what they can do in relation to each other. Maintaining an immanent principle in this inquiry is thus an explicit critique of every system of thought that does not allow changes. Simultaneously, an immanent principle affirms flows of thought, open systems, and processes without predetermined ends. When it comes to research, education, and training, it entails an open-ended approach that does not establish a dominant principle from which everything is derived. Rather our bodies are permitted to spread out in a milieu without dividing this milieu between us.

For me, this is a situation in/of fractal trust and where we at least occasionally trust each other and produce fluid turbulences rather than relying on some predefined

methodological system within which credible research can be performed. While I sat on the stand, Amira came by and sometimes we talked to each other. In these chats, various thoughts, questions, and answers emerged and coordinated each other. Each thought, question, and answer had affective capacities just as they were results of affective capacities. In the process of being hit by thoughts, questions, and answers and hitting thoughts, questions, and answers, Amira and I produced a zone of indetermination. Theoretically, this is a zone where various affects are produced and populates the situation through uncontrollable becomings (compare Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 173) of thoughts, questions, answers, Amira, and myself. Affects then refer to preconceptual intensities of bodily states of excited or anxious uncertainties about what happens (Massumi, 2002) in the swimming event. This, in turn, entails important destabilizations of how we perceive things. And it is precisely this kind of destabilizations and simultaneously production of new ways of feeling and seeing that is methodological central in this inquiry. How we perceive things has nothing to do with perceptions (Deleuze, 1990). Objects of our perceptions are occasional or perhaps even accidental results of the package of relations and sensations in the situation of a case-assemblage, and that live on beyond our control and within which we at least sometimes become other.

Similarly, creative observations assume no principles of truth. I would say that is to think together beyond the end in situations where we cannot be sure. And hence to speculate. However, in creative observations, there is always a risk that we use a standard language to describe novel situations, and thus express things that do not belong to the order of the situation. For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 80), this is a possible paradox in philosophy at large, and to avoid resembling contradictions I want to support infinitive movements by welcome every reader to think with me and Amira. To destabilize today's provisional result of the inquiry and become destabilized by it. By encouraging destabilizations and disruptions to multiply and spread out on their own terms outside habitual approaches and rigid regulations, my intention is to extend occasional establishments of our evaluative capacities in the swimming event to a creative plane of innovation and perhaps grasp what Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 59) call "the nonthought within thought." For me, this is both an ethical and political act of making resistance to present hierarchical arrangements and binary division of various roles. This since escaping criteria and definitions in thought by embracing multiplicities is essential for the creation of alternative democratic spaces (compare Deleuze, 1994, p. 108) in research, physical education, sport, public health and so on.

For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 399), this is to act with passion, and where we as interdependent intensities set in motion things we are not fully aware of. It is "the dawn of desire" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 9) where desire is the perceptual infrastructure that constitutes the objects we become interested in as well as the milieu in which they appear. In this perspective, desire is a productive force that makes our bodies engage with each other, and hence affect each other to move in various directions within the case-assemblage. We do not desire because we lack something, but because of the intense and productive forces of desire produced in our encounters. In other words,

desire is "what first introduces the affective connections that make it possible to navigate through the social world" (Schrift, 1995, p. 69). To achieve this, it requires us (Amira, me, and you) to move away from zones of idealistic knowledge and enter a zone of infinite learning and allow it to become increasingly unclear if we are researchers, data or readers, subjects or objects. A zone of infinite learning where we no longer are either…or, but one and all moving in multiple directions at the same time. And in this zone of indetermination I suggest that we try to collaborate like various intensities coming together to make "a new" intensity full of uncontrollable creativity (compare Deleuze, 1995, p. 136). This is my practice of inquiry, and by releasing the creativity of our collaboration, I hope we may modify some truths about learning to swim and hence educational (swimming) events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities.

What Encounters Make Students a Swimmer?

For now, Amira's and my collaboration give rise to thoughts about the relation between learning and knowledge, and specifically the knowledge of methods for learning to swim. What encounters make students a swimmer? Amira says her family has no money. That is also why they never go for a swim together and why she is not used to this kind of water. There are simply other problems they need to address first. Like food and clothes. During my time on the stand, she comes there alone and she walks home alone. Often hungry and worried about things an 11-year-old girl should not have to worry about. It is difficult in many ways, but the difficulties are also mixed with the hope of someday becoming a lawyer. She is aware of the importance of her school results and that she cannot afford to fail on a single grade. This puts pressure on her. A pressure she sometimes handles/does not handle. All together this is constitutive of Amira, and also why she tries so hard to learn to swim even if the swimming education is hardly adapted to her as an individual, and hence moves in a different rhythm than those she knows and can possibly step into. It is not even sure she recognizes the beat. She does and does not. Statistically, she is doomed to failure. Although the studies are relatively few, they seem to point in the same direction. At a macro level, there has been a focus on the extent to which a widespread timetabling of free swimming sessions attract new swimmers and results in new swimming patterns. Beyond immediate short-term changes, there is no evidence that changes in the levels of physical participation actually took place (e.g., Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42). On a meso level it is argued, though, that structured sessions including appropriate exit routes within free swimming programs may have a greater potential to create experiences where individuals will return and gain continuity in their participation than unstructured sessions with unstructured pathways (e.g., Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42). Methodologically, it is suggested that systematic targeting is essential to attract individuals who lack a history of participation in swimming activities and the associated sporting capital (Anderson et al., 2014; compare Coalter, 2002). In any case, Pilgaard et al. (2020) show that broad investments in swimming training for everyone at an age of 7–8 years do not

seem to contribute to the coveted result that more children learn to swim, and recommend the solution to start swimming training at an earlier age.

However, these statistics (Anderson et al., 2014; Bullough et al., 2015, p. 42 and Pilgaard et al., 2020) do not ask questions about learning processes and how they could possibly change. Nor is it noted that learning processes may have affective starting places just like the skin-to-skin contact when Amira learned how to float. That is, learning is more than a cognitive process of transferring idealistic knowledge and involves affective experience-based unconscious processes where students and teachers think with each other, destabilize existing knowledge, and produce new desire. The statistics simply do not tell us what to do other than repeat the already known on younger children. Yet, there is something amorous about Amira's and the swimming instructor's learning processes, which at least at the moment seems to disarm the occurrences of fatality in traditional swim training indicated by previous research. For me, these processes seem to relate strongly to Deleuze's (1994, p. 27) when he says, "We learn nothing from those who say: 'Do as I do'. Our only teachers are those who tell us to 'do with me', and are able to emit signs to be developed in heterogeneity rather than proposes gestures for us to reproduce." So, for the moment I will try to think with Deleuze's immanent philosophy not only when it comes to create swim educations for more, but also when it comes to produce courses in physical education for all, as well as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities. Therefore, I will now go on with more on thresholds of consciousness, affective starting places for learning, trust, novel learning, and ontology of becoming.

Thresholds of Consciousness and the Production of Novel Learning

How is it possible that Amira does not take part in the status quo indicated by the statistics above? Why does she float when everything we know indicates that she should sink? I am not sure, but what pops up in my mind is that at the moment when Amira became someone who floats, her body was combined with some of the others, and that could be the reason why she espoused a process that did not reproduce previous states. Amira, the swimming instructor, the water, the smell of chlorine, the waves, the ten-stage model, me at the stand, we all seemed to renew ourselves in each other. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 88), this process can be understood in terms of an "assemblage," and thus like an organic, desiring, self-organizing always becoming machine where various elements meet each other and where one element creates a flow that is broken by another. Like for example when the swimming instructor told Amira to act like she was sleeping, the moves of Amira did not resemble that of the swimming instructor's information. She says she had no intention of being troublesome, but the swimming instructor's suggestion did not make any sense to her, and did not bear any relation to how she experienced the water as something uncertain, imposed, and dangerous. And that she tried really hard but could not do it. Accidentally,

Amira responded with panic and fear and grabbed the swimming instructor's arms, and to that sign the swimming instructor responded by moving her body closer to Amira's body. For Deleuze (1994) 27), these encounters between signs and responses are precisely those spaces where novel learning takes place. And to elaborate a bit further, each sign involves heterogeneity in at least two more ways than the ones mentioned above, where neither Amira's nor the swimming instructor's responses echo that of a sign. First, in the object(s) that is, in Amira who emits the sign of panic and fear while she is doing her best to adapt to the swimming instructor's information, and in the swimming instructor who gives off the sign that Amira can manage to float while she is doing her best to save her from drowning. In a flash, there are two orders of disparate realities in their respective bodies between which the signs move rapidly. Second, in the signs where Amira's panic and fear completely surround the swimming instructor and incarnate an idea of moving her body closer to Amira's body. And where the swimming instructor's move closer to Amira envelops Amira's body and brings to life an idea of trust. A physical and mental power that moves Amira away from a mode of uncertainty and into a mode of certainty, and makes her rely on the swimming instructor, the water, and herself.

At this moment, bodily contact seems to be crucial for the development of conscious and unconscious factions in/of trust. Furthermore, Amira's trust seems to be anchored not so much in the system of the ten-stage model but in the process of the present and related to the indeterminable potential of the swimming instructor, the water, and herself. This is also why I suggest that the production of trust in physical education may not first and foremost be thought of in systematic, moralistic, or logical terms. It is not that Amira makes moral assessments whether the ten-stage model, swimming instructor, the water, and herself are trustworthy or not. Neither does she take chances to reach specific outcomes. There is simply no calculation of future risks other than that she needs to survive and get her final grades, and hence no other transgression of the bounds of the present. Rather, Amira's trust is produced within a situation of experiences. Conscious and unconscious. Between herself and others. Simultaneously, she is placed within an emergent learning process, that is, an iterative processes without mutual order. While Amira learns how to float, the swimming instructor learns that physical contact and closeness are important for Amira to feel safe in the water. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 258), these are all processes of becoming. Born within the present and placed in between the past and the future.

To theorize a bit, becoming is about to create something new (Deleuze, 1995, p. 171), rather than attain a form of representation, identification, or imitation. It is about finding a zone of juxtaposition, a zone of closeness where bodies are placed together with contrasting effect and where they can achieve a stage of immanence and open to new trajectories. A zone that "liberates desire from all its concretizations in order to dissolve them" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 86), and where desire as an engine of becoming opens up territorializations of power and forms of subjectivity. Amira says she is always so proud of herself in the swimming event. And that she does things she could never imagine herself to do. The unfolding of skills surprises her and she is not

sure why and how they emerge, or where exactly she is going. She says she does not know what will happen next. Or what she will manage to do next. If anything. All she knows is that she right now is able to laugh, splash, run, and float in the water, and that this is not enough to get a grade in physical education. Happy and unhappy at the same time. Successful and unsuccessful. Right and wrong. Relaxed and stressed. Trustworthy and not trustworthy. For Deleuze, our bodily expansions and creations occur through connections, and not due to awareness of our lackings. Amira simply does not learn to float because she knows that she cannot swim or that she needs a grade in physical education. Rather, learning is of a different nature to knowledge, and a creative process that concerns the part of our minds of which we are not fully aware but which influences our actions and feelings. The process when Amira becomes someone who floats is probably shaped by affects that are not entirely rational or which she is fully aware of, and as such neither her trust nor learning have final objects. By surrendering to the rhythm of occasions, both Amira and the swimming instructor attain a stage in which their bodies are immanent and open to new affective flows, relations, and pathways, and to me it seems like they are equipped with what Deleuze (1994, p. 173) calls "the necessary modesty not managing to know what everybody knows". Neither when it comes to the statistics, nor when it comes to the ten-stage model and its carefully developed methods for teaching swimming. Their newly acquired knowledge is not possible to reduce to the static bodies of facts, but constitutes a dynamic process of inquiry embedded in experience. Prepersonal, experimental, and practical, and where experience is the surrounding that provides them with the capacities to affect and be affected.

The Ontology of Becoming

Amira's and the swimming instructor's experiences can be seen as milieus populated with relations between signs that produce affective becomings. It also seems like these relations between signs are ontologically prior Amira's and the swimming instructor's terms. The distinction between what Amira and the swimming instructor are simply erodes, and their previous fixed roles dissolve. There is no longer a dualistic split between Amira being the student, and the swimming instructor being the teacher. Rather, they become students and teachers, objects and subjects. For Deleuze, it is precisely this in-between relation that is ontologically basic. In the same way, he argues that the reality consists of two distinct but inseparable movements—the virtual and the actual. While the virtual comprises mobile structures where "differential elements and relations along with the singular points which correspond to them" (Deleuze, 1994, p. 272) form the creative component of reality, the actual consists of conditions and states of affairs within which spatiotemporal situations are established and form the calculable, foreseeable, and presumed component of reality. By producing singularizations that hardly fit in the predictable aggregations of the actual, virtual movements often mean the establishment of trouble in various situations. Not so much because they oppose the universal, but since they tend to extend themselves and unfold

close to each other. And this is perhaps what happens to Amira and the swimming instructor at the moment when Amira becomes a person who floats. Close to each other they start to vibrate, and the vibrations as a process generates effects of different bodies (human and nonhuman) that open up various ways to both learn and teach how to float that do not conform to a static apprehending of the aforementioned ten-stage model of the swimming education.

It is not that the approach of the ten-stage model and the process between the swimming instructor and Amira are opposed binary forces or educational worldviews; neither are they distinguished by scale, size, or dimension. Rather, they presuppose each other and coexist as different forms of educational segmentarities. While the force of the ten-stage model is rigid and delivers specific swimming training at the agreed swimming lesson, in tune with the whole (curriculum, swimming instructors, teachers, and the realms of perception and representation), the force of the process between Amira and the swimming instructor is flexible, imperceptible, nonrepresentable, and concerned with assembled bodies that are perceptually becoming. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pp. 199–200), this is a distinction between molar and molecular lines. The molar line of the ten-stage model can predominantly be defined as a calculated arrangement to "ensure and control the identity of each agency, including personal identity" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 195). In this rigid line of segmentarity, there are no becomings. It works just like an established discourse that keeps bodies in their original positions. The molecular line of the relation between Amira and the swimming instructor, on the other hand, brings about short-lived and transitory segmentations-in-progress, and sometimes (as the moment when Amira learns to float) these molecular lines extract themselves from the molar and while they mutually destroy each other's segmentarity a "line of flight" is produced (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 197). However, there is no guarantee that molecular lines produce lines of flights. It can go either way, that is, both liberate and constrain bodily capacities. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 197) say, "there is a line of flight, which is already complex, since it has singularities: and there is a customary or molar line with segments: and between the two (?), there is a molecular line with quanta that cause it to dip to the one side or the other."

For me, it is suddenly not so far-fetched that the heart of educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities could be quantum spaces. Or that novel learning requires quantum spaces, and not so much combinations of the curriculum or the ten-stage model as a whole and its parts, that is, students and their calculated progresses. Even if the curriculum's or the ten-stage model's quest for essences of problems (what) may pinpoint contradictions or socially more acceptable activities in an absolute swimming education as well as skills and abilities in absolute swimming instructors and students, they do not include emergences of the essential multiplicities of various problems. So, whenever the curriculum or the ten-stage model conceptualizes essences of problems detached from their multiplicities, they risk becoming constructions of empty universals, and where the same instructions and exercises are supposed to fit all students (compare Au,

2016, Giroux, 2010; Valente & Collins, 2016) and transform them into swimmers. And if someone unexpectedly fails to learn to swim, it is perhaps something wrong with that student. To me, this space of marginalization is almost unbearably familiar, and I guess most of us have been there. At least sometime. Thinking, preferring, wishing, and almost begging students to listen to the instructions, be more interested, stand still, sit down, not think so much of their appearance, lose weight, build some fitness, show a little courage, change into the right clothes, put some trust in us, or at least try to do the exercises, and hence learn in a way coherent with the dominant culture of a standard-based education. However, in relation to the swimming instructor, Amira seems to develop a strange passionate complicity, a whole intense molecular existence that does not even enter into a rivalry with the route she is supposed to take part of in the ten-stage model. By bodily engaging with each other, Amira and the swimming instructor are no longer individuated as subjects, but as a new set of interdependent intensities that start to unfold close to each other and set in motion various desire that make them think beyond the regulations of the ten-stage model and attend a situation of novel learning–teaching. And while their collaboration forms a smooth and flexible flow marked by quanta, the state of passion is perhaps what makes the swimming event endurable for Amira, the swimming instructor, me, and you?

I suggest that we slow down a bit here and try to figure out what is going on, or whatever could go on? Amira's participation in the swimming event is not imaginary; it does not go on in her/my/your head. It happens right here and now. It is for real, and Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 196) would probably say that there are "two politics involved… a macropolitics and a micropolitics" that do not envision learning processes, trustworthiness, and quality in at all the same way. And as already discussed there are two different types of relations. Some inherent to the ten-stage model involving carefully determined aggregations of those who can perform the planned exercises and those who cannot. And some slightly more difficult to localize and that are always external to themselves, and instead have to do with the flows of elements that defies or eludes these divisions between right and wrong, knowing and unknowing, taught and untaught, teacher and student. So, why is Amira not fully comfortable with the occurrence of her extra-self as a knowing and taught instructor? Why does she excuse herself and says that she did not mean to be rowdy? That she really tried to follow the route of the ten-stage model, but failed? In the middle of her success also unsuccessful. Proud and ashamed. Normal and abnormal. To me, it seems that even if the present is produced in this latter quantum flow and by the ungraspable matter of something that has already happened (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 196), quantum flows and lines of segmentation still interfere with each other and while this brings some flexibility to the molar it also brings some rigidity to the molecular. I mean, for a few seconds Amira perhaps reached the greatest amount of suppleness possible in her molecular relation with the swimming instructor, and which she cannot go beyond. At the same time, it seems like nothing has changed. While the swimming instructor will go on as a knowing and taught teacher, Amira will go on as an unknowing and untaught student. Yet, everything has changed. Amira and the swimming instructor seem to have reached the

aforementioned line of flight. A line that does not allow the existence of segments and seems to uncover hidden parts of both Amira and the swimming instructor. A line that makes both molecular quantum flows and molar lines of segmentation explode. At the moment when Amira learned to float, I guess she broke through the wall and got out of what Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 199) call "a black hole" of not knowing how to float in the water. She says it is difficult to orientate and she does not know where to go next, so she might have been a bit dazzled when she came out into the light. But one thing is for sure, her floating skills are not hiding in the dark anymore. Simply, because there is no darkness to hide in. No form or predetermined pattern that creates shadows and contrasts that will allow her floating skills to hide again. To get rid of that pattern, both Amira and the swimming instructor seem to dismantle themselves, Amira as a student and the swimming instructor as a teacher. To me, it is a bit like they dismantle themselves to get hold on themselves through the encounter with each other, and hence become capable of learning again.

Dismantling Ourselves—A Step Toward Physical Activation, Higher Education, and the Dissolution of Health Inequalities?

So what does dismantling ourselves really imply when it comes to educational events as movements toward physical activation, higher education, and the dissolution of health inequalities? To me, it seems like we need to support and maintain teaching as an "open system" (Deleuze, 1995, p. 32), and relate training activities to situational circumstances rather than predetermined results. In open teaching systems, training activities do not turn up ready-made. They do not preexist, but have to be invented by those who participate in the event. The job of teaching is to contribute to the production of new training activities with their own necessities, requirements, and indispensability of/in the moment. And hence start to learn again. But there is no way I can guarantee that we will approach courses in physical education for more. Nor can I promise immediate progression. Open teaching systems mean, per se, that we do not know the end in advance, that is, what exactly we will learn.

Perhaps it would be more reasonable to say that if we want to develop courses in physical education for more, we should do our very best to go back and forth between quantum spaces and segmented spaces. And where situations like the one where the swimming instructor discovered that physical contact is important for Amira to feel safe in the water can be a constant inspiration to the established curricula and rigid teaching models, at the same time as the ability of the established curriculum and rigid teaching models to measure activities can be helpful when it comes to the translation of the often quite "strange" results of situations like the one when Amira learned to float. I know that this is not an easy task, but ignoring what Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 486) express as "all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space" would be to do many students a disservice. The statistics have already shown us that students will have insufficient opportunities to learn if we hold on to segmented spaces (compare Poplin et al., 2011) and try to save them from

various multiplicities, and I can only speculate about what would happen if we, out of some sheer convenience, hold on to quantum spaces and try to isolate them from segmented spaces. Probably, we would not only help students to live in a lie for a short while; we would also be co-creators of that lie. It would be like helping students to become other, but not to rewrite the rules so that the changes they undergo can be recognized as qualities. To be co-creators of amazing relieves in their bodies, and at the same time throwing them to the wolves. Cynics might say that at least they will die happy, but can you feel the fear in their bodies just as the wolves attacks them, in the swimming instructor's body, my body, your body when they/we realize that they/we have failed? Again. To have become a fantastic success in one moment only to realize that they/we have become even bigger troublemakers in the next moment. Exhausting I would guess. And life-threatening. For the students. The swimming instructor. Me. You?

So, dismantling ourselves is not only about taking a step back, putting our roles aside, and opening up for others to affect local training activities within our so often rigid spaces of physical education. It is also about allowing changes in the constant curricula, and thus endlessly renew the space it striates. There is an enveloping character of this process that devoid any kind of homogeneity. No predetermined linkages between one space of physical education and the next can be defined, and the space of physical education can be affected in an infinite number of ways (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 485). When it comes to quality and quality assessment, these conditions are entirely different from those determining the metric space of physical education and its constant curricula. No longer relating to a universal stand but to concepts of our understandings in a situation, quality becomes what happens, and hence an event in the moment that defines various rhythmic values of physical education that are not found elsewhere. These values are results of various desire produced in the moment of each training activity.

Dismantling ourselves thus implies that we need to counteract every attempt to define what quality is and how quality can be assessed in the long term. And to co-create cultures of innovation where new qualities continuously can be produced and tied to novel individual values. For me, this is a political matter of equality, equality of bodily movement, and hence educational equality. And to set quality in motion, like I collectively suggest in this inquiry, puts the discussion of predetermined methods, criteria, and definitions in physical education in an ominous political perspective of exclusion, oppression, and production of otherness not far from what can be find in today's prejudices about gender, ethnicity, race, and sexuality. And to stop producing prejudices and inequalities in physical education, I guess we need to make sure that there is a lot of friction between quantum spaces and segmented spaces without ending up with one taking over the other. Hence, dismantling ourselves emphasizes the importance of trust and consultation between different interests in order to put up new ideas, that is, innovations. By supporting creative creations that make communicative differences in physical education, I guess bodies will be set in motion in relation to each other in each training event. Physical and mental motion that, if we are brave enough

to bridge divergences, will be allowed to make differences in some later events. Events that may be about physical activation, higher education, and dissolution of health inequalities, but also about something completely different. So, what do you think? Can we do it together? In a quantum space?

ORCID iDs

Åsa Andersson ⓘD https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-2646
Anne B. Reinertsen ⓘD https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0467-4515

References

Anderson, M., Bolton, N., Davies, B., & Fleming, S. (2014). Local implementation of national policy: A case-study critique of the free swimming initiative for the 60 plus population. *Managing Leisure*, *19*(2), 151–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2013.859456

Andersson, Å., Korp, P., & Reinertsen, A. (in review). Becoming interested–the evolvement of research interest in case study research on sports.

Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the 'right' way: Markets, standards, god and inequality*. Routledge.

Au, W. (2013). Coring social studies within corporate education reform: The common core state standards, social justice, and the politics of knowledge in U.S. schools. *Critical Education*, *4*(5), 1–15.

Au, W. (2016). Techies, the tea party, and the race to the top: The rise of the new upper-middle class and tensions in the rightist politics of federal education reform. *The Educational Forum*, *80*(2), 208–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2016.1135378

Baez, B. (2014). *Technologies of government: Politics and power in the "information age."* Information Age Publishing.

Barrett, B. D. (2009). No child left behind and the assault on teachers' professional practices and identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(8), 1018–1025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.021

Bullough, S., Davies, L. E., & Barrett, D. (2015). The impact of a community free swimming programme for young people (under 19) in England. *Sport Management Review*, *18*(1), 32–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.09.001

Coalter, F. (2002). *Let's make Scotland more active – Entrance charges and participation: A review of evidence*. Center of Leisure Research.

Deleuze, G. (1990). *Negotiations. Columbia university press*.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Bloomsbury.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1986). *Kafka: Toward a minor literature*. University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. Athlone.

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

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Dumbing down teachers: Rethinking the crisis of public education and the demise of the social state. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *32*(4-5), 339–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2010.510346

Gray, D. E. (2007). Facilitating management learning – developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management Learning*, *38*(5), 495–513.

Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing no child left behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*(3), 493–518. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207306764

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables forthevirtual: movement, affect, sensation*. Duke University Press.

Pickup, A. (2020). Embodied phronesis conceptualizing materiality engaged practical wisdom in teaching, teacher education, and research. *Journal of Thought*, *2*(1–2), 4–22.

Pilgaard, F. I. H., Östergren, P.-O., Olin, A., Kling, S., Albin, M., & Björk, J. (2020). Socio-economic differences in swimming ability among children in Malmö, southern Sweden: Initial results from a community-level intervention. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *48*(5), 495–501. https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494818821478

Poplin, M., Rivera, J., Durish, D., Hoff, L., Kawell, S., Pawlak, P., Hinman, I. S., Straus, L., & Veney, C. (2011). She's Strict for a Good Reason: Highly Effective Teachers in Low-Performing Urban Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(5), 39–43. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171109200509

Schrift, A. D. (1995). *Nietzsche's French legacy: A genealogy of poststructuralism*. Routledge.

The City of Gothenburg. (2018). *Göteborgs stads program för en jämlik stad 2018–2026*. Gothenburg. The City of Gothenburg.

Valente, J. M., & Collins, K. (2016). [Dis]Ableing educational inequities: A disability studies in education perspective. Review of Disability Studies. *International journal*, *12*(1), 1–19.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1544–1552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004

Author Biography

Åsa Andersson is a sociologist and currently a PhD student at the Department of Food and Nutrition, and Sport Science at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. Åsa´s main research interests are the areas of sociology of knowledge, and social change. Specifically, she is interested in how sociological research can contribute to an equal knowledge production and bridge the growing gap between academics and "non-academics". For instance, she has devoted herself to expand the academic field of youth work by enable academics and practitioners to engage in mutually respectful dialogues. The project of this research is to make visible the invisible

knowledge of youth workers and to validate these connections as parts of the academic life.