

Scholarship Impact

Adams, Catherine, and Ellen Rose. "Will I Ever Connect with the Students?' Online Teaching and the Pedagogy of Care." *Phenomenology & Practice*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, pp. 5–16, doi:10.29173/pandpr20637.

Do online instructors experience challenges in attaining empathy and attunement to students who may be experienced solely as “*typed bodies*” (Kazan, 2007, p. 253, emphasis in original), composed of diction, grammar, and syntax rather than corporeal substance?

Chen, Angel. “Exploring the Body Politics of Female Teachers from the Perspective of Intersectionality and Agency in Education Locale.” *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, vol. 7, no. 3, Mar. 2017, pp. 345–360, doi:10.17265/2159-5836/2017.09.

Kazan (2005) encountered a male student’s resistance who challenged her authority as a teacher by asking about her age, and she argued that the male student’s resistance may have to do with cultural practices of respecting only elders as teachers or may be more related to gender issues.

Daniel, Molly E. “Dancing=Composing=Writing: Writing about Performing and Visual Arts through Dance.” *Writing In and About the Performing and Visual Arts: Creating, Performing, and Teaching*, edited by Steven Corbett et al., Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse (online) and University Press of Colorado (print), 2019, pp. 201–211, doi:10.37514/atd-b.2019.0292.2.13.

Tina Kazan (2005) suggests that “as we engage in an embodied pedagogy in our classrooms, we make students more aware of their own bodies in the classroom context” (p. 404). Therefore, the explicit integration of bodies into writing supports and extends embodied writing pedagogy, which challenges us to make the implicit body of the writer explicit in ways that mirror that of the dancing and performing body.

When we ask students to analyze a performance, we are also asking them to read the bodies on stage, so an embodied approach to writing provides a foundation that can “bestow significance to bodies that [are] interpreted” (Kazan, 2005, p. 394).

Darder, Antonia. “Decolonizing the Flesh: The Body, Pedagogy, and Inequality.” *Postcolonial Challenges in Education*, edited by Roland Sintos Coloma. Peter Lang, 2010, pp. 217–232.

---. *A Dissident Voice: Essays on Culture, Pedagogy, and Power*. Peter Lang, 2011, pp. 327–342.

In light of this tendency, revolutionary multicultural educators need “to reflect on what bodies we give ‘permission’ to in our classrooms and the extent to which we let those bodies speak” (Kazan 2005, 394) or move freely.

Edmiston, Brian. *Forming Ethical Identities in Early Childhood Play*. Routledge, 2008.

Garrett, Robyne, and Alison Wrench. “‘If They Can Say It They Can Write It’: Inclusive Pedagogies for Senior Secondary Physical Education.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 20, no. 5, 2015, pp. 486–502, doi:10.1080/13603116.2015.1095248.

Central to this article is an exploration of embodied pedagogies as pedagogies for social justice and improved academic outcomes amongst students attending a school located in an area of high socio-economic disadvantage (Ivinson 2012; Kazan 2005; Wilcox 2009).

According to Kazan (2005), the institutional spaces of schools discourage movement in learning and structurally hinder some pedagogical goals. The embodied pedagogy literature discusses the importance of the body as an instrument of knowledge construction (Horn and Wilburn 2005; Kazan 2005).

Hawhee, Debra. “Toward a Bestial Rhetoric.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2011, pp. 81–87.

When scholars have cited “A Hoot,” they (and here I count myself) often zero in on the idea of rhetoric-as energy (Bone et al. 2008, 435), a notion that has found legs in both the rising interest in material and bodily rhetorics (Petraglia 1998, 125–27; Kazan 2005, 393) and in the refiguring of topoi as social energy (Cintron 2010; Olson 2010).

Heilker, Paul, and Peter Vandenberg, editors. *Keywords in Writing Studies*. University Press of Colorado, 2015.

Highberg, Nels P. “‘Beware! This Is a Man!’” *Feminist Teacher*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2010, pp. 157–170. doi:10.1353/ft.2010.0004.

I provide what Scott calls an extended “think about” (51) where I unpack my own uncritical dysconsciousness and how it has affected my teaching, paying most attention to my “somatic mind,” the belief, as Kristie S. Fleckenstein puts it, in “mind and body as a permeable, intertextual territory that is continually made and remade” (281; see also Kazan).

Inckle, Kay. “Embodying Diversity: Pedagogies of Transformation.” *Educational Diversity: The Subject of Difference and Different Subjects*, edited by Yvette Taylor, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 159–179.

Dualism privileges separation and rationality over connectedness and feeling; and eschews lived realities, embodied subjectivity, desire and affect in favour of abstract, cognitive discourses (Kazan, 2005; Zembylas, 2007).

A female or an embodied pedagogical subject violates dualistic value structures where a body of knowledge is both literally and figuratively male (hooks, 1994;

Kazan, 2005; Seymour, 2006).

Kennedy, Eileen and Morag Gray. “‘You’re Facing That Machine but There’s a Human Being Behind it’: Students’ Affective Experiences on an Online Doctoral Programme.” *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, vol. 24, no. 3, 417-429, DOI: 10.1080/14681366.2016.1175498

For Kazan, (2007, 261) ‘word choice, syntax, sentences and paragraphs’ deliver the ‘*other* physicality of writing’: the body and its history remains written into users’ linguistic conventions.

However, knowing that affective responses will occur, but that they are unfinished and indefinite, means that there is all the more reason for teachers can to endeavour to become “hyper-readers” who actively listen to the other’s bodily responses online (Kazan 2007, 252) since it is possible to intercept those feelings before they endure as negative states.

Such an approach has implications for the way we design the online environment to allow students to experience the full potential of online learning. Kazan (2007) suggested that learning and teaching online involves an ethical relation to the other with whom one communicates. We should always be wary that ‘there is always more than what we see on the screen, more than can be contained in those typed words’ (Kazan, 2007: 266).

Kroll, Barry M. *The Open Hand: Arguing As an Art of Peace*. Utah State University, 2013.

Mbuvi, Andrew, et al. “Teaching Exegesis in Historically Black Theological Schools.” *Teaching Theology & Religion*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2014, pp. 141–164, doi:10.1111/teth.12184.

Murphy, Pdraig. *Biotechnology, Education and Life Politics: Debating Genetic Futures from School to Society*. Routledge, 2014.

Nind, Melanie, et al. *Research Methods for Pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Østern, Tone Pernille. "The Embodied Teaching Moment. The Embodied Character of the Dance Teacher’s Practical-Pedagogical Knowledge Investigated in Dialogue with Two Contemporary Dance Teachers." *Nordic Journal of Dance: Practice, Education and Research* 4.1 (2013): 29-46.

In the last decade, the research on embodied education, learning and teaching has grown. Due to the limits of the size of this article, I will not present different research contributions, but only mention Diane P. Freedman (2003); Tina Kazan (2005); Mary Dixon and Kim Senior (2011); Michalinos Zembylas (2007); Margaret Macintyre Latta and Gayle Buck (2008); and Eeva Anttila (2003; 2007) as a limited selection of those conducting research within the realm of embodied pedagogy.

Reis, Giuliano. “A Socio-Culturally Sensitive Science Curriculum: What Does It Have to Do

with Our Bodies?” *Sociocultural Studies and Implications for Science Education*, edited by C. Milne et al, Springer, 2015, pp. 231-255.

Roberts, Rosemarie A. “Dancing with Social Ghosts: Performing Embodiments, Analyzing Critically.” *Transforming Anthropology*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2013, pp. 4–14, doi:10.1111/traa.12002.

Replacing the concept of voice with body, I attempt to understand the ways in which the body acts in “dialogic relationship with other bodies” (Kazan 2005:38).

Dancing bodies reveal the ways in which dance is relational, social, and dialogic (Kazan 2005).

Robinson, Heather M., et al. *Translingual Identities and Transnational Realities in the U.S. College Classroom*. Routledge, 2020.

Ryan-Scheutz, Colleen, and Nicoletta Marini-Maio, editors. *Dramatic Interactions: Teaching Languages, Literatures, and Cultures through Theater: Theoretical Approaches and Classroom Practices*. Cambridge Scholars, 2011.

Shellenberger, Lorin. “Body.” *Keywords in Writing Studies*, edited by Paul Heilker and Peter Vandenberg, Utah State University Press, 2015, pp. 6–10.

Tina Kazan contends the created texts represent “the embodiment of a writer’s ideas” and also “the corporeal presence of the absent writer” (Kazan 2006, 260). According to Kazan, online writing allows an author to “re-code her culturally coded body” to “reveal chosen identities that the body does not” (257–58).

Seegert, Natasha. “Play of Sniffication.” *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, vol. 47, no. 2, 2014, p. 158., doi:10.5325/philrhet.47.2.0158.

Endnote #5. Examples of scholars engaging Kennedy’s concept of rhetoric as energy include Bone, Griffin, and Linda 2008, 435, Brinkley and Smith 2006, n.p., Kazan 2005, 393, Khushf 1995, 32, Malesh and Stevens 2010, 6, and Moe 2012, n.p.

Stern, Danielle M. “You Had Me at Foucault: Living Pedagogically in the Digital Age.” *Text and Performance Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2011, pp. 249–266, doi:10.1080/10462937.2011.573191.

Tina S. Kazan argued for the importance of how we construct our online selves so that we might also better understand our offline selves.

In conclusion, these online bodies constitute a community that “spills out” (Smith and Kollock 19) into our offline community. Moreover, Web-based classrooms demand flexible boundaries (Turpin), which can spark understandings

and appreciation of flexible norms. To be sure, through this “pedagogy of production” (Kazan 263), we still operate within a particular heteronormative system (Warren and Davis).

Sund, Louise, et al. “The Embodied Social Studies Classroom—Repositioning the Body in the Social Sciences in School.” *Cogent Education*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2019, doi:10.1080/2331186x.2019.1569350.

As recognized by, for example, Ord and Nuttall (2016) issues of embodiment or the embodied nature of education has been surprisingly absent in certain areas of research in teaching and learning, and like many other school subjects, social studies have often been explored as disembodied (cf. Almqvist & Quennerstedt, 2015; Kazan, 2005; Ord & Nuttall, 2016).

By way of conclusion, the results of the analysis are discussed in terms of the liminality of pedagogical encounters in classroom practice in order to further scrutinize the pedagogical potential of social studies if teaching and learning in the classroom moves towards what Kazan (2005) term an embodied pedagogy.

As a consequence, students’ learning is regarded as primarily involving the mind and not the body. In this vein, Kazan (2005) argues that “teachers who do acknowledge embodiment [...] benefit from a more complex understanding of the students and their classroom” (p. 381). Estola and Elbaz-Luwisch (2003) further state that: “Because body has been considered more as a ‘problem’ or a ‘sin’ than a ‘treasure’, there is much that is unsayable about bodies in classrooms” (p. 702), and Kazan (2005) even goes so far as to say that by not considering the body teaching cannot be done effectively.

There are also examples of studies of embodied aspects of educational practice in music education (e.g. Mark & Madura, 2013), mathematics (e.g. Alibali & Mitchell, 2012; De Freitas & Sinclair, 2014; Radford, 2009), science education (Almqvist & Quennerstedt, 2015) and critical literacy (e.g. Enriquez, Johnson, Kontovourki, & Mallozzi, 2016; Johnson & Vasudevan, 2012; Kazan, 2005). This mirrors what Kazan (2005) describes as a physical embodied position of authority.

The students are in an embodied sense (Kazan, 2005) “feeling” and “finding” their way in the interaction.

In this sense, we build on previous research regarding embodied aspects of education in terms of the importance of including and emphasising embodied pedagogies (e.g. Bresler, 2013; Evans et al., 2009; Kazan, 2005; Shilling, 2016, 2017, 2018).

It also extends Kazan’s (2005) argument that teachers require a particular attention to embodiment in the classroom and that “as teachers, we enter

classrooms with assumptions about our students; that reading bodies is a complicated task; but that reading these bodies is necessary for [...] successful pedagogy” (p. 386).

In line with Kazan’s (2005) argument regarding transformative pedagogies and how students embody pedagogical practices in everyday classrooms we, in this study, use the lens suggested by Todd (2014) in order to further scrutinize the pedagogical potential of social studies when teaching and learning in the classroom is handled embodied.

Swacha, Kathryn Yankura. “Bridging the Gap between Food Pantries and the Kitchen Table’: Teaching Embodied Literacy in the Technical Communication Classroom.” *Technical Communication Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2018, pp. 261–282, doi:10.1080/10572252.2018.1476589.

Tau, Ramiro, Kloetzer, Laure and Simon Henein. “The Dimension of the Body in Higher Education: Matrix of Meanings in Students’ Diaries.” *Human Arenas* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-021-00206-1>

More recently, different studies focused on the functions of the body in university teaching and research settings (among many others: Bunglowala & Bunglowala, 2015; Dall’Alba & Barnacle, 2005; Gallagher & Lindgren, 2015; Hodkinson Biesta & James, 2008; Kazan, 2005; Probyn, 2004; Shoval, 2011).

Wenger, Christy I. “‘Feeling Lore’: The ‘Problem’ of Emotion in the Practice of Teaching.” *English Teaching: Practice and Critique* 10.3 (2011): 45-59.

To reclaim writing bodies, or “bodies who aspire to write” (Kazan, 2005, p. 392), these pedagogies validate the importance of felt knowledge, or the “body’s knowledge before it’s articulated in words” (Perl, 2004, p. 1).