
OUTLINES - CRITICAL PRACTICE STUDIES

• Vol. 20, No. 1 • 2019 • (01-03) •
www.outlines.dk

Editorial

Eduardo Vianna

Social Science Department, LaGuardia Community College, CUNY
New York City, United States of America

Mike Rifino

Developmental Psychology PhD program, CUNY Graduate Center
New York City, United States of America

It is with great excitement that we bring you this volume of Outlines. Our chief editor, Pernille Hviid resigned from the role in the summer of 2018 and we, Eduardo and Mike, humbly and with honor accepted to take on the roles of chief editor and journal manager, respectively. Becoming acclimated in this role, in addition to adjusting to our new online platform, has been a thrilling and challenging experience. We are immensely grateful to Pernille for her unwavering support in helping us navigate all sorts of editorial and technical difficulties during this transitional period. We would also like to thank the contributing authors, editors, and readers for their patience and support during this phase.

Since taking up the position as Chief Editor, Pernille has ambitiously and graciously led Outlines into critical and innovative terrain at the nexus of theoretical debates and collaborative projects that span across interdisciplinary fields. The authors who contributed during Pernille's inspiring leadership came from diverse backgrounds and perspectives and we hope to contribute to the momentum of this growing community. We aspire to keep up the great work Pernille has done all these past years. On behalf of our authors, editors, and readership we wholeheartedly thank you, Pernille for your deep commitment as chief editor.

Moving onward, there are exciting updates for Outlines we wish to bring to your attention. First and foremost, we are proud to introduce two new editors to our team: Silviane Barbato, Professor of Psychology at the University of Brasilia (UnB) and Cristiano Mattos, Professor of Science Education at the University of São Paulo (USP). We welcome Cristiano and Silviane and look forward to expanding our international

community of researchers. We are also working on a couple of special issues that we hope to be able to announce very soon. For the moment, we would like to invite you to read the exciting articles we are publishing in this current in this issue.

In Christensen's (2019) *Former right-wing extremists' continued struggle for self-transformation after an exit program*, the author explores the struggles for identity among people seeking to leave their right-wing extremist backgrounds and (re)integrate into mainstream society. Drawing on cultural-historical psychology and Holland's Figured Worlds, identity and agency are understood not as an internal entities within an individual, but rather as "specific to practices and activities situated in historically contingent, socially enacted, culturally constructed 'worlds', as figured worlds" (p.3). The main contention is that socio-cultural and historically contingent defined worlds enable one to develop certain "sensitivities and sensibilities" that can enable participation and identity formation. Or as the author puts it, "...personal transformation grows out of participation in figured worlds". However, based on the current paper's ethnographic investigation, the author illustrates how leaving such figured worlds entails, for former right-wing extremists, a complicated process of (re)integrating into mainstream society, while embodying a new identity with new sensitivities crucial for them to participate in their new social world. The interviews conducted with former neo-nazi members and staff at EXIT, a Swedish support community for those seeking to leave their extremist right-wing backgrounds, illustrates how crucial community is in affording people, as agents, the mediating devices of signs and artifacts needed to gain a position and thus participate in new figured worlds.

Axel, Hermansen, and Jacobsen's paper, *The Aesthetic as an Aspect of Praxis – Architectural design as a cooperative endeavor* (2019), aims to contribute to the continuing discussion of defining the aesthetic and how it is produced and experienced. Often understood as an individual private experience, their paper posits a theory of aesthetic consisting not only of subjective sensuous feelings, but also as a cooperatively produced struggle among participants in praxis producing the aesthetic experience. To illuminate the social dimensions of the aesthetic, the authors draw on Gibson's notion of perceptual systems to understand how the sensuous feelings of aesthetics emerge from active human social life. To illustrate, the authors explore how artists and designers collaborate and negotiate shared projects in creating their works. Based on the author's observations during a design project for a community center in a Danish village, the aesthetic designs of the project were negotiated and thus co-constructed between designers and clients' evolving priorities and agendas. The authors argue that the interplay between negotiating these priorities and agendas must be taken into consideration in order to understand how the aesthetic experience of the community center came to being.

In *Critique as locus or modus? Power and resistance in the world of work* (2019), authors Triantafillou and Dyrberg raise the provocative question of "how and from where can power be criticized and resisted." They begin by reminding readers that the advent of non-coercive and pervasive forms of capitalist power that have permeated all sectors in in society has led to intensifying pessimism among scholars about the revolutionary potentials of resistance and critique. As they convincingly argue, critique and resistance are often co-opted by managerial power, which tends to reinforce, rather than dismantle, capitalist forms of power. In exploring how to critique and resist power without reaffirming it, their paper compares and contrasts French pragmatic sociology with

Foucauldian-inspired genealogy to discuss how to address power and resistance in the workplace. Although both of these theoretical frameworks recognize the bottom-up forms of resistance from those who are oppressed (in this context, workers) “as viable forms of critique”, they differ in their stances regarding what it takes for such a critique to be effective. On the one hand, French pragmatic sociology pays close attention to the position (locus) of those who exercise critique and resistance of the conception of capitalism as a totalizing system, whereas the Foucauldian genealogy focuses critique and resistance on the concrete forms of power being scrutinized (modus). Despite finding more promising to focus on the forms of power rather than the source of critique against these powers, the authors argue that both approaches can inspire each other to advance effective critiques of power relations.

In Langemeyer’s (2019) *Modeling Undergraduate Research and Inquiry-Based Learning-Why Enculturation matters*, the author discusses the epistemological and practical assumptions underlying several prominent models of undergraduate student research and inquiry-based learning. Langemeyer demonstrates how the models proposed by Healey and Jenkins (2009), including its modified version by Levy and Petrulis (2012), both neglect the process of students’ emerging identities within scientific communities of practice as it relates to their worldviews and emotional-intellectual way of experiencing the world. The author then extends her analysis to two prominent ‘wheel’ models by Brew (2013) and Reinmann (2016) that offer a holistic and more explicitly student-centered approach to engaging in undergraduate research and inquiry-based learning. Drawing on the concept of Horizons of significance (Taylor, 1991) and enculturation, Langemeyer argues that none of these models explicate the relationship between teachers and learners, nor do they consider students’ meaningful relation to learning. The author then considers two additional models that establish various horizons of significance in the field of science, while situating scientific practices in societal context. This paper then concludes with a discussion of the implications concerning undergraduate research and inquiry-based learning with a specific focus on the process of students becoming active participants in the production of scientific knowledge and critique.

We welcome you to this new volume of *Outlines*! But before this editorial concludes, we would like to give this space to Pernille.

Words from Pernille Hviid

On behalf of *Outlines – Critical Practice Studies*, I was very happy to entrust the editorial position to Eduardo in 2018. Since 2010 Eduardo has tirelessly contributed to the journal as editor of articles. I am confident that Eduardo and his team will preserve and renew the journal in a genuine developmental manner and I look forward to follow its course.