Resonance as a conceptual lever for transforming educational practices and institutions

Nicolas Cuneen

In his recent work on *resonance*, Hartmut Rosa makes a number of unique contributions to contemporary critical theory, not the least of which is his success in making meaningful and substantive claims about the structural requirements for leading a good life. One of the great strengths of Rosa's endeavor is his theory's ability to articulate those necessarily ephemeral experiences of resonance with the potentially sustainable forms of social, institutional and relational architecture that allow for a human life to be regularly populated with such experiences. The theoretical conception of such *axes of resonance*, as Rosa calls them, translate the otherwise critical-romantic categories of resonance and alienation into an actionable framework for pursuing a new collective relationship to the world.

Of the eleven resonance axes explored in *Resonance*, the one regarding educational institutions represents somewhat of an outlier in that, as a formative space, it has a unique impact on all the other axes. As an axe of resonance, schools can enable students to "cultivate relationships to the world" (Rosa 2019, p. 241) by developing a form of *dispositional resonance*, whereby we "[confront] the world, including what is strange, new and other, with both intrinsic interest (*that could be interesting/ exciting/fascinating*) and high expectations of self-efficacy" (p. 247). Viewed through the lens of resonance theory, the goal of education is explicitly to open up and establish axes of resonance that will allow individuals to sustainably transform themselves and the world throughout their lives. As Rosa states in his preface (p. 19), the development and maintenance of such axes depend not only on the institutional and physical configuration of the world but also on a subject's disposition, as well as the relationship between this configuration and disposition.

Since this one resonance axe seems to so heavily condition access to all the other scaffolding of a good life, one could expect the elaboration of an educational politics to be a priority within resonance theory. And yet, true to the apolitical tone of his work, Rosa shies away from the task. With regard to society as a whole, Rosa notes that while his theory "does not pursue its own political agenda", it may serve as "a compass in contemporary political debates, as it provides a standard for action" (p. 458). And yet, when it comes to educational politics and institutions, he takes a further step back in claiming that he cannot simply provide a "resonance compass" for schools, but that he thinks one could be built (Rosa 2022, p. 146).

Instead, his writings and interviews on education offer a theoretical lens that provides a sort of perspective shift, where the value of educational practices is grounded in a specific *mode of relation*. Applying his fundamental conceptual opposition of resonance and alienation to the field of pedagogy, he paints two ideal-types of pedagogical relationships: one that transforms students and teachers alike by sparking their desire to learn together and from one another in responsive dialogue, and one where silence, fear or hostility end up stunting the dynamic process of self-transformation for all those involved. The vibrant language of Rosa's conceptual apparatus poignantly and faithfully captures those moments of pedagogical joy and despair that we have all experienced in our lives at least as students, if not also as educators.

The purpose of this contribution is to make some tentative steps forward in determining how the concept of resonance might meaningfully participate in the transformation of educational practices and institutions. Rosa makes it clear that his concept is intended to be both descriptive and normative; here, I intend to explore its *operational* potential within the field of education. After briefly framing the issue of relational *vs* individualized educational goals, I'll put forward two hypotheses that open up avenues

for further research. The first hypothesis explores the relationship between resonance theory and moral education through a confrontation with recent literature in education sciences on the development of responsibility. This follows the idea that, for educational policy to shift away from the skills approach that gels uncomfortably with resonance pedagogy, it would be interesting for the latter to articulate its capacity to effectively promote a wide range of desirable outcomes beyond the theoretically indigenous aim of dispositional resonance, integrating the legitimate ambitions of the skills paradigm but also those of ethical and civic education. The second hypothesis posits two ways that resonance theory might affect decision-making processes within educational institutions, examining the role that teachers might play in securing the institutional conditions of resonant pedagogical relationships. The paper will close with a short reflection on the practical distinction between *resonance* and *responsiveness* as conceptual levers for educational change.

Valuing the quality of relations over individualized outcomes

In the realm of pedagogy, the core of Rosa's proposal is *a perspective shift wherein the quality of educational practices is to be measured along a scale ranging from alienating to resonant*. In the wake of Ivan Illich[1] and Pink Floyd (Rosa 2019, p. 240), he decries the alienating practices taking place in educational institutions across the world and fears that this tendency towards alienation has only become more pervasive as we have moved away from the period of "dark pedagogy" into a perhaps less violent but more sterile institutional framework (Rosa 2022, p. 65). These practices can only lead to the development of *dispositional alienation*, an attitude toward the world that extinguishes curiosity and openness to otherness, which becomes spontaneously perceived as boring, unappealing, harmful or threatening. Against the foil provided by this compelling image of classroom-driven alienation and the lasting damage it can produce, Rosa is able to provide a rich description of those educational moments that go right, when the fire starts crackling, ears perk up and the classroom embarks in an earnest collective quest for new knowledge. The proposed educational ideal, which I'll return to in a moment, consists in a *specific mode of relation* between the three poles that constitute the pedagogical relationship – teacher, student and material –, one that enables the people and the program to speak and to be heard. For Rosa, educational practices and institutions contribute to creating good lives in a better world to the extent that the relationships within them are resonant.

This is in stark contrast with the way that educational practices are typically addressed in today's world. As Peter Taubman makes the well-documented case in *Teaching by Numbers* (2009), the value of educational institutions and practices is typically measured through individualized outcomes that are aggregated so as to render salient certain trends and provide contrastable data points. Relevant student outcomes include the basic indicators of success – diplomas and test scores indicating skill- and knowledge-acquisition – as well as its precursors: student engagement, the meta-cognitive skills behind academic and behavioral discipline, or even students' self-efficacy beliefs. Similarly, teachers' performance and value are made measurable through various methods that boil relational practices down to the individual person: academic qualifications, pass rate, sick days taken, hours of yearly professional training, etc. In the "audit culture" (*idem*, p. 88) that has emerged and spread through global education governance, decisions are often made based on what will lead to an increase in these measurable-because-individualized outcomes. This culture has worked its way into the language of policy, which, having wholly adopted the skills approach, mandates their development through the vocabulary of standards, assessment and accountability. The global educational reform movement that has emerged is

[1] "Now young people are prealienated by schools that isolate them while they pretend to be both producers and consumers of their own knowledge, which is conceived of as a commodity put on the market in school. School makes alienation preparatory to life, thus depriving education of reality and work of creativity." (Illich 1972, pp. 46-47)

largely built around international student assessments that offer a narrow definition of success (Sahlberg 2016).

In the current state of affairs, then, a fundamentally relational practice – education – is tending toward dissection into pieces for study and improvement, with a focus on the acquisition of measurable skills whose comparability across contexts lends an allure of objectivity to reform legitimization practices.

Rosa insists, however, that this is not the right way to go about steering educational practices, which should instead be modeled around a specific mode of relation, lest we miss the forest for the trees. In the section of *Resonance* on education and in his interviews on pedagogy, Rosa offers up an alternative framework in which the triadic relationship (teacher-student-material) comes first, both theoretically and practically. In Rosa's pedagogical ideal, resonant learning starts from a spark, lit from the kindling of intrinsic interest and the inkling of self-efficacy. What emerges is a relational dynamic in which fragments of the world – people, objects, books, processes – are given voice, that is, they are made to speak and be *heard* in a way that touches students and teachers alike. By giving life to the objects of study, the teacher plays a key role in enabling their assimilation by students, who may then transform the world-fragment through their response or transform their relationship with themselves thanks to the contact with otherness. Indeed, at the core of educational resonance is truly responsive relationship with otherness in all its forms, one that allows participants to decenter themselves by hearing the other's voice without reducing it to a self-confirming echo. Such a dynamic involves nontrivial subjective vulnerability, and thus requires a sufficiently safe space, but safety is not synonymous with harmony. On the contrary, resonance allows for and encourages contradiction – not conflict, but fruitful friction between viewpoints and ways of approaching the world. This friction indeed constitutes an entry point for the assimilation of otherness.

Rosa's perspective shift thus calls us to reevaluate our educational practices in the light of this mode of relation. What makes an educational practice good or bad, by contributing to or undermining actors' capacities to build a sustainably good life, is the *quality of the triadic relationship*, not the output of diplomas, grades, disciplinary hearing, etc. An individualized outcome is posited as the explicit goal of the pedagogical relationship – dispositional resonance –, but this posture toward the world doesn't appear measurable in any way that could usefully inform policy or practice, despite Rosa's poetic indication (2022, p. 43) that resonance is measurable in the eyes. If anything is measurable in the resonance paradigm, it is the relationship itself, whose quality could in principle be measured through careful qualitative research.

This way of approaching the value of educational practices is thus in strong dissonance with the skills-based approach that has become dominant in global education policy. As Rosa (2022) puts it, focusing excessively on skills and their evaluation can lead to resonance-killing fear or simply cognitive habits of true-or-false reasoning that are incompatible with self-transformation through the assimilation of otherness. And yet, the development of skills is vital, not only for schools to fulfill their various societal and economic mandates but also in the emancipatory logic of resonance. Skills are like resources, they widen the range of action possibilities through which a subject can respond to a situation, and may thus enable immediate resonant experiences or participate in the creation of stable resonance axes. In Rosa's discussion of the economic and social *minima* required for one to flourish, he is careful not reject the importance of resources and their minimally equitable distribution, despite his main posture of cautioning against their fetishization. The same could be said for skills, whose practical and economic versatility has made them a perfect candidate for framing educational aims in an ethically pluralistic society. In the end, nothing says that resonance-dominant logic is incompatible with the development and evaluation of skills, as long as the relationship comes first when making decisions at an institutional

level. The case could be made – and Rosa begins to do so through his discussions on motivation (2019, 2022) – that skills are better developed in a non-skills-based approach.

This brings us to the first point of this contribution: for resonance theory to have a concrete impact on educational institutions, it would do well to articulate the integration of a wider range of educational objectives, including both economically viable skills and the objectives of moral and civic education. To put it bluntly, dispositional resonance is unlikely to be enough. This in itself is not an obstacle, but rather a call for inquiry. Rosa lays the groundwork for this by taking psychology's highly successful construct of *self-efficacy* as a theoretical cornerstone: resonant pedagogical relationships build self-efficacy through successful experiences of responsively engaging with the world (Rosa 2019, pp. 158-161, 248). In his wake, some authors have begun articulating pedagogical resonance with other educational goals and subfields, such as critical thinking (Robin 2020) or literary studies (Felski 2020).

However, the bulk of the work lies ahead. If a pedagogical framework grounded in resonance theory were able to account for a wide range of educational goals, it would represent a possibility for educational policy to be weaned off of the individualizing language that drowns the importance of the pedagogical relationship in measurable data points. This is not to say that evaluation and measurement are incompatible with resonance-driven schools. What is means is that for resonance to guide educational practice, steering mechanisms and processes need to be decoupled from individualized outcomes and instead fed by the qualitative measurement of resonant relationships. If data from the aggregated individualized outcomes is to inform practice, it would then need to be reinterpreted through the relational paradigm, acting more as a warning light: something is off, let's first look at the relationships.

We will return to the issue of securing the conditions of resonant relationships in a moment. First, let's take a look at how resonance pedagogy might begin to more systematically integrate and articulate the goals of moral education, as a contribution to the development of a more complete and compelling educational politics.

Reinterpreting moral education through relational logic: resonance and responsibility

There is a growing body of literature in the education sciences regarding the development of responsibility, one that provides an interesting conceptual bridge between resonance logic and moral/ethical education. The most complete study in the field comes from Hélène Hagège, who, in *Education for Responsibility* (2019), proposes an educational framework grounded in cognitive science and informed by philosophy, which culminates in a list of relevant prerequisite competences (skills). The development of responsibility, as an educational goal, is little more than a recent expression of moral or ethical education, one that puts an accent on the need for a dialogical and responsive relationship with the world.

Indeed, the connection between resonance and responsibility first appears through the middle term of "responsiveness". Hagège defines responsibility as the "subject's ability to [respond] by themselves, of their own accord and instead of reacting" (p. 104). We can only be responsible when we are able to *hear* the ethical demands of the world around us (the human and non-human environment) and *respond* to them with reflexively-deliberated values. This description already rubs up against Rosa's (2019) depiction of resonance, as those experiences always involve responding to the world in accordance with our strong evaluations. From the outset, resonant pedagogical relationships should then help students to meaningfully and ethically engage with the world: to hear its voice and to answer with their own. This gives a first picture of the contribution made by dispositional resonance to responsibility: a capacity to hear the ethical demands that spring up in one's life and to answer them through one's actions. However,

it may be instructive to go a step further in articulating how resonant pedagogical relationships develop students' responsibility, and especially their own strong evaluations, through the lens of attention.

In Hagège's view, the core issue behind responsible action lies in the fact that the perceived (or relative) world is a reflection of the mind, co-constructed with the real (objective) world but never fully coinciding with it. Acting responsibly requires us to develop and maintain a responsive dialogical relationship between the inner and outer worlds, so that we can respond to a reality that goes beyond our pre-reflective experience of the world. However, the ego creates an illusion of its own essentialized existence (a true self), one that nurtures a dualistic relationship with the world at the expense of dialogism, leading to a disconnect between the two worlds (inner-relative and outer-objective): their responsiveness is suppressed to protect a substantive self-image that might not survive contact with reality. Such a disconnect separates us from others, their perspectives, the impact of our actions on others, and ultimately the social significance of our actions. Responsibility, in the end, boils down to a "a process of aligning relative reality with the real" (Hagège 2019, p. 101).

To develop responsibility, as she understands it, Hagège breaks down the prerequisites of this process into many components, most notably a three-tiered model of reflexivity and a demanding list of 'psycho-spiritual' skills that educational practices should focus on. In the end, a long series of emotional, epistemic, attentional, relational and axiological competences thus compose the educatable basis of responsibility.

The skillset that Hagège focuses the most on is that of attention, which she deliberately and explicitly (p. 38) reduces to its purely cognitive sense: executive control over consciousness's focusing power. For the author, this is our main tool for keeping ahead of the ego's cunning ways of tricking us back into our fully-relative worldview and thus closing our ears to the ethical demands of the world around us. As such, Hagège's devotes enormous importance to the deliberate practice of regaining momentary control over our attentional processes: meditation. In her view, schools should invest heavily into meditative practices in order to develop the core attentional competences necessary for responsibility.

From a resonance-theoretical perspective, Hagège's work brings us so close and yet leaves us so far. As soon as she captures the dialogical nature of responsibility, she reduces its development to a set of trainable skills. The author goes so far as to thematize the relationship between resonance[2] and harmony before settling on harmony as one of the guiding criteria for determining the skillsets relevant to responsibility, alongside coherence, relatedness, empathy, vigilant attention and creativity. The skills and criteria that Hagège identifies are certainly important for creating a responsible relationship with the world, but, in order to fit into the dominant educational paradigm, her proposal ends up being 'merely' pedagogical in that it argues for the inclusion of new curricula (largely centered around meditation) but ignores the relational and institutional conditions that determine how the material would be taught.

The intuition behind this brief exploration of Hagège's work is that the fundamentally relational dimension of responsibility *development* becomes clear when attention is no longer reduced to its cognitive sense. Indeed, one's attention at any given moment is determined by a large number of elements, going from the macro-level of the global mediasphere down to the interpersonal dynamics of collective, in-person attention (Citton 2017). We have a somewhat limited capacity to override the attention-grabbing aspects of these, which is increased to the extent that we gain control over our attentional environments. For Hagège, we become more responsible by training the cognitive override muscle to increase its capacity for sustained vigilance, but even if we can override the immediate

[2] As a physical phenomenon, no reference to Rosa (Hagège 2019, pp. 134-146)

influences of our attention, what determines what we will override them towards? It is not enough to pay attention to the ethical demands that surround us to act responsibly, which may lead to varying interpretations of our own contextual duties. We must also pay attention to the value of our actions, their moral quality and how they affect other people. While we could say with Honneth (1996) that autonomy requires us to relate to ourselves positively as a bearer of value through our actions, so as to be motivated to act in accordance with our representations of the good, a positive relationship with oneself is ethically sterile if one simply isn't paying attention.

This brings us to the following educational question: how can a teacher help their students build a durable habit of paying attention to the value of their actions? My hypothesis is that in order to become habitually attentive to the value of our actions, we need other people to pay attention to it within a certain mode of relation. When we value someone's perspective, we pay attention to what *they* value. When a beloved teacher really gives their attention to a student, the student becomes extremely attentive to the teacher's evaluative perspective, which they imaginatively reconstruct based on received feedback. The more responsive the pedagogical relationship is, the better the teacher's evaluative eye can be understood in depth and thus durably absorbed. When the teacher is able to be open and honest – to be vulnerable enough to speak in their own voice – their sense of good and bad, right and wrong, shines through. The students they manage to reach may then probe this normative posture by interacting in class and getting feedback on their submitted work, leading to a progressive internalization of the evaluative perspective. At the same time, when a respected teacher focuses their attention on a students' responses to the world, this draws the students' attention to the value of their own words and actions.

In this view, students learn to be responsible by understanding in depth, and thus rendering accessible through imaginative reconstruction, of a series of evaluative postures from people who have earned their respect and esteem thanks to the quality of the relationship they were able to build: *they learn to pay attention to what their teachers value because they value their relationships with their teachers*. Having these normative postures available populates their ethical workspace with memories and imagined reactions, with criteria and methodological considerations – material from which they can reflexively build their own strong evaluations. Those same resonant pedagogical relationships then build ethically relevant attentional dispositions when *students learn to pay attention to what their teachers pay attention to: the value of their responses to the world.*

Schools are rife with experiences of extrinsic evaluation, but the majority of these do not nourish lasting attentional habits because they emerge from a deeply alienating framework. Instead of absorbing a beloved teacher's understanding of good and bad, students figure out how to jump through the right hoops in order to move on the to next stage. This is because the evaluations tend either to be mediated through forms of abstraction or quantification or to emanate from educational actors that demonstrate neither real sustained attention nor benevolent care toward the student in question. In other words, the lack of a positive and sustained relation skews the internalization of an ethically relevant evaluative posture.

This schematic take on responsibility education offers a rough sketch of how educational objectives grounded in a skills framework might be usefully reinterpreted through relational logic following Rosa's resonance-theoretical perspective shift. In this view, securing the conditions of resonant relationships becomes far more important than new curricula aimed at training specific skills that might bolster responsible action. Instead, the quality of the pedagogical relationship appears as a central element in the development of not only strong evaluations, fed by those of esteemed teachers and peers, but also the attentional habits necessary to regularly perceive and thematize the value borne by one's actions in different contexts. Our ethical capacity is not something to be trained in a specialized class, but instead grows from the internalized legacy of the teachers that have marked us through our educational history;

the gift of their attention is preserved as a moral example that students whom they have touched may continue to draw from, long after the pedagogical relationship itself has come to an end.

Securing the institutional conditions of resonant pedagogical relationships

This brings us to the crucial issue of securing the institutional conditions necessary for resonant pedagogical relationships to emerge and flourish. Redefining policy through the conceptual apparatus of resonance theory (or another relation-focused homologue) would not only be politically difficult, but could also lead to a variety of practical outcomes. In this section, I want to explore two possible ways in which an educational politics of resonance could be implemented.

If a school or society decides that resonant pedagogical relationships represent the best expression of their educational values, how would they go about fostering them? A resonant pedagogical relationship cannot be forced into being, but Rosa does stipulate some basic conditions of its emergence. For students and teachers to reach each other, there must be an absence of fear, teachers must believe they have *something to say* about the material, students "must approach the material openly […] and trust that they can *make it speak*" (Rosa 2019, p. 245), and the relational atmosphere between students must be one that doesn't require them to adopt defensive postures to fend off various forms of harassment.

Based on these preliminary indications, a first possibility would be for academics, education officials and policy-makers to extensively investigate these conditions and take them seriously when making decisions or writing policy. The interpretation of these conditions would likely vary drastically; the requirement of trust and spaces that enable vulnerability, for example, could lead an educational authority to implement new classes, to train teachers in trust-creating pedagogical techniques, to tighten security protocols and strengthen harassment reporting mechanisms, to reduce class sizes so as to make the relationship more manageable, or to design the school around a fundamental trust in teachers and their professional capacities (Sahlberg & Walker 2021). Resonance-informed decision-makers might pay more attention to the conditions behind teachers' attentional needs (class size, lesson length, administrative duties, etc.), which constitute the basic parameters that allow them to hear their students well enough to respond in their own voice. Indeed, schools would need to minimize the attentional needs that distract teachers from their students' voices, restructure teacher evaluation processes that deform what they hear by promoting defensive postures[3], and avoid overly-directive curriculum mandates that prevent teachers from seizing spontaneous opportunities to explore a world fragment that has come alive (Cuneen 2021a, 2021b). Along those same lines, the need for teachers to feel like they have something to say about the material could motivate policy-makers to move away from standardized curricula in favor of a process(-inquiry) model where, instead of setting measurable content- or skill-objectives, the curriculum consists of a set of hypotheses and procedural principles that guide a collaborative research process led by the teacher but heavily involving students (McKernan 2008, Stenhouse 1975). Schools would need to pay greater attention to the non-fungibility of actors, swapping around teachers and students only as a last resort and not as a routine administrative principle. Finally, preservice teacher training would likely see an important overhaul with the inclusion of new classes aimed at making a subject come alive or connecting with students.

While these ideas illustrate a step forward in prioritizing the pedagogical relationship, the option that they represent is limited insofar as the factors that lead to resonant pedagogical relationships are so contextually variable. Some classes are easy to connect with, and others remain out of reach in seemingly similar circumstances. In many cases, specific factors need to be addressed in order to build resonant

[3] Most notably, through the anticipation of decontextualized extrinsic evaluations of their professional performance (Cuneen 2021a, pp. 325-326).

relationships, which requires teachers 1) to identify the relational impact of the obstacles at play, 2) to express these issues clearly and be convinced of the legitimacy of their relational needs, and 3) to actually be taken seriously when the relational cost of a given decision or established practice is too high. Teachers have always needed their needs to be taken seriously, but as long these needs are interpreted in a classic (non-relational) framework, technocratic response structures maintain an allure of legitimacy: someone in a higher position and with a better diploma certainly knows better than the teachers what they need. If we are to put the relationship first, however, it becomes clear that no external expert knows better than the teachers themselves what they need to click with their students.

The alternative, then, is for resonance theory to *become a vector of collective teacher efficacy*. Teachers' collective control over the conditions of their professional working environment could be relegitimized and refocused through the creation and application of a responsive and context-specific 'resonance compass': a tool for identifying the contextually-relevant factors that enable resonant pedagogical relationships and for taking institutional action to invest in these and to address any systematic obstacles. Such a guiding mechanism would require every institution to be constantly engaged in heavily qualitative action-research (Elliot 1991), but most importantly to act on what they hear and see. There would need to be a significant budget set aside not just for teachers to devote time to understanding and expressing their needs, but also to provide leeway when those needs cannot be met without the expenditure of further resources.

Most importantly, such a bespoke resonance compass would need be the affair of the entire (willing) teaching staff, not just a handful of specialists. This would require teachers to be educated in some abridged form of resonance theory in order to better identify opportunities and obstacles, to clearly express their unmet needs in terms of resonance cultivation, and to understand the well-justified foundations of these needs. The language of resonance – hearing and being heard, speaking in one's own voice, transforming ourselves by assimilating otherness, learning through intrinsic interest and self-efficacy – this language would need to be normalized within the educational profession in order for teachers to feel like their real relational needs are able to be perceived as legitimate by other professionals and society as a whole.

Following this bottom-up approach, resonance theory might help to transform educational practices and institutions by empowering teachers to secure the conditions of their profession's most important dynamic: the pedagogical relationship. While some constants might emerge, the contextual variability of educational needs would likely lead to a wide range of solutions and measures. In some cases, teachers' most pressing need may indeed end up being the implementation of a daily meditation practice after recess!

Choosing the right conceptual tools

If an educational politics of resonance would, in the end, require educators of all stripes to become versed in resonance theory, we are forced to take seriously the question of the concept's audibility. As one author puts it, what is the potential resonance of *resonance* (Susen 2020)? Would it not be wiser to adopt a vocabulary less prone to ideological distortion (Rosa 2019, p. 186), something less *out there*? Perhaps *responsiveness* is the more politically appropriate option for transforming educational practice; beyond its role as the middle term between resonance and responsibility, its legacy in the literature on responsive governance might make it more palatable to policy-makers. Shouldn't we set our sights on the more reasonable goal of responsive pedagogical relationships instead of going all-in on resonance?

While this remains an open topic for discussion, there are some indications that *resonance* remains the better option. In the field of education, *responsiveness* introduces a tension between teachers'

availability and their autonomy – the margin in which they can, as professionals but also as people, decide how and to what extent they will invest themselves in a given pedagogical relationship. The resonant relationship enabled by this margin is what must be protected, not some form of on-demand availability. Resonance cannot be neither coerced nor fully suppressed, but attempts to force its onset by making teachers more accessible are likely to backfire.

Despite its somewhat esoteric or romantic feel, the concept of resonance thus continues to demonstrate unique potential in capturing and thus building toward the educational practices that can contribute to the creation of a new collective relationship to the world. Operationalizing the concept of resonance would require us to pay close attention to its projective surface – the experiences, ideas, and dynamics that users feel capable of expressing through it – but the effort may well be worth it. At least in the field of education, the triangles of pedagogical resonance and alienation are likely to resonate with teachers and thus initiate a perspective shift from which more concrete action, ranging from a relation-centered policy shift to the creation of resonance-focused steering mechanisms within individual institutions, may emerge.

References

Citton, Y. (2017 [2014]). *The Ecology of Attention* (B. Norman, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.

Cuneen, N. (2021a). *Reconnaissance et éducation identitaire. Compétences identitaires et gouvernance scolaire.* Brussels: Peter-Lang.

Cuneen, N. (2021b). Essentialist beliefs and school governance. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *53*(4), pp. 338-349.

Elliot, J. (1991). *Action Research for Educational Change*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Felski, R. (2020). Resonance and Education. *On_education Journal for Research and Debate*, *3*(9), pp. 1-5.

Hagège, H. (2019). *Education for Responsibility.* London/Hoboken (NJ): ISTE/Wiley.

Honneth, A. (1996 [1992]). *The Struggle for Recognition* (J. Anderson, Trans.). Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.

Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.

McKernan, J. (2008). *Curriculum and Imagination: Process Theory, Pedagogy and Action Research.* London/New York: Routledge.

Robin, J.-Y. (2020). Résonner ou raisonner. In *Résistance, résonance. Apprendre à changer le monde avec Hartmut Rosa*, N. Wallenhorst (coord.), pp. 41-62. Paris : Le pommier.

Rosa, H. (2019 [2016]). *Resonance. A sociology of our relationship to the world.* Cambridge: Polity.

Rosa, H. (2022 [2016]). *Pédagogie de la résonance. Entretiens avec Wolfgang Endres.* Paris: Le Pommier.

Sahlberg, P. (2016). The Global Educational Reform Movement and Its Impact on Schooling. In *The Handbook of Global Education Policy*, K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard & A Verger (eds.). Sussex: Wiley.

Sahlberg, P. & Walker, T. D. (2021). *In Teachers We Trust: The Finnish Way to World-Class Schools*. United Kingdom: WW Norton.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.

Susen, S. (2020). The Resonance of Resonance: Critical Theory as a Sociology of World-Relations? *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, *33*(3), pp. 309–344

Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by Numbers. Deconstructing the Discourse of Standards and Accountability in Education.* London/New York: Routledge.