

Maja Maksimović¹, Ivan Nišavić²
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade

Learning the Unknown: the Potential of Liminal Space for Adult Education³

Abstract: The following paper is an attempt to speculate about the potential of liminality for adult learning by relating it to the existing concept of the “pedagogy of the event” which challenges the imperative for pedagogy to maximize the effects of teaching and learning by achieving predefined learning outcomes. As opposed to outcome-based education, “pedagogy of the event” is concerned with the unknown, and learning involves a move into a new or modified ontological state. Within this paper, a philosophical basis for the idea of threshold for learning process is outlined and some of the implications on education are presented. We conclude with the notion that liminality in education, as understood within the concept of pedagogy of the event, challenges normalizing and disciplining educational practices by creating radical openness towards the unknown.

Key words: liminality, pedagogy of the event, the gap, adult education, liminal education

Introduction – starting from liminal

It is impossible and paradoxical to elaborate on the concept of liminality within the epistemological parameters that rule the dominant thinking about the contemporary adult education practice, making andragogy a mere prescription for the most efficient road that leads to the desired learning outcomes. Adult education operates within the bigger apparatus of mainstream education which, as Biesta (2015) rightly put it, wants to be risk-free at all levels. The main narratives are focused on an effective production of pre-defined learning outcomes in

¹ Maja Maksimović, PhD is an assistant professor at the Department for Pedagogy and Andragogy, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade (mmaksimo@f.bg.ac.rs).

² Ivan Nišavić, PhD has completed his PhD studies at the Department for Philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade (nisavic.ivan@gmail.com).

³ This paper is part of a research project being undertaken at the Institute of Pedagogy and Andragogy, Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, titled “Models of assessment and strategies for improvement of quality of education” (179060), supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

a small number of subjects or with regard to a limited set of identities, such as that of a good citizen or work-capable and functional individuals. To achieve this goal, the international organizations such as OECD and World Bank promote education that is strong, secure and predictable (Biesta, 2015). Outcome-based curriculum design does not tolerate unpredictability of empty spaces of learning or ontological uncertainty of risk-taking that are the essential ingredient of horizons that lie in between and betwixt.

Mainstream educational theories rely on a chronometrical approach to time (Alhadeff-Jones, 2016). Time, divided in sequences, serves as a given structure, “an external temporal framework” (Alhadeff-Jones, 2016, p. 43) to plan educational activities, but also as a criterion for an evaluation of learning. Therefore, the desirable skills of a lifelong learner are related to “time management” providing advice on how to develop strategies in order to avoid time shortage (Alhadeff-Jones, 2017). Time is conceptualized as something that should be measured, organized, planned, used, and saved according to the objective predictions of cognitive rhythms, and within outcome-based learning, it is mostly organized according to the principle of efficacy, and educational procedures are directed towards initiating the productivity of the body. Besides that, now more than ever, dominant educational processes are defined and governed by economy, economical or financial progress and growth of wealth. Wealth is understood thorough material and countable instances such as income, while other views on “wealth” – enjoyment, happiness, self-sufficient or wisdom – are hugely marginalized. On the other side, education based on the pedagogy of the unknown puts to the test classical and traditional methods of education and deep-seated understanding of educational processes established in rigid differentiation between the teacher and student and in usual processes of acquisition of knowledge.

Foucault introduced the concept of *docile body* and thereby emphasized the power mechanisms that are directed at disciplining an individual. A docile body can be altered and improved (Foucault, 1977). The basic technique to achieve discipline is a distribution of bodies, thus turning an educational space into a learning machine. Edwards (2008) continues the discussion initiated by Foucault and states that power relations in adult education are expanded to activity, because disciplining does not simply turn people into passive objects, but requires productivity. These normalizing actions produce subjects; they create a process of self-in-making, that is, an aesthetic endeavor. Subjects are constituted through specific practices and discourses. An individual is an “ascetic” who, by referring to the dominant knowledge, manages his actions, thoughts and desires, to correct and trigger actions that lead him into the desired direction (Maksimović, 2015). In this text we wonder how liminality deployed within the context of the

pedagogy of the unknown can disturb those disciplining education technologies by insisting on uncertainty and learning as a creative endeavor.

In the context of education, liminality can be assumed not only as an alternative approach to recognition, acquisition and utilization of knowledge, but also as an opposite and unfamiliar attitude towards standardized gaining of knowledge. Every educational praxis has its own structure and nature, that in one sense includes different kinds of people or groups of people, and in another sense, excludes or marginalizes some people or groups of people. From ancient times, when philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle thought about education, until now, the educational processes were overwhelmed with problems such as discrimination, authority over the people, knowledge and truth, structure of power, alienation, influence of political or social turmoil, inability to apply or practical inapplicability etc. Contemporary educational theories offer approaches that are characterized by more or less the same problems that tormented ancient theorists. As Richard Shaull puts it in a foreword to Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*: "There is no such thing as a *neutral* educational process. Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, *or* it becomes "the practice of freedom", the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world" (Shaull in Freire, 2005. p. 34). The educational processes are mostly realized in the first sense, i.e. as an *introductory course* to the mainstream epistemological and logical principles and systems.

The notion of liminality invites us to re-imagine and embrace pedagogy/andragogy "as addressing the learning self as an emergence — as a self and an intelligence that is always in the making" (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 57). It involves not only participation in the transformation of the world, as suggested by Freire, but the radical openness of self-in-making within the worlds that are unfolding. The emergence to what has not been predicted includes a phase of transition, a threshold, a place of possibility, openness, ambiguity, heightened awareness, and imagination (Neilsen, cited in Maksimović & Knezić, 2014). The very concept of liminality is a result of the ethnographic studies of social rituals conducted by the author van Gennep (1960) and Turner (1969, 1995). Van Gennep (1960) was the first to accept the concept of liminality. "Whoever passes from one territory to the other finds himself physically and magico-religiously in a special situation for a certain length of time: he wavers between two worlds" (van Gennep, 1960, p.18). He introduced it as a part of the transformation process – a person is between past and future identities so anything can happen. There are three different phases of rites of passage: separation, transition and incorporation. During the

first phase, an individual is detached from usual social structure, social position and identity. The second phase, which is of the most interest for this paper, is demarcated by an ambiguous state of being, where a person stands outside of normal space and time frame of their society, and whose identity and worldview is dissolved or challenged. This middle stage is an actual passage that marks the boundary between two other phases, which was introduced as liminality (Szokolczai, 2009). The third phase is characterized by the reentering to the regular social structure, but changed and with a new identity. Rituals of passage often demand a completion of a certain task, but a success means that a person is “converted”. However, due to the conflict with Emil Durkheim, the work of van Gennep was not widely recognized and the book *Rites of Passage* has been translated in English only in 1960 (Szokolczai, 2009). His ideas were spread after Victor Turner accepted the term liminality (Latin: *limen* – limits or thresholds) to mark the transitional space, which is a part of the change from one state to another, from one world to another, one place to another, or one period of time to another. “A person passes through a cultural realm that has few or none of the attributes of the past or coming state” (Turner, 1995, p. 94). After he had published his work in 1967 and 1969, the concept became famous:

The attributes of liminality or of liminal personae (“threshold people”) are necessarily ambiguous, since this condition and these persons elude or slip through the network of classifications that normally locate states and positions in cultural space. Liminal entities are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial. As such, their ambiguous and indeterminate attributes are expressed by a rich variety of symbols in the many societies that ritualize social and cultural transitions. Thus, liminality is frequently likened to death, to being in the womb, to invisibility, to darkness, to bisexuality, to the wilderness, and to an eclipse of the sun or moon. (Turner, 1995, p. 95)

A person is in a space of limbo and statuslessness, and opposites constitute each other. It is a period of time when an individual exists in a gap liberated from normative demands and between ordered words where everything is unknown while a new identity is in a state of emergence. The existence of an individual is free and full. This kind of existence is similar to non-existence, as in that moment we can choose what we are going to become next. The only difference is that we can continue to live, in a completely distinct and new way. “He is invisible to the society that he is separated from and they consider him dead, waiting to be

reborn, for the entirety of the liminal phase” (Westerveld, 2010, p. 9). It is a space of contradictions, filled with doubts, often with turmoil and sense of loss. Liminality infuses a feeling of isolation from the outer reality; the space is foreign and strange while an identity is in the process of reconfiguration. The past is no longer possible, and the presence is unknowable while the new is not yet born. A person endures dramatic exposure to the unknown world, empty of defined structures, a self is floating and “a traveler” is full of questions. In order to become an adult, an individual is going through a series of rites of passage which involves a painful separation from the family and some sort of a clean state of being (Szakolczai, 2009).

For groups, as well as individuals, life itself means to separate and to be reunited, to change form and condition, to die and to be reborn. It is to act and to cease, to wait and rest, and then to begin acting again, but in a different way. And there are always new thresholds to cross: the threshold of summer and winter, of a season or a year, of a month or a night, the threshold of birth, adolescence, maturity and old age; the threshold of death and that of the afterlife-for those who believe in it”. (van Gennep, 1960, p. 189)

This intersubjective quality has set the framework for the exploration of liminal not as an exclusively subjective episode, but as an interconnected and relational phenomenon. Therefore, liminal is experienced as a fusion of the spatial, temporal, personal and relational as it does not dwell in binary oppositions of the inner and outer, but it reflects betweenness. This has ontological and epistemological implications on learning which cease to be an inner change provoked by an environmental stimulus or new knowledge. The new concepts and subjectivities are simultaneously created and lived, while the new worlds are unfolding. The liminal is infused by undoing, experimentation and potential for becoming which has strong influence on inquiry of education.

Liminal in educational research

The issue of liminality in the context of adult learning is not a widely represented subject of research within educational disciplines. We choose to present several research productions – one within the area of higher education (Meyer & Land, 2003), another which is more relevant for adult education field as it emerges within the scope of transformative learning theory (Mcwhinney & Markos, 2003) and one that deals with the status and potential strength of liminal education (Conroy & de Ruyter, 2009).

Meyer and Land (2003) introduced the idea of *threshold concepts* within the academic disciplines echoing the notion of liminality, although they take an epistemologically different position from the one presented in this work. Their ideas were developed within the framework of the project aimed at enhancing quality of teaching at undergraduate level (Barradell, 2013) which significantly influenced the meaning of the concept. Liminality is seen as a metaphor for the phase of conceptual transformation that students face during which they may encounter a feeling of anxiety or being stuck (Meyer & Land, 2005). Difficulties may occur because of the epistemological obstacles, implying that the role of teachers is to remove those obstacles, or use them as a source of learning. They suggest teaching interventions such as “redesigning activities and sequences, through scaffolding, recursiveness, provision of support materials and technologies or new conceptual tools, through mentoring or peer collaboration” (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 377). Entering the liminal phase and confusion is seen as a barrier to learning that needs to be overcome by choosing adequate learning strategies: “It has long been a matter of concern to teachers in higher education why certain students ‘get stuck’ at particular points in the curriculum whilst others grasp concepts with comparative ease. What might account for this variation in student performance and, more importantly, what might teachers do in relation to the design and teaching of their courses that might help students overcome such barriers to their learning?” (Land, Cousin, Meyer, & Davies, 2005, p. 53). They described threshold concepts as particular ideas within all subject areas that can open portals to a previously inaccessible way of thinking (Land et al., 2005; Meyer & Land, 2005). These concepts represent a new way of interpreting or understanding without which a learner cannot progress (Meyer & Land, 2003). They are *transformative* (occasioning a significant shift in the perception of a subject), *irreversible* (unlikely to be forgotten, or unlearned only through considerable effort), *integrative* (exposing the previously hidden interrelatedness of something) and *troublesome*. The encounter with threshold concept requires a change in a learner’s identity and his/her relationship to discourses. The students who manage to internalize such perspectives are seen to be more successful in their learning, in comparison to ones who learn new ideas in a more fragmented fashion (Land et al., 2005). Such knowledge is characterized as troublesome as it entails a move from comfortable positions into unknown territory. There is a demand from learners to integrate new perceptions and transform their own understanding, which often provokes the reconstitution of one’s identity. The authors warn that students might remain stuck in an “in-between” state and “oscillate between earlier, less sophisticated understandings, and the fuller appreciation of a concept that their tutors require from them” (Land et al., 2005, p. 55). The introduction

of the threshold concept has been recognized as pedagogically fertile. Although we agree that a threshold concept is of great use for curriculum design, it does not make discursive extension as learning is comprehended as an exclusively rational endeavor that nevertheless influences the learner's identity. The objectives of learning and desirable student's subjectivities are already defined, limiting possible becomings to what has been already known. What we aim throughout this writing is to demonstrate a possibility of learning that involves concepts as lived and experienced (Manning & Massumi, 2014).

Liminality was also explored within the framework of transformative learning, and it is described as a middle phase of the process of personal transformation. The change of perspective, being a landmark of transformative learning theory, is preceded by a state of confusion and loss of structure. It is initiated by a disorienting dilemma or personal crisis, which makes the existing point of view impossible. "For a person, the crisis may be induced by physiological changes and promoted in the traditional rituals of passage. Each of these changes may present shocks to one's self-image, often as a loss of capacity that provide openings to new perspectives and values for social engagement" (Mcwhinney & Markos, 2003, p. 24). The phase that an individual enters after challenging and painful decomposition of cognitive structures is similar to what has been described as liminal in anthropology. Mcwhinney and Markos (2003) within their paper *Transformative Education: Across the Threshold*, claim that after experiencing crisis, individuals move into a liminal domain during which they "vanish from their familiar selves and their community into night journey" (p. 26). This liminal space is empty and lonely, and a person is vulnerable and prone to "sudden moods and highly charged images and thoughts, to sudden gains and losses of confidence" (Stein, cited in Mcwhinney & Markos, 2003, p. 26). They make an interesting link between liminality and communities stating that wonderers being empty of self "seek intimacy with others as they become strangers to themselves" (Mcwhinney & Markos, 2003, p. 26), so they can recreate communities. By relying on certain characteristics of the middle phase, the authors make suggestions for educators on how to facilitate the process of transformation by embracing liminality as an inevitable stage. One of the recommendations is to set the learning in distanced and separated spaces which symbolize a journey from the usual and quotidian. The ultimate goal of transformative education is seen as a continual self-renewal, constantly challenging one's beliefs and assumptions and inviting others to do the same.

The exploration of liminality by James Conroy, based on the work of Victor Turner and Edith Turner, is concerned with the political dimensions of education and schooling. In his book *Betwixt & Between: The Liminal Imagination*,

Education, and Democracy published in 2004, the author suggests that what is considered to be liberal democracy in late industrial society is inextricably linked to the values of market economy and consumerism, arguing that we need to find new solutions on how to live a good life. Educational spaces and schooling mirror the economic interpretation of democracy and there is a lack of exposure to multiple perspectives (Caron, 2006). Conroy believes that teachers need to encourage dissonant perspectives which are manifestations of the liminal – “the intellectual, cultural and ideological spaces that ...[exist] on the margins, neither at the centre nor on the outside” (pp. 7-8). The role of school is to cultivate the liminal as a way for students to adopt a critical perspective to society and thus avoid discursive closure.

Namely, he states that there are three interrelated aspects of liminality: *borderlands*, *contact zones* and *communitas* (Conroy, 2004, p. 57). In this sense, especially with borderlands and contact zones, liminality may be easier understood: as a place and time between the parts of experience, knowledge and understanding, a moment that is on the edge and where change is inevitable and necessary. Two touching parts of our experiences, that are completely different and inconsistent, are connected and attached to each other through the point that is recognized as a liminal or threshold point. It looks like that border cannot contain any period of time or space, e.g. the moment of New Year's Eve: when exactly is that moment between the old and new year? We cannot see, notice or catch it. It is a transition between two inseparable moments of time which is out of our sight and when and where the change takes place. Same as in this example, the transformation in one's own experience happens at those borderlands, where contact is possible. We can understand *contact zones* as a place where we are capable to see, feel or understand the mere possibility of different conceptions, to get out and liberate ourselves from usual and imposed social and political structures, ideas and ideals, to accept otherness and differentness. It is a place where we recognize our potential to liberate ourselves from the “discursive closure emanating from the growing symbiosis of state and corporation” (Conroy, 2004, p. 52). On the other side, following Turner (1995), the notion of *communitas* represents the people who experience the liminal phase and are in a state in which no one has authority over another as equal status means no status. In some sense, *communitas* is more than community, since the process of liminality equates the people.

Furthermore, Conroy introduces the concept of liminal education suggesting that it includes “positional strategy to counter the tendency of the centre to homogenize and to challenge its centripetal force by revealing with and for children alternative positions critical of, or running counter to, the centre in

order to enable them to cultivate a critically reflective disposition themselves” (Conroy & de Ruyter, 2009, p. 6). Even when those authors write about liminality in political terms, such as center and alternative positions, we can transfer it to a different context; namely, as they continue shortly after: “liminal education carries the potential to assist children in recognizing that otherness, those who are not in the mainstream, is not the same thing as being alien, thus offering them a nuanced account of sameness and alterity (Conroy & de Ruyter, 2009, p. 6)”. Beside these contextual differentiations, it is important to notice that liminal education is not just for children or young people, but for adults as well. The main reason why we think that liminal education practices are even more applicable to adults is based on an abundance of learner’s experiences, that allows them to (re) create different situations and circumstances which could represent initial states of new ways of learning, knowing and understanding, i.e. new ways of living. In that sense, adults are more capable and more equipped with the physical and mental strength that is necessary to create, produce and accept change, regardless of the sense: moral, economic, political or emotional. Having that in mind, understanding the position and needs of adults is of fundamental importance. The role of educators is not only to generate and interpret knowledge or provoke and induce a critical reflection on acquired knowledge (which is certainly of great importance), but to create, invent and enable completely disparate and unusual forms and methods of learning and understanding. In order to include more adults in the educational processes, who are not used to or simply are not disposed to standardized learning methods, we need to overcome the limitations of traditional education. In that way we will “un-marginalize” marginalized persons, by providing and allowing them to create and understand their self and their position in many different and incoherent societies and cultures.

It is important to notice the adamant (unbreakable) and rigid connection between liminality (which is understood as a border position) and center (taken as a common and widely acceptable position). Liminality is prone to change and flexible – it is possible that one circumstance that once was a borderline situation (liminal) becomes central, and *vice versa*, a central and usual situation could become marginal. A useful illustration is the following example featured in the Conroy and Ruyter paper (Conroy & Ruyter, 2008, p. 5) – during the second part of XX century, corporal punishment was not only acceptable, but also desirable and very welcome in educational practice. In the final decade of XX century, a change in educational processes took place, and the efficiency and usefulness of corporal punishment was revised and inspected. The results were absolutely contrary and it was understood that the value of corporal punishment in education was next to nothing. The same teacher who, for the sake of argument, accepts

the plausibility of corporal punishment would be in a central or mainstream position forty years ago, but now he would occupy the liminal position with the same attitude. This and similar examples are significant because they warn us of the problematic occurrences that can infiltrate liminality. Not all or any marginal positions may be taken as useful and allowable and in that sense desirable as an educational method or standard.

Pedagogy of the event for learning the unknown

Although liminality is recognized and explored, particularly as a phase of transformation, this conceptualization of the neutral phase within the transformative learning theory or for the purpose of improving the quality of teaching stays in the linear epistemological realm with the clear beginning and the end of learning process, whether it is absorbing a new point of view which is already known to teachers, or personal growth that includes reaching the edge of knowing. What is missing from these theoretical standpoints is pedagogical conceptualization that overcomes the dichotomy epistemology/ontology, being/becoming, rational/emotional but embraces what Biesta (2015) calls “the beautiful risk of education” by opening potentiality of the threshold as a space of multiple becomings. Thus, we are using the concept of the *pedagogy of the event* coined by Atkinson (2011) as a thinking tool for embracing elusiveness of liminality as relevant for education and learning. “A pedagogy of the event is concerned with moving beyond the law (state) of a situation, precipitated by a desire for new states of existence; a desire of learning is a desire for new states of existence” (Atkinson, 2011, p. 39). Dennis Atkinson (2011) in his book *Art, Equality and Learning* has introduced the concept of *pedagogy of the event* in order to invent vocabulary for learning which is seen as a leap into the unknown and as an ontological shift to a new way of being. He based his thinking on the idea of *an event* which is, according to Badiou “a radical disruption that leads to a subsequent truth procedure which reconfigures the existing knowledge frameworks, practices and values of a social context” (Atkinson, 2012, p. 9). Being is not understood according to the parameters of traditional humanism but rather as an inconsistent multiplicity (Feltham, in Badiou, 2005) and the subject does not exist prior to events – there is no unified form that is transformed. What is present, but not yet attainable serves as an attractor to pass into new space that is beyond existing knowledge.

An event takes place when a new situation cannot be explained within existing logics – “logics and affects are reconfigured by persevering with the

truth of the event, by sticking with its new and transformative potential” (Atkinson, 2012, p. 9). In this occasion we are resisting interpretation by using already existing knowledge and conceptions – it is a paradox of the unknown because truths of an emerging situation can be created/discovered only if what is considered to be the truth is set aside. “A truth bores a hole in knowledge” (Badiou, 2005, p. 525) and that exceeds what accounts as knowledge for the situation. Therefore, there are unfolding truths that are specific and contextualized, and the subject comes into new existence through participation/creation of the event. Therefore, education that is based on the pedagogy of the event welcomes the unpredictable and does not aim to impose a vision of reality, but traverses existing knowledge and potentially reshapes the power structure. It is a shift from being to becoming and it attempts to accept the ontological variations for learner’s and teacher’s positions beyond the established ways of representations in order to produce new subjectivities and communities (Atkinson, 2011). It is focused on the potentiality and unknown of the becoming, suggesting that learners take risk as there is no predicted outcome and direction of learning, but a possible new existence which is not configured by frameworks of knowledge. The pedagogy of the event indicates to an exclusion of a part that appears on the social scene and interrupts the existing social order by disrupting the appearance of normality making the previously invisible parts visible – coming from the margins to the center. Similarly, liminal education (Conroy & Ruyter, 2009) aims at revealing alternative positions by cultivating critical reflection and engaging insights from the periphery enabling the variegation of experiences and knowledges. The liminal classroom would be characterized by a richness of disordered interactions and polyphony of voices that disrupt legitimized discourses. However, this constant exchange between the periphery and center fails to bring together the liminal and unknown – there is an intention to disrupt the existing order by inviting a multiplicity of truths to become alive and exist in a classroom. Such a teaching position counters hegemonic positions and possibly reconfigures power relations, but stays in the realm of familiar realities and representationalism.

Concluding by staying in liminal

If we accept the proposition of pedagogy of the event that learning is movement into a new ontological state and existence, then it involves liminality as a space of potentiality. Learning lies beyond the frameworks of comprehension and this notion provokes the idea that education always assumes content, even what

is considered to be a threshold concept that creates disturbance in a personal structure of knowledge. These intersubjective experiences that merge selves and the environment can possibly invoke the undoing of personal “riddles”. “It is as if we enter the world without preconceptions, startled by the phenomena where everything is given and nothing taken for granted” (Hillman, 2009). Learning is peculiar and unpredictable and it occurs at the eruption of processes and new thoughts without the need for their application to existing reality (Richardson, 2017). Elisabeth Ellsworth (2005) suggests that within spaces of transition “learning and teaching about the world are seen as a constant movement of folding, unfolding, and refolding of inside to outside, outside to inside” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 58). She speaks about an activation of the felt reality that occurs in the transitional space which is full of becomings and emergence. Lather (1998) refuses “the privileging of containment over excess, thought over affect, structure over speed, linear causality over complexity, and intention over aggregate capacities” (p. 497). Therefore, we consider liminality not as an anomaly making us outcasts from the ordered world, but as a constellation of vectors of desires that exists in imagination which is a world in forming. It is a different approach to education that conceptualizes us as *knowing beings*. Liminality is a state of unpredictability, inconsistency without waiting a new structure to be born. In this deserted space in which the symbolic representation is ruptured, the void emerges. It is a chance to go beyond the given epistemic architecture and to undo subjectivities that answer the question of who we are. The empty space is not a chance to find new responses, but to embrace possible becomings by being response-able. In a “between world” through the sensitivity to surroundings we experience a world in a sensual way by being empty of self and in a contact with direct experience. The immediacy of experience is a counter-narrative to the chronological approach to time in education and knowing overcomes the binary position of the rational/emotional/corporal, but it includes the synchronicity of sensing and thinking, not thinking about, but thinking with the moment and allowing to be influenced. This position certainly disrupts the main constructs of adult education – outcomes, curriculum, and content which imply a linear logic to the planning of educational activities. Education can possibly transform from a normalizing and disciplining practice, into a sensuous endeavor that involves risk and might be followed by confusion and frustration. Such a position provokes us to think about the conditions for learning that embraces an entanglement of imagination, memories, actions and environment. This paradigm shift involves movement from predictability of education to uncertainty and creation.

References:

- ALHADEFF-JONES, M. (2016). *Time and the Rhythms of Emancipatory Education: Rethinking the temporal complexity of self and society*. London, New York: Routledge.
- ATKINSON, D. (2011). *Art, Equality and Learning*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- ATKINSON, D. (2012). Contemporary art and art in education: The new, emancipation and truth. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 31(1), 5-18.
- BADIOU, A. (2005). *Being and Event* (O. Feltham, Trans.). London: Continuum.
- BARRADELL, S. (2013). The identification of threshold concepts: A review of theoretical complexities and methodological challenges. *Higher Education*, 65(2), 265–276.
- BIESTA, G. J. (2015). *Beautiful risk of education*. London, New York: Routledge.
- CARON, E. J. (2006). Book review: *Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Imagination, Education and Democracy*, by James C. Conroy. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 9(3).
- CONROY, J. C. (2004). *Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Imagination, Education and Democracy*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- CONROY, J. C., & RUYTER, D. J. (2009). Contest, contradiction, and security: The moral possibilities of liminal education. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 1-12.
- EDWARDS, R. (2008). Actively seeking subjects? In A. Fejes & K. Nicoll (Eds.), *Foucault and lifelong learning* (pp. 41-53). Routledge.
- ELLSWORTH, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. London New York: Routledge.
- HILLMAN, J. (2009). *Alchemical Psychology: Uniform Edition* (Vol. 5). Spring Publications.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish* (A. Sheridan, trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- FREIRE, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos). New York: Continuum.
- LAND, R., COUSIN, G., MEYER, J. H. F., & DAVIES, P. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Implications for course design and evaluation. *Improving Student Learning Diversity and Inclusivity*, (3), 53–64.
- MAKSIMOVIĆ, M. (2015). Power and knowledge in adult education: Some considerations. *Andragoške studije*, (2), 69-84.
- MANNING, E., & MASSUMI, B. (2014). *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience*. University of Minnesota Press.
- MCWHINNEY, W., & MARKOS, L. (2003). Transformative Education: Across the Threshold. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1(1), 16–37.
- MEYER, J. H. F., & LAND, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 49(3), 373–388.
- RICHARDSON, J. (2017). What art thinks. In J. Jagodzinski (ed.), *What Is Art Education After Deleuze and Guattari* (pp. 111-126). New York: Springer Nature.
- SZAKOLCZAI, Á. (2009). Liminality and Experience: Structuring Transitory Situations and Transformative Events. *International Political Anthropology*, 2(1), 141–172.

- TURNER, V. (1995). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Cornell Paperbacks.
- VAN GENNEP, A. (1960). *Rites of passage* (M. B. Visedom & G. L. Caffee, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago. (Original work published 1909).

Maja Maksimović⁴, Ivan Nišavić⁵
Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu

Učenje nepoznatog: potencijal liminalnog prostora u obrazovanju odraslih⁶

Apstrakt: Autori rada nastoje da razmotre potencijal liminalnosti u sferi obrazovanja odraslih tako što je dovode u vezu sa postojećim konceptom „pedagogije događaja“. Ovaj koncept preispituje pedagoški imperativ postizanja unapred određenih ishoda učenja kako bi se ostvarila najveća delotvornost nastave i učenja. Za razliku od koncepta obrazovanja koje se zasniva na ishodima, „pedagogija događaja“ nastoji da prodre u nepoznato, a sam proces učenja podrazumeva iskorak u novo ili izmenjeno ontološko stanje. U ovom radu smo predstavili filozofsku osnovu za ideju granica procesa učenja, kao i određene implikacije po obrazovanje. U zaključku iznosimo stav da liminalnost u obrazovanju, kada je tumačimo shodno konceptu pedagogije događaja, postavlja izazov pred prakse obrazovanja koje imaju za cilj normalizaciju i disciplinu tako što stvara prostor za radikalnu otvorenost prema nepoznatom.

Ključne reči: liminalnost, pedagogija događaja, jaz, obrazovanje odraslih, liminalno obrazovanje

⁴ Dr Maja Maksimović je docent na Odeljenju za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.

⁵ Dr Ivan Nišavić je doktorirao na Odeljenju za filozofiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu.

⁶ Rad je nastao u okviru projekta Instituta za pedagogiju i andragogiju (Filozofski fakultet, Beograd) „Modeli procenjivanja i strategije unapređenja kvaliteta obrazovanja“ (br. 179060), koji finansira Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja Republike Srbije.