“... Barad proposes a reading of different theories which, instead of opposing them, engages them with one another... in order to provide more sensible accounts of the world” (Revelles Benavente, 2010).

This is the basis of Barad’s reworking of Donna Haraway’s metaphor of ‘diffraction’ as a tangible method and practice in research – a way to read the insights of different theoretical approaches through one another to illuminate differences that matter (Barad, 2007; 2003).
Emerging insights

Entanglements of insights from different theoretical perspectives, leading to “interim conclusions / new questions” (Chappell et al., 2019)

The iterative nature of the process leads to further entanglements between insights arising from subsequent ‘diffractions’
An attempt to make transparent and record those moments in analysis that produce “an event of knowing things differently.”

Recognising that a significant part of a diffractive analysis takes place in the writing of the analysis: “This is where new additional cuts were made and where different data were literally written into each other.”

Osborne argues that the effect of exposure to only one type of science writing in schools is to: “erect a ‘monolithic castle of impenetrable speech’ ... which intimidates the outsider with an ability to jam out all other forms of speech with which it comes into contact, denying challenge, argument or alternative interpretation. The consequence is that science remains distant and elevated” (Osborne, 2008).
Scaffolding ‘traditional’ model of writing in school science
“Science inspires the writing, but the writing helps explore the science. Because a subject like space, they’re never going to be in space but they’re using the writing to kind of explore what it might be like. What it might feel like to be there.” (Year 3 teacher, North London)

“There are some children who love writing descriptions and poetry but others who are very reluctant because in their minds they see it as boring and they don’t know how to describe anything. But when you’re doing experiments with light beams and sending it through prisms, suddenly it becomes a whole lot more exciting and they actually want to write.” (Year 3 teacher, North London)
Sciku are scientific haiku – haiku that communicate the essence of scientific research, discoveries, thoughts or ideas using haiku structure. You can find examples in physics, chemistry, biology and social sciences by searching #sciku on Twitter and at The Sciku Project https://thescikuproject.com/

Many sciku use traditional haiku form – a poem in three phrases totalling 17 syllables in a 5/7/5 pattern – but others play with these rules. You can also find examples of sciku using as part of longer poems.

Traditional haiku employ a ‘cutting word’ or kireji, in the middle of the verse. This may function to cut or interrupt but also interconnect or entangle two distinct phrases of the haiku. There are parallels with diffractive models of writing, the “simultaneous engagement of multiple vantage points from which to engender new ways of seeing” (Sousanis, 2015).

Traditional haiku use imagery from nature to capture or tell us something about an emotion. As writers of sciku, then, we consciously entangle the scientific phenomenon we are exploring with our individual emotional state or response. The result is a piece of writing/thinking/performance with an effect much greater than its short form might suggest.