


10-7-2018

Un-Naming Collaboration: An Unexpected Catalyst for Understanding Participation in Critical Ethnography

Allison Anders
AANDERS@mailbox.sc.edu

Joshua Diem
Rhode Island College, joshdiem@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Community-Based Research Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Anders, A., & Diem, J. (2018). Un-Naming Collaboration: An Unexpected Catalyst for Understanding Participation in Critical Ethnography. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(10), 2294-2312. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3425>

This How To Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

A promotional banner for the Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate at Nova Southeastern University. The banner is split into two sections. The left section has a dark blue background with white text: "Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate", "Indulge in Culture", "Exclusively Online • 18 Credits", and a "LEARN MORE" button. The NSU logo is also present. The right section shows a group of six diverse people sitting on a stone ledge in front of a building with "NOVA SOUTHEASTERN" visible on the wall.

Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Un-Naming Collaboration: An Unexpected Catalyst for Understanding Participation in Critical Ethnography

Abstract

In this article, we trace interactions with participants in two different research projects. Although the research settings were different, we focus on what the projects had in common: a commitment to collaboration, methodological training from the same faculty, and our respective decisions to turn away from labeling our work collaborative deep into each project's development. In a narrative as chronicle, we represent ways each project unfolded and then why each of us abandoned claims of collaboration. Specifically, we share the critical positions we staked early in our research designs and the communication with participants that taught us to un-name what had been a priori hopes for collaboration. Subsequently, we represent the effects that un-naming collaboration generated. Using in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2013) to search for explanations of participation, we found that participants wanted to help us. We discuss the theme: "Sharing to Help" and three subthemes. We found participants helped, because (1) a "story told" might "benefit" someone else; (2) participants wanted to challenge stereotypes about people of Color, people in prison, and people in transitional housing; and (3) participants believed in our "concern" and "care" about what it was we were trying to understand.

Keywords

Participants, Collaboration, Naming Research Design, Ethnography

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Un-Naming Collaboration: An Unexpected Catalyst for Understanding Participation in Critical Ethnography

Allison Daniel Anders

University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina, USA

Joshua D. Diem

Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island, USA

In this article, we trace interactions with participants in two different research projects. Although the research settings were different, we focus on what the projects had in common: a commitment to collaboration, methodological training from the same faculty, and our respective decisions to turn away from labeling our work collaborative deep into each project's development. In a narrative as chronicle, we represent ways each project unfolded and then why each of us abandoned claims of collaboration. Specifically, we share the critical positions we staked early in our research designs and the communication with participants that taught us to un-name what had been a priori hopes for collaboration. Subsequently, we represent the effects that un-naming collaboration generated. Using in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2013) to search for explanations of participation, we found that participants wanted to help us. We discuss the theme: "Sharing to Help" and three subthemes. We found participants helped, because (1) a "story told" might "benefit" someone else; (2) participants wanted to challenge stereotypes about people of Color, people in prison, and people in transitional housing; and (3) participants believed in our "concern" and "care" about what it was we were trying to understand. Keywords: Participants, Collaboration, Naming Research Design, Ethnography

Introduction

In this article, we trace interactions with participants in two different research projects and examine ways our respective journeys into research unfolded when we abandoned claims of collaboration in our work and asked why participants still engaged in its absence. "The student that is the ethnographer must be forever willing to learn, must expect to learn, and must expect, therefore, to be forever ignorant. Ethnographic learning is at best conditional" (Noblit, 1999, p. 8). Our purpose is to highlight salient moments in the process of research and to represent what participants shared with us when we asked them why they participated in our research projects. Rather than focus on the findings of our respective projects, we represent this tale of disappointment (Stacey, 1988), discovery, and salvage (Behar, 1991) from our respective first forays into qualitative research. Although the research settings were different, correctional facilities and a transitional housing program, we focus on what our projects had in common: a commitment to collaboration, methodological training from the same faculty, who underscored the importance of collaboration, and our respective decisions to turn away from labeling our work collaborative deep into each project's development. We shared, too, a critical orientation to research (Villenas, 1996). While each of us found that we had engaged in ethnographic work that fell short of the collaboration with participants for which we had hoped, the absence of collaboration in our work produced new questions for us, and in turn, produced

new and unexpected understandings. We represent our pursuit of collaboration and what happened when we un-named collaboration.

In the sections below, we detail the similarities in our learning, stumblings, and reorientations that took place in each of our respective research projects. As a member of an evaluation team tasked with assessing an educational program in correctional facilities across North Carolina, I (Allison) became interested in the educational narratives of students who were incarcerated. I completed a series of in-depth interviews with 11 students who were taking college courses in prison. I asked questions about experiences with education and school growing up and represented their educational narratives and how they made meaning of their experiences. In my (Josh's) study, I represented the lives of two homeless mothers living in a transitional housing program. I focused on the role that education and schooling played in their daily lives, and how my relationship with each woman served as a catalyst for new understandings about education. My data collection methods included observations and formal and informal interviews. Both research projects received approval from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at the university we attended during the completion of our research. Below, we have used pseudonyms for all participants and for the transitional housing program.

As current faculty members who teach qualitative research methodologies, we offer our experiences to students and teachers of qualitative research as a way to layer our understandings about when and what ethnographers name collaborative work and the conditions under which ethnographers might make such a decision. Notably, we share the critical commitments we staked early in our research project designs, describe our projects and the communication with participants that taught us to un-name what had been a priori hopes for collaboration. We examine the effects that un-naming collaboration generated and new understandings about why participants shared their lives and vulnerabilities with us. Using in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2013) we searched for explanations of participation and found that participants wanted to "help" us for a few reasons. Three sub-themes formed the theme "Sharing to Help." Participants helped, because (1) a "story told" might "benefit" someone else; (2) participants wanted to challenge stereotypes about people of Color, people in prison, and people in transitional housing; and (3) participants believed in our "concern" and "care" about what it was we were trying to understand.

Although we began our respective projects years apart, they are "irrepressibly connected" (Behar, 1991, p. 373) through our socialization in the same doctoral program and through our memories of a conversation Josh and I had just after his dissertation defense. In the east stairwell of the school of education where we ran into one another after Josh's defense, we began grappling with claims of collaboration. For Josh, though his dissertation defense had been successful, lingering questions remained about relationships with participants, the narratives we as ethnographers tell ourselves about those relationships, and the representations we produce about those relationships.

In our first conversation, Josh shared that the white scholars on his committee thought he had "romanticized" his participants and the role his participants had in his work and in his life. I (Allison) asked him what he meant. "They questioned whether the relationships were what I thought they were," he said.

"They understood that my relationships with participants produced the lens through which I wrote everything, but they thought I was making claims about the relationships being closer, more meaningful than they really are, were. They used 'iconic male' to make the point that as a white man who is in a position of authority as director [of Phoenix House, a transitional housing program], I had a great deal of capital with the social service provider community. They argued

that I was in a position where the women at Phoenix House could forge a relationship with me to benefit themselves. I get what they're saying. I understand their point. But I just don't agree."

"Can't your relationships with them be more complicated than that?" I asked.

"They are," he said.

"The ways my relationships with the residents unfolded was important," Josh said. "It's funny, because the only person on my committee, who has actually seen me at Phoenix House, has seen the work I do, the way I interact with the families, she agreed with me. She's the only Black person on the committee, and she thought the other committee members might have been extending their own white liberal guilt to me."

"I don't know how to describe what is happening," I said, "but when we're [participants and I] talking, something's there. Maybe it's not a relationship, but it's not just my questions and their responses either. There are conversations that don't feel like research."

Learning Ethnography, Choosing Methodology

The literature to which we refer in this section is to provide the context of our methodological training. We retrace some of our learning from graduate school to capture the allegiance we felt to critical (Crenshaw, 1994; Denzin, 2003; Giroux, 1983; Villenas, 1996) and collaborative (Ellis, Kiesinger, & Tillmann-Healy, 1997; Juhasz, 2004; Lamphere, Ragoné, & Zavella, 1997; Viswesvaran, 2003) approaches in qualitative research. Additionally, we explore other dimension of our positionalities, specifically our whiteness.

In the methods courses we took, we learned that the spaces in which critical ethnographers work are layered by cultural, historical, political and social discourses, and affected by institutions and structures, and contextualized by our own identities; researchers and participants embody and perform identities and discourses and do so differently depending on context and often the intersectionality of identity (Aretxaga, 1997; Clifford, 1986; Crenshaw, 1991, 1994; Denzin, 2003; Dirks, 2001; Mignolo, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999; Villenas, 1996). We studied histories and legacies of anthropology and the work anthropologists, typically Western and white, produced to categorize Others in order to solidify and reify systems of control. Colonial administrations deployed difference as justification to perpetuate cultural genocide and economic and political disenfranchisement, and modern anthropologists critiqued their predecessors for not only contributing to exploitation and oppression, but also for failing to recognize the people European empires colonized as individuals (Levi-Strauss, 1966; Lewis, 1973).

The will to know often appropriates the Other and extends the entitlement and power of the West (Willinsky, 1988). The threat of a detached representation and a single story (Adichie, 2009) are ubiquitous. Relationships between researcher and participants remain problematic, asymmetric, and situated in histories of imperialism and white supremacy (Krog, Mpolweni-Zantsi, & Ratele, 2008; Murillo, 2004; Swadener & Mutua, 2008).

Consequently, we read work that critiqued this history and called for ways to mitigate the potentially exploitive relationships between researcher and participant (Behar 1996; Noblit, 1999; Oakley, 2003; Villenas, 1996). Even so, navigating research across cultural, economic, gendered, geopolitical, racial, and social differences remains difficult. Ethnographers frame

participants in the languages and ideas we know, and we situate our work and participants in the discourses we study. We do this in an attempt to make meaning for ourselves, even as we pursue understandings about the ways participants make meaning about the world. We must work against ourselves, our identities and our biographies in order to learn from participants. We stand in our own way when we do not (Noblit, 1999). As white ethnographers, we don't ever avoid the possible charge of white savior or the good white (Thompson, 2003) but working against ourselves means acknowledging the histories behind the charges and interrogating our white racial power and privilege (Noblit, 1999; Pillow, 2003).

We had learned that power always accompanied the deployment of methods (Noblit et al., 2004) and that our invitations to vulnerability and our pursuit of the will to know were imbued with authority (if not audacity) each time we inquired, "Tell me about . . .," particularly as white researchers. Ellsworth (1997) warned us that all invitations to engage in dialogue are political, and her work encouraged us to reflect on the situatedness of our invitations, the way that they were extended, and their reception. We believed, too, that the invitations involved multiple performances of identities for us, and participants (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000; Bernal, 1998; Denzin, 2003; Dixon, 2006; Murillo, 2004; Urrieta, 2009; Villenas, 1996).

Concern over the possibility of (re)colonizing knowledges and experiences of participants reinforced our commitments to interactive interviewing (Ellis, Kiesinger, & Tillmann-Healy, 1997) and collaboration (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). We oriented toward and sought practices that promoted collaborative work, (Juhasz, 2004; Lamphere, Ragoné, & Zavella, 1997; Viswesvaran, 2003), open-ended dialogue and reflexivity (Pillow, 2003), and examined our whiteness and complicity in whitestream discourse and practice (Grande, 2004; Urrieta, 2009). If collaboration was possible, perhaps the threat of re/colonizing participants might be mediated, perhaps our whiteness and authority might not dominate our communication.

Much of the literature on ethical practices in qualitative research emphasizes ongoing communication and member checking with participants (Lassiter, 2005; Madison, 2012) and the practice of reflexivity across the research project (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004; Kuntz, 2010; Lassiter, 2005; Pillow, 2003), as well as accurate, thoughtful, and complex representations that include participant perspectives (Dávila, 2014; Murillo, 2004; Pickering & Kara, 2017; Rallis, 2010). Attention to process and the inclusion of participants' perspectives in a research project demands what Ellis (2007) called relational ethics. Practicing relational ethics means centering concerns for human dignity and "connectedness between researchers and researched" and "researchers and the communities in which they live and work" (p. 4). Sharing research materials, coding, analyses, and representations reflects a commitment to relational ethics. Working together may demand the navigation of analyses and representations from contrasting perspectives (Anders & Lester, 2015; Rallis, 2010), but opening spaces for collaboration is critical in the practice of relational ethics. Because research is always already (Habermas, 1988) situated (Haraway, 1988), partial (Goodall, 2000), and positional (Noblit et al., 2004), using analytic memos, practicing reflexivity (Kuntz, 2010; Pillow, 2003) and generating careful and complex representations can aid qualitative researchers in their pursuit of engaged ethical practice across the research process. To engage in a research process that reflected these commitments we knew we needed to practice recursive reflexivity and critique our own authorities as researchers and critics (Noblit, 2004). Alongside our recorders and notepads, we took these commitments with us into the field.

The Youth Offenders Program and Phoenix House

Allison: For three years prior to beginning my dissertation research, I was a member of an evaluation team that assessed the North Carolina Workplace and Community Transition

Youthful Offenders Program (YOP), now the Incarcerated Individuals Program (IIP). The YOP was a federally funded program in North Carolina prisons that served approximately 300 students a year. The evaluation team made site visits to participating correctional facilities and sent out surveys to students each year. At each site, the team interviewed education directors, case managers, current students, former students, and students who had been re-incarcerated. The goal of the YOP was to reduce recidivism, something that our data seemed to indicate happened for program participants (Anders & Noblit, 2011). Typically, participants in the program were 18- to 25-years-old and within five years of their release date. The program included: college courses taught by professors and graduate students from nearby colleges and universities; a cognitive behavioral class; and an employabilities class. (Anders, 2007; Anders & Noblit, 2011).

In 2003, I taught an education and society course at a women's facility, and in 2007 at one of the men's facilities. My experiences interviewing and teaching informed the way I navigated the prisons, correctional officers, school administrators, and the evaluation work and the interviews I completed. I completed a series of in-depth interviews with 11 men and women at five different correctional facilities for my dissertation research. Seven of the students were men: three African American students, one Caucasian student, one student identified as "Chicano," one identified as "Mexican," and one student identified as "Puerto Rican, Indian, and Black." Four of the students were women, three African American students, and one Caucasian student. I wanted to understand the ways the students made meaning about their experiences with school, knowing from our evaluation and research on school push out and school leaving (Fine, 1991) that most of the students endured experiences in school that tracked, targeted, or humiliated them. For one student, the first time he felt "smart" was in a prison classroom (Anders, 2007, p. 113).

Josh: I focused on the meanings of school and education held by families living in Phoenix House, a transitional housing program for homeless families, located in the Piedmont region of central North Carolina. Specifically, I described the lives of two homeless mothers, the role that education and schooling played in their daily lives, and how my relationship with each woman served as the lens through which I saw and made meaning from that which I observed. The participants and I problematized the various ways education affected the lives of homeless families. Historically, education has been seen as a potential solution to economic deprivation—a means out for those living in poverty (Finley & Barton, 2003)—yet education was a problem for these families, too, as they tried to negotiate educational systems from their status others named as "homeless."

The Phoenix House provided transitional housing and supportive services to a maximum of fifteen families at any one time. Approximately 90% of the families served during my tenure as program director consisted of a single mother and her children. There were several two-parent families (all consisting of a mother and a father) who lived at Phoenix House while I worked there, but never a single father. There was one family consisting of two mothers and one child who applied and was admitted to the program, but they did not show up for move-in and we never heard from them again. The program operated under the umbrella of a larger non-profit organization that served homeless people in the area. I had two roles at Phoenix House.

In addition to being a researcher, I served as the program director from June 1999 – June 2003, and during my last two years, I completed interviews with families. This role must be recognized and named as a possible conflict. I did as much as I could directly and explicitly to address the issue. I spoke at length about this with my supervisor, my adviser, other professors who served as academic and professional mentors, and most importantly, the families at the facility. I made it clear that families were under no obligation to participate in the study, and several declined. I am aware of the tension and possible conflicts and make no

attempts to pretend that this was not a possible issue across all stages of the research. My job as a practitioner always took priority over my role as researcher (as scholars like Madison, 2012 have argued it should); however, there were very few instances when my dual role was an issue. My first responsibility was meeting the needs of the families we served, then the staff and organization, and then my research. Through informal and formal interviewing, and rapport I developed with families over time, I believe the families I served felt the same.

In addition to serving as a methodological critique and example of how relationships can, and sometimes should, serve as the lens through which we can see and engage in research, the central argument in my dissertation positioned “education” as something that had to be conceptualized as an omnipresent, everyday practice that families had to negotiate constantly, and that my understanding of their experiences of that negotiation was predicated on the very relationships I had with the families. I came to these findings through my attempts to frame my work with and engage my participants in a type of research praxis that the participants co-created through questions we asked, analysis of findings, and the type of representation of the final product would take (Savage, 2003).

Methodology in Practice

Our aim in this section is to bridge our early training about methodology to our actual experiences engaging in research. We share reflections, excerpts from our field journals, and chronicle the steps we took during data collection and early analysis in each of our respective projects. Specifically, we address methodological tensions around data collection and early analysis in our respective projects.

For both of us establishing rapport (Glesne, 2006), creating conversations rather than interviews (Ellis et al., 1997), and engaging in collaborative and reciprocal practices were ways we thought we could complicate our power, authority, and whiteness; but we weren’t sure how to navigate asymmetry in practice.

What we found was work unfolding before us faster than we could capture it. Our fieldnotes, taxonomies, and memos were never enough. We began to feel the lived consequences of the research. We relived conversations with students and families when we shared stories with our mentor, and transcribing sent us reeling into moments with participants that we lived all over again. At times, we had nightmares about the structural violence affecting the lives of participants (Bourdieu, 1977; Farmer, 2005).

Allison: Over time, with most of the participants, interviewing began to feel like catching up. We talked about North Carolina basketball, what it was like to be a student, volleyball games in the yard, working in the kitchen, the cannery, the canteen, cleaning third shift, c.o.s (correctional officers), racism, the seeming impossibility of a Black or Latino president [the year was 2007], immigration policy, leaving home as a child, girlfriends, ex-husbands, and children.

Once I learned to follow where the participants led, I felt the ways we spoke with one another expand. As we talked across interviews and “the paths upon which we tread were never the same. We changed them as we traveled” (Anders, 2007, p. 48). We talked about our families, our homes, our moms, living at home as a teenager, friends who were not really friends, and death: their teacher’s, brothers’, cousin’s, aunt’s, and grandmothers’, my father’s. I listened to anguish over funerals missed. Often, I fell silent as witness to indescribable grief.

There was an emotional force to each interview that stayed with me for days and sometimes visited me in dreams and nightmares (Behar, 1991). Many days I completed routine tasks only through habit. My thoughts and feelings were engaged with the students. When I shared the interviews and the effects of them with my mentor, he said, “You do not have a

relationship with them.” At the time, I thought: “He is right. I don’t.” But “[the students were] a part of my community and a part of who I think I am and what I think I do.” (Anders, 2007 p. 29). Even if a relationship was not there, something was.

Josh: In the spirit of what I thought about qualitative research, I wanted the research process to be as open as possible. I saw the possibility for the research process, as well as the findings I hoped to produce, to be an organic process that would evolve somewhat naturally. I do not mean to imply that all the activities that would unfold were unaffected by the fact that I was there to observe and record. I was well aware of the fact that my mere presence, as unobtrusive as it may have been at times, had an impact, sometimes more dramatic than others. However, I wanted to try to observe things as they would normally occur, had I not been there to observe. I argued the fact that I was already someone who was at Phoenix House every day, as part of the already constructed scenery of the setting I was observing, would minimize my influence on the surroundings compared to a researcher whose sole purpose for being at there would be to observe and record.

Yet the initial approach I took was to interview participants. Soon into this process I realized that while the interviews did yield data, it was far less meaningful data compared to the data that emerged from the everyday informal conversations with families. These conversations generated the best information and set me straight in terms of what I was asking and how I ought to approach asking. I came to understand that the formal interviews were far more intrusive than I had anticipated and inorganic in practice. Conversations that unfolded naturally, during a normal day and the social interactions therein, along with observations of the families’ daily lives were far better means for answering my questions.

As I started the process of interviewing families, everything seemed to be going fairly well. All of the families whose children were old enough to participate in the study wanted to participate. I felt good about the families’ willingness and seeming desire to participate, as I did not feel that any of the families felt any pressure or obligation to participate, though I obviously could not be completely sure. (Diem, 2004, p. 103)

I wanted to assume as little as possible and asked the families to operationally define everything we talked about in terms of their own lives. I asked each person to define education, school, a good school, a good teacher, how to tell whether a school and/or teacher cares about a child, etc. Quickly, I discovered that I was embarking on territory more interesting, but more complicated than I had imagined. Central to my understanding of the complexities of the stories I was being told were my already established relationships with the participants and my role as program director at Phoenix House.

As Josh and I started to represent what it was we thought we were learning with participants, we purposefully created multiple representations. We wrote against the construction of cases that could be merely illustrative of theories we knew. Our training had been deeply emic. We wanted to deepen understandings (Abu-Lughod, 1991; Noblit, 1999) rather than present a “case of” something or provide evidence to legitimate a theory. With the aim of confronting the dehumanization of those whom the justice system incarcerates I (Allison) worked to complicate the coupling (Weick, 1976) of illegal work with monolithic images of men raced Black and Brown (Anders, 2007; 2011). Similarly, I (Josh) worked to produce narratives in a manner that reflected analytical critique of the structures, ideologies, contexts, and practices that constituted the “othering” of the families as “homeless” (Bhavani, 1992; Fine, 1994).

As we prepared to start member checking our early analysis and representations, we were aware that we wanted to “get it,” and we were nervous not knowing if we had. We knew member checking could be a way to open communication further, deepen details, complicate understandings, and ask more questions. We had high expectations. The basic practice of member checking is to share “interview transcripts, analytical thoughts, and/or drafts of the final report with research participants” (Glesne, 2006, p. 38). We wanted to know if we were on the right track, if early representations resonated with participants.

Allison: When the students reflected back to me my role as researcher when I member checked, I felt lost. When I shared the representations, I had created from the students’ interviews, I saw nods and sometimes smiles. I remember handing the pages of each poetic representation to each participant and holding my breath. I heard Shoran say, “It’s beautiful,” and Ladybug voice surprise. “I didn’t know I had shared so much,” she said. But little else was shared.

I gave my narrative analyses to each student in later interviews. Concerned about the change in communication when talking about the representations, I decided I needed to ask the students how they would describe and name their stories. Tony said he would describe his story as a story of “hope.” “Hope is the best I can describe [my story],” he said, “‘Don’t worry it will be alright.’ I try to shine hope into people, telling people pain and sadness happen to everyone, it’s what you make of it” (Anders, 2007, p. 141). When I handed Tony my representation of his story, he nodded as he read along. I had represented his story as “a story of redemption.” When he finished, he looked up and said, “I like what you called it.” In the moments that followed Tony and I discussed why he liked what I called it, and specifically, an encounter in middle school that I had named racist. He said he was not sure if racism was the reason one of his teachers had targeted him. He thought her negative attention might have been because he was from California and different from the other students in the class, all of whom were from North Carolina.

We talked about my interpretation and his, but my notes from the interview reflect a brief and tidy exchange. The absence of conversation with other students and the tidiness of my conversation with Tony made me feel like I was inviting approval rather than dialoguing about analytical representation. In contrast to the conversations we had been having across two years, the ones that included member checking felt staged. It was as if the students and I had returned to respective roles of researcher and participant as they had been upon our first meeting. The conversations felt technical.

In retrospect, I am not sure the exchanges could have been otherwise. Although I felt relieved each time I heard agreement after the student read a representation, sharing them made me feel like I was handing back a paper and asking the student if he or she agree with the grade. Conversations that felt like they had flowed easily for months now quieted in ebbs in unfamiliar territory.

From the little the students shared, I knew that some of them were surprised they had shared as much as they did. I wanted to give them time to process, so after encouraging their comments and feedback, when comments were not shared, I moved from engaging the representation to open-ended questions about how things were going. In those moments, I was comforted when talk about what I had produced was over and we returned to conversations about what the students thought about their classes, work, and other things that were on their minds. After each interview that included member checking, I left the facility feeling disoriented, wondering about the possibilities of my ability to enact this thing called “collaboration.” How could all of the other interviews feel like ongoing conversations and the one that involved member checking feel like only research procedure? After months of

dialogue and layered and complicated stories, I had anticipated layered and complicated exchanges about the analyses.

I came to understand that my frustration over the failure to dialogue around member checking was mine alone—an ethnographer's frustration. The students did not seem frustrated. Dutifully, they read the poems and analyses and answered what questions they could. In retrospect, I am aware that the literal object of representation, the text, was between us. For the first time in two years, an object centered our conversation. I had wanted the exchange of ideas to persist through analyses. I wanted this because it had been what I had known with the students, but I wanted it too because of what I thought it would mean if it were there—that I had worked against my authority, power, and privilege. But commitments to decolonial, feminist, and postcritical methodologies do not erase researcher authority or economic and racial privilege. Working against is a practice not an accomplishment. It was a lesson I had to learn again and again.

The practice of member checking demanded a reconceptualization of my notions of collaboration. Not only was there contrast between my methodological training and what was happening in practice but there was contrast, too, between the conversations I had during formal interviews and the ones I had during informal member checking. The participants' pace of engagement slowed considerably. Member checking allowed me to pursue a claim of accuracy in the representations of data—students had agreed with the representations—but the process of member checking, the conversations I had with students did not include an exchange of ideas.

Ultimately, I realized I produced through my research design the member checking that was. That is to say, I had used a semi-structured interview protocol that was a part of the larger evaluation study, which meant responses were framed a priori by the list of questions themselves. The students and I had not worked together as co-researchers to develop a research idea, nor had we created interview questions together that might invite the kinds of experiences they wanted to share. I had pursued questions, open-ended as they were, off an interview protocol. The protocol framed the study but in doing so limited the study. To the students' credit, they shared their lives with vulnerability and complexity in spite of the structure of a protocol. Although the in-depth interviews had dimensionality and felt to me like an interactive space (Ellis et al., 1997), the member checking of early analyses and representations of those analyses did not. My claim of collaboration disappeared.

Josh: I had been completing daily observations, informal and formal interviews and was already over a year of data collecting into my project when Gloria flipped my whole project on its head. I will always remember that grey, wet autumn afternoon. It was right as the kids were about to return from school, and I crossed paths with Gloria in the kitchen. Gloria, an African American woman, had been living at the facility for only a couple months, but we had a relationship that to me felt like we had known each other longer, and in greater depth. I think folks in social services who claim that their relationships are basically the same with all the people they serve are lying, a bad social worker, or both. Though the relationships are fundamentally different within a service relationship, people social workers meet in their professional settings are similar to those we meet in the personal contexts of our lives. Sometimes you meet someone, and it feels like you already know that person. Consequently, it is easier to relate to and understand that person. When you are working with people in a residential setting, where your workplace is their home, meaningful relationships develop and can develop fairly quickly. Gloria and I had built an open and honest relationship from the moment we met. She felt quite comfortable telling me how the program needed to be improved and when I or any other staff member or volunteer was doing a good job or a bad job, she demonstrated no hesitation in letting us know. I was not surprised that her honest

communication extended to the research I was doing. Indeed, she told me I was going in the wrong direction.

I stopped to talk to Gloria, to see how her day was going, and to ask if we could set up a time to do another interview. She said that it would be fine to interview again, but then, she asked me if “finally” we were going to get to the “real” issues. Surprised that what we had already talked about was not what she felt was “real,” I asked her to say more. She said she appreciated what I was trying to do, but that I was asking the wrong questions. She told me I was defining education and schooling in a way that made it impossible for her to answer my questions. We were speaking two different languages, without the help of a translator. Gloria informed me that my goal, as I had constructed it, was flawed. My goal was predicated on an understanding, construction, and definition of education and schooling that my participants simply did not share. If I continued to pursue these understandings in the manner in which I was engaged, the understandings I thought would answer my questions would not at all. Simply put, I could not achieve the goal of my project—to understand the roles education played in the lives of the families at Phoenix House—by pursuing the line of inquiry I had been heading down.

Gloria shared that when I spoke of education and schooling I did so in a manner that was fundamentally different than hers. This, she informed me, was true for my other participants as well. Though I had designed against it, in practice, I was engaged in a project with a taken-for-granted meaning of schooling and education. I had asked questions about what education and schooling meant to the participants, but I had been doing so in ways that assumed too much about how I thought they would respond. I allowed the participants some degree of an ability to shape what education and schooling meant, but I did so in a manner that was wrought with fundamental assumptions that Gloria and the rest of my participants did not share. Gloria told me that I was asking the wrong questions and pursuing the wrong goals. She informed me I was not giving history enough weight, neither in a broad sense nor in the individual and shared lived experiences of the participants. In short, Gloria was calling me out for not being nearly reflective enough of how my own schooling experiences as a middle-class white man were shaping how I was proceeding with the project. I was the quintessential white person with good intentions (Thompson, 2003), believing that my intentions were enough. Gloria showed me where I was blind in the research, how my own positionality was not just framing my understandings but bounding them at the expense of her and others’ contrasting experiences with education as a system. I was not paying enough attention to what living through segregation, desegregation and white resistance, and resegregation had been like for African American communities. I was talking about and treating school desegregation, something Gloria lived barely 20 years prior, as something to read and watch films about. I had been sharing how much I valued collaboration and shared decision making, while blind to how my understandings of historical context kept history at a distance. I was making all the decisions and they were the wrong ones. Gloria could see this, and while she did not see it as her role to be my teacher, she was not going to just let me continue.

More than the critique of the specificity of my goals, I remember Gloria telling me how these misunderstandings could have all been avoided if I had I collaborated with her and the other participants from the outset. She was proposing a more collaborative model, one that I had thought I was pursuing but realized I was not. It was only through this conversation that turned into informal member checking that I learned I needed to redesign. Although I thought I had been collaborative in my interviews, even after a year of conversations, collaboration remained elusive.

Gloria explained that she knew I really wanted to gain an understanding of the roles education had played in the lives of the families at Phoenix House, and that it was because of the commitment she saw from me that she felt comfortable telling me about the errors I was

making. She knew I wanted to understand, and she knew she had the knowledge to help steer me in the right direction. Gloria's willingness to point out my lack of collaboration helped me redefine the scope of my work. And while I thought I was engaged in collaborative work, Gloria's comment that miscommunication could have been avoided had I simply included the participants' voices and experiences from the beginning taught me that naming collaboration through one's research design did not mean it would exist in practice. I had defined the terms of the research, both in how I had operationally defined school and education and in the larger sense in how I defined the terms under which my research would progress. I had not ceded a space for participants to help design and define how the research might proceed. Although there seemed to be evidence of mutual investment in conversations we had during interviews, what was shared was not, Gloria informed me, what I wanted to know. My design had not included participants as co-researchers, nor did I code and construct representations with participants. We discussed different representations and analyses but never at length. Not having participants as co-researchers is not inherently bad, but neither is it collaborative.

Collaboration Aside

It was here in the life of our projects that we both realized that the idea of collaboration had been as seductive in our imaginations as it had been elusive in practice. We "invade everyday life and use people's lives to render interpretations and critiques important to the *ethnographer's world*" (p. 1, italics original), Noblit (1999) wrote. Our research designs were about us as researchers, and the processes of formal and informal member checking reminded both of us of the centrality of our training and authority as researcher amongst our identities (Noblit, 2004).

Although collaboration remained an elegant moral goal in our fieldwork and to some degree pacified concerns for us as privileged, white ethnographers working with participants who were targeted youth of Color and marginalized families of Color, such an aim was untranslatable in practice. Certainly, dialogue occurred, and an exchange of ideas took place, but collaboration was absent.

Authority can colonize and oppress and malign. Having participants remind us of our authority layered the feelings we had experienced during our interviews and forced us to remember that we were indeed invading "everyday life" and using "people's lives to render interpretations and critiques important to *our worlds*" (Noblit, 1999). In our research designs we had named collaboration as an aim long before we even began our work. Notably, when we realized its absence in our processes, we could not help but wonder why participants stayed engaged. Certainly, we had evidence that the students and families had accepted our invitations to vulnerability, but in light of our collaboration-less work, we did not understand why. And so, deep into our projects we stopped to check and see if participants wanted their stories shared and to ask them why they talked to us.

Why Participants Share, Where Participants Led

In this section we represent the methodological responses we took in trying to figure out why participants continued to work with us as researchers when we had failed to create collaborative spaces across the research process. In our conversations together, Josh and I shared our disappointment in ourselves in our practice of research and our disappointment that collaboration had remained elusive. We wondered why, given collaboration's absence, participants still worked with us. Learning why participants did was powerful.

We decided to revisit our original data (observations, interviews, and field journals) and code for reasons participants had given us about why they participated in each of our

projects. The question we asked as we returned to our original data sets was “Why did participants participate in this project?” We coded in vivo across our respective projects and then completed a round of pattern coding; we generated “a willingness to help” as a pattern (Saldaña, 2013). After analyzing data across each project “a willingness to help” became the theme, “Sharing to Help.” Although each of the three subthemes is identifiable in the data, at times the forms of helping dovetailed into one another. Participants described “a desire to help,” because (1) a “story told” might “benefit” someone else; (2) participants wanted to challenge stereotypes about people of Color, people in prison, and people in transitional housing; and (3) participants believed in our “concern” and “care” about what it was we were trying to understand. It is important for us to note here that even with commitments to understanding, understanding is always limited, partial, and positional (Noblit, Flores, & Murillo, 2004). Consequently, following where participants lead becomes paramount.

A Theme: Sharing to Help.

Most of the students who were incarcerated wanted their story shared and a few wanted their story shared with children and adolescents in particular. When I (Allison) asked, “You know I think your story is important, but what do you think about your story?” True, an African American student, responded:

(My story) is important. It’s important that you’re asking the questions. I know, I realize that my story’s important. You guys got some pretty good questions, really good questions, you know, because I mean maybe you never know who it could help and that’s why I’m here. That’s why I’m here. Maybe that whatever it is you write, whatever it is I say, could maybe help somebody else. That’s why I talk to you when you come and talk. Hopefully, it’s gonna benefit somebody if that’s one person, somebody, hopefully, they won’t come this way. Or you know they’re here for a small amount of time, and they don’t want to come back, and they can see that education is needed . . . when they’re young. (Anders 1, 2007, p. 183)

True was explicit in his hopes that telling his story might “benefit somebody.” “You never know who it could help, and that’s why I’m here,” he shared. “Maybe that whatever it is you write, whatever it is I say, could maybe help somebody else. That’s why I talk to you when you come and talk.” In the arc of our interviews about school growing up and school in prison, True offered his life as a lesson to his imagined audience (Anderson, 1991), hoping that his experiences might shine light on a different path.

This idea of educating through stories and an explicit desire to prevent others from making similar mistakes was shared by Ladybug, too. Ladybug, a Caucasian student, said: “If I can learn from [my incarceration] and help one other person and some of the choices they may be making, it’s worth it to me” (Anders 1, 2007, p. 161).

True’s and Ladybug’s positions were echoed by Gloria, an African American woman and resident of Phoenix House.

My story needs to be told. If telling my story helps anyone, in any shape or form, then it needs to be told. If someone can learn and feel better or feel not alone in their situation, then by all means, write about it. If anyone can learn from the happenings in my life. . .then what I’ve lived through is worth it. (Diem, 2004, p. 5)

Ladybug and Gloria both stated that someone else benefiting from their story made the lived experiences they had endured “worth” surviving.

Valerie, another resident from Phoenix House, and Tony, a Chicano student, expressed similar aims in sharing their stories. Each offered us “insights” so that we as researchers could begin to understand what they had experienced. Both Valerie and Tony sought to challenge stereotypes, too. Valerie explained:

My story needs to be told so people know what it’s like for me, and the other people like me. ‘Cause, and I know you know this, there are a lot of us. People need to know this, know how we fight and struggle. Know that we ain’t just lazy, living off welfare cause we don’t want to work. They need to know how I got here, why I’m where I’m at. And what I’m doing to get up on outta here and be in a better place. (Diem, Fieldnotes, Winter 2003)

Valerie wanted people to know the “fight and struggle” and context of her experiences. Critiquing the stereotype that individuals who utilize social service programs do not want to work, she explained people need to know how and why she was at Phoenix House and that she was making plans to transition.

Tony, a Chicano student, explained that he was trying to teach me (Allison) how to challenge racial stereotypes about who becomes incarcerated.

I’m trying to give you insight from how we look at life from in (prison). I’ve been through a lot of experiences status wise. I know what Black people, Mexican, whites (are) trying to express, some of their feelings as well. I know some smart people in here and artists. Some people in here speak two or three different languages (Anders, 2007, p. 183).

Tony shared that he did not know he was “smart” until he went to prison. When his teachers told him that he was valedictorian of his general equivalency exam (GED) class, at first, he thought “it was a joke.” He explained that in his graduation speech he wanted to inspire his fellow graduates and challenge the stereotype that people in prison were “just trouble makers.”

There’s only so many Hispanic guys here. I wanted to make like a statement letting people know that you know, just cause we Hispanic and some of us don’t speak English doesn’t mean that we grow up and are not smart, that we’re stupid. It’s that, “Don’t look at us that way,” kinda thing. So, I was trying to show em, you know we’re not here to just to fill in the profile that we’re just trouble makers (Anders, 2007, p. 114).

Tony sought to uplift his classmates and deconstruct racist stereotypes in his speech. “This shows that we can accomplish things even though we’re in here,” Tony declared in his speech. You have to let “people know that,” he said. “Some of ‘em have kids, ‘like you gotta do this for your kids, not for yourself anymore. It’s for them. You don’t want them to go through what we going through.”

Near the end of his first interview, Michael, a Caucasian student, said that he could see that I (Allison) was concerned about what happens to students in school. “You [Allison] really have a concern about what’s going on,” he said, “whatever your purpose is. You can tell people don’t. You have a small percentage of people who care” (Anders, Fieldnotes, Spring, 2006). Similarly, Gloria noted that she knew Josh cared. She emphasized the duration of her relationship with Josh and his interactions with children at Phoenix House.

I don't know what it is. It's trust, but it's more than that. I don't know the word for it exactly. I don't know why I feel like I can tell you so much of my life. Others have asked, and I haven't told them as much. I just like you. I like the person that you are. I've known you for a long time now. It doesn't come in one day. . . .I've seen how you talk to my child, the other children. I've seen how you are with us. Sometimes you just know. I don't know why it is that I feel this way. And as far as being as being a white man, I don't know why it is that I feel like I can tell you things when I can't tell other people who might look more like me. I know you've never lived in our shoes and probably, hopefully, never will have to. But I just like the person you are. I know you care. (Diem, 2004, p. 4)

Knowing that Josh cared and assessing his interactions over time informed Gloria's judgment of him and subsequently, her willingness to share her experiences with him.

We would be remiss if we did not complicate the idea of "a willingness to help." Travieso's sentiments reveal his interest in having his story shared but also his investment in privacy.

Although Travieso thought that "everybody, especially children" should hear his story, when I asked him how he would describe to a friend the time he spent talking with me, he said that he wouldn't. When I asked him what he would say if a friend asked him what we talked about he said, "nothing . . . people don't need to know your business, you know what I'm saying?" (Anders, 2007, p. 184)

It is important to note that letting go of the claim of collaboration and waiting for confirmation from participants that they wanted their stories shared was difficult. But we were prepared to walk away from our projects, or particular narratives, if participants decided they did not want their stories shared. We believe that the communication we had with participants provided us with opportunities to keep learning from them. Participants were our most instructive teachers about the everyday practice of qualitative research. Participants taught us to reflect more deeply on what research design means in practice.

Closing Thoughts

We want to address some of the limitations in our work and offer some connections between what we learned through the process of reflecting on our practice and ideas about ethical qualitative research. This article is a retrospective narrative account about our respective journeys into our first qualitative research projects. As such, our coding and analysis was bounded by the data we had already collected. No longer in communication with participants, we could not probe further about their reasons for participating in our respective projects. Their responses are limited to what they shared with us during the life of each project. Future iterations of similar research would include more detailed analyses and representations of participants' perspectives.

Additionally, the perspectives that are offered here should not be generalized to other participants' reasoning for their participation in research projects. We represent this data as work in the particular (Abu-Lughod, 1991), reflective only of our specific research encounters. We recognize that myriad reasons exist for participation in research projects.

Although none of the participants were co-researchers, they participated generously, courageously, and instructively, wanting to help us as researchers and through us to the imagined communities who might hear their stories (Anderson, 1991). Graciously, they helped us get out of our own way and led us through our projects even when we bound their participation. Learning to follow where they led was one of the most important lessons. Letting go of what we thought member checking ought to generate—a confirmation of our ideas and representations—allowed us to follow where participants led. In that following we learned to ask new questions, which in turn generated new understandings of participant participation, our research process and our authority as researchers. Although we continue to work against ourselves (Noblit, 1999) in all our qualitative projects, we relinquish hopes and claims of particular methodologies mediating our authority, power, economic and racial privilege. Ultimately, participants decide how they experience us as ethnographers regardless of any commitments we might have. They decide what they will and will not share, even when they might not know why they share in the ways that they do. As Gloria shared, she did not know why she felt she could tell Josh things when she couldn't "tell other people who might look more like [her]." We highlight the honest communication Gloria and Josh established.

In addition to candid feedback from participants, we believe that working to stay present and reflect on the research process throughout the life of our projects allowed us to take what became next steps. The significance of being flexible cannot be underscored enough. One lesson that participants taught us was the importance of being open and responsive to the unexpected in the practice of research and willing to change course when necessary. Qualitative methodologists have argued that ethical practices must include ongoing communication and member checking with participants (Lassiter, 2005; Madison, 2012). Although the importance of recursive engagement with participants has been noted in the literature, the practice of changing course as a consequence of such engagement needs equal attention. Qualitative researchers are rewarded for their preparation, and internal review boards require preparation and descriptions of anticipated findings, but what we found in practice was that our interview protocols bound us too tightly to our own notions of what it was we thought we might learn about education and limited what we were able to hear from our participants. Letting go of the rigidity of process and design, and relinquishing claims of collaboration and our own needs to lead allowed us to examine tacit assumptions about how to invite the telling of educational narratives and what member checking ought to look like. In Josh's project learning to follow where his participants led was possible because he had established respectful, honest communication with participants. Ellis (2007) argued that relational ethics means affirming the human dignity of participants and focusing on the importance of connectedness between the researcher and participants. Participants' recognition of our concern and care was one explanation they offered for their participation.

We still find the elements of collaboration that initially attracted us to the idea of collaboration appealing. However, we recommend whenever possible that researchers interrogate their own aims, definitions, and pursuit of collaboration in practice and ask participants how they would describe their participation in their project. Finally, given what we learned from and with our participants, we suggest withholding the claim of collaboration in a project until its arbitrarily designated end point.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R. G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (pp. 137-154). Santa Fe, NM: School of the American Research Press.
- Adichie, C. N. (2009). *The danger of a single story*. The Sapling Foundation. TED Conferences, LLC. [Video Recording]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story.
- Anders, A. D. (2007) Revisiting the Panopticon: educational narratives from incarcerated youth. *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, NC, UMI No. 3257541
- Anders, A. (2012). Lessons from a postcritical ethnography, Burundian children with refugee status, and their teachers. *Theory into Practice*, 51(2), 99-106.
- Anders, A. D. & Lester, J. N. (2015). Lessons from interdisciplinary qualitative research: Learning to work against a single story. *Qualitative Research*, 15(6), 738-754
- Anders, A. D. & Noblit, G. W. (2011). Understanding effective higher education programs in prisons: Considerations from the incarcerated individuals program in North Carolina. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 62(2), 77-93.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso.
- Aretxaga, B. (1997). *Shattering silence: Women, nationalism, and political subjectivity in Northern Ireland*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Behar, R. (1991). Death and memory: From Santa María del Monte to Miami Beach. *Cultural Anthropology*, 6(3), 346-384.
- Behar, R. (1996). Introduction: Out of exile. In R. Behar & D. A. Gordon (Eds.), *Women writing culture* (pp. 1-32). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bernal, D. D. (1998). Using a Chicana feminist epistemology in educational research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(4), 555-582.
- Bhavani, K. (1992). Talking racism and editing women's studies. In D. Richardson & V. Robinson (Eds.), *Thinking feminist* (pp. 27-48). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Brayboy, B. M., & Deyhle, D. (2000). Insider-outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 163-169.
- Clifford, J. (1986). On ethnographic allegory. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 98-140). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. In K. Bartlett & R. Kennedy (Eds.), *Feminist legal theory: Readings in law and gender* (pp. 57-80). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In M. A. Fineman & R. Mykitiuk (Eds.), *The public nature of private violence* (pp. 93-118). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dávila, L. T. (2014) Representing refugee youth in qualitative research: Questions of ethics, language and authenticity. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 8(1), 21-31.
- Denzin, N. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diem, J. D. (2004). Unheard voices: a relational ethnography of homeless mothers and education. *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, NC, UMI

- No. 3140304.
- Dirks, N. B. (2001). *Castes of mind: Colonialism and the making of modern India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dixson, A. D. (2006). The fire this time: Jazz, research, and critical race theory. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song* (pp. 231-230). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3-29.
- Ellis, C., Kiesinger, C. E., & Tillmann-Healey, L. M. (1997) Interactive interviewing: talking about emotional experience. In R. Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity and voice* (pp. 119-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York, NY: Teachers College.
- Farmer, P. (2005). *Pathologies of power: Health, human rights, and the new war on the poor*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Fine, M. (1994) Working the hyphens: Reinventing the self and other in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70-82). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Finley, S., & Barton, A. (2003). The power of space: Constructing a dialogue of resistance, transformation, and homelessness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 483-487.
- Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53(3), 257-293.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goodall, H. L. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Guillemín, M. & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261-280.
- Habermas, J. (1988). *Theory and practice*. (J. Viertel, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3) 575-599.
- Juhasz, A. (2004). Victim stories: Documenting pain, punishment, prison and power. In A. Sarat and P. Ewick (Eds.), *Punishment politics, and culture* (pp. 247-260). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the indigene-colonizer hyphen. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krog, A., Mpolweni-Zantsi, & Ratele, K. (2008). The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC): Ways of knowing Mrs. Konile. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L.T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuntz, A. M. (2010). Representing representation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(4), 423-433.
- Lamphere, L., Ragoné, H., & Zavella, P. (1997). Introduction. In L. Lamphere, H. Ragoné & P. Zavella (Eds.), *Situated lives: Gender and culture in everyday life* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Lassiter, L. E. (2005). Collaborative ethnography and public anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 46(1) 83-106.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). Anthropology: Its achievements and future. *Current Anthropology*, 7(2), 124-127.
- Lewis, D. (1973). Anthropology and colonialism. *Current Anthropology*, 14(5), 581-602.
- Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Murillo Jr., E. G. (2004). Majado crossing along neoliberal borderlands. In G. W. Noblit, S. Y. Flores, & E. G. Murillo, Jr. (Eds.). *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique* (155-179). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Noblit, G. W. (1999). *Particularities: Collected essays on ethnography and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Noblit, G. W. (2004). Storytelling as ethnographic representation. In G. W. Noblit, S. Y. Flores, & E. G. Murillo, Jr. (Eds.), *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique* (pp. 307-317). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Noblit, G. W., Flores, S. Y., Murillo, E. Jr. (2004). Introduction. In G. W. Noblit, S. Y. Flores, & E. G. Murillo, Jr. (Eds.), *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique* (pp. 1-52). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Oakley, A. (2003). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In Y. Lincoln & N. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 469-486). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Pickering, L., & Kara, H. (2017). Presenting and representing others: Towards an ethics of engagement. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 20(3), 299-309.
- Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196.
- Rallis, S. F. (2010) "That is NOT what's happening at Horizon!": Ethics and misrepresenting knowledge in text. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(4), 435-448.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Savage, M. (2003). Can ethnographic narrative be a neighborly act? In Y. Lincoln & N. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 331-350). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Stacey, J. (1988). Can there be a feminist ethnography? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11(1) 21-27.
- Swadener, B. B., & Mutua, K. (2008). Decolonizing performances: Deconstructing the global postcolonial. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(1), 7-29.
- Urrieta, L. (2009). *Working from within: Chicana and Chicano activist educators in whitestream schools*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. New York, NY: SUNY.
- Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized Chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 711-731.

- Viswesvaran, (2003). Defining feminist ethnography. In Y. Lincoln & N. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 73-94). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21 1-19.
- Willinsky, J. (1988). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Author Note

Allison Daniel Anders is an Assistant Professor in Educational Foundations and Inquiry, and Qualitative Research at the University of South Carolina. She studies the everyday experiences of targeted youth, contexts of education, and qualitative methodologies. She teaches courses in foundations of education, sociology of education, critical race theory, and qualitative research methodologies. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: anders@sc.edu.

Josh D. Diem is an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Work at Rhode Island College. He teaches courses in social welfare policy, structural inequality, and research methods. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: joshdiem@gmail.com.

Copyright 2018: Allison Daniel Anders, Joshua D. Diem, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Anders, A. D., & Diem, J. D. (2018). Un-naming collaboration: An unexpected catalyst for understanding participation in critical ethnography. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(10), 2294-2312. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss10/5>
