

Exploring Our Perceptions of Key Events in a Qualitative Research Class:  
Applying Principles of Collaborative Analytic Autoethnography in Practice

Janet C. Richards, Ph. D.  
Professor  
Department of Teaching and Learning  
College of Education  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, FL 33620  
E-mail: JRichards@usf.edu

and

Steven Haberlin, M. Ed.  
Doctoral Student  
Department of Teaching and Learning  
College of Education  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, FL 33620  
E-mail: stevehaberlin@yahoo.com

## Abstract

Little research portrays the emerging form of collaborative analytic autoethnography in practice. Drawing on our dual lenses, we, a professor and a doctoral student in an advanced qualitative methods course, applied principles of collaborative analytic autoethnography to construct new understandings about key events that occurred during advanced qualitative research class. Using asynchronous e-mail communication, we shared, affirmed, and questioned each other's and our own storied recollections of moments of joy and learning intertwined with some challenging issues. To begin our inquiry, we planned and negotiated our responsibilities, voiced our concerns and questions pertinent to the project, and avowed our willingness to risk emotional vulnerability and discomfort as we confronted our truths. We also studied the extant literature to learn as much as we could about the emerging genre of analytic autoethnography. In the second phase of our work we documented what we believed were significant moments in the course and responded to each other's and our own assumptions. Our reflections helped establish the value of collaborative analytic autoethnography to create space for self-study. In keeping with tenets of analytic autoethnography, philosophically we had reservations generalizing our discoveries to broader social phenomena,

**Key Words:** Collaborative Analytic Autoethnography, Key Events, Meaning-Making, Qualitative Methods Course

**Note:** All student names are pseudonyms.

Exploring Perceptions of Key Events in a Qualitative Research Class:  
Applying Principles of Analytic Collaborative Autoethnography in Practice

*“Truth is not to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 110)*

*Collaborative autoethnography is “engaging in the study of self, collectively; it is a process and product of an ensemble of performance, not a solo act” (Chang, Ngunjiri, & Hernandez, 2013, p. 11)*

*“In recent years, ‘analytic autoethnography’ has been proposed as an alternative to traditional ‘evocative autoethnography’ for researchers who want to practice autoethnography within a realist or analytic tradition. However, questions remain about how this alternative method should be applied in practice” (Pace, 2012, p. 1)*

### **Overview**

We are a professor of an advanced qualitative research course (Janet) and a doctoral student in the class (Steve). In this paper we describe how we employed principles of analytic collaborative autoethnography and asynchronous e-mail communication to respond to each other's and our own recollections of key events that occurred throughout the semester. Typically, those who write autoethnographies piece together their impressions of significant happenings using hindsight (Brunner, 1993; Denzin, 1989; Freeman, 2004). “Looking back on experiences enables one to “recall, consider, and reconsider one's thoughts” (Rubenstein-Avila & Maranzana, 2015, p. 245) (also see Hickson, 2011). Accordingly, our collaboration took place immediately after the semester ended when our impressions of events remained vivid.

### **Inviting A Fellow Traveler to Join the Inquiry**

Knowing “autoethnography is a knowledge-building process” (Geist-Martin, Gates, Wiering, et al, 2010, p. 4), as the professor of the class, I (Janet) was committed to reflexively uncovering and considering key events in the class that were sometimes troubling and periodically uplifting to me. I considered this venture as a type of self-study. But, I needed a way of seeing beyond my own views- a sounding board –another voice and fellow traveler – some “other” to help me in my journey of coming to know. Therefore, I invited Steve to engage with me in the research to provide insights only available through collaboration. A number of reasons prompted me to ask him to join me in the study. I knew Steve well. He was a doctoral student in two of my qualitative courses. He was keenly interested in research, had good observation skills, and regularly e-mailed me his impressions of significant moments in the advanced qualitative class. I recognized we would make good partners and I trusted his insights. We also have similar writing styles. We write to see what happens, to come to know, to discover, rather than plan out everything ahead of time. And, we trust ourselves to find our way in our writing journey. Equally important, Steve had his own concerns about course events to untangle and sort out.

### **Why Analytic Autoethnography?**

Scholars characterize autoethnography along a continuum. For example, at the emotive end of the spectrum, evocative autoethnographers bridge the gap between the aesthetic and biography. They write stories about highly emotional personal experiences, such as loss and pain that “move the reader to feel the feelings of the other” (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 744).

Falling on the analytic side of the autoethnographic scale, other researchers engage in a more traditional style of autoethnography useful for purposeful analysis of events (Ngunjiri, Hernandez & Chang, 2010). Our aim was to explore, and make sense of our perceptions of significant incidents in a qualitative research class. Therefore, considering our research as a type of self-study, we deemed it appropriate to turn to a more traditional form of self-reflection and writing. “There are many ways analysis via self-study may be accomplished and the term analytic autoethnography applies to all such possibilities” (Anderson, 2006, p. 406). Consequently, following principles of analytic autoethnography, we participated in critical reflection, presented philosophical perspectives to support our inquiry, and reflexively dialogued with each other. However, when we came to the last step in our journey, we made a decision to forgo what Anderson (2006) recommends as the finale in analytic autoethnography. In keeping with our postmodern philosophical orientations, we considered it inappropriate to develop and present theoretical understandings of our discoveries and understandings to broader social phenomena. Along with Ellis and Bochner (2006), we have difficulties making positivist statements about the world, or producing theory from any form of autoethnography. Adhering to Bochner and Ellis’s (2006) claim, we believe there are many truths and consequently we want to “encourage multiple perspectives, unsettled meanings, and plural voices” (p. 438). Thus, we cannot reach conclusions “about the human condition or something that holds true for all people at all time” (p. 438).

### **Writing as Inquiry**

Throughout our journey of self in relationship with each other we were mindful of Richardson and St. Pierre’s (2005) powerful view of “writing as inquiry.” Writing and

talking about our writing with each other forced us to make our thinking transparent and exposed our socially constructed beliefs and values as they applied to our realities.

Writing also allowed us to confront our vulnerabilities by reconsidering and questioning our personal perspectives about the moments and dynamics we considered important in the class (see Adams, Holman Jones, & Norris et al., 2015; 2013; Sawyer & Norris, 2004). Interpreted through Deleuze and Guattari's (2004) notions of rhizomes (i.e., a continually growing root system), our writing partnership helped us consider fresh viewpoints and opened up new entry points concerning our perceptions and beliefs (Boghossian, 2016). Consequently, as we wrote we gained insights that served as a vantage point heuristic to help us understand each other and ourselves.

### **Taking First Steps**

We began our inquiry by writing back and forth to each other in an effort to collect our thoughts about our research efforts, delineate responsibilities, and discuss issues of concern.

**Janet:** Those who engage in collaborative autoethnography speak about the importance of finding “the right fellow traveler” (Chang et al., 2013). Steve, I know you and I will be great fellow travelers. We're both captivated by qualitative research and we're avid writers with similar writing behaviors. We already have a good working relationship - you as my student and I as your professor in two qualitative research classes. And we both want to revisit and make sense of some events that took place in the advanced qualitative class. But, we still need to make sure we know “the rules” of collaborative inquiry, and apply these ideas to our study. Gershon (2009) states, “It is... somewhat surprising that with a few notable exceptions... almost all qualitative studies have tended not to make

explicit... the ways in which co-authors work together” (p. xviii). Let’s heed what Gershon says. Without a doubt our separate realities and interpretations of events may vary. So, as a first step, we need to consider and make explicit how we will react if one of us challenges the other’s interpretations of events.

**Steve:** I agree we’ll work well together because we already have formed a good relationship this past year in two qualitative classes. To tell the truth, I don’t know how we’ll work out any differences we may have until we have to work out our differences. But, I’m not concerned about challenging each other. I have confidence we can work things out. Yet, we do need to find out more info about this method of inquiry. I want to read more collaborative autoethnographies-learn from those who have traveled this road before us. For instance, Martinez and Andreatta (2015) offer some good points in their collaborative autoethnography. They wrote separate autoethnographies, read each other’s stories, asked questions, and honestly answered those questions. We don’t plan to structure our inquiry in that way, but I have confidence we’ll be honest.

**Janet:** I like the part you wrote about honesty- honesty as we each know it according to our perceptions of the world. Now, as Gershon (2009) advises, I want to share some more questions and concerns I have prior to beginning our collaboration. How much should we/can we each reveal about ourselves to each other? Does being honest mean telling all? For example, Ellis (2007) cautioned two students who contributed to her autoethnography to not share anything they would later regret “because they might be concerned about how... their professor, saw them” (p. 20). Yet, I think we have to reveal a considerable amount about our beliefs and perceptions to ensure this inquiry is honest and trustworthy.

However, being honest might impact our emotional vulnerability. We've got to be aware of vulnerability and still speak the truth. It's an act of faith.

Another big issue we've got to figure out is how we can disclose what we each perceive as key events in the class when significant moments, in all probability, will often involve students in the class. Ethically my concern is the involuntary participation of study participants. Ellis (2007) describes this dilemma as "situational ethics" arising from moments in the field that require researchers to act from their hearts and minds and acknowledge their interpersonal bonds to others" (p. 4). It is almost inevitable students will be "implicated in our stories" (Chang et al., 2013, p. 13). If and when that happens we have to delete all mention of events tied to these students, or we need to get students' permission to involve them in our inquiry. Perhaps we might use pseudonyms. That might work. We don't need to submit an Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol because the IRB doesn't consider autoethnography as research since it doesn't involve collecting data from "outside" study participants.

I also have a concern that makes me think of the post-structuralist, Foucault. Foucault (1980) argues power **is** relationships - meaning power determines relationships at any given time. Whether we consciously admit this or not, as the instructor of the course I am the one perceived to have more power than you since you are a student. Because of power differentials, I might dominate the inquiry and repress your voice. I worry you will keep silent about how I, as the professor of the course, might have contributed to some of the low points and challenges in the semester. Please don't think you'll hurt my feelings if you speak the truth as you see it. One last comment: Might the blending of our separate

voices be misread as a narcissistic, navel gazing partnership? How do we guard against self-absorbed solipsism?

**Steve:** I, too, am concerned about the involuntary inclusion of students in the class. Yet, how do we give detailed accounts of key events without implicating them in the process? Perhaps Johnson's (1982) advice on "ethical proofreading" can help. Prior to publishing qualitative research, she suggests reviewing the article's language to ensure it is descriptive as opposed to judgmental, providing context for unflattering descriptions, and asking some of the participants to read the manuscript to check for accuracy and provide feedback. Regardless, if we do think we've "implicated" students through our research, I concur we must seek permission from those students to use these data. One of the positives of a collaboration is we have each other to crosscheck these ethical decisions.

Of course, power does play a part in this collaboration. I will do my best to be truthful with my reflections. Though, I must admit I worry slightly about having my voice repressed in this process. As we move along in the piece will my "writing voice" be suppressed, or molded to fit your writing style, or preference? But, power, as Foucault (1980) argued, is not simply a negative or repressive thing that makes us do things against our wishes. Power can serve as a productive, positive force. In our writing collaboration, the power you possess as my professor will probably entice me to work harder, write better, improve my skills and push me out of my comfort zone---and I believe this process has already begun. And, I think our best defense against solipsism is to make sense of our individual and collective narratives but also help provide meaning, depth, and value for others who might read this work.

**Moving Forward On the Journey: Studying The Extant Literature**

Once we figured out our responsibilities and made a pact to be honest, even if honesty caused us discomfort, our next step was to determine how we might proceed. Therefore, we carefully studied the extant literature. Since there is “little information about what analytic autoethnography looks like” (Ellis & Bochner, 2006, p. 432), our mission was to learn as much as we could about a methodology in which researchers engage in the study of self in relationship to a community to which they belong(ed). We read Caroline Ellis’ writings on evocative autoethnography (2004, 2007, 2009, 2015) and Bochner and Ellis’ *Communication as autoethnography* (2006). In addition, we studied Laurel Richardson’s (1994) and Norman Denzin’s work (1997), and chapters in Holman Jones, Adams & Ellis’s *Handbook of autoethnography* (2013) that briefly mentions and minimally describes analytic autoethnography. We also examined Chang, Ngunjiri, and Hernandez (2013) informative text, *Collaborative autoethnography* in which they offer tantalizingly tidbits about the type of analytic inquiry we had in mind.

During this learning process we discovered much ambiguity surrounds the term “collaborative autoethnography.” For example, Chang et al. (2013) note there are methodological variations of analytic collaborative autoethnography, such as co-ethnography, community autoethnography, collective autoethnography, and duoethnography. Moreover, qualitative scholars continue to develop different titles for their approaches. A case in point is, the work of Martinez and Andreatta (2015) who retitled their duoethnographic work, “*dialogued collaborative autoethnography*” after concluding they employed a new writing dynamic.

Similarly, when defining duoethnography, Chang et al. (2013) default to Sawyer and Norris’ (2009) explanation - “[T]wo or more researchers work in tandem to dialogically

critique and question the meanings they give to issues and constructs. Examining personal artifacts, stories, memories, compositions, texts and critical incidents, duoethnographers excavate the temporal, social, cultural and geographical cartography of their lives, making explicit their assumptions and perspectives” (p. 127). However, since Chang et al. (2013) are almost always cited as the sole, seminal work by collaborative autoethnographers (see Martinez & Andreatta, 2015), it is difficult to ascertain other perspectives to formulate a complete, satisfying definition.

When we came across Leon Anderson’s (2006) article entitled “Analytic Autoethnography”, we recognized his ideas characterized our inquiry as we envisioned it. We were full members of the research community and planned to be visible in the study. We also intended to engage in critical reflexivity that would lead us to deeper levels of analysis and meaning making (see Chang et al., 2013). Our only philosophical concern was the final step proposed by Anderson (2006) - linking what we discovered about ourselves and others to wider cultural, political, and social concerns (see Adams, et al, 2015; Anderson, 2006; Chang et al., 2013).

Our readings also helped us recognize that two theoretical perspectives particularly situated and supported our inquiry: 1) interdisciplinary symbolic interactionism with postmodern propensities (Bochner & Ellis, 2001); and, 2) the discipline of phenomenology that in part studies individual’s lived experiences (i.e., phenomena) from a first-person point of view (Bayne & Montague, 2011; Moran, 2000). In the following section we briefly describe these philosophical approaches and connect their ideas to our research.

### **Symbolic Interactionism**

Introduced by George Herbert Mead in the 1920s, symbolic interactionism asserts that human beings act in a manner that matches their interpretation of the meaning of their world. As individuals interact within their social context, they generate meaning in relationship to what they experienced (Carlson, 2013; Reynolds, 2003). Succinctly stated, the meaning people make of things emerges from social interaction with others. Symbolic interaction theory addresses the subjective meanings people impose on objects, events, and behaviors. Subjective meanings are significant because it is believed people behave based according to what they believe and not just on what is objectively true. These meanings are addressed and modified through an interpretive process. In particular, symbolic interactionism offers a pivotal assumption that embodies collaborative autoethnography - the importance of social interaction.

### **Phenomenology**

Based on Husserl's (1982) phenomenological philosophy, phenomenology emphasizes the meaning people make of their lived experiences and strives to understand their perceptions of lived experiences (Bartholomew, Gundel, Kantamneni, 2015). Calling it "descriptive psychology", Husserl positioned phenomenological work as a systematic study of the content of one's experiences (Kaufer & Chemero, 2015). Exemplary phenomenological researchers possess open, curious minds that blend meaning of experience, psychology, and the content of study participants' conscious expressions (Bartholomew, Gundel, Kantamneni, 2015; Finlay, 2014;). As Finlay (2014) sees it, the challenge for researchers is to go beyond what they already think they know, and "remain open to new understandings" (p. 122). In essence, researchers must "bracket" aside their habitual understanding. In this way, researchers develop a persona

of openness, a capacity to be surprised and aware of unexpected and unpredictable phenomena (Dahlberg, Dahlberg & Nystrom, 2008). Consequently, rather than entering our relationship with preconceived notions, as collaborative autoethnographers we must keep an open mind to what might emerge from our own reflections and individual and collective interpretations of the data.

### **Turning Inward: Studying Ourselves**

**Janet:** Now we've entered phase two of the inquiry Steve-what Deleuze and Guattari (2013) call a plateau, emphasizing that a plateau is always in the middle of what one is trying to accomplish. In this phase we study our perceptions of key events in the course. I'd like us to begin with the text I chose. My thinking was (and is) that I needed to make a radical shift and offer my advanced qualitative students some theoretical ideas beyond constant comparative methods to analyze data. I chose post structuralist theories because they also provide theory to support for one's research.

But, the post structuralist philosophies of Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, and the like, were difficult for me to understand unless I engaged in considerable repeated, close readings. I worried constantly that students hated this text and were sorry they had to purchase it because they could not get any meaning from it. Other than Samuel, the brilliant, young man who seemed to know everything about the post-structuralists, until mid-semester, students in our class struggled to comprehend each chapter. But by mid-semester, they included notions, and theories from the text in their mini authentic inquiries and by the end of the semester, all students inserted concepts from the text into their presentations. Regardless, I messed up because I did not offer sufficient guidance early in

the semester. Looking back, I expected students to read and understand the text on their own.

**Steve:** I certainly don't believe you "messed up." As Ifody (2013) notes, the idea of learning through experience can be described as the art of being present and the willingness to get in touch with our worlds. What would be worse is, as a professor of the class, you remained ignorant of the fact that students struggled and needed your help early in the semester--- or you dismissed the notion that students at the doctoral level even needed assistance, that they should be able to figure it out on their own. Rather, you are now in a position to take what you learned regarding the text and use it to better teach incoming students in your next advanced qualitative class. You wanted to keep students on the cutting edge of the field, and anytime you push the limits, you risk challenges and the inevitably learning curve.

**Janet:** Steve, remember, you can't hold back your thoughts. You did give me a different way of looking at my actions. But seriously, how did you feel about the text? Remember, we already discussed Foucault's ideas about power and relationships. You can and must be honest with me. We need to look deeply into ourselves to discover our inner most thoughts so we see where "those thoughts might take us, separately and together" (Wyatt, et al., 2011, p.134).

**Steve:** You're right. My biggest challenges during the course involved making sense of the Jackson & Mazzei (2012) text and comprehending the post structural theorists and figuring out how to implement this knowledge in research. But it's not because you didn't help us understand the ideas. When I first read the text, it felt like I was reading in a foreign language; the ideas were completely alien to me. The authors contend using the

theorists' ideas on power, gender, desire, and other concepts, one could graduate from traditional approaches to data analysis such as constant comparative methods and interpret the data through the lens of these philosophers to gain much richer meaning. The problem was that, as an emerging scholar, I was still gaining familiarity with constant comparative methods and not quite ready to embrace the "next best thing." Second, I was unfamiliar with the theorists in the text. Therefore, how could I analyze data through their eyes when I really didn't understand what they wanted me to see? After many close readings and class discussions, including one with an awesome guest lecturer you invited, --a professor who employed post-structural analysis in his work-- I began to grasp the concepts. I even used Derrida's(1978) ideas when scrutinizing data for my third mini-inquiry. By the last day of the course, I actually felt like I had a decent understanding of how to use post structuralist ideas in my work. I truly believe most everyone seemed much more comfortable with post structural ideas and how to use them. You pushed us out of our comfort zones and, though it was challenging and took time, learning took place. The final presentations showed a quantum leap in our thinking level/data analysis...what a difference from the start of the course.

**Janet:** OK- but I still think I could have done better. One comment- I don't consider post structuralism as "the next best thing." Rather, post structuralism is just one of a number of ways (along with constant comparative methods) to analyze data. For example, some scholars believe constant comparative methods do not tell the entire story of an inquiry because this data analysis approach looks for what is and ignores what is not (of course no inquiry can reveal the complete story). Anyway, I now use "post" theories and concepts when appropriate, to support ideas and statements I make in my

research. Now think about these questions. How might I have met Samuel's learning needs? What was the biggest issue you for you in the class? Did you hear other students' complaining about the text?

**Steve:** Your question regarding Samuel's learning needs made me smile and think of the elementary gifted students I teach. Like Samuel, they are far advanced intellectually, but must often "suffer" through the curriculum at the same pace as classmates; I think this is unfair. Samuel, and students like him, would benefit from the principles laid out by Cross (2015) in a student's Bill of Rights (gifted or otherwise). Among these rights, students need access to a rigorous, complex, and challenging curriculum and should be able to accelerate through the curriculum at an appropriate pace. In addition, they should have choices in what to study and how to pursue that learning. For Samuel, this might involve studying post structuralist theorists or theoretical frameworks with which he was unfamiliar or wanted to further explore for dissertation purposes. It could mean asking him if he would like to assist in the instruction of the course—he would have been a wonderful tutor for students struggling to understand the text. Of course, these are merely suggestions. My "biggest" issue in class also related to a lack of differentiation. At times, the overall pacing of the course felt too slow me. It felt like I was always waiting...*waiting* for classmates to finish their work, *waiting* for them to present—so I could present again. Personally, I wanted to move faster, to learn more, present more, and share more. Unfortunately, the situation reminded me of research suggesting advanced students often spend a quarter to half the school day waiting for classmates to catch up (Webb & Latimer, 1993). It's frustrating since I didn't have control over how fast the course moved, or the curriculum, and I didn't want to say anything to you since I might

upset or offend you. So I slowed myself down to meet the pace of the class. While completing a fourth inquiry project would be challenging given time constraints, I wasn't entirely opposed to the idea—since it would allow me to further refine my skills.

Nevertheless, this would have caused problems for others in the class who were trying to meet the minimum requirements. Oh yes, I heard a few complaints about the text but not many. Classmates said it was just too hard to understand. At least one student said she needed to learn more about the basics of data analysis (i.e. constant comparative methods) rather than spend time on “post” endeavors. But not to worry—anytime you challenge students, there's sure to be some kickback, some resistance.

**Janet:** You mention how some students slowed you down. I agree that this was a BIG issue with me - they slowed down other students and me too. That happens sometimes in the advanced qualitative course because students have varying experiences in the prerequisite class. My opinion is that some learn a lot and some don't and those who lack prerequisite understanding need a review. However, in our class there were not only some students with varying learning experiences and understanding. A few were unmotivated students. They were often late to class and they were absent too much. In fact, Maya, the student who sat next to me in class, whispered to me one night, “Dr. R., too many students are always late.”

So, that's the night I made this announcement – “Students are complaining that other students are often late. Please attend class on time.”

Steve, do you notice a pattern here with me? I do. Writing to enact these memories help me make sense of my attitudes and behaviors in class. In my mind's eye I can even see myself in the classroom, where I stood, where I sat- what I said. And now I

amrememberinganother inquiry I conducted in which I discovered I wanted all my qualitative methods students to be happy and I trusted them to do their best (Richards, 2011). It appears I don't want to be the "bad guy". Actually Maya mentioned that I'm too nice. But do I have to stand with an attendance sheet in my hand, and mark people present, absent, and late? Maybe I do have to take attendance. As I write this I had another thought. When one student (more than once) kept looking at a personal laptop computer screen I knew that student wasn't taking notes. That student was reading and responding to e-mail. I know this because I walked over and stood behind the student. But did I say anything?? No I did not! Notice the pattern? As I write this I'm annoyed with my behavior. I am not a wimp at all. I am confident and outspoken, but I am also caring of my students.

**Steve:** Yes, I remember the night you reminded students to show up on time. I thought, "Wait, aren't we doctoral students? Should she really have to remind us of the class starting time?"

I understand people are busy; things come up. But habitual lateness was certainly a problem. I think there is such a thing as "being too nice." Since I am a teacher teach of young children, this is something I had to learn as well. Perhaps it is human nature for others to take advantage of one's kindness. The challenge is you want to be nice and want your students to be happy, yet you must be firm. To further understand your dilemma, I read Hirschi's Social Control Theory (1969), which posits all people have a tendency toward deviancy unless they feel strong bonds to a community. Maybe some of the students (particularly ones that had not taken your prerequisite class) failed to feel a connection to the classroom community, to each other, and/or yourself? Seeing we only

spent a few hours together a week, a bond might not have been established. I definitely did not feel the camaraderie experienced during the prerequisite course I took with you the previous semester where for some reason the students “gelled.” While wanting your students to be happy and feel supported, perhaps this is translating –or at least being perceived by students- as lower expectations, which can result in less supportive teacher-student relationships (Demantet & Van Houtte, 2012). According to Social Control Theory, these non-cohesive relations lead to less-than-desirable behavior, which is what you experienced with your students during the course.

One thing that especially bothered me also involved that particular student—let’s call him Miguel—who I perceived as acting disrespectful to you and classmates. For instance, when you spoke, or students presented their inquiries, Miguel had his head buried into his laptop, presumably typing e-mails or writing papers for other classes (though, as a researcher, I should not speculate). Judging from his facial expressions and lack of participation in discussions, Miguel had no interest in being there. Worse, when he presented projects, he “turned” every presentation into a racial issue. Since Miguel tainted every topic with racial tension, so many opportunities for learning were lost. For example, during a presentation about an ethnography Miguel and his project partner had read, Miguel bashed the book, simply saying he totally disagreed with the perspective of the (insert race here) author. Rather, as a student of qualitative research, I had hoped we would discuss the author’s methodology including participation observation, note-taking, and data analysis. While normally a patient person, I found my patience wearing thin on more than one occasion.

Actually, I don’t think Miguel meant to purposely annoy or frustrate classmates. As

Lett (2014) notes, “sometimes it feels as if the accused person is actually thinking, ‘If I do this particularly obnoxious thing, I will ruin someone’s day’ but, in all honesty, this is probably not the case” (p. 12). Nonetheless, this kind of student can harm the overall morale of the class and make change the dynamics of the class. And as a student myself, what can I do about it? If I say something to this student, it would just create hard feelings, possibly backfire, and possibly make others uncomfortable. As the instructor of the class, I suppose you could be “harder” on this student—but, likewise, it could create animosity or a negative environment.

**Janet:** I wished every week Miguel would shape up by himself but that didn’t happen. Foucault (1980) would tell me I did not use my knowledge and power wisely with Miguel. Therefore, I failed Miguel and the entire class. I’ll remember – with knowledge and power come responsibilities.

**Steve:** I now also notice a pattern with me. While I learned much during the course, my high points during this time—as well as much learning-- actually emanated from outside activities related to class. For instance, after several weeks into the course, you asked me to present one of my projects (an oral history I wrote) to students in a beginning qualitative class. Following my presentation, I can remember your exact words. You told students, “Steve’s only in his second semester as a doctorate student. He has an affinity for qualitative research.”

Honestly, I enjoyed the praise—and the experience validated for me that I had produced high-quality work. The opportunity to share my work provided other benefits. I had to prepare for the presentation. This meant deciding how to arrange my material-what to leave in, what to take out—what visual aids to utilize (I settled on black and white

images to produce the right tone), and how to package my presentation via PowerPoint. The experience also honed my public speaking skills—I reminded myself to make eye contact, speak clearly, and smile. In addition, I had to field questions from the audience.

A second-high point came when you asked me to collaborate on projects, such as the arts-based inquiry I had initiated on my own, as well as this inquiry. I believed at this point in the course I had made major strides in my ability as a qualitative researcher; I knew instinctively if you-- someone who prolifically published research-- respected my work enough to want to become part of it, then I had truly reached a new level. The idea of collaborating with the instructor on an inquiry excited and inspired me. These outside activities pushed my abilities and learning way beyond classroom learning. For instance, for this collaborative autoethnography, I read books on the subject and immersed myself in the genre. I have revised and edited with you. I have received personalized feedback and guidance, which does not normally happen within the confines of the classroom. Actually, I have learned as much or more from you outside of class as I have within it.

**Janet:** You're correct. Students usually learn more from authentic interactions and experiences with a more advanced "other". For example, consider Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development). And-I just had a thought—In a way our writing together in this inquiry embodies Vygotsky 's developmental theory. I learned from you – you learned for me. Through our recollections we provided space for our own thoughts opinions, and questions to emerge. Therefore, we are each other's more knowledgeable other. Now it's time to make more sense of our work.

**Steve:** I make sense of our work in these ways. Perhaps I suffered from extremely high (unrealistic?) expectations. I wanted to progress faster through the course and I expected

classmates to do the same. Since I was able to fairly easily complete three, authentic mini-research projects, I expected others to follow my lead. My expectations failed to consider that students learn at different rates and speeds, and those in the class, possessed varying levels of experience. And, despite the post structuralists' theories being difficult for even you to comprehend, you (perhaps unrealistically) expected your students to grasp the material. I recall you stating that even some of your colleagues in the qualitative field questioned your lofty goals with post structuralist theories. Not only did students have to apply these higher-level concepts in their research but also as you stated, you "expected students to read and understand the text on their own."

**Janet:** Steve, I believe you are right. I do expect my students to rise to the occasion. I have hubristic tendencies and have published previously about my hubris as a professor of arts-based research classes. I think, "If I can do it- surely my students can do it also." So I need to be aware of my over confident, brash proclivities. On the other hand, I learned through your description of Miguel's behavior in class, I needed to take action and not be a wimp. As you mentioned, there is a possibility Miguel was not aware of his impolite actions and retorts. Perhaps he needed some help and guidance and I failed to provide support. I only remember being mad at Miguel and doing nothing about his behavior and negative attitude

### **Ending the Journey**

**Janet:** We're at the end of our journey for now Steve. I know we revealed our honest feelings and perceptions. Our work is honest and trustworthy. The data are authentic. We followed reliable analytic autoethnography processes, showed these processes clearly, and made our thinking transparent to help others understand collaborative analytic

autoethnography in practice. We also followed ethical steps to protect others presented in our work; analyzed and interpreted the meaning of our personal experiences, and included extant literature (see Ellis & Adams, 2014). However, although scholars such as Ellis and Bochner (2006) believe analytic autoethnography should not produce theory that is generalizable, I was awake last night worrying about Anderson's (2006) assertion that analytic autoethnography must produce theory. As you know I've been dragging my feet about this final phase of our collaboration. Now I've made a decision that makes me comfortable and I wonder if you feel the same way. Making broad conclusions that emanate from our work just did not seem right to me. I reject this positivistic goal. Ellis and Bochner (2006) criticize analytic autoethnography for that very reason. They say unfortunately, there will always be an assumption on the part of some qualitative researchers that "one must go beyond particular and immediate experience... to reach some conclusion about the human condition or something that holds true for all people all of the time" (p. 438.). I have to say I agree with Ellis and Bochner. And even Anderson (2006) notes not all ethnographic writing is explicitly or self-consciously analytic, or committed to addressing general theoretical issues.

**Steve:** Janet I agree with you. I, too, read and reread the arguments presented by Anderson (2006) and Ellis and Bochner (2006), and I always believed our original intent was to engage in a discussion to make greater meaning of our experiences, to sort things out – not to produce theory that generalizes. I never once thought we intended to have the final word. We employed principles of analytic autoethnography because of our research aim - to explore issues related to an advanced qualitative class through self-study rather than to ponder emotional experiences. You are correct. We both believe there are no fixed

truths. There are only multiple forms of knowing that often are modified over time and with experiences. This brings to mind Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) use of the term rhizome you used previously in this work. Rhizome refers to concepts and understandings that are always open, reversible, and modifiable, like the discoveries we made in our research. As Dewey (1933) suggested, no mode of inquiry can offer "anything approaching absolute certitude" (np).

### References

- Adams, T., Holman Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, L. (August, 2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373-395.

- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., & Delamont, S. (1999). Ethnography: Post, past and present: *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28, 460-471.
- Bartholomew, T., Gundel, B., & Kantamneni, N. (2015). A dream best forgotten: The phenomenology of Karen refugee's pre-settlement stressors. *The Counseling Psychologist* (43), 8.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bayne, T., & Montague, M. (Eds.), 2011, *Cognitive Phenomenology*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard, R., & Ryan, G. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bochner, A., & Ellis, C. (1992). Personal narrative as a social approach to interpersonal communication. *Communication Theory*, 2(2), 165-172.
- Bochner, A., & Ellis, C. (1995). Telling and living: Narrative co-construction and the practices of interpersonal relationships. In Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), *Social approaches to communication* (pp.201-213). New York: Guilford.
- Boghossian, P. (2016). *What is Social Constructionism?* Retrieved from <http://philosophy.fas.nyu.edu/docs/IO/1153/socialconstruction.pdf>
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: PrenticeHall.
- Brunner, J. (1993). The autobiographical process. In Robert Folkenflik (Ed.), *The culture of autobiography: Constructions of self-representation* (pp.38-56). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

- Carlson, E. (2013). Precepting and symbolic interactions—A theoretical look at preceptorship during clinical practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(2), 457-464.
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. Wambura, & Hernandez, K.A. (2012). *Collaborative autoethnography. [electronic resource]*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2012.
- Cihak, D., K., E., & Boon, R. (2009). Effects of class wide positive peer “tootling” to reduce the disruptive classroom behaviors of elementary students with and without disabilities. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 18(4), 267-278.
- Cisneros-Puebla, Ce., Faux, R., & Mey, G. (September, 2004). Qualitative researchers – stories told, stories shared: The storied nature of qualitative research, An Introduction to the special issue: *FQS Interviews* [35 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0403370>.
- Cross, T. (2015). Social and emotional development of gifted students: A psychosocial bill or rights for students (Including those with gifts and talents). *Gifted Child Today*, 38(2), 128-129.
- Dahlberg, K., Dahlberg, H., & Nystrom, M. (2008). *Reflective life world research, (2nd ed)*. Student literature, Sweden.
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972-1990* (trans. Martin Joughin), New York: Columbia University Press.

- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2004). *A thousand plateaus* (Trans. Brian Massumi), London, Continuum.
- Demant, J., & Van Houtte, M. (2012). Teachers' attitudes and students' opposition. School misconduct as a reaction to teachers' diminished effort and affect. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 860-869.
- Denzin, N. (1989). *Ethnographic practices for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*, trans. Bass, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1930). *The quest for certainty: A study of the relation of knowledge and action*. London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3-29.
- Ellis, C. (2009). Telling tales on neighbors: Ethics in two voices. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 2(1), 3-28.
- Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research series* (with T. Adams and S. Holman Jones), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T., & Bochner, A. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1) Article 12, Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589>

- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narratives, and personal reflexivity. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln( Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2006). Analyzing analytic autoethnography: As autopsy. *Journal ofContemporary Ethnography*, 35 (4), 429-449.
- Finlay, L. (2014). Engaging phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11, 121-141. doi:10.1080/14780887.2013.807899
- Foucault, M. (1980).*Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. 1972-1977. Trans. Colin Gordon et al. New York: Pantheon.
- Geist-Martin, P., Gates, L., Wiering, Liesbeth, K., Erica, Houston, R., Lilly, A., & Moreno, J. (2010). Exemplifying collaborative autoethnographic practice via shared stories of mothering. *Journal of Research Practice*, 6(1), Article M8. Retrieved from <http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/view/209/187>
- Gershon, W. (2009).*The Collaborative Turn: Working Together in Qualitative Research*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Hickson, H. (2111). Critical reflection: Reflecting on leaning to be reflective, *ReflectivePractice:International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 12(6), 829-839).
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holman Jones, S., Adams, T., & Ellis, C. (Eds.). (2013) . *Handbook of autoethnography*. New York: Routledge.
- Husserl, E. 1982 [1913]. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Trans. F. Kersten. The Hague: Nijhoff.

- Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL. (Original work published in 1936).
- Iftody, T. (2013). Letting experience in at the front door and bringing theory through the back: Exploring the pedagogical possibilities of situated self-narrative in teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 19(4).???
- Jackson, A., & ., Lisa (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research*. NY:Routledge.
- Käufer, S., & Chemero, A. (2015). Phenomenology. [electronic resource]: An Introduction. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2015.
- Lett, C. (2014). *Modern Civility. [electronic resource]: Etiquette for Dealing with Annoying, Angry, and Difficult People*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.,
- Lett, C. W. (2014). *Modern Civility. [Electronic resource]: Etiquette for Dealing with Annoying, Angry, and Difficult People*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.
- Martinez, A., & Andreatta, M. (2015). "It's My Body and My Life": A Dialogued Collaborative Autoethnography. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, 15(3), 224-232.
- McAdams, D. (1995) *The Life Story Interview*. Retrieved from <https://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/foley/instruments/interview/>
- Mehra, B. (March, 2002). Bias in Qualitative Research: Voices from an Online Classroom. *The Qualitative Report*, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR7-1/mehra.html>

- Ngunjiri, F., Hernandez, K.A., & Chang, H. (2010). Living Autoethnography: Connecting Life and Research. *Journal of Research Practice*, 6(1),
- Pace, S. (April, 2012). Writing the self into research: Using grounded theory analytic strategies in autoethnography. *TEXT Special Issue: Creativity: Cognitive, Social and Cultural Perspective*, 1-15. Retrieved from [textjournal.com.au](http://textjournal.com.au).
- Polkinghorne, D. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. Amos Hatch & Richard Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp.5-23). London: Falmer Press.
- Prus, R. (1996). *Symbolic interactionism and ethnographic research: Intersubjectivity and the study of lived experiences*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Reynolds, L. (2003) Intellectual precursors. In *Handbook of Symbolic Interactionism* (Reynolds, Larry, & Herman-Kinney, Nancy Eds.), AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA, pp. 39–58.
- Richards, J. (May, 2011). *Every word is true*: Stories of our experiences in a qualitative research class. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(3), 782-819. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR16-3/richards.pdf>
- Richardson, L. & St. Pierre, E. (2005). Writing as a method of inquiry. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rubinstein-Avila, E., & Maranzana, S. (2015). Reflexiones sobre la enseñanza y el aprendizaje de la autoetnografía: Preparando a un docente para una carrera en la universidad. *Qualitative Research in Education*, 4(3), 243-268.

- Sawyer, R., & Norris, J.(2005). *Duoethnography*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professional think in action*. New York:Basic Books, Inc.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,
- Vyran, K. (2006). Expanding analytic autoethnography and enhancing its potential. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 405-409).
- Wyatt, J., Gale, K., Gannon, S. & Davies, B. (2011). Deleuze and collaborative writing: An immanent plane of composition. Responding to/with ‘JKSB’. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(4), 407-416.
- Webb, J., & Latimer, D. (1993). *ADHDand children who are gifted*.Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. *ERIC Digest*

### **Authors**

**Janet Richards** Is a professor of Literacy in the Department of Teaching and Learning and holds an Affiliate Professor appointment in the Department of Educational Measurement at the University of South Florida, Tampa. She publishes widely in literacy and qualitative research journals and is the first author of 10 books and third author of another volume. She was selected as a Visiting Scholar at the University of Victoria, Canada, and was selected as a Literacy Scholar in the Reading, Writing and Critical Thinking Project where she supported higher education faculty and teachers in Azerbaijan, Estonia, Hungary, and Romania and in jungle camps between Myanmar and Thailand. She is Senior Editor of *Literacy Practice and Research*.

**Contact:**

Janet Richards

Department of Teaching and Learning

University of South Florida

4202 East Fowler Ave.

Tampa, FL 33620

USA

E-mail: [JRichards@usf.edu](mailto:JRichards@usf.edu)

**Steve Haberlin** is a teacher of gifted students at Tampa, Florida, and a doctoral student in the elementary education program at the University of South Florida. Twice peers have named him as the school's Ida Baker Educator of the Year, which recognizes teachers who strive to meet the needs of all students on campus, including minorities. Steve has served on Gifted Education Advisory Committees and worked as a coach to implement an advanced mathematics program, in elementary schools across Florida. His research, focuses on the social-emotional needs of gifted children, mindfulness, and teachers of gifted preparation,

**Contact:**

Steve Haberlin

Department of Teaching and Learning

University of South Florida

4202 East Fowler Ave.

Tampa, FL 33620

USA

E-mail: [stevehaberlin@yahoo.com](mailto:stevehaberlin@yahoo.com)