
Volume 4, Issue 1, 2020

Cartography of evidence, ethics and engagement: Researcher decisions in (re)presentation

Kerry Earl Rinehart

Editors: Robert E. Rinehart and Jacquie Kidd

To cite this article: Earl Rinehart, Kerry. 2018. "Cartography of evidence, ethics and engagement: Researcher decisions in (re)presentation". *The Ethnographic Edge* 4, (1): 35–47.
<https://doi.org/10.15663/tee.v4i.66>

To link to this volume <https://doi.org/10.15663/tee.v4i>

Copyright of articles

Creative commons license: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Authors retain copyright of their publications.

Author and users are free to:

- **Share**—copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
 - **Adapt**—remix, transform, and build upon the material
- The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.
- **Attribution**—You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use
 - **NonCommercial**—You may not use the material for commercial purposes.
 - **ShareAlike**—If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

Terms and conditions of use

For full terms and conditions of use: <http://tee.ac.nz/index.php/TEE/about>

Cartography of evidence, ethics and engagement: Researcher decisions in (re)presentation

Kerry Earl Rinehart

Te Kura Toi Tangata, Division of Education
University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Abstract

A novice researcher may anticipate that on completion of gathering evidence, the decision-making involved in a project might become more straightforward. Typically, ethics committees and review boards have asked researchers to look ahead in consideration of research design and conduct to the gathering of evidence. However, decisions about representation and presentation of research contain further challenges and tensions. There are researcher decisions in determining what to say, how to say it and to whom. In the field of qualitative inquiry, there are multiple and increasing (re)presentational options and recognition of diverse standpoint epistemologies with implications for these researcher decisions. The core of this article is a written script or ethnodrama, the presentation of research in the form of a play. The dialogue in this play originates from questions, information and reflections recorded in my journals during one project and related to decisions of representation and presentation of research for audiences.

Key words

Ethnodrama, ethics, representation of evidence, research presentation

Introduction

Every utterance is deficient—it says less than it wishes to say ... Every utterance is exuberant—it conveys more than it plans.

(~ Jose Ortega y Gasset in Alton L. Becker 2000, 5)

Having journeyed through project development, ethical approval, research design and the time taken to gather empirical evidence, the novice researcher might believe they have reached the point where the path turns downhill and the decisions involved will be more straightforward. After all, ethics committee concerns are largely focused on the completed stages. However, decisions about representation and presentation of research contain further ethical challenges and tensions. There are myriad researcher decisions in determining what to say, how to say it and to whom. Sikes (2006, 115) wrote, “The relationship between research completed and in the public domain and individual researchers’ decisions is by no means a simple or straightforward one.” In contemporary qualitative



inquiry, there are implications for novice researchers' decision-making arising from multiple and increasing (re)presentational options and standpoint epistemologies.

The core of this article is a written script, the presentation of research in the form of a play. Whether text (readers' theatre) and/or a performance ('reality theatre', 'ethnographic performance'ⁱⁱⁱ), Saldaña writes that

an *ethnodrama*, the written script, consists of dramatized, significant selections of narrative collected through interviews, participant observation field notes, journal entries, and/or print and media artifacts such as diaries, television broadcasts, newspaper articles, and court proceedings. Simply put, this is dramatizing the data. (Saldaña 2005, 2).

The dialogue in this play originated from questions, information and reflections recorded in my research journals during one project (2013–2017) and relates to decisions of representation and presentation. As such, this exchange does not present a moment in time but a stage in a process that may last many months—from the beginning of analysis (When does that begin? Brinkmann 2014) until “getting it out the door” (H. Becker 2007). Ethical guidelines and the researcher's own ethical conduct, the participants' experience as shared in interviews and the results of analysis, and the researcher's skills in crafting the writing are the central voices. These characters do not represent any individual in real life whose advice may have influenced/contributed to the project. Although not actually neatly discreet categories, rhetorical, ethical, evidential and audience considerations each speak for themselves and, supported by reference to literature in the endnotes, illustrate some of the tensions in researcher decision-making about representation of participants and presentation of insights for an audience.

Saldaña describes the aim of ethnodrama as being “to investigate a particular facet of the human condition ... for the purposes of adapting these observations and insights into a performance medium” (2005, 1). Not claiming talent or skill as a playwright, I began this piece as a conference presentation or an activity for a research class to open/stimulate discussion regarding researcher interpretation and judgement. The direct quotes in boxes were to be displayed in a slide show as timed background to the 'on stage' dialogue and these remain included. Endnotes hold relevant literature references in support of specific comments made by characters.

'Cartography' in the title refers to a process of mapping. This is not about an accurate mapping or notions of scale but to call what happens during researcher deliberation and decision-making an actual dialogue would personify the workings of the embodied mind. Instead, this conversation can be seen as a map of points visited in the process of researcher decision-making. Although the core of this article is a play, I did not want readers to come away with the impression that the decision-making process is one of voices taking turns in polite order: rather, the competing arguments and blended voices can be a cacophony.

Cast^{iv}

Riley speaks for the heads and hands of knowledge and craft of writing.

Pat speaks for the heart and stomach of ethical considerations, ranging from personal to official.

Phoenix speaks for the eyes and ears to ensure researchers see and listen to participants (as individuals and as a group), to the evidence and analysis of evidence.

Chorus (three speak and act in unison) are the voices of reviewers, readers, any members of future audiences.

Andrea is a well-known editor of a leading journal.

Kim is the researcher and decision-maker.

The Play

As the curtain rises, the audience can see a slide projected as the background.

Wolcott (2009) proposed that research is not complete until it is disseminated, and Cahnmann (2003, 35) declared that “we must assume an audience for our work, an audience that longs for fresh language to describe ... experiences”.

Four people walk around in a loose circle muttering and gesturing to each other: Riley, Pat, Phoenix and Chorus.

Their pitch and volume vary with uneven levels of insistence trying to get their point across. At random intervals, individual voices become more distinct:

Riley: You don't know what you're saying ... How best to convey that idea ...

Pat: That wouldn't *feel* right ... do no harm ...

Phoenix: But what I said was ... where did that come from?

Chorus: Can you tell what the message is? ... What is it all about?

Kim walks on stage, head down, tapping on a cell phone. The cluster goes silent and become attentive.

Pat: [as an aside] What's happening now?

Phoenix: Tweeting is my guess, maybe blogging?

Riley: Public profile, very important. Call it research profile or [spoken grandly] *impact*.

Meanwhile, Kim sits down and extracts various items from pockets, setting them aside with the phone (various digital gadgets, cords, pens, highlighters, Post-its: basically, whatever the actor chooses to secrete in their clothing).

Kim: Okay, I have to make some decisions here, so let's get this sorted. All I need to do now is the writing up.

Everyone else: Groan

Kim: My dilemma is how am I going to represent the principal participants and to fairly and realistically present what they said in the interviews?

Everyone: [relaxing and some nods] Okay

Chorus: [importantly] Research is not complete until it is disseminated. You must assume an audience for your work.

Ethics: Researchers' decisions are by no means simple or straightforward.

Riley: It's a privilege to talk about people. No matter how the text is staged, it *is* staged, remember that.^v

Pat: Representing participants, their stories, and settings in research writing—it's a significant responsibility, given participants might be identified by members of the intended research audience.^{vi}

Riley: You are responsible for all choices you make as an ethical and reflexive person. You do need to communicate your research in some form.

Kim interrupts: Look, I've spent some time bogged down in [makes a huge circle with her arms] analysis. I am pretty sure about what I have to say.

Pat: Your decisions are recorded?

Riley: I hope your methods text is not bogged down as well.

Phoenix: What *I* want to say.

Chorus: Say to whom?

Kim: Umm, okay, I'd really like policy makers to understand that school principals are individual human beings and these principals were trying to meet everyone's expectations including their own.

Everyone else: [with optimism] Ooh.

Phoenix: [happily] That's how it feels. Sounds good for your primary school principals.

Pat: Yes, that would be consistent with your theoretical approach and who you are as a researcher.

Riley: Well, we have some decisions to make.

Everyone walks around in their own circles, in their own thoughts.

The background slide changes:

As Eisner (1997, 4) wrote, "The selection of a form of representation ... is a selection of not only what can be conveyed but of what is likely to be noticed."

Each different form serves to "communicate findings in multidimensional, penetrating, and ... accessible ways" (Cahnmann 2003, 29).

Pat: In this situation you are researcher *as* author. You make the decisions in selecting the words. You will know what feels right. Be open to when you feel uncomfortable and think about why. Ethical conduct continues throughout any research. Ethics is your most important consideration.

Phoenix: Kim wouldn't have anything to say without my interviews.

Riley: There is not much point having something to say if you cannot say it well enough to communicate with your audience. To capture their interest. To make them care.

Phoenix: It's my experience and views. I need to be known *and* I want the reader to care.

Riley and Pat exchange a look that says naïve.

Riley: [firmly to Phoenix] You can't speak directly to the audience in text. You have to go through me. There is no direct reading—or, for that matter, direct communication.

Phoenix's mouth drops open, a little stunned.

Riley: [being consolatory] You might get fifteen minutes of fame when you out yourself as a participant to the media but the researcher is not meant to give that much away.

Pat attempts to interrupt with a coughing noise but Riley: [speaks over Pat] The researcher, [waving an arm in Kim's direction] selects what goes in and what is out. That is the way of it. Besides, Kim can't remap the whole of the world^{vii}, all your experience! Choices need to be made; limits need to be set!

Pat: [to Phoenix] No. If you step forward, by a process of elimination someone could find out who the other participants are. No.

Pat: [to Riley, crossly] Do not tell Phoenix that. After all that trouble we had over ensuring anonymity or using real names ... then fussing about the phrasing of the informed consent information. Oh dear, no. Pseudonyms have already been agreed on.

Phoenix: I hadn't thought of that. But wait a minute, do I get lost at this point? Is that what you're saying?

Kim: Ivan Snook asked researchers to practise no deceit. In all dealings with participants, researchers need to treat people fairly, including what I present of what you told me.

Phoenix: [to Kim] I trust you. I checked the transcripts of my interviews. You are going to take what I said, weigh it with what other participants said and express key messages in ways that might be heard. This research will give added weight to our own voices.

Kim: [less sure] R-r-r-right.

The characters on stage head for different corners before turning to resume their conversation.

Chorus: [addressing Kim] The written form influences what I notice, what is communicated, and what I connect with. The textual form influences my evaluation of the credibility of what claims you make.

Riley: Forms of representation draw attention to complexity, feeling, and new ways of seeing. Poetry and prose have potential as different mediums that give rise to ways of saying things not otherwise expressed.^{viii}

Chorus: One way of presenting evidence is as selected quotations.

Riley: [to Kim] Yes. It is quite common. 'Conventional' would be a better word. It is conventional in some contexts for qualitative researchers to use edited quotations, in 'an authoritative' voice.^{ix} [Turning to Chorus] Are you saying you prefer selected quotes?

Chorus: Not necessarily. Some of us criticise the use of quotations because it can be easy to overlook the researcher role in their selection and the framing of the text.^x Sometimes I can accept quotations as the 'exact words'. Maybe forget that researchers are always shaping those words.

Pat: It is important that readers of research are reminded to ask questions, such as *who was listening to the participant speaking? How were analysis and content decisions made regarding the presentation of evidence? And, who made those decisions?*

Riley: Exactly!

Pat: I know ethics committees don't seem to care about presentation. I mean, aside from ongoing anonymity and confidentiality, I suppose, but all research decisions reflect ethical responsibilities.

The characters on stage head for different corners.

The background slide changes

Nespor (2000) was concerned about the "decoupling of events from historical and geographically specific locations" (549) as "anonymization is likely to be most problematic precisely where it would be most useful—at the local level—and that it can do little to protect the identities of participants from intimates and associates" (548).

Kim walks back to the chair and sits down.

Pat: [to the play's audience and Kim as a lecture] The ethics' application and approval process serve to ensure that all steps are taken to prevent potential foreseeable harm to the groups we are aiming to benefit from our research. Ethical guidelines and codes, along with ethics review committees and their processes are there to protect people, not only participants, but researchers and their associated institutions, also, if relevant, funding agencies.^{xi} Key research concerns have been participant confidentiality, and protecting the privacy and anonymity of individuals.^{xii}

Kim: [standing, suddenly hopeful] I know this stuff. Researchers protect the privacy of participants by not discussing information provided through the privilege of the research that could identify individuals. We ‘anonymise’ evidence in our presentations.^{xiii}

The others turn back to the conversation.

Riley: And create amalgams of participants to make more general points.

Chorus: The idea that leaving out certain details will mean that an individual or research site cannot be identified is unrealistic.^{xiv} This is New Zealand! Besides, how will such a report be useful?^{xv}

Kim takes a deep breath.

Riley: [continues] Chorus is right. There is a risk in removing those very aspects that make it vital, unique, believable.

Phoenix: And at times painfully personal.^{xvi}

Kim: It is the rural context of this study that could help inform policy. Wolcott—2009—advocated for doctoral theses to have a significant proportion of well-considered description. He argued description serves to present the researcher as having a good grasp of the evidence and of research skill to a reader. I want some of that.

Riley: You will choose the length of selected quotes too. Editing out, or leaving in, ums and repetition, the punctuation, modifications and substitutions to any text all involves choices and skill.

Everyone paces back and forth, each in their own line parallel to stage front.

The background slide changes:

Soutar-Hynes (2016) talks of loyalty, truth and explicitness in “the masking of identity, deciding what to remove/rework, what to name directly” (77). The decisions any composer of poetry makes involve loyalty (and sensitivity) to the people in their research and “the constraints/dilemmas of self-censorship, the tensions between naming/not naming, telling it ‘straight’ or telling it ‘slant’” (Soutar-Hynes 2016, 77).

Kim: I still have two more areas to address: How principals feel judged informally by parents and community members when incidents happen at school, and how they self-assess.

Phoenix: I did enjoy the one about how the parent found out there was some marijuana at school by listening to her child and his friend in the backseat of her car. That was a good thing she told the principal. I mean, I would want to know.

Kim: Stories? [looking around] Stories? The principals in my study all suggested the kinds of occurrences they talked about ‘happen in every school’ and such events could have happened to any one of them. So, I could use a few stories.

Chorus: Sure, you can deliberately disrupt my expectations, disturb the familiar when you change text forms to more literary options. Then I need to slow down, even backtrack. But I could stop.^{xvii} That disruption comes with risks.

Riley: The use of narratives in research representation is now well established.^{xviii} To judge the quality of this writing, you can ask yourself is the work lifelike and believable? Can the reader imagine this occurring?^{xix} The creation and use of stories needs to align with your approach, purposes and the evidence.^{xx}

Kim: I need to think about crafting cohesive stories. There were no whole stories in any one interview all nicely wrapped with a beginning, middle and end. Stories were more likely to be told to me in snippets over the three interviews.

Riley: There is no one way or best way to write stories from research interview transcripts.^{xxi} There is some boundary crossing between literature and literary texts and stories produced from research have proved useful in other disciplines.^{xxii}

The four original characters walk in overlapping/intersecting circles and Kim sits down again with head cradled in both hands.

Andrea walks in and is recognised by Riley, who breaks from the group and tries to intercept.

Riley: [without pleasure] Andrea, what are you doing here?

Andrea: [side stepping around Riley and nodding to the others] You are not the only ones who have influence on research writing, you know.

Chorus: Nice to see you Andrea.

Riley: [to Kim] It's too soon to let Andrea's lot start telling you what you can and can't do through the gatekeeping and gameplaying of publication. The writing needs to have integrity aligned with your project and your purposes.

Phoenix: And me. You need to keep faith with me.

Andrea: [ignoring Phoenix and turns to Kim] As an editor of a journal with a high impact score, I can get you published, you know. I am on the inside of your field and discipline. All the big names write and review for me. You want to be in on that, don't you? Of course you do.

Chorus: When I'm reviewing a manuscript, I look for whose camp you're in, who you have cited: names of colleagues. Sometimes I recommend my own work, which isn't viewed as badly as you might suspect, I'll have you know.

Andrea: You need to think carefully before straying from—let's say conventions—conventional formats and what counts as reliable evidence. To have readers you need to get published. Think carefully. These decisions could affect your academic career.

Pat: But what about just looking in the mirror every morning?

Riley: What about creativity in what you do? What about communicating to other audiences?

Andrea: There are people specialising in what you do. I can lead you to them, or more precisely, I can lead them to you.

Chorus: Oh, I am of two minds ...

Everyone waits for Chorus to say more.

Andrea: [after a drawn-out pause] I'm too busy for this. But you mark my words, Kim. I'll see you at the Association Conference, we can talk more then.

Andrea exits the stage.

Phoenix: Will you be presenting narratives, vignettes or stories?

Kim: [with one eye on Riley] Good question. Are they really different?

Chorus: [changing tack] Stories, like poems, are used because they have the power to capture attention, to connect emotionally, and that connection helps convey your message.

Riley: It would be helpful, Chorus, if you were not changing your point of view all the time. Might I suggest, Kim, that you fix an audience—your reader—in your head.

Kim: Is there a suggestion here that I need to be a short story writer, or a poet to use these forms of presentation?

Everyone slowly backs further away from Kim and turns to look at the play's audience.

The background slide changes:

Poetry, as Faulkner (2009) writes, is “a means to enlarge understanding, resist clear undemanding interpretations, and move closer to what it means to be human” (16). And “because of its rhythms, silences, spaces, breath points, poetry engages the listener’s body, even when the mind resists and denies it” (Richardson 1993, 704–705).

Chorus: [to everyone] There is more space for my interpretation, for my impressions when reading poetry. Fewer words can paint very vivid pictures in my mind. More than my mind, actually.^{xxiii}

Pat: [warmly] The communication task of researchers and poets in relation to their audience may be very similar but it is the credibility of the research and the issue that is important rather than the researcher’s credibility as a poet and quality of the poetry. Besides, the use of poetry is not common in education research in New Zealand at doctoral level.

Riley: There is a debate regarding the use of poetry to present research and how good the poetry needs to be. Some say that ‘good enough’ research poems are acceptable/valid as you develop your craft, while others argue that researchers need ‘training’ in writing poems.^{xxiv}

Chorus: Are you a poet, Kim?

Kim: [shaking her head] I have written poems before, but I do not claim to be a poet.

Phoenix: You want to say something of the individual participant’s sense of purpose and how we spoke about our work when judging ourselves. You want to say something about the nature of expectations on us as school leaders. Maybe something about selfcare.

Riley: Make choices about layout and how the evidence will be read to hook in your reader.

Pat: Leave out their go-to metaphors. I mean all her nautical references; they might be recognisable.^{xxv}

Riley: Oh, it would be a shame to leave out that lovely vocabulary.

Kim: I agree.

Phoenix: How many school principals have been in the Navy?

Riley: [to everyone] A few nautical words does not make a Navy!

The others look at their shoes or some other place avoiding eye contact.

Riley: [to Pat] Why do you always have to be so ... right? It’s very annoying.

Pat: [pleased] Yes, I am, aren’t I? [Head snaps up] ‘Right’, I mean.

Kim: You *are* hard to argue with, Pat ... I can still use different visual and rhythmic layouts to convey individual characteristics and use the transcribed words to communicate the emerging knowledge.

Riley: [firmly to start with and then expansively, as if excited] Every word choice, every sentence, every line. Every space is important. Punctuation matters. Logics, sequencing, flow and disruption all matter. Affect and art, marrying the mundane with the marvellous.

Kim: I really like the idea of poems, one for each participant. Each one will probably need to look different on the page so that the text somehow speaks to salient characteristics about each person.^{xxvi} I don’t have to call them poems though, do I? I can call them research poems so not to over claim their quality as poetry.^{xxvii} [Turning to Phoenix] I need to be faithful to the evidence from participants and the analysis. I want to do that. [Then to Pat] And I need to be careful in what is included, modified and what I leave out. I can be care-full. [to Riley] Plus I need to be skilful to the best of my ability as a poet. [Shoulders slump ... breathes out slowly but visibly] ... Okay.

Chorus: Some poems sound good. As appendices, you mean?

Others turns to look at Kim with blank expressions (poker faces).

Kim: Ugh [looking around at everyone] ... Umm ... No.

Chorus puts hand on hips

Kim: The poems will be the evidence, analysis and presentation together.

Chorus: So whose words are you using? How will I know whose are whose?

Kim: I will use transcribed and participant-checked words only ... and maybe, as close as I can to chronological order in the interviews. Actually, if I stick to participant words then I do not have to make decisions about my words and it should be obvious that the texts are the products of my selection and crafting. Anyway, I want the presentation to be about individuals and not slide into labelling these people with categorising leadership styles.

Phoenix: The way each principal assesses what he or she does, and their self-knowledge is a more personal and individual 'appraisal'.

Kim: So many *more* decisions. [ironically] Okay, great! [beseechingly] What do I do now?

Riley: "*Bird by bird, buddy. Just take it bird by bird.*"^{xxviii}

Chorus: Sometimes I do wish you would speak more plainly, Riley.

Phoenix: I don't get it either.

Everyone draws closer together.

Riley: Anne Lamott tells a story of her older brother back when he was ten and he had a school report to write about birds. He had left this major task until the night before it was due and was very stressed and not actually doing anything. How was he going to complete a three-month project in one evening? Anne's father sat down beside him and said gently, "*Bird by bird, buddy. Just take it bird by bird.*"

Phoenix: Oh ... I'm glad we can still talk like this.

Kim: [standing up and repeating] Bird by bird. Bird by bird. [to everyone including the play's audience] Okay, I need to get started.

Riley: [rubbing hands together] Ready when you are.

Pat: [stretching a little taller] Good to go.

Kim: Who needs a coffee?

Others: "Yes!" or "Sure, why not."

Everyone gathers themselves and as they walk off we hear ...

Riley: I could go for something stronger.

Post ending

As Eisner (1988) wrote, forms of representation "can only partially represent what we know" (15) because "each form of representation has its own boundaries, its own constraints, and its own possibilities" (16). The evidence and knowledge from any research study are of a particular place and time and gained through the particular interactions of particular people. The presentation of the evidence from one study in whatever form constitutes a 'snapshot'.

There are many decisions to be made by the researcher in concerning representation and presentation. In the way of maps, questions about ethics, rhetoric, evidence and audience talked about in the play are also decisions that I needed to make *for* the play. As is suggested in the play, such decisions need to align with the researcher's theoretical position, approach and the nature of the study. I am responsible and need to stand by my decisions.

One choice is where the ethnographer-researcher is in a dramatisation or "how performance ethnographers decide to script themselves" (Pelias 2008, 189). Pelias outlines some options: "The ethnography is implied but not embodied" (189), the ethnographer as narrator or as a central character. The ethnography here is the study of researchers: specifically, the influences on the presentation decisions of one. Characters embody voices from authors, institutional and disciplinary norms, participants and evidence, and mentors. The researcher, Kim, is in conversation with these other characters. Such decisions support the crafting of text. For example, I decided that only Kim could quote authors. The rest of the cast represented those voices and their quotes would be referenced as endnotes. To provide a sense of dramatic tension, I relied on the different priorities of the characters and the researcher's waxing and waning feelings of self-confidence and self-efficacy.

Decisions about the crafting of the text (writing/rhetoric) are also ethical decisions and therefore are not necessarily benign or neutral. Ethical decisions have implications for the use of evidence, and both rhetorical and ethical decisions influence communication with potential audiences and research contribution. Considerations of audience—including participants—influences the crafting of the text. Research decisions involve evaluation and judgement in relation to reference points in terms of disciplinary and research scholarship, of the continuity of researcher biography and values of ethics and concern for participants, rhetoric, intended audience(s) and the evidence. Through the description of the research design and researcher decisions, the situated, relational and textual structure of the research and the thesis can be evaluated. Echoing Jose Ortega y Gasset's comment used as the epigraph to this piece, Denzin wrote:

... language and speech do not mirror experience. They create experience, and in the process transform and defer that which is being described. Meanings are always in motion, incomplete, partial, contradictory. There can never be a final, accurate, complete representation of a thing, an utterance, or an action. There are only different representations of different representations. (2015, 200)

References

- Ackroyd, Judith., and John O'Toole. 2010. *Performing Research: Tensions, Triumphs and Trade-offs of Ethnodrama*. Stoke-on-Trent; Sterling: Trentham Books.
- Barone, Tom, and Elliot Eisner. 1997. "Arts-based Educational Research." In *Complementary Methods for Research in Education*, 2, edited by Richard M. Jaeger, 75–116. Washington: American Educational Research Association.
- Becker, Alton. L. 2000 [1995]. *Beyond Translation: Essays Toward a Modern Philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Becker, Howard. S. 2007. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start, and Finish your Thesis, Book, or Article*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Borges, Jorges. L. 1999. *Collected Fictions*. Translated by Andrew Hurley. London: Penguin Classics.
- Brinkmann, Sven. 2014. "Doing without data". *Qualitative Inquiry* 20, no. 6: 720–725.
- Cahnmann, Melisa. 2003. "The Craft, Practice, and Possibility of Poetry in Educational Research." *Educational Researcher* 32, no. 3: 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032003029>
- Denzin, Norman. K. 2015. "Coda: The Death of Data?" In *Qualitative Inquiry and the Politics of Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, & Michael. D. Giardina, 197–206. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

- Denzin, Norman. K. 1994. "Evaluating Qualitative Research in the Poststructural Moment: The Lessons James Joyce Teaches us." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 7, no. 4: 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839940070401>
- Denzin, Norman. K., and Yvonna Lincoln. 2005. "Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., edited by Norman. K. Denzin, & Yvonna. S. Lincoln, 1–32. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Earl Rinehart, Kerry. 2017. *Judging What They do: Formal, Informal and Self Appraisal of New Zealand (Rural) Primary School Principals*. Research Commons, <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/11543>
- _____. 2018a. "Researchers as Poets: Anonymity and Fidelity in Crafting Portraits." *Qualitative Inquiry* 25, no. 9–10: 862–865. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418787555>
- _____. 2018b. "Researcher Decisions in Presentation: Using a Painting Scheme to Stage Research Poetry." *The Ethnographic Edge* 18, no. 1: 67–76.
- Eisner, Elliot. W. 1988. "The Primacy of Experience and the Politics of Method." *Educational Researcher* 17, no. 5:15–20. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1175100>
- Eisner, Elliot. W. 1997. "The Promise and Perils of Alternative Forms of Data Representation." *Educational Researcher* 26, no. 6: 4–10.
- Faulkner, Sandra. L. 2009. *Poetry as Method*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Furman, Rich. 2016. "Poetic Forms and Structures in Qualitative Health Research." *Qualitative Health Research* 16, no. 4: 560–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732306286819>
- Glesne, Corrine. 1997. "That Rare Feeling: Re-presenting Research Through Poetic Transcription." *Qualitative Inquiry* 3, no. 2: 202–221.
- Grinyer, Anne. 2009. "The Anonymity of Research Participants: Assumptions, Ethics, and Practicalities." *Pan* 12, no. 1: 49–58.
- Hill, Djanna A. 2005. "The Poetry in Portraiture: Seeing Subjects, Hearing Voices, and Feeling Contexts." *Qualitative Inquiry* 11, no. 1: 95–105.
- Hager, Tamar. 2019. "'If They Cannot Take It Straight, They Will Get It in Fiction': The Power of Literature." *Poetics Today* 40, no. 1: 33–57 <https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-7259873>
- Lahman, Maria K. E., and Veronica M. Richard. 2014. "Appropriated Poetry: Archival Poetry in Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20, no. 3: 344–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413489272>
- Lamott, Anne. 1995. *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. 2005. "Institutional Review Boards and Methodological Conservatism: The Challenge to and from Phenomenological Paradigms." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 165–181. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- MacLure, Maggie. 2013. "Researching Without Representation? Language and Materiality in Post-Qualitative Methodology." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26, no. 6: 658–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788755>
- Mazzei, Lisa A., and Alecia Youngblood Jackson. 2008. "Introduction: The Limit of Voice." In *Voice in Qualitative Inquiry*, edited by Alecia Y. Jackson, and Lisa A. Mazzei, 13–26. New York; London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891889>
- Nicol, Jennifer. J. 2008. "Creating Vocative Texts". *The Qualitative Report* 13, no 3: 316–33.
- Nasheeda, Aishath, Haslinda Binti Abdullah, Steven Eric Krauss, and Nobaya Binti Ahmed. 2019. "Transforming Transcripts Into Stories: A Multimethod Approach to Narrative Analysis." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 18: 1–9 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919856797>

- Nespor, Jan. 2000. "Anonymity and Place in Qualitative Inquiry." *Qualitative Inquiry* 6, no. 4: 546–569.
- Pelias, Ronald J. 2008. "Performative Inquiry. Embodiment and its Challenges". In *Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research*, edited by J. Gary Knowles and Andra L. Cole, 185–193. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Richardson, Laurel. 1993. "Poetics, Dramatics, and Transgressive Validity: The Case of the Skipped Line." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34, no. 4: 695–710.
- _____. 1992. "The Consequences of Poetic Representation. Writing the Other, Rewriting the Self." In *Investigating Subjectivity. Research on Lived Experience*, edited by Carolyn Ellis and Michael G. Flaherty, 125–37. Newbury Park: Sage.
- _____. 1994. "Writing. a Method of Inquiry." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research* edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, 516–529. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Saldaña, Johnny. 2005. *Ethnodrama. An Anthology of Reality Theatre*. (Crossroads in Qualitative Inquiry Series). Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- Saunders, Benjamin, Andrea Kitzinger, and Celia Kitzinger. (2015). Anonymising Interview Data: Challenges and Compromise in Practice. *Qualitative Research* 15, no. 5: 616–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794114550439>
- Sikes, Pat. 2006. "On Dodgy Ground? Problematics and Ethics in Educational Research." *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 29, no. 1: 105–117.
- Snook, Ivan. (1999). "The Ethics and Politics of Social Research." In *Social Science Research in New Zealand: Many Paths to Understanding*, edited by Carl Davidson & Martin Tolich, 69–81. Auckland: Longman. Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Soutar-Hynes, Mary Lou. 2016. "Joys and Dilemmas." In *Poetic Inquiry II—Seeing, Caring, Understanding*, edited by Kathleen. T. Galvin and Monica Prendergast, 71–79. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Sparkes, Andrew. C., and Kitrina Douglas. 2007. "Making the Case for Poetic Representations: An Example in Action." *The Sport Psychologist* 21:170–190.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth Adams. (1996). "The Responsibilities of Readers: Toward an Ethics of Responses." *Qualitative Sociology* 19, no. 4: 533–538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02393376>
- _____. 2013. "The Appearance of Data." *Cultural Studies↔Critical Methodologies* 13, no. 4: 223–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708613487862>
- Wiles, Rose, Graham Crow, Sue Heath, and Vikki Charles. 2008. "The Management of Confidentiality and Anonymity in Social Research". *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11, no. 5: 417–428.
- Wolcott, Harry. F. 2009. *Writing up qualitative research*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage.

ⁱⁱⁱ Also see Ackroyd & O'Toole (2010).

^{iv} Names of cast members are intentionally gender-neutral.

^v Richardson (1992) highlights a researcher's responsibility as a writer: "when we write social science, we use our authority and privileges to talk about the people we study. No matter how we stage the text, we—the authors—are doing the staging" (131).

^{vi} Saunders, Kitzinger, & Kitzinger (2015).

^{vii} like Borges (1999).

^{viii} Forms of representation draw attention to complexity, feeling, and new ways of seeing (Eisner 1997). Cahnmann (2003) explained, "poetry and prose are different mediums that give rise to ways of saying what might not otherwise be expressed" (31).

^{ix} Richardson (1994) was not being complimentary when she described "the practice of quoting snippets in prose" (522). '[A]n authoritative' researcher voice comes from Sparkes and Douglas (2007).

^x The use of such quotations has been criticised because of the ease in which a reader might overlook the responsibility of the researcher in their selection and interpretation (MacLure 2013; St. Pierre 2013). A reader's acceptance of the transparency of the presentation of participants' 'exact words' in quotations "fails to consider how as researchers we are always shaping those 'exact words'" (Mazzei & Jackson 2009, 2).

^{xi} See Lincoln's (2005) discussion of Institutional Review Boards, and their role in protecting the institution.

^{xii} Grinyer (2009) commented on the assumed ('given') importance of anonymity in research guidance: "Mechanisms to protect the identity of research respondents appear to have become central to the design and practice of ethical research. Consequent assumptions about the desirability of anonymity are embedded in various codes of ethical conduct" (1).

^{xiii} For example, Wiles, et al. (2008).

^{xiv} Wolcott (2009).

^{xv} See Nesper (2000) and Saunders, et al. (2015).

^{xvi} Wolcott (2009) commented that, in qualitative research, "to present material in such a way that even the people central to the study are 'fooled' by it is to risk removing those very aspects that make it vital, unique, believable, and at times painfully personal" (4).

^{xvii} Nicol (2008) suggests that readers may disengage with the text when their expectations are not met.

^{xviii} The use of such literary forms in qualitative research can be traced back to the crisis of representation (1986–1990) (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, 3) when scholars began questioning the place of researcher in research texts and the relationship between researcher and participants.

^{xix} Denzin terms this form of realism 'verisimilitude' (Denzin 1994).

^{xx} Within narrative inquiry and using narrative analysis specifically, Nasheeda et al. (2019) focus on illustrating how researchers can create a story from interview transcripts.

^{xxi} Nasheeda, et al. (2019) wrote that there is no one way to undertake this task.

^{xxii} Hager (2019) explores the boundary crossing ("leaking") between literature and literary texts and how stories produced from research have proved useful in other disciplines. Even as researchers in these other fields are "compelled to explain, justify, and defend the application of literary devices, poetic structures, and methods of interpretation in their respective cultural and academic domains" (35), there remains a reluctance to employ literary methods to analyse and interpret stories in research (Hager 2019).

^{xxiii} Many argue the accessibility of poetry (Furman 2006; Nicol 2008; St. Pierre 1996). The use of poetic forms in the presentation of research can give room for impressions to be suggested to the reader with potential for an empathic connection made through what is learned about and from research participants (Glesne 1997; Hill 2005). Poetry, as Faulkner (2009) writes, is "a means to enlarge understanding, resist clear undemanding interpretations, and move closer to what it means to be human" (16). And "because of its rhythms, silences, spaces, breath points, poetry engages the listener's body, even when the mind resists and denies it" (Richardson 1993, 704–705).

^{xxiv} Some say that "good enough" research poems are acceptable/valid as the researcher develops their craft (e.g., Lahman & Richard 2014), while others argue that researchers need 'training' in writing poems (Barone & Eisner 1997; Cahnmann 2003).

^{xxv} Participant's 'signature' phrases and metaphors would undermine their anonymity (Earl Rinehart 2018a).

^{xxvi} For more on the decisions, I made regarding the crafting of the research poems see Earl Rinehart (2018b).

^{xxvii} In the PhD thesis (Earl Rinehart 2017), I argued the poems were *research poems* because they are part of the research and I crafted them using transcribed participants' words (Faulker 2009; Lahman & Richard 2014).

^{xxviii} Anne Lamott (1995).