

Reconciliation of Philosophical Perspectives to Address Autoethnographic Methodological Concerns

Timothy Sibbald¹, Victoria Handford², Lloyd Kornelsen³

¹ Nipissing University, ² Thompson Rivers University, ³ University of Winnipeg

An instance of editorial work was found to address methodological issues at the juncture of autoethnography and narrative inquiry. The particular case is reported because it addresses the conceptual basis of known methodological issues. The case involved interactions between a chapter author and editors of a book as well as between the editors. Although the chapter was autoethnographic as initially submitted, through the use of research-oriented open-ended questioning, the editors engaged with the author causing the author to gain a deeper insight and richer narrative regarding his own experience. The result bridges the gap between autoethnography and narrative inquiry. Interactions between the editors were directed at providing constructive support while leaving ownership of the narrative with the author. The process has features overlapping and distinct from duoethnography. An empirical explanation is proposed through the reconciliation of philosophical stances of the author and editors.

Un exemple de travail éditorial a permis d'aborder des questions méthodologiques à la jonction de l'autoethnographie et de l'enquête narrative. Le cas particulier à l'étude porte sur la base conceptuelle de questions méthodologiques connues. Le cas implique des interactions entre l'auteur d'un chapitre et les éditeurs d'un livre, ainsi que des interactions entre les éditeurs. Bien que le chapitre ait été autoethnographique lors de la soumission initiale, l'emploi par les éditeurs de questions ouvertes axées sur la recherche et communiquées à l'auteur lui a permis d'arriver à des connaissances approfondies et à un récit enrichi relativement à ses propres expériences. Les résultats jettent un pont entre l'autoethnographie et l'enquête narrative. Les interactions entre les éditeurs visaient à apporter un appui constructif tout en permettant à l'auteur de conserver son récit. Certaines caractéristiques du processus chevauchent la duoethnographie; d'autres s'en distinguent. Nous proposons une explication empirique née de la réconciliation des positions philosophiques de l'auteur et des éditeurs.

During the development of a book (Sibbald & Handford, 2017a) a substantial and prolonged interaction occurred between the two editors and a chapter author (Kornelsen, 2017). The book collected personal narratives of lived experiences of tenure-track professors. The particular author's initial chapter draft was critical of the academy and the editors accepted it as a starting point for a chapter. The editors noted that the criticisms presented by the author had potential significance for the book itself. A back and forth exchange of revisions ensued, consistent with standard editorial processes. In addition, however, the editors dialogued between themselves

about how to invoke improvements in the chapter being careful to leave ownership with the chapter author. They did not want to interfere, but wanted to be a constructive influence directed at gaining a rich chapter. This resulted in formative dialogue for all.

The unusual characteristics of the editorial process for the chapter led the editors and author to examine what had happened through the editing process because it seemed quite effective in spite of being different. The process, which involved stages of the chapter author being heard, challenged to clearly articulate, and obligated to develop a final improved chapter, in short—academic rigour—changed the author’s view of the editors. He had cast the editors as representatives of “ills” of academia, and the process of pushing for academic rigour led to the editors being recognized as supportive colleagues. This recasting of the editors from institutional agents to individuals of academic integrity resulted in the chapter author migrating from academy skeptic to a balance that included some acceptance and understanding of the role of the academy itself. This was an unintended consequence that we argue arose from details of the process.

A former high school teacher, the chapter author was concerned with the tendency for the academy to be dismissive of knowledge acquired through teaching experience. He had been highly committed and effective in his high school teaching role. As a new faculty member in a faculty of education he believed his (and others) teaching practice was being given low status or little account in teacher education literature and scholarship (Loughran, 2004; Aulls & Shore, 2008; Kornelsen, 2017). The chapter author believed (and continues to believe) in the value of experiential learning. Further, he believed that faculties of education do not consider knowledge acquired through teaching practice on par with knowledge more typical of academic tradition. The chapter author was critical of the academy in relation to this view. He was concerned that the editors might be dismissive of his stance. However, the view was not simply a theory-practice division with the academy on one side and teaching on the other. It is akin to questions aligned with the notion of a teacher-as-researcher (Stenhouse, 1975), where grassroots knowledge is viewed with a lens of “the more significant problems of how we come to know, how we learn, and how we are taught. The understanding that all knowledge is a construct and can thus be deconstructed and transformed by the knower is also disregarded” (Britzman, 1991, p. 230). The author has described himself as an interpreter or mediator who was bridging the divide between the academy and practice.

The draft chapter was revised several times in response to questions raised by the editors. The questions were part of a process the editors utilized for completing their editorial work. In the process, when a chapter was received, one editor would review the draft and provide detailed editorial feedback. The feedback included questions of a conceptual nature, but also order considerations, and editing to improve clarity. The two editors would subsequently discuss the chapter, even when, on the initial receipt, only one editor had read the chapter. The result was that the editor who revised the chapter had to explain what they understood from the chapter, often placing the narrative in a larger context of an issue in higher education. Following the discussion, the chapter was returned to the author who revised the chapter prior to it being reviewed by the other editor. After the second editor reviewed the chapter, there was another conversation between the editors (A comment between editors after it came to light that the author was unsure if he had tenure or not: “I remain baffled as to his forced application for promotion It appears this [issue] genuinely has emerged from his close reading of our feedback”) before the chapter was returned to the author. Following another revision by the author, the chapter was typically accepted. In the instance of the focal chapter the process was prolonged and the chapter was revised more than twice.

The process was effective because it invoked questions that led to revisions that clarified the chapter writing and enhanced the consideration of broader issues or alternative interpretations. The result for the focal chapter was a narrative of considerable contribution that also resulted in a recasting of the author's views of the academy. The editorial process clarified the message(s) of the author and brought out a "voice" that resonates. This particular chapter evolved significantly through the process and did more than simply clarify his "voice". The questioning by the editors led to further development and a clearer articulation of the author's thinking, but more profoundly, the process resulted in the author's growing trust of the academy itself. It is this deeper issue that has led to substantial conversation about methodological aspects for the development of this particular chapter.

Further investigation and discussion has shown that the development of this particular chapter was unusual. The editorial process was prolonged and it was evident that the chapter author was intent on gaining an understanding of his experience (as opposed to simply trying to revise the chapter to completion). The author used an autoethnographic approach and many of the questions the editors asked focused on clarity of meaning. This inadvertently created an introspective critique of the author's "reality," as multiple perspectives and alternative interpretations were suggested. The result was akin to Clandinin and Murphy's (2009) description that researchers "attend closely to the move from field texts to research texts, a move that is grounded in a thorough understanding of ontological and epistemological commitments" (p. 599). The process was unique among the chapters of the book, but important because it appears to address common concerns about autoethnographic methodology. Specifically, the editorial process provides insight into epistemological and methodological issues that have been pointed out by Hughes, Pennington, and Makris (2012). It is also informative for discussions regarding emergent design (Merz, 2002).

During the process of preparing this manuscript a reviewer provided the constructive suggestion that we consider the position of our work with respect to duoethnography. We appreciate the supportive commentary and concluded that our work bears a similarity but does not satisfy the ten tenets of duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). In particular, we did not have intention of conducting duoethnographic research and it was only after the fact that any of the authors became aware of the method. In the discussion section we address the similarities and differences.

Through the subsequent sections we address the facets of philosophical and paradigmatic components that Creswell (2013) identifies as fundamental to qualitative research. We begin discussing perspective to clarify the distinct roles of the chapter author and the editors.

Perspective

The chapter author used autoethnography to describe his relation to academic research culture. His chapter was the "personal story of the author as well as the larger cultural meaning for the individual's story" (Creswell, 2013, p. 73). Within the chapter, the author used narrative accounts from his past teaching practice—accounts that were seminal to his knowledge of education. These narratives legitimized his claims for scholarly recognition, and informed the relationship between practitioner field experience and academic theory development. It was not autobiographical because the analysis (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011) drew together three academic accounts of practice that had been published during the chapter's focal time period and brought the various episodes into a larger ethnography.

The challenge that arose was engagement in the reflective process and collaboration with the editors led to modifications of the stories and their telling. In particular, the editors asked the author to consider altering the stance of the analysis of recounting of his teaching practice to focus on a process of reconciliation (between field and academy) rather than a justification for scholarly recognition. This fit with the author's view that his relationship with the field and the academy was one of "interpreter for each and mediator of both" (Second draft of chapter, Feb. 9, 2015) that implied he did not belong strictly to either and led to his feeling he was an 'outsider'. The requests, responses, and revisions led to his chapter becoming a "thick description" (Ellis et al., 2011) rather than a restorying (Creswell, 2013), as the editors did not directly alter the stories in a substantial way. This is notably contrary to a tenet of duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). In particular, Sibbald and Handford (2017b) detail exercising a phenomenological approach to editing that included writing their own narratives and editing each other's chapters as part of a bracketing (or epoche) process (Merriam, 2009). The editors were particularly careful to seek an authentic account of the author's lived experience and in the editorial process focused on asking for details and specifying places where they felt improvements could be made. An example was an editor suggesting that the author's brief, purposeful synopsis of Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, was too narrow in its interpretation. There were some alterations for style, spelling, and grammar, but changes did not constitute restorying. The author subsequently admitted that the inquisitive tone with which requests were made helped him see the editors as trusted allies rather than distant gatekeepers (which addressed the tenet of trust for duoethnography).

The process also did not fit collaborative notions in narrative inquiry because the researcher and participant were one and the same. The chapter author was the participant that he, as researcher, analyzed. The editors did not collect details or write the account, nor did they collaborate in or co-construct the story. Rather, the iterative sequence of exchanges through draft writing and editing processes led to the story being 'told' through an evolving lens.

The editors shared the cultural milieu with the author—all were tenure-track professors in education, all were effective former JK–12 teachers. All three were seeking promotion and tenure, endeavoring to gain the academy's approval after many years of working in the field. This allowed them to address common concerns of autoethnography being "insufficiently rigorous, theoretical, or analytical" (Ellis et al., 2011). The methodological details of how those concerns were addressed clarifies a methodological approach for using external editors, or other peers, to address the common concerns about autoethnography (Hughes et al., 2012).

Hughes et al. (2012) refer to the American Education Research Association (AERA)'s 2006 empirical reporting standards and provide details across four focal areas. In the area of formulating social scientific problems, the chapter author provided scholarship with connections to theory, practice, methodology, and research. A distinction arose where "autoethnographers reframe and refocus their inquiry in order to draw conclusions and establish further questions" (p. 212). Although the author was the sole decision maker, the editors contributed to some refocusing for the purpose of clarifying the account, an increase of rigour, and a broadening of analysis. This suggests that this particular detail needs to be controlled by the author in order to be autoethnography, but in our case allowed informed external suggestions. We do not feel this is necessarily the case of all peer review or editorial work, but that the approach facilitated an external voice that was conducive to addressing the concerns raised about autoethnography.

With respect to methodological choices Hughes et al. (2012) identify the issue of relationship between the researcher and participant when they are one and the same. Methodologically, the author used data collection, but to the extent he used introspection or reflection, this data was

subjected to considerations of alternative interpretations and questioning by the editors. To address this, the author added clarity to the introspective elements, personal interpretation, and analytic considerations through iterative cycles of articulation, editorial questioning, reflection, and revising, which served to validate the author's story. It was this aspect that led to the editorial process being prolonged because it was evident the process had not finalized the chapter after two rounds of revisions.

The process developed the story as a thick description that provided "sufficient detail for the reader to determine whether findings extend to analogous situations" (Hughes et al., 2012, p. 215). The author has expressed a degree of emancipation (in being able to successfully articulate his concerns about the relationship between practitioner field experience and academic theory development. He has indicated, "This had a lot to do with trusting the editors, their interest and caring, and knowing they shared a common concern/culture with him."

Theoretical Reconciliation

In theoretical terms, autoethnography is essentially an internal process. It can include artifacts and the narrative entails external interactions. However, the locus of analysis and interpretation is researcher-centered as they study themselves. The inclusion of external editors serves to address concerns about autoethnography, but this was not simply external oversight, peer review, or editorial feedback. It was a discussion that passed through several iterations—a purposeful systematic developmental cycle. It was intrinsic to the philosophical assumptions of qualitative research (Creswell, 2013). In particular, the iterative process between the chapter author and the editors was effective because of different philosophical paradigms that the different perspectives (i.e. author/editor) facilitated. The reconciliation of the different individual philosophical perspectives (whether author or either editor) provided a mechanism for addressing concerns commonly arising with autoethnography. The paradigms are addressed as philosophical assumptions, worldview, and interpretive community with the chapter author and editors' stances presented sequentially.

Philosophical Assumptions

The chapter author used narrative inquiry, telling three paradigm-shifting stories from his high school teaching days. These stories served as a primary portal to his experience, with narrative inquiry being uniquely and critically situated for accessing teacher professional knowledge and the production of teaching knowledge generally (Huber, Caine, Huber, & Steeves, 2013; Connelly & Clandinin 1988, 1990). His stories involved international themes with social justice implications. The choice of three narratives provided an ontology of experience (Clandinin & Murphy, 2009). The author understood that an interpretive lens would be used; he mitigated this by developing his position as themes supported by multiple experiences.

The author's narrative was important in axiological terms because the three narratives from his teaching experience contributed to his chapter narrative about tenure-track experience. This was perceived as value-laden, particularly where the author felt that the academy would not accept or understand the three (published) practitioner (field) narratives. The narratives were important for his career narrative because, "each had a profound influence in how I experience, see, and interpret my academic work today, including the insights I bring to education scholarship." The implication was that the unknown editors, as members of the academy, might draw on values that

were not aligned with the author's own assessment of the value of the experiential narratives that informed his own scholarship.

The editors took considerable care to bracket (Merriam, 2009) their own stories and editorial process. They did not, for example, call "for articulation of the belief systems in language and research" (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 15) as required in duoethnography. Instead they established a protocol of inquiry that sought clarification from chapter authors about the details of their narratives. The approach was phenomenological (Sibbald & Handford, 2017b) with the chapter narrative envisioned as an epistemological conduit detailing how the chapter author understood his lived experience within the tenure-track.

The phenomenological bracketing provided the editors with a means to set aside their own views of tenure-track experience and focus on the chapter author's interpretation of his reality. It was value-laden in a phenomenological sense of wanting the chapter to provide a comprehensive description of the lived experience. The editors' perspective was also value-laden in terms of needing the overall book to be successful and meet the peer review criteria of the publisher. (Similarly, the author was developing a publication that would support his application for tenure.) However, this was ethereal in the sense that the editors lacked experience and operated on an assumption that the quality of the narratives would directly influence the overall quality of the resulting book.

The reconciliation of philosophical assumptions came from the development of a relationship between the author and the editors. When an edited version of the narrative was returned to the author, he became aware that the value-laden component was not what he thought it would be.

... the editors, by not asking to change the stories or interpretations of my experience, but by asking open questions and being curious, helped me understand that my anger was interfering with a more nuanced perspective on the issue and that my account might be better framed as reconciliation (tone of paper changed significantly after that). It also helped clarify my thinking and enrich the narrative ... (Kornelsen, personal reflection, March 19, 2017)

The feedback was more objective, supportive, and inquiring than he had anticipated. This was due primarily to the use of bracketing and questions that mimicked a research interview that sought details to better understand the author's perspective. We have no doubt that "relational tensions persist" (Clandinin & Murphy, 2009, p. 600) but they were substantially reduced.

Worldview

The chapter author believes that experiential learning is of primary importance in teaching. Teachers' professional knowledge, he argues, could be conceived as experiential; knowledge that derives from decisions made and actions taken in the "heat and thick of teaching" (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 9), and knowledge that is embodied (Huber et al., 2013). He believes that work that teachers do in the field mediates, advances, and nuances research and teaching endeavours in faculties of education. Often this mediation is in unique and indispensable ways, and therefore worthy of formal scholarly recognition (Kornelsen, 2017). The author felt strongly that "... research should contain an action agenda for reform that may change the lives of participants, the institutions in which they live and work, or even the [authors'] lives" (Creswell, 2013, p. 26). However, he was also conflicted by feelings that the tenure-track, and subsequent tenure review was a normative process; that his views on bridging practice and theory were not sufficiently

mainstream for gatekeepers of promotion and tenure in universities. He believed peer review would be dismissive of the experiential narratives because the values of peers, generally, would not recognize his insights from experience as grounds for advocacy within the academy.

The chapter author was particularly concerned the editors would not appreciate his insights from experiences as a valid approach to academic research. Experiential narratives based on practitioner experiences are important storytelling. However, the author was concerned that they might be seen as theoretically insufficient for promotion and tenure. In his words:

If we say that a Ph.D. plus requisite publications, sans field experience, is worthy of tenure/promotion consideration, we must also consider how a Ph.D. (including the defense of a dissertation that demonstrates superior facility with requisite literature and research philosophies) plus related experience should be a consideration for tenure and promotion. It is an issue with which many professional schools grapple. I don't think faculties of education are unique in this regard. (Kornelsen, personal communication, June 29, 2017)

The editors held a pragmatic view of the book as a whole. An allowance for heterogeneous worldviews adds to the intrigue of any book. The intention was to allow the chapters to exercise forays into different worldviews but maintain consistency, regardless of the specific worldview of each chapter, focused on the lived experience in the tenure-track. In duoethnography this is “difference as heurism” (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 21), but its scope is the book as a whole and not within individual chapters. For the development of each chapter, the editors recognized that they did not necessarily share the same worldview as each author, and that, given the relatively short time in the academy, which all the tenure-track chapter authors had, chapters might not articulate each author's worldview sufficiently for the novice editors to fully understand. Pragmatically this situation required the editors to take a constructivist view where they attempted to build a detailed understanding of each author's worldview. This was not done in one round of editing, nor was it in isolation; it was effectively a social process where the editors were perceived as working with the narrative author to draw out the richness of the author's experience.

The social constructivist approach was not evident to the chapter author until he received revisions and began to understand that the worldview of the editors was nuanced rather than simply evaluative. Although the author was not sure what the worldview of the editors was, he recognized that social constructivism was helpful and beneficial to drawing out his narrative; “... when I realized that the two editors were just that—equals in a critically supportive relationship—then my stories began to ‘open up’.” The recognition of equality was later attributed, in part, to the author using, but not liking, the term “outsider-ness” and an editor taking this to task, for its meaning, but also admitting they could not think of an alternative word though they wanted it changed. The realization of collegial equality contributed significantly to the development of a relationship that was focused on developing the rich thick narrative.

Interpretive Community

A primary concern of the chapter author was the use of experience in conjunction with iterative reflection, as a basis for knowing or interpreting reality (Sibbald, Kornelsen, & Handford, 2017). He had published individual narratives prior to developing his chapter, but developed the theoretical basis of his work by using multiple narratives to add support for his axiological stance. The developing chapter was theoretically deeper than any of the single narratives, but the clarity

was diminished by the novelty of the process of developing a theoretical framing from the multiple narratives, which was new for the author. It was primarily this aspect of the interpretation that was developed through the sequence of revisions and questions that were transacted between the author and editors.

The editors maintained that the interpretation belonged with the author. They focused on eliciting a holistic account of reality. The view was taken that the recounted experiential narratives and the author's lived experience in the tenure-track were inseparable. The editors felt that the author's struggle to reconcile the experiential narratives with the value-laden peer review processes in the academy was fundamental to the narrative account of his lived experience in the tenure-track.

For the editors to enact their vision that the "author owns the narrative account," it was necessary to consistently provide questions that avoided imposing meaning. With interpretation belonging with the author, the editors focused on seeking clarity about the interpretation. For example, the author described himself as having a feeling of "outsider-ness" with an implication that he was outside the field of practitioners but not yet accepted in the academy. The editors questioned whether he was feeling outside in terms of the decision process for tenure and suggested this may be ignoring the detail that the committee would very likely contain sympathetic others who had similar experiences when they joined the academy. This stance lacked specificity and the author was obliged to clarify his meaning and examine the autobiographical details further. The author has subsequently described the process: "in clarifying the interpretive account a more satisfying interpretation emerges (one that is more comprehensive and comprehensible)." It was the lack of specificity in the editorial questions that led to an iterative sequence of revision, as an open-ended inquiry elicited details, and to additional requests for improving the clarity. This is not to fault anyone engaged in the process; it is to acknowledge that avoidance of imposing direction led to a need for more iterations of revision than would have been required if specific suggestions or speculations had been made.

Discussion

In the process of developing an edited book, the chapter that is the focus of this paper was unique. We do not suggest that it fits with editing generally, but that it may inform opportunities for an editorial process that can develop thick description. This may, for example, be confined to circumstances where the author has access to additional details, such as autobiographical approaches. However, this one instance is important because it provides a potential resolution to issues that exist in autoethnographic research.

The instance recounted here may be viewed as a tenure-track professor, relatively early in his academic career, struggling to "reframe and refocus their inquiry in order to draw conclusions and establish further questions" (Hughes et al., 2012, p. 212). It has become evident through discussion subsequent to the final drafting of the chapter manuscript that the author was reframing his work by bringing together three experiential narratives. The editors were not aware of this, but acted as an external locus of questioning that assisted the author in refocusing and clarifying his conclusions.

The process has been described in terms of philosophical assumptions, worldview, and interpretive community because these clarify how changes took place. Practically, attention was initially focused on the interpretive community because the author was concerned with making a convincing case that his work was sufficiently academic to justify inclusion in the book. The

editors recognized immediately that the use of three narrative accounts within the chapter was distinct among the draft chapters they had received. In the sequence of editorial feedback and revisions there was a focus on developing the author's interpretation, but with careful attention that the account had to remain the author's.

As the process developed, the author responded to questions and developed the needed clarity. For example, the first draft of the chapter ended a paragraph "Working in a faculty of education has helped me to understand why." And the feedback was "I don't understand. 'why what?' I think you are meaning that it has helped to enrich your understanding of education. But I am not sure." Another example that highlights the complexity of some of the discussions arose when it became revealed that the chapter author might have tenure, but was not sure. In essence, the university that he joined has the same Board of Regents as the school where he was teaching for many years and that implied that he had permanence within the governance structure that hired him. An exchange of emails took place where the author quoted from his letter of appointment that he was hired but had to apply for promotion (and only promotion) within five years. The two editors had an exchange of emails and a telephone conversation because being tenure-track was a requirement in the call for chapters of the book. That conversation focused on the interpretation of the chapter author not being certain as to his status in the tenure-track. One editor consulted the collective agreement for the institution and quoted to the chapter author "For a Member with a probationary appointment at the Assistant Professor rank, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are inextricably linked." However, the chapter author was an assistant professor and his response to the email was "Wow, thanks for all of the research on my behalf! You now know more about the Collective Agreement than I do. Again, I'm sorry for contributing this wrinkle to the project." (Kornelsen, personal communication, Jan. 20, 2015) These two examples clarify why it was necessary to have several iterations for the negotiation of that clarity with minimal imposition on the meaning or interpretation by the editors.

The process is inherently bilateral and the chapter author was not isolated from revelations about the editors' worldviews (regarding their own situations to generate rapport, but maintaining their bracketing regarding the author's chapter). However, this was not something the author dwelled on beyond appreciating a sense of non-evaluative objectivity. The extent that the revelation of worldview was substantially one-sided was due to the editors engaging in a bracket (or epoche) process ahead of engaging in editing. It is noteworthy that the text ownership belonged to the chapter author and this mitigated the "disjuncture between researcher and writer" (Clandinin & Murphy, 2009, p. 600) that has been noted in narrative inquiry. It also mitigates the issue of not being able to "know the intimate working of a participant's thoughts" (Clandinin & Murphy, 2009, p. 601) by connecting the book reader to the narrative inquiry authorship more closely.

The methodological qualities that made development of the chapter unusual were due to differences in philosophical assumptions held by the author and the editors. The iterative process was a transaction of communication about the philosophical assumptions that provided for the chapter author's autonomy (Sibbald & Handford, 2017b) in preparing the narrative. In this sense, the author had to reconcile his narrative with a distinctly different set of philosophical assumptions than he personally held during his initial writing. Initially he was concerned about value-laden editorial opinions regarding the use of the narrative method. This led him to draw three experiential narratives together in an effort to provide a broader base of support that could defend his work against unreasonable value assessments. Simultaneously, the editors were immersed in assumptions that were primarily phenomenological and focused on eliciting a

detailed account from the author. Although the author was giving attention to value-laden components, this was not stated overtly and the editors saw an author giving rigorous attention to his narrative. There was a concordance of value-laden views, but although the author initially felt a need to be defensive, the editors were constructive and, in our opinion, it was the reconciliation of these philosophical assumptions that directly addressed common concerns with the use of autobiographical methods.

In the process of this paper being reviewed we had the good fortune that a reviewer raised the question of whether the process was a duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). It is our contention that the focal events of this paper are closely related to duoethnography, but do not satisfy all the requirements. There is no doubt that the editors were “others” who were “inherent in the process” of developing the chapter (Breault, 2016, p. 780). The author and editors shared the experience of being tenure-track and had a mutual understanding of context, though one could argue the book was an examination of how individuals understand that context and this implies only a partial understanding. However, within that partial understanding there was grounding for a relationship of “mutual protection, respect, and empowerment” (Breault, 2016, p. 789) that developed as a “safe space” (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Consistent with the tenets, the particular chapter did not convey a universal notion of truth.

Problematic aspects of describing our experience as a duoethnography arise from fundamental premises. It could be claimed that “what was important about the dialogue was its embodiment of difference” (Sawyer & Norris, 2015, p. 2), but we have to be liberal in the interpretation of difference if we wish to qualify for this interpretation. We did see the chapter differently and articulated places where the editors felt differences of interpretation could be generated, but the view that the author owned the narrative provided a lens of seeking clarification as opposed to dwelling on the differences. The editors were not meaning-makers (Sawyer & Norris, 2013) though they did point out places where they believed the author needed to develop the meaning further, yet the onus was on the author to perform any meaning-making.

It is insightful that duoethnography has provided a useful lens for examining the process. Many notions, such as catalytic validity (Lather, 1986), that are utilized in duoethnography fit with the experience we had. However, a fundamental problem is that “duoethnography has an intentional design” (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 29) and even though that can be qualified as being oriented to dispositions rather than techniques, we simply did not begin with the intention of jointly conducting research.

We have also considered that the process of preparing this manuscript, where the dialog focused on shared experiences of seeing a chapter of a book move from a proposal to inclusion in the published book, may amount to a duoethnography. Although we have not provided details of the actual development of this manuscript, it does seem to constitute a shared effort, in conjunction with a shared experience, which meets the requirements of duoethnography. The co-authorship of this paper was intentional and, in the opinion of the authors, did fit the ten tenets of duoethnography (Sawyer & Norris, 2013).

Conclusions

The methodological approach that emerged in this account is unusual. It did not arise to the same extent with any other chapter in the book. However, it is not the rarity that makes it important, because it may be possible to draw out this methodology more frequently in editorial work. It is that possibility that can inform emergent design (Merz, 2002). However, it also challenges

emergent design because the chapter development was initially perceived as editorial work and the recognition that the editors had become entwined in a research process was an emergent component of the process. This is dissimilar to other emergent design accounts (such as Bruce, Beuthin, Shields, Molzahn, & Schick-Makaroff, 2016) because the emergent design was not due to receiving new data. One can argue revisions of the author's narrative constituted new data, however, this ignores the emergence of the relationship between the researchers as to what constituted the paradigm in which they were researching.

The importance of this paper is threefold. Firstly, it speaks directly to the experience of novice members of the academy making their way with the chapter author coming to terms with academic writing about practice ("I have needed to engage with past experience through a scholarly lens," personal communication, May 21, 2019), and the editors forging their own experiences as editors. Second, it is that a process of reconciliation of different philosophical assumptions, worldviews, and interpretive communities can address issues in autoethnographic methodology. Thirdly, the relaxing of systematic inquiry toward a transactional stance facilitated the engagement of two parties, who held different paradigms, in a discussion that enriched and clarified research findings. It is important to recognize that the transactional stance followed a series of systematic narrative inquiries and that the transactional component arose during the synthesis of those narratives. This does not imply that systematic inquiry can be dropped in favor of a transactional stance; it means that the full research process does not require a single systematic approach and that scholarship can be enhanced, when circumstances are conducive, through reconciliation with a different paradigmatic approach.

Finally, the approach used here is informative about duoethnography and emergent design. It was not the intent of the process to foray into duoethnography or emergent design. However, in hindsight the process seems to be a particular instance of emergent design that has considerable overlap with duoethnographic methodology. The approach we have taken provides a mechanism for providing a theoretical justification for the design that emerged and invokes considerations of how editorial processes might be informed by modern research techniques.

References

- Aulls, M. W. & Shore, B. M. (2008). The experienced teacher and action research. In M. W. Aulls, & B. M. Shore (Eds.), *Inquiry in education*. (Vol.1., pp. 69–81). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Breault, R. A. (2016). Emerging issues in duoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 29(6), 777–794. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2016.1162866
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bruce, A., Beuthin, R., Shields, L., Molzahn, A., & Schick-Makaroff, K. (2016). Narrative research evolving: Evolving through narrative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 15(1), 1–6. doi: 10.1177/1609406916659292
- Bullough, R. V. & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 13–21. doi: 10.3102/0013189X030003013
- Clandinin, D. J., & Murphy, M. S. (2009). Comments on Coulter and Smith: Relational ontological commitments in narrative research. *Educational Researcher*, 38(8), 598–602. doi: 10.3102/0013189X09353940
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2–14. doi: 10.3102/0013189X019005002
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), article 10. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095>
- Huber, J., Caine, V., Huber, M., & Steeves, P. (2013). Narrative inquiry as pedagogy in education: The extraordinary potential of living, telling, retelling, and reliving stories of experience. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 212–242. doi: 10.3102/0091732X12458885
- Hughes, S., Pennington, J. L., & Makris, S. (2012). Translating autoethnography across AERA standards: Toward understanding autoethnographic scholarship as empirical research. *Educational Researcher*, 41(6), 209–219. doi: 10.3102/0013189X12442983
- Kornelsen, L. (2017). For academy's sake: A former practitioner's search for scholarly relevance. In T. M. Sibbald and V. Handford (Eds.) *The academic gateway: Understanding the journey to tenure* (pp. 159–177). Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17(4), 63–84. doi: 10.1007/BF01807017
- Loughran, J. J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. Laboskey, & T. Russel (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (Vol. 1, pp. 7–39). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: a guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Merz, A. H. (2002). A journey through an emergent design and its path for understanding. *Reflective Practice*, 3(2), 141–152. doi: 10.1080/14623940220142299
- Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sawyer, R., & Norris, J. (2015). Duoethnography: A retrospective 10 years after. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 1–4. doi: 10.1525/irqr.2015.8.1.1
- Sibbald, T. M. & Handford, V. (Eds.). (2017a). *The academic gateway: Understanding the journey to tenure*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- Sibbald, T. M., & Handford, V. (May, 2017b). *A substantive model of the tenure-track experience*. Presentation at the Canadian Association of Action Research in Education (CAARE) portion of Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) 2017 conference, Toronto, ON.
- Sibbald, T. M., Kornelsen, L., & Handford, V. (May, 2017). *Story-telling as an iterative qualitative method*. Proposed to the Canadian Educational Researcher Association (CERA) portion of Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) 2017 conference, Toronto, ON.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London, UK: Heinemann.

Tim Sibbald is an Associate Professor of Education with the Schulich School of Education at Nipissing University. He focuses on mathematics education and teaches in the pre-service and graduate programs. He is the editor of the Ontario Association for Mathematics Education (OAME) Gazette. Two books that he edited and coedited, respectively, are *Teaching Interdisciplinary Mathematics* (Champaign, IL: Common Ground Research Networks) and, with Victoria (Tory), *The Academic Gateway: Understanding the Journey to Tenure* (Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press).

Victoria Handford is an Associate Professor of Education with the Faculty of Education and Social Work at Thompson Rivers University. She currently serves as the coordinator of Graduate Programs in Education and teaches courses related to leadership. Her research is focused on leadership, strong school districts, issues related to higher education leadership, and trust. Tory, along with Tim, has co-edited *Beyond the Academic Gateway: Looking Back on the Journey to Tenure* (in press, University of Ottawa Press) and is working on the development of a book about sabbaticals.

Lloyd Kornelsen is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education and the Director of the Human Rights program at the University of Winnipeg. His research interests derive from 25 years of teaching social studies and his current work with high school teachers. Lloyd has been awarded the Manitoba Education Research Network award for outstanding achievement in education. His recently published book, *Stories of transformation: Memories of a global citizenship practicum*, examines the meaning of global citizenship and several of its most affecting pedagogies.