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INTRODUCTION: SANITIZED RESEARCH DESCRIPTIONS AND MESSY REALITIES

A story of contrasts

Todd Ruecker and Vanessa Svihla

Introduction

Read the literature, develop research questions or hypotheses, design a study to answer them, collect data, analyze data, write up the results. The research process discussed in many articles, methodology textbooks, and methodology courses often comes across as linear and tidy. For instance, Johnson & Christensen (2016) said little about the nuances and challenges of participant recruitment and instead discussed the importance of sampling in a way that overlooks the agency and humanity of research participants: “Once these inclusion boundaries are set, the researcher knows whom he or she wishes to study and can then attempt to locate and observe the sample” (p. 273). They urged researchers to pick a sample that can be used to answer research questions while “meeting cost and other constraints,” noting that “Trade-offs will always be present” (p. 273). To be fair, broad survey textbooks like Johnson & Christensen’s (2016) have to cover a lot of material in a short amount of time. Methods books focused specifically on qualitative or ethnographic research tend to cover issues such as rapport (Marshall & Rossman, 2016) and how open and honest one can be with participants (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Yet, even with this advice, understanding what this looks and feels like in practice can be unclear. Paris & Winn (2013) drew attention to researcher emotionality, writing that methodology courses “ignore the obvious; some of the dehumanizing processes, conditions, and experiences that our participants/students/friends have encountered will remind us of our own lived experiences. No one tells emerging scholars that, yes, sometimes ‘we cry’” (p. 1). Unfortunately, broad methods courses may not always include books and topics like these and early researchers may feel deficient when they fail to meet the neat plans described in their textbooks and the articles they read.
As a number of scholars have noted (e.g., Cook, 2009; Lerum, 2001; Mellor, 2001; Thomas, 1998), challenges and disruptions underlying the research process tend to be left out of depictions of the research process for various reasons: our fields’ preoccupation with objectivity in research; space limitations in a typical journal article; and perhaps the fear of looking naive as a researcher. These issues may often be connected back to what Lerum (2001) referred to as “academic armor,” the “linguistic, physical, and ideological” moves that academics make to “protect their expert positions and jurisdictions” (p. 470). Lerum (2001) argued that academic researchers “have clearly marked their turf as the intellectual, the detached, the objective, and hence, because of the cultural privileging of these qualities, the superior realm” (p. 471). The dominance of this “academic armor” is evident in the experience that inspired this collection, which Ruecker details in Chapter 8. Here, he emotionally raises concerns about how immigrants were treated in a school where he was conducting research, resulting in him being disinvited from future visits. As he unsuccessfully tried to publish an article detailing this in two different venues, he faced a mix of enthusiasm and skepticism, ultimately resulting in rejections without a chance to revise. Reviewer comments at one venue noted appreciation for a provocative discussion on the real challenges faced by researchers while rejecting it, in part because of a sense of bias towards participants and its focus on one experience. In response, Ruecker toned down some of the comments revealing his true feelings about the situation and submitted it elsewhere. There, one reviewer was generally enthusiastic, noting that we needed to do more of this type of reflection and discussion of the challenges we face as researchers. The other reviewer strongly advised not to publish this piece in part because it would make Ruecker look emotionally and politically naive and hurt his reputation as an early career scholar—the risk of dropping his “academic armor” was deemed too great.

As is evident from our work on this collection, we share concerns that these reviewers’ comments are symptomatic of a research culture in which discussions of interruptions and researcher emotionality are suppressed—or at least not shared in ways that support growth and learning—even though our discussions with others indicate they are quite common. As early career researchers and while working with graduate students developing their research abilities, we have been concerned that the sanitized realities so common in methodology descriptions may lead emergent researchers to question themselves and their work when something does not go as neatly as planned. This led us to craft a call for proposals, which posed questions such as the following:

- What are some challenges you have faced in recruiting participants?
- Have you put yourself at risk physically, mentally, financially or otherwise, in conducting your research?
- In what ways have language or cultural differences created tensions in or otherwise interrupted your work?
- What are some of the ethical dilemmas you’ve faced while researching and how did they impact your work?
Our drive in working on this collection stemmed from a desire to hear stories of interruption at various stages of research processes, as we believed these stories needed to be heard and that both new and established researchers would learn through reading how other researchers navigated challenges.

**Challenge and mess in research: what we know**

By and large, the clean portrayals of methodological processes presented in published research have gone unquestioned. There have been a few exceptions to this trend in the various fields we inhabit—education, learning sciences, applied linguistics, engineering education, and writing studies—and we review some of these here. For instance, action researchers, perhaps because of their increased focus on researcher positionality, have been more open than others about some of the methodological challenges they have faced, and we found several examples in the journal *Educational Action Research*. We argue that positivist traditions have, in some cases covertly and in others overtly, structured expectations about the research process, and this has encouraged researchers to avoid transparency in reporting on their work. We share consequences of this, including misleading novice researchers about the research process, rendering some findings suspect, and limiting the potential of our work.

Thomas (1998) provided one early critique of the positivist tradition, in which faults in research approaches and designs are typically masked or suppressed, leading to an approach in which “fertility is sacrificed to orderliness” (p. 143). He problematized the idea that the researcher is expected to consistently make order out of chaos, in his words a modern day Midas who is expected to turn everything into theory: “In the modern circumstances of the education academic this predisposition provides a predilection to make shape and theory out of chaos. And having once constructed the shape we of course have to start being analytic and rational about it” (p. 146). Researchers in the field of writing studies—a field that has an established tradition of questioning the objectivity of traditional research modes—have openly discussed such challenges. Describing her ethnographic dissertation project, Cook (1998) explained how “ethnography can seem spectacularly out of control” (p. 107).

Some qualitative researchers have reported challenges getting study approval from institutional review boards (IRBs), as—in their regulatory role—these bodies tend to encourage researchers to coerce their studies into traditional positivist designs (Babb, Birk, & Carfagna, 2017; Patel, 2015). While all IRBs are guided by federal mandates, it is relevant to note that they make determinations based on the opinions of local reviewers and administrators; when such boards are primarily staffed by those from positivist traditions, their guidance and decisions can diminish study design. For instance, Lunsford & Lunsford’s (2008) national study of error and feedback in writing classes—a replication of an earlier study (Connors & Lunsford, 1988)—included a reflection titled “A new study of student writing: those IRB blues.” The authors discussed how the process of soliciting research
approvals had changed dramatically in the intervening 20 years. In the first study, the protocol “easily gained approval from their home institution IRBs—and that approval covered all requirements” (Lunsford & Lunsford, p. 787), allowing them to study classrooms at many other institutions. In the second study, the authors’ IRB required them to seek approval from all institutions where their participants were enrolled, a process that extended what had been three months in the first study to eighteen months in the second, while also reducing the number of participating institutions. Furthermore, whereas in the first study they were able to use entire, intact classrooms, in the second they were typically restricted from using data unless students consented, resulting in a much smaller dataset. They described this process in some detail:

To our surprise, instead of exempting or expediting local approval in light of the Stanford and UCSB approvals, many officials then asked us to go through their own full review process. Thus began the tedious, the time-consuming, the mind-numbing task of filling out dozens upon dozens of IRB forms, each with slightly different emphases and questions, and then waiting, sometimes for months, for a response. (Lunsford & Lunsford, p. 787)

What is notable about this instance is how institutional requirements, while well intentioned, dramatically reduced the number of participants in the study.

Researchers who work outside the positivist paradigm may also face rejection at the hands of journal editors and other gatekeepers. Work that does not fit into particular molds of what reviewers see as new, rigorous, and objective can be deemed unsuitable for publication and that work may never be published. We are not disputing the value of the peer review process but note that it can present additional challenges to researchers whose work does not fit in particular molds. And, as Svihla explains in Chapter 14, these challenges can be time consuming, but also discouraging to the point of abandoning an initial commitment of sharing findings with the people most positioned to act upon them. As Ruecker (2017) explained elsewhere and Svihla discusses in Chapter 14, publishing challenges can be especially acute for interdisciplinary researchers, as many in education are. For instance, Ruecker reported that applied linguistics reviewers would critique his writing style as too subjective, delaying the publication process as he strove for a more impersonal, objective, and sanitized voice.

These sanitized representations of the research process provide an impoverished view of research for novice researchers. For instance, Strauss (1995) revealed how his research led him into multiple periods of despair and self-doubt about his ability as a teacher, writing at one point in his journal: “Maybe I’m just not a very good teacher. Maybe teaching is, knowing what the children are learning and responding to that knowledge. Maybe there’s nothing else to it, and I’m not very good at it” (p. 33). Another action researcher, Cook (2009), described feelings of doubt in light of the published descriptions of research: “We saw a gap between our more
convoluted practice and published models of neat research. This led to doubts as to whether we were doing ‘proper research’ or whether we were doing ‘research properly’” (p. 278). A different Cook (1998) wrote that only after completing her ethnographic dissertation did she feel comfortable talking about some of the challenges she faced, including feeling “deviant” throughout the process. These comments highlight the sense of risk that novice researchers encounter when things don’t go quite as planned.

McKinley & Rose (2017) noted that sanitized versions of research are “depriving researchers of valuable insights from which we can grow and allow novice and experienced researchers alike the chance to learn from our pitfalls, mistakes, and follies” (p. 14). Their edited volume invited applied linguistics researchers to shift their focus away from the findings of an already published study and more closely examine the methodological implications of their work. By not being more transparent about the realities of our research, we make it harder for newer researchers to learn the trade, particularly as they might struggle with feelings of self-doubt as they are unsure how to proceed when facing challenges.

Researchers who are experienced with the complexities of doing longer term, larger scale, or more critical research have also raised concerns about the limitations posed by typical final form representation. In light of her experiences with mess in research, Cook (2009) argued that it is not necessarily a sign of sloppy, poorly done research but in fact “an indicator of serious critique taking place” (p. 285). Upon recognizing that the research process as reported in journal articles is not always the whole story, some researchers react with suspicion about published findings. Writing about the “messiness” of action research, Mellor (2001) explained how he initially came to research with the impression that it was a neat, linear process involving three steps: “collect data, analyze data, write up” (p. 467). He described how he came to be “suspicious of ‘hygienic’ accounts” and that “messy method” was the norm: “if we are honest, we all work this way” (pp. 474–475). In talking with other researchers, Mellor found that, while some said their work aligned to the neat approaches described in journal articles (whether they were honest or not is another question), others admitted to messiness in their own research process. Cook (2009) argued that hiding this mess from view in published research makes “it difficult for future researchers to understand how outcomes were achieved and how they might build on those outcomes” (p. 289). In that sense, detailing researcher challenges and interruptions can be vital if other researchers are to replicate the process and really understand how the researcher came to the conclusions they did.

An increasing number of researchers in education and related disciplines have challenged the traditional research paradigm in recent decades, recognizing that rigid paradigms fail to serve researchers well in a complex world. In the oft-cited book After Method, sociologist John Law (2004) made an argument somewhat similar to Cook’s (2009): “hegemonic and dominatory pretensions” (p. 4) within the traditional, restrictive culture of research methods limit researchers in their quest to capture a complex, messy reality. He wrote, “if we want to think about
the messes of reality at all then we’re going to have to teach ourselves to think, to practise, to relate, and to know in new ways” (p. 2). Part of this new way of thinking and practicing involves room for emotionality in research as well as an understanding that the researcher plays an integral role in shaping a reality that we can never have a complete, firm grip on. Prior (2017) exposed the emotional side of analyzing participant narratives, writing: “I was not just exposed to emotionality by vicariously ‘reliving’ participants’ narratives through repeated data analysis; I was also (re)exposed to emotionality by reliving the intensity of the interviews and the fieldwork” (p. 176). The emotional aspect of researching is often avoided and even discouraged under the guise of objectivity. Prior’s (2017) suggestions of self-care and taking breaks from data are welcome. Appleby (2017) discussed how to deal with controversial findings in which participants express racist views or detail illegal activities or emotionally charged experiences. He suggested thinking through issues that might arise in advance, so one can think of how to respond or not. For instance, should one be silent or speak out if interviewees express ideas that are objectionable to the researcher? As Ruecker details in Chapter 8, speaking out carries risks that can interrupt the research, especially if relations with participants are not fully established.

Law (2004) argued that we need to dismiss our notion of “hygiene” (p. 9) in research because our obsession with clean, neat research methods limits researchers’ abilities to uncover new findings in their work. It can also limit researchers from tackling ambitious and challenging critical work. For instance, Kubota (2017) explained that she has generally avoided studying those less powerful than herself, such as migrants, because of the discomfort and risks of ignoring the institutions and policies that oppress less powerful groups. Cook (1998) detailed the challenges she faced when reluctantly trying to recruit students as a white outsider at an HBCU, noting that in her original writing she relegated this challenge to a brief footnote. She described the process of calling and leaving messages for participants; she did no further follow up with students at the HBCU, telling herself they were too busy with their work and school commitments to participate in her study. The present collection builds on these past concerns, illustrating some of the challenges researchers have faced and providing a vivid and vicarious account of how they navigated them.

Researching in a messy world: new paradigms

As mentioned earlier, ethnographic researchers have a longer tradition of recognizing the diversity of our world and the ways that research changes based on the context in which one is working and their relationships with participants. Hammersley & Atkinson (2007) devoted extensive discussion to issues such as how researchers present themselves to a particular community through their dress and what they choose to share. They acknowledged that some aspects of a person (e.g., their gender or their race/ethnicity) cannot be hidden and will shape the research context, yet noted that a researcher “often has to suppress or play down personal
beliefs, commitments, and political sympathies” (p. 72), even going so far as silently to tolerate situations that they might find “distasteful or shocking” (p. 72), while noting that a researcher can never fully suppress their own biases and convictions.

In contrast, in Humanizing Research, Paris & Winn (2013) aimed to embrace the tension that comes with being concerned about social justice while also being educational researchers. Their collection included chapters that detailed “humanizing approaches as those that involve the building of relationships of care and dignity and dialogical consciousness raising for both researchers and participants” through “reciprocity and respect” (p. xvi). They rejected “the kind of research that does not take as a starting point the humanity and dignity of all people” (p. 251).

For instance, Irizarry & Brown (2014) argued for the importance of participatory action research with youth in schools while detailing how their project was shut down by administration a semester early, noting that “the highly political nature of urban schools makes [participatory action research] and other approaches to humanizing research simultaneously difficult and necessary” (p. 77).

Patel (2015) similarly argued that education research has traditionally been a colonizing enterprise, positioning particular populations in need of interventions and salvation by more privileged researchers. She critiqued Western colonizing frameworks that have shaped research processes, making a strong case that research is “a fundamentally relational, cultural, and political practice” (p. 62) and that research should not just focus on answering questions but, rather, should be accountable to the contexts and participants involved.

To pursue such work, we again take advice from After Method, in which Law (2004) suggested that we “need to teach ourselves to know some of the realities of the world using methods unusual to or unknown in social science” (p. 2). While he resisted imposing “a new orthodoxy” (p. 154) for how this should look, he suggested we reimagine our methods by considering metaphors such as “localities,” “multiplicities,” and “interferences” (p. 156). These metaphors resonate particularly well with the depictions of interrupted research shared in this collection.

The present collection

We approached this collection with an aim to draw out honest stories of how research was interrupted and how researchers navigated and made sense of their experiences. In evaluating proposals, we looked for diversity in different senses: racial/ethnic, institutional, geographic, and disciplinary. We were turned off by proposals that focused too much on the author’s successes. We received a number of proposals sharing this trait, perhaps because the authors had been conditioned by an increasingly competitive research environment in education where researchers are discouraged from dropping their “academic armor” and admitting and discussing failings.

We would be remiss not to mention the proposals we did not receive for this collection. In our editorial discussions, we considered the potential for unintended consequences should we publish a transparent account written by someone very
early in their career. For instance, we had one advisor who said she forwarded the call to a student with an “incredible story” but was unsure if she would submit (she did not). A new assistant professor queried us about the potential of a chapter focused on his research being threatened when his dissertation advisor refused to sign off on the continuing review of his IRB proposal; he recognized the personal and professional risks of writing about this experience and ultimately decided not to submit. We heard from another graduate student who wanted to write about how political constraints in his home country, where speech is often restricted, impacted what he could say or do in his research; after further discussion, he came to the realization that he would not feel comfortable writing openly and honestly about these challenges due to the potential for professional repercussions. Across each of these non-submissions, we see a theme of risk, which further clarified the need for a volume of this nature.

We organized the collection into four sections following this introductory chapter. Our organization traces the research process, from planning through publication. In Part 1, the chapters share stories related to navigating the research approval process and recruiting study participants. Many submissions, including chapters in other parts, reported recruitment issues. It is unsurprising, then, that these issues stemmed from many sources, such as cross-cultural challenges and misunderstandings, power dynamics, and distrust. The chapters in Part 2 report on interruptions due to relationships of various kinds, including with participants as well as with other researchers. These narratives provide a vivid account of the potential complexity and emotionality of qualitative research and the challenges of building relationships across contexts. In Part 3, the chapters detail interruptions—due to mundane, bureaucratic, or major issues—during data collection that lead researchers to abandon or redesign their projects. Finally, the chapters in Part 4 report on challenges faced in the publication and dissemination process, such as prejudices against particular research methodologies or non-standard varieties of English. These are followed by an Afterword that responds to and reflects on the ideas discussed throughout the preceding chapters. We detail each part below.

Part 1, “Getting started: navigating bureaucracies and recruiting participants,” begins with Chapter 2, by Kendi M. Ho, who describes challenges of navigating the Department of Education (DOE) in the state where her research was conducted. She explores a year-long process of applying for a data-sharing agreement with the DOE, only to secure approval just as she was informed of the program being shuttered. In sharing these experiences, Ho explores how researchers need to be ready to adapt their projects based on contextual changes that the researcher has no control over. Chapter 3, by Steven McGee, Randi McGee-Tekula, Lucia Dettori, Andrew M. Rasmussen, and Ronald I. Greenberg, is based on research in Chicago Public Schools and explores the ethics of “do no harm.” They describe the challenges, especially selection bias, that arise when teachers have a distrust of outsiders in part due to distrust of the district as a whole. They offer strategies they have used to overcome these biases, such as offering a pizza party if 90 percent of the students in a class return a consent form, even if the form indicates non-
participation. In Chapter 4, J. Michael Rifenburg takes us to the university level as he describes challenges he faced in recruiting student athletes. He explores how athletes are often buried in levels of institutional protection and discusses the importance of gatekeepers and key informants in facilitating the recruitment process. Chapter 5, by Tanita Saenkhum and Joseph Anthony Wilson, continues this post-secondary focus by exploring the power dynamics they encountered as program administrators seeking to interview students about university assessment practices and placement techniques. They focus particularly on second language speakers of English, which contributed to challenges, as some students were reluctant to participate because they feared their English speaking abilities were not sufficient, or agreed to participate but misunderstood the purpose of the interview as an assessment of their skills.

The chapters in Part 2, “Relationships across contexts: geographical, cultural, political, institutional,” explore the opportunities and challenges inherent in maintaining relationships with participants after the recruitment process, as well as the challenges encountered in cross-cultural relations between researchers. Chapter 6 continues the focus on recruitment challenges while transitioning to broader concerns of relationship building across contexts. Here, Romeo García describes his return to the region where he grew up and his awakening upon discovering that he was no longer the insider he imagined himself to be. He describes how he traded in his rental car for a lower model, dressed more casually, and worked to adopt the dialect of the region while grappling with the emotionality of political realities beyond his control that impacted participants: economic pressures, being arrested, and the threat of deportation.

In Chapter 7, Victor R. Lee, Mimi Recker, and Aubrey Rogowski explain how district restructuring meant that the people with whom the researchers had initially partnered were different from the ones they ended up working with when the project started. During this shift, the researchers learned that the librarians (and others in their schools and the district) had come to see the university as a service provider of programs and resources; consequently, their role as researchers was obscured and hindered. They explain how they worked to readjust their role and relationship with the district and participants. In Chapter 8, Todd Ruecker explores his experience of being disinvited from future visits to a research site after he sent an email decrying racist behaviors against the immigrant students his work focused on. He explores issues such as the way researchers represent themselves to participants as well as the impact of emotionality on researchers and their relationships to their projects and participants. He ends by reflecting on navigating the tension between preserving one’s project and standing up for personal values. In Chapter 9, Ilene R. Berson, Michael J. Berson, Aaron Osafo-Acquah, and Joyce Esi Bronteng explore cross-cultural challenges faced while engaging in a comparative multi-case study of civic education in kindergarten classrooms serving low-income students in the US and Ghana. They focus especially on their relationships with one another, noting how the US and Ghanaian researchers had to negotiate their different understandings, from the design of interview protocols to the analysis of data.
Part 3, “Interruptions during data collection: making it work,” delves into the various interruptions that can happen during the data collection process and how researchers have adapted, sometimes resulting in completely different studies. In Chapter 10, Maggie Dahn explores the everyday interruptions in school-based research that range from unplanned fire drills to the deportation of a student’s family. In arguing that interruptions are the norm in educational research, Dahn encourages researchers to let go of the urge to control everything and instead embrace some ambiguity as a means to improve their work. In Chapter 11, Sharon L. Smith, Loren Jones, and Luciana C. de Oliveira continue this focus on everyday interruptions, ranging from their focal teacher switching grades just before the school year started to the impact of a natural disaster in the form of Hurricane Irma. Harkening back to the discussion on bureaucracies in Part 1, they explore the challenges they faced navigating the IRB process as they sought to adapt their project to account for these changes. Chapter 12, by Michael Tan, is based on case study research in Singapore and explores the challenges he faced, first trying to find purpose as his research plans changed, then making sense of drastic changes in his case study teacher’s approach. He soon learned that the teacher’s contract was not being renewed by the school, a factor that abruptly changed his teaching.

Part 4, “The disruptive forces of scholarly peer review,” includes three chapters focused on interruptions while attempting to disseminate work. In Chapter 13, Grant Eckstein describes his attempt to publish in a top-tier journal and his resilience during six agonizing revise-and-resubmit requests; he ultimately decided to drop the attempt before the paper was rejected. Eckstein describes how the insights he gained through this process helped him navigate future publication experiences as well as develop his own thought processes when he became the founding co-editor of a journal. In Chapter 14, Vanessa Svihla details challenges she faced when the aims of her research shifted and revealed practical implications. She felt strongly that her work should be published in a journal that would be read by scientists who could actually implement her findings, but after three journals rejected the work as not methodological, she resolved to publish it in a more welcoming—if less likely to have worldly impact—journal. Chapter 15, by Aliya Kuzhabekova, focuses on the challenges that non-native speakers of English face when publishing in English, something they are increasingly pressured to do at universities around the world. She describes a time in which an edited collection editor heavily edited her English and took credit in the chapter acknowledgements without seeking her permission, as well as financial and other challenges posed by seeking editors for work to ensure it meets the “standards” of international journal editors.

The collection closes with an Afterword by Amanda K. Kibler. Guided by her extensive qualitative research in diverse settings, Kibler draws out lessons from the preceding chapters. She critically considers the chapters to reveal structural concerns and opportunities related to the kinds of experiences new qualitative researchers might benefit from as well as institutional barriers that could be improved. Finally, she articulates the significance of the collection by elucidating some of the insights from such transparency.
References


Chapter 2

1 In this situation, this is the written agreement between the researcher and the state Department of Education specifying the researcher’s access to student or staff data in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

2 In the US, adults without a high school diploma can earn a high school equivalence by passing a state approved high school equivalency test, like the GED. In 2011, the American Council on Education, a non-profit that administered the GED, collaborated with Pearson Education to revamp the test for the twenty-first century by creating an online assessment that was aligned to the Common Core with a focus on complexity using Webb’s Depth of Knowledge. Because of the increased difficulty and cost, states began adopting alternative high school equivalency tests, such as Educational Testing Service’s High School Equivalency Test (HiSET) or McGraw-Hill’s Test Assessing Secondary Completion (TASC) (Porter, 2015).

3 IES specified that all grant applications must be submitted by an institution via the internet and using software found on Grants.gov.

Chapter 6

1 Previous conversations on critical ethnography and the relationship between rhetorical and ethnographic studies helped lay the foundation for this concept (see Brown, 2004; Gorzelsky, 2004; Thomas, 1993).

Chapter 12

1 Charlie was an expatriate teacher on a short-term contract, and because of the small size of the community, I am deliberately obfuscating personal details due to the risk of identification.
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