



## ***Disrupting the Able-Bodied Normativity of Shared Power in the Duoethnographic Process: A Critical, Disability Studies Lens***

---

*Emily A. Nusbaum, University of San Francisco  
Kathleen C. Sitter, Memorial University*

### ***Abstract***

*Duoethnography (DE) is a collaborative research method where two or more individuals explore similar and different meanings of a phenomenon, based on each of their life experiences (Norris, 2008). Created by Joe Norris and Rick Sawyer, the approach is informed by the narrative tradition of storytelling and builds on Pinar's concept of currere. This paper will use one author's experience with a DE project as a "case," which provides a context for both authors to juxtapose their histories with DE. Our purpose is to uncover and disrupt many of the assumptions of able-bodied normativity within DE's methodological processes, as this has yet to be explored within the duoethnographic literature. More specifically, we will use a reflexive process about the tenets of duoethnography as identified above to better understand the role of power within co-researcher differences, and to also explore the challenge and personal risk of research methods that require relationship, care, trust, and vulnerability.*

***Keywords:*** *duoethnography, currere, normativity, ableism*

### **Background**

Duoethnography is a form of research that connects the narratives of two individuals with Pinar's (1975, 1994) concept of *currere*. The use of *currere* within duoethnography positions the researchers' lives as the curriculum—the sites of the research—with the goal of using themselves to support deeper exploration and understanding of a phenomena. Our conversation uses one of our recent encounters with duoethnography as a "case" through which we use the method to explore various methodological questions. Here, we draw on a number of the duoethnographic tenets outlined by Norris and Sawyer (2012). We ensure our stories and voices are made explicit in order to intentionally juxtapose and disrupt metanarratives at the individual level by unpacking our personally held beliefs, and we invite the reader to further critique the relationship between the personal and larger narrative (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Duoethnographies are more than a conversational transcript; the conversation is inclusive of both the research and the analysis. In duoethnographies, readers are asked to bear-witness to the act of researchers engaging in a dialogic encounter where they explore and juxtapose their experiences and beliefs (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). It is through

this explicit juxtaposition of stories where “meanings can be and often are transformed through the research act” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 9).

Duoethnography is also about making explicit how people “can experience the same phenomena differently” (p. 17). In our dialogical encounter, we also share our different experiences of previously engaging with the methodology of duoethnography. Specifically, we use duoethnography to explore its potential as a critical, qualitative method through our discussions about normativity and ableism, related to research methods, disability, privilege, and the academy. While this approach calls for researchers to engage in a process that strives for research “with” and not “on” another individual (Norris & Sawyer, 2012), we find ourselves pushing the boundaries of this claim in a methodology that predominantly privileges written text. As a result of this process, we reconceptualise meanings of the past and found our own perspectives changed in how we understand and critique duoethnography as a critical qualitative methodology.

### **Encountering Duoethnography**

#### **Kathy**

I remember when we met at the American Education Research Association conference in 2013 based on our mutual work and research in the disability community. While we live in different countries, we continued to communicate via email about our research, especially our shared interested—yet varied experiences with—duoethnography. When you suggested we explore duoethnography as a critical methodology, I was very excited! I remember when I learned about duoethnography, a research method created by Rick Sawyer and Joe Norris (Norris, 2008). The approach is based on learning about a topic through a discussion (Lund & Nabavi, 2008). The approach expands on William Pinar’s concept of *currere*, where people explore their own perspectives by engaging through dialogue (Norris, 2008). It builds on the power of storytelling and personal narrative. So the idea here, is that we revisit our discussions through email, and build and rework our dialogue.

So where should we begin? I wonder if we should start by talking about our own experiences with duoethnography (DE)? We each seem to have varied histories with the process, and I know that I have questioned whether it is a methodology that can be taken up by everyone. Darren Lund introduced me to DE, and has also published on the topic (Lund & Evans, 2006). When I first heard of DE, I was a student and very interested in learning about critical methodologies. While I initially didn’t consider it as such, as I read about it, what attracted me to DE was that it was about sharing and co-creating knowledge through a dialogical encounter from two dissimilar experiences or perspectives. Aspects of the process spoke to me: two individuals distributing power in the research process, learning from and with each other through a shared reflexivity, and considering our current situation while also acknowledging our histories. For these reasons, I ended up engaging in DE with a colleague about our own different experiences and backgrounds about professional boundaries (see Sitter & Hall, 2012). I learned a great deal from that process and how DE can be a process that brings together divergent positions to develop new knowledge about a topic. I’m curious what attracted you to duoethnography? And whether you consider it to be a critical methodology?

## Emily

I “found” duoethnography almost by accident it felt like. I had some narrative data—summaries of conversations, as well as email and text exchanges between a friend and me, over the course of a few years, which I wanted to analyze. I began my research trying to use video to support analysis of our narratives. My friend is a young woman who was labeled with intellectual disability and our conversation began about five years ago when she asked me “how did they know that I had *it*?” The “*it*” that my friend referred to was the label of intellectual disability. Originally, I wanted to answer questions like these: In what ways can participatory video be used to explore, develop, and expand the narratives of identity with young adults with intellectual disability? And, how do these individuals understand and interpret their own narratives, and how might this empower them? What this original approach and set of guiding questions left out, however, was where I was situated within these narratives—most of which began as co-constructed conversations between myself and my friend. I am a university professor, a white, cisgender woman, who was pursuing the academic exercise of data analysis. Significantly, what this approach left out was how our conversations reflected not just her identity work, but my own internalized scripts that were being examined, questioned, and reconceptualized. And this was when I found a methodological text on duoethnography and the method seemed to provide exactly what was missing in how I’d previously conceived of this research. Most importantly, was what Sawyer and Norris (2012) refer to “bracketing in,” versus traditional notions of the researcher “bracketing themselves out,” typically in the name of increased “objectivity.”

In reflection, I had been on a “search for method” since my friend and I began our conversations, and especially as I became more fully aware of and comfortable in the uncomfortable space of placing myself within these conversations—a space and process that narrative inquiry, as method, did not fully address. I was also thrilled to reconnect with you after reading your chapter in the Norris, Sawyer, & Lund (2012) text. I thought very early on that duoethnography had great potential as a critical method and that it posed some significant challenges within the academy—this was where I initially reached out to you. However, it was when I encountered my own power and privilege in my research with my friend that I wanted to write about the method with you, as someone more experienced with DE, whom I trusted. My turn to DE as a way to uncover my own role in co-constructed narratives with my friend have actually uncovered the challenge and personal risk of using a research method that requires relationship, care, trust, and vulnerability. For our conversation right now I want to unpack this idea of DE as a critical method a bit more.

The question of critical method is one that, on the surface as it relates to duoethnography, seems easy to answer. As a non-prescriptive and non-linear method, which relies on researcher difference, that captures the voices of each researcher explicitly, and that uses a reflexive and dialogic process to disrupt and re-story metanarratives of a phenomena and the self (Norris & Sawyer, 2012), duoethnography seems absolutely critical. I wanted to engage in this process with you to explore this question and find a possible answer. Do you think of duoethnography as critical?

## Duoethnography as a Critical Methodology: Power and Privilege

### Kathy

Your question is interesting, as I consider that most of my research and community work is guided by critical theories. Freirean pedagogy and critical disability studies predominantly inform how I approach participatory arts-based research, where I think that working alongside community members using processes that are accessible and honor different ways of knowing are key. However, when I first learned about DE, I never thought of it as a “critical” methodology. What largely influenced my frame-of-reference with DE was the work of Gadamer and the idea of the hermeneutic circle, as it involves a process of engaging in a conversation by moving back and forth between our histories, what we know, and it also calls for us to put our assumptions and what we know into play (Gadamer, 1975, 2004). It was only when I actually participated in my first DE that I began to understand how power was shared between both my colleague and myself in this process. It was then where I began to see commonalities between critical, participatory-based approaches with DE. As we were both in the roles of “researcher and participant” we were able to make decisions about what we share, how we share it, and the ways in which we engage in the DE process together. I still find DE extremely vulnerable, but yet that is also a reminder of what researchers often ask of participants!

As I previously mentioned, my first DE research was with a colleague. We were both cis-gender, white, non-disabled, and held a strong awareness of our different positionalities (he was a psychologist, I was a social worker, and we were exploring the topic of professional boundaries). At the time of our DE, I was a PhD student, he had recently completed his Masters and we both worked in the community. I found the duoethnographic research process a positive experience. We were both new to the methodology but we had the time to work through the process and co-create new knowledge in areas that came through our discussions.

### Emily

What are your thoughts about this method and “if it can be taken up by everyone?” I think I should backtrack a bit and tell you about the friend who was going to be my co-researcher. Our friendship began five years ago when I was a new, assistant professor at a large, public university and worked in a special education/teacher licensure program. During this time I had the opportunity to meet a young woman in her mid-20’s, who was part of a segregated program to support access to post-secondary settings for young adults labeled with intellectual disability (ID). During the time I continued to work at that university, my friend would often spend afternoons during the week in my office. Initially, our conversations almost always began with her asking questions about her history and life- I remember the day that she asked me “how did they know that I have *it*?” I asked her what she meant by “it” and she said “disability, how did they know?” She asked if it was her thick glasses, the arm that was smaller and not as developed as the other, or if it was something about how she walked or spoke. I have other disabled friends- some with visible and some with invisible disability, most who claim this identity. But this was the first time I had ever had someone I’d grown to care about as an individual, someone I respected and valued in my life, ask me, as a non-disabled professional, this question about themselves and their body/mind. Until this point and that question (“how do they know I have *it*?”) our conversations often began with an experience that she had had and that she was reflecting about in light of a newly acquired sense

of herself as an individual who had experienced a significant amount of oppression. We spoke as friends, although I was able to give her my opinion based on my own professional experience with special education and other disability-related systems.

### **Kathy**

Your friend's questions about "*it*" are so powerful. And I also think her comment touches on some of the critiques of the social model of disability. The social model is critical in understanding how people are disabled from/by their environment, and if society addresses these barriers, then the disability is removed. While this can be easier to understand with physical barriers, her question reminds me of the attitudinal barriers that are embedded in normative assumptions of how people are "expected" to be in the world. For me, your friend's reference to "*it*" embodies this reality.

### **Emily**

Early on in our friendship, when I thought about my privilege, I know that I tried to be aware of it and use it in ways that could support her to uncover aspects of herself that she was newly exploring, and also to help build a circle/system of support for her to create the life that she talked about wanting—a life that included continuing to live in her own apartment, having paid work in the community, being respected by her family, and having meaningful, social relationships. During that period I never thought critically of the power and privilege I have, as a white, educated, middle-class, non-disabled woman; rather I acknowledged to myself that I had this power and believed that if I used it to help my friend get access to the things that she wanted in her life then it would mitigate these myriad differences between us. Some of our conversations were very vulnerable—for her to trust me to talk about her body, her history, and her lived experiences so openly. And also for her to call me out on my privilege ("you don't have to do this because you don't have *it*, right?" as she was navigating various disability-related funding systems). Until the time/space that our relationship and our communication became a site for research, I thought that we would just be friends— not a white, able-bodied professor and a person labeled with intellectual disability who was living within all of the constraints of the disability service system.

### **Kathy**

Your last sentence really captures what many people with various types of privilege—including myself—can relate to as a false and problematic assumption. I know I am guilty of it. I'm wondering if you can explain a bit more how that approach has unfolded in your research with duoethnography?

### **Emily**

As I described above, I had previously understood my power—especially when my friend talked to me about challenges she faced that, as she pointed out "you don't have to do this because you don't have *it*, right?" But it really began to surface for me when I began to write about DE. This "encountering" feels like hitting a wall or a punch in my stomach when I allow myself to *feel*

it. I can write and talk about the power and privilege that I know that I have, in relation to my friend. I am a white, able-bodied, woman who has had access to doctoral level of education and is an assistant professor. My friend is a woman of color, who was labeled with an intellectual disability in middle school, and lives within the disability service system. The very real “*feeling*” of my power and privilege, in relation to someone I care about personally, is something that I know I haven’t encountered in a research methods text or in many pieces of academic writing.

### **Different Ways of Knowing**

#### **Kathy**

When I have thought about the accessibility of this method, specifically in written form, I am reminded of Heron and Reason’s (1997) four ways of knowing: Experiential (knowing through direct encounter), propositional (knowing through theories and statements), presentational (creative forms of expression), and practical (knowing through doing). In honoring different forms of knowledge, I also think people communicate their truth and share their practical wisdom in different ways, and in these spaces, voices can take shape beyond the written and spoken word. When thinking of language, presentational knowing acknowledges there are many different languages in which meaning is created. For instance, the language of colors and shapes also leads to paintings and sculptures, and the language of both still and moving images can lead to visual storytelling. Written and spoken communication are not always the most accessible ways to share knowledge, and I find myself asking if there are ways in which DE can further support presentational ways of knowing? I find participatory, visual arts-based methods more accessible. For instance, in photovoice, people are asked to take photographs about their experiences and/or perspectives related to the topic being explored and subsequently use their images as a means to explore the topic amongst the group. Similarly, participatory video involves handing the camera over to the community to develop and create videos as a means to explore issues and honor stories and lived experiences. People do not have to be able to read or write to engage in these processes. Accessibility also includes audience accessibility; the visual affords ways to reach people and share knowledge in multimodal ways. However, I find DE in written form may present participatory challenges. Must a person have the ability to articulate a strong self-awareness of their own social location and personal history to be able to engage in this process? Or in a very practical sense, what if someone can’t read or write? By privileging the written word in meaning making, does the DE process support ableist assumptions?

What I found interesting in your work Emily, was that you attempted to unpack these ideas especially as they relate to accessibility and knowledge, by introducing video. I’m curious how found this process? Did it create a more inclusive space?

#### **Emily**

My friend and I spent years primarily using in-person conversations or text (emails, text messages, and text summaries of our phone conversations) to communicate. As I said earlier, I came to DE after talking with my friend about doing research together—analyzing our communication. Originally thought I’d only be analyzing her narratives. My intention had been to use participatory video as a tool to use narrative analysis to understand her identity work. When I found DE (as I described above) I felt video could be useful to bridge the divide of 1000 miles between

my friend and me (I had moved to a new university a few states away). Since my friend lives on a very limited budget (she works part-time at minimum wage and relies on state-funded, supported housing once she had to move out of her apartment) I knew that she didn't have and couldn't afford a smart-phone. I was able to use some grant monies from my university to purchase a portable, flip camera and a plane ticket to where my friend lives. Over the phone my friend and I planned that when I came we would learn how to use the camera together and that I would purchase a number of addressed/stamped envelopes to mail it between us. Each one of us would keep it for a few weeks and then mail it to the other to watch and respond. We would use our video recorded conversations to, in essence, analyze our historical conversations that existed in emails, electronic documents, text messages, and memory. I struggled with the issue of knowledge production for ourselves, versus knowledge production in the academy- and what would emerge as the product of our conversation/research. My friend agreed that she would work on a written manuscript with me since I needed that to eventually get tenure. This was what we had planned to do with video and DE—but what happened when I was preparing and then traveled to see her disrupted the course of our project and also our relationship as a whole.

We never were actually able to use video to continue our conversations and use DE to understand them more fully. A few days before I was traveling to see my friend and learn how to use the camera together she called me very upset. She told me that the woman who ran the family-home program where she now lived would not allow me in the house. This was a firm house/program rule. When I asked my friend how she felt about this she became very upset. When I called her the next day I told her that we did not need to pursue the research together—to set up the camera and establish our system of recording and mailing it back and forth. But that I was still coming (I had a plane ticket) and that I just wanted to be able to see her. But it was this conversation that ended our friendship. My friend told me that the woman she lived with wanted to know what the purpose of the research was because most people did research “*on*” disabled individuals, told her that I was likely not a “real” professor because why would I have a friendship with *her*, and that she no longer needed friends who were outside her program. This brings me back to consider the “possibility” of video in the construction of new knowledge—and yes! I believe that video offered possibility in access to our constructing new knowledge together that would have been difficult otherwise for a number of reasons, but especially related to the privileging of the written word in DE. But because of other factors related to some of the enormous differences between each of our lives- and the taking away of her own autonomy and control based on policies of the program she lived within- these possibilities were never explored.

### **Kathy**

That's terrible. It doesn't sound like there is a lot of autonomy and decision-making power for your friend. I can understand why this was so emotional for her to talk about.

### **Emily**

This is where critical reflection about power begins for me. My friend and I could have a shared sense of power in our relationship and thus in how we constructed the idea of this research together. But as a non-white, disabled woman, living within disability systems and having been systematically denied opportunities to education and a life integrated in the community, I possess power and privilege in my life that she will never have based on our differences in every marker

of identity besides gender. Although my friend possesses a form of “indigenous knowledge” (Chilisa, 2012) that I believed was essential to some of the tenets/aims of DE, our friendship was unable to mitigate the able-bodied and normative expectations of the academy. And, even more so, the deeply institutionalized forms of structural and social oppression that exist for disabled people. Perhaps our DE work was achieving a kind of truth—“speaking a truth that is not otherwise made visible by normative ways of knowing or coming to know.” As such it represents a powerful and important example of Heron and Reason’s (1997) experiential knowing—knowing through direct encounter. And perhaps, by sharing power within our conversations my friend and I were able to achieve this critical aim just in that space—our conversations. But this sense of shared power and privilege could not translate into the spaces of what happens before and after the field of research, if that makes sense.

I’m left with loose ends and a feeling of untidiness after writing this—in acknowledging and accepting the deep tensions between relational space and research space of my friend and I specifically because within DE, the relational space is the research space. I wonder how you experienced shared power in your experience in DE and if this is similar to how you’ve experienced it using other, critical research methods with disabled individuals?

### **Kathy**

My experience with DE was very transparent and I did find it extremely collegial. In one of my experiences, we actually recorded a 2-hour conversation, transcribed it, then we went “back and forth” revisiting our positions and further reflecting on our comments. We each had the autonomy to make the decision of what was included and/or excluded in our written dialogue. If we had different ideas on a topic, we would incorporate that into the DE and write about it and explore it more from our own perspectives. I guess you could say we both “actively” participated in the process, as we decided how we wanted to present our voices, and how what we wanted to share in our writing. We talked about the vulnerability of it, which is also why I appreciated the time that we had to reflect on the writing itself. From when we started to when we finalized our completed manuscript, it was 6-7 months.

However, I think your experience with DE touches on an important part of duoethnography—and perhaps many other methodologies—where sharing power in the relational space is understood as critical to the process, but there are also limitations in that the power doesn’t carryover; it doesn’t address the structural or systemic forms of oppression your friend faces outside of the research context. I have noticed similarities between DE and other critical methods I’ve work with. For instance, in different photovoice and participatory video projects where I’ve worked with disability advocates, an extended length of time was critical in order to develop relationships, trust, and be immersed in the process of critical reflection. Like DE, participants engaging in these visual methods also could decide how and if they represent their experiences and ideas about a topic. However this was primarily done via still and moving images, not written text that does take precedence in DE. This is where I find myself wondering if the written format of DE lends itself as well as arts-based methods do when it comes to addressing power differentials, and other guiding principles of participatory research? It is here where I wonder if DE bumps up against normative assumptions, and if so, is there a way this can be reconciled or addressed?



## Sharing Power Outside of the Research Process

### Emily

This privileging of the written form, even if using art to approach—this is where you made the distinction in our conversation between mitigating power and transparency in what happens *before* and *after* the research. Leading up to writing this DE with you, I proposed, had accepted, and presented work related to the method and my experience with my friend at a large, educational research conference. My proposal received high scores and comments from reviewers about the critical potential of this emerging method. My paper presentation went well, I suppose. And yet, not one reviewer, panel member, discussant, or audience member who commented noticed the absence of not only my friend's voice in my proposal (it was a single-author submission), but also in the physical space of the conference and panel. This realization for me was also not immediate—but occurred as I was preparing just a few hours before my talk, when I noticed that I had constructed a proposal and paper for these spaces that were based on my voice—specifically, my academic voice that I use in order to meet the normative expectations of the academy and of those in attendance. It brought up for me an early conversation that my friend and I had had, when we decided to do a DE together. She asked if we would present the work at a conference (we had presented at some disability rights conferences about our co-teaching work together at my former university) and I remember profound discomfort as I thought about how to answer her in a way that was honest about the expectations for my work in academia and how the sharing of power between us, in the research field, so to speak, likely would not translate to academic conference spaces and even publication.

In one of our phone conversations you talked about the difference between mitigating power (a tenant of DE, as a method and methodology) and transparency, when doing participatory work with community members and other research project partners. The difference between the two, as you described some of your previous research and the goals of you (a university researcher) and your community partners (who were a group of self-advocates that organized to raise awareness about sexual health as a human right) had particular relevance for me—and especially the consideration of DE as a method that could mitigate power between two individuals, and the question of if this can be done when the research is attached to a university?

### Kathy

Yes, I think this is a challenge. As academics, we are bound by certain responsibilities associated with our roles. This includes aspects of Institutional Review Boards (IRB)'s. While I don't think it's about ignoring that in any way, I do think it requires transparency about my roles and responsibilities with the people I work with in the community. When I start a project with people in the community, we discuss what our expectations are, our needs in the research, and what my roles are when it comes to my relationship with the university, and that is our starting point. But it does create challenges when we are working from a participatory framework. That's where I do make a distinction from participatory action research (PAR) and participatory research. My approach with PAR is from beginning to end: inclusive of developing the agenda to the distribution. It's a focus on process, engagement, voice, and yes, mitigating power. But I find that participatory research differs for me in that this "shared collaboration" is focused mostly in the context of fieldwork. The principles of participation and community knowledge guide the work

in the field. This means that the community uses the final pieces in different forums that I might not be involved in. For example, in one project, the community group I worked with continued to share the participatory videos in different spaces, as part of workshops and community presentations. While the videos are on YouTube, over the years, I don't know all of the places the group has shared the videos. The videos have lived on in different spaces as decided by the group. Similarly, when we started the research, I was transparent in my desire to be able to write about the work in peer reviewed journals. While we have co-presented in different forums, we've also worked independently in the distribution. I am still wondering how best to navigate this process.

### **Emily**

I also encountered this during the process of moving the DE work with my friend through my university's institutional review board (IRB), which was when I first contacted you about using duoethnography. I submitted the proposal to my university's IRB and identified my friend as my co-researcher, which fits within the tenets of DE. The head of the IRB returned my proposal to me, very focused on the "it" that KJ had previously asked me about- having "it" (the label of intellectual disability). The normative work of the IRB went beyond her status as part of a vulnerable population—and seemed to work in very ableist ways to reify intellectual disability as a self-fulfilling way of being, as well as reinforce ableist and normative ideas about the academic expert and where they were positioned in relation to someone labeled with intellectual disability. The head of the IRB repeatedly asked for documentation of "how much" intellectual disability my friend *has*—as if this is an unquestioned "truth" about her being in the world, versus a constructed phenomenon. I recognize that this reflects not only the legitimization and privileging of certain methodologies, but also (and perhaps more so), the ableism that is built into procedures created to "protect" those that they discriminate against. I removed my friend as co-researcher from my proposal; she and I remained the participants together and our relationship the site of the research. But only I was listed as the researcher. My proposal was subsequently approved almost immediately.

### **Kathy**

You asked me earlier how I've experienced shared power in working with critical research methods with disabled individuals, and I'd like to revisit that question here. When it comes to distribution—specifically who and how decisions are made when sharing aspects of participatory arts-based works—that has been a space where participants have made those decisions. In my experience with IRBs, I now indicate that the visual stories are owned by the participants, but I ask permission from the participants (in the consent forms and outlined by the IRB) to write about and share their visual stories in certain spaces. While I do not think this mitigates power, this is where I am currently at in supporting participants leading the decision-making process in public distribution which can open up spaces for what I understand to be "radical incrementalism." Radical incrementalism is about striving for fundamental change, that might result in some minimal improvements to the current status quo, but these changes can lay the foundation for incremental change in the future (Schram 2002). This type of research is grounded in community, where participants are actively involved in leading where the work goes. With the example I shared earlier about participatory videos, this was a research project where disabled activists created videos about their perspectives and experiences with sexual rights, and included these videos as part of a community organizing and human rights initiative to raise awareness. Yet the efforts of these activists

in organizing screenings, exhibitions, putting their videos online, and so on also resulted in mobilizing further support within and beyond the disability community. When I think about radical incrementalism, I think of the voices that are often on the margins being at the forefront.

I find myself coming back to the “written text” as the core means of the DE methodology. This is where I think access and inclusion within the context of critical research must be addressed. I wonder how a space can be created that is inclusive of different ways of knowing, and concomitantly how this can be done through expressing our knowledge beyond the written word. In order to value multimodalities of sharing and developing new knowledge that holds the type of “power” assigned to peer review publications, perhaps this is where the arts can assist in creating such a space? I do think this would require reconsideration to how the weight that is placed on academic publications that challenge normative assumptions. Would it have been different if both you and your friend explored what the word “*it*” meant through an art form? And then you each went back and forth until a shared image was created from both your positionalities? For me, this would be quite powerful. Yet I am still wondering what that would mean when we think about distribution and academic spaces. Perhaps if we are to venture into and develop these spaces—that may be considered radical - we must also create more academic publication channels that support this way of creating new knowledge.

### **Emily**

Your ideas and questions here deeply and powerfully get at some of the questions that I came to you originally wanting to explore, related to duoethnography. I am struck by my original response to your thinking here—sort of an “of course,” just look at different forms of representation in disciplines outside the social sciences. And then questions of “how” and “where,” when considering my own status as a not-yet-tenured assistant professor within the social science. Where does that leave us here—in our consideration of duoethnography as a critical, qualitative method in educational and community contexts, and in partnership with disabled people? The challenge of this- of true praxis- is tied to the “messiness” of this work- of relationship and the personal within our work, of thinking about research that can be truly inclusive, and how this can be used to, in turn, create spaces for distribution that are expansive of the current, hegemonic peer-review process in social sciences. How can these spaces that critical methods open hold the same power as traditional academic ones?

### **Kathy**

I think that critical methods hold quite a bit of power (or have the potential to) with consideration to honoring voice, lived experiences, decision-making, and collaboration. Attempting new ways to engage in the DE process, such as you’ve done, are important efforts that raise key questions that must be raised as this methodology continues to evolve. In our discussion, you’ve given me further insight into this methodology, and also challenged my thinking with how we can potentially address normative assumptions that are implicit in the DE process. I do think that the theories informing DE align with inclusion, and the arts may be one of many different avenues that speak to this. I agree that this will require creating more academic channels that are open to publishing various academic forms of representation. The possibilities of DE are exciting, and I’m glad that we are exploring some of these areas through the process itself.

### References

- Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Gadamer, H-G. (2004). *Truth and method* (2nd ed.) (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, (Trans.)). London, UK: Continuum. (Original work published 1975).
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A participative inquiry paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(3), 274-294.
- Lund, D. E., & Evans, R. E. (2006). Opening a can of worms: A duo-ethnographic dialogue on gender, orientation and activism. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 10(2), 55-67. Retrieved on November 1, 2010, from: <http://www.freireproject.org/taboo-journal-culture-and-education>.
- Lund, D. E., & Nabavi, M. (2008). A duo-ethnographic conversation on social justice activism: Exploring issues of identity, racism, and activism with young people. *Multicultural Education*, 15(4), 27-32.
- Norris, J. (2008). Duoethnography. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2) (pp. 233-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Norris, J. & Sawyer, R.D. (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. Sawyer, & D. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, Health, and educational research* (pp. 9-39). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Pinar, W. (1975). Currere: Towards reconceptualization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 396-414). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. (1994). The method of Currere: Essays in curriculum theory 1972-1992. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Autobiography, politics, and sexuality* (pp. 396-414). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Schram, S. (2002). *Praxis for the poor: Piven and Cloward and the future of social sciences in social welfare*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sitter, K. C. & Hall, S. (2012). Professional boundaries: Creating space and getting to the margins. In J. Norris, R. Sawyer, & D. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 243-260). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

**Emily A. Nusbaum** is an assistant professor at University of San Francisco. Her current research is focused on developing critical, qualitative research methods related to disability. She has also used ethnographic methods to uncover the tenuous commitments of teachers to inclusive schooling within accountability pressures, concluding with the need for inclusive education to be taken up as an ideological stance.

**Kathleen C. Sitter** is an assistant professor at Memorial University. Her research in critical disability studies primarily focuses on the affordances and limitations of participatory and arts-based research relating to community engagement and human rights. She is currently a co-investigator on a national research study (CIHR) involving the creation and distribution of anti-stigma participatory videos exploring the topic of mental health.