Teaching and Learning Research Literacies in Graduate Adult Education: Appreciative Inquiry into Practitioners' Ways of Writing

Dorothy A. Lander, Saint Francis Xavier University

ABSTRACT

Graduate students in Canadian universities who conduct research with human subjects as part of the requirements for their degree must submit a research proposal to the University Research Ethics Board and receive approval on the basis of compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (1998). This reflexive account of teaching and learning research literacies is based on a participatory research activity that the author has used during graduate students' introduction to a research-based, self-directed graduate program in adult education delivered at a distance. For the purposes of this paper, "research literacies" refers to any research practices that culminate in

RÉSUMÉ

Ce compte rendu, de nature réfléchie, sur l'enseignement et l'apprentissage de la littératie de recherche, offre un cadre théorique et méthodologique pour une démonstration-application en salle de classe d'un projet de recherche active. Ce projet s'est fait avec une cohorte d'étudiants gradués pendant leur orientation à un programme de maîtrise, enseigné à distance, en éducation aux adultes. Au cours du module résidentiel de trois semaines, la démonstration-application prend la forme d'un projet de recherche simulée qui dure une heure et qui utilise la méthodologie de la recherche active (voir Cooperrider & Srivasta, 1987). Il y a un double but à la démonstration-application en salle de classe de la

Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education
Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 2002
pp. 31–55

the writing of a research thesis, taking into account the procedures for compliance with the Tri-Council Policy. The focus of the reflexive account is an experiential classroom innovation with multiple cohorts of graduate students (8-12 students each) in which the faculty advisor as the principal investigator involves the graduate students as research participants in appreciative inquiry into practitioners' ways of writing. This participatory research into practitioner and researcher literacies offers some implications for teaching and learning the ethics of representation throughout the research process up to and including publication.

recherche active dans les styles d'écriture de praticiens: d'abord, offrir une introduction plus ciblée et concise à la littératie de recherche, et deuxièmement, identifier et valoriser les styles d'écriture de praticiens des styles qui se traduisent ensuite en littératie de recherche. La littératie de recherche comprend de multiples pratiques sociales et éthiques qui se révèlent au fur et à mesure que l'on fait des projets de recherche originale – des pratiques variant des comités universitaires d'éthiques de la recherche à celle de la rédaction d'un mémoire de recherche. Ce compte rendu décrit une salle classe expérientielle innovatrice qui utilise la méthodologie de la recherche active, où le membre du corps professoral et conseiller remplit le rôle de directeur de recherches et où de multiples cohortes (8 à 12 étudiants chacun) d'étudiants gradués assumant le rôle de participants. Cet article se termine avec un compte rendu décrivant le transfert d'apprentissage, tel que témoigné dans la recherche active des travaux écrits soumis par les étudiants-gradués-participants après leur orientation.

INTRODUCTION

This article emerges out of my *response-ability* as a faculty adviser for supervising, reading, and responding to successive drafts of the research theses of graduate students who are experienced practitioners in diverse areas of adult education. Like Neilsen (1998), I approach my work of faculty advising in terms of a response-able conversation with graduate students. A dialogical approach to becoming "research" literate necessarily engages teachers and students in learning (and sometimes unlearning) the protocols and procedures of diverse research perspectives and in complicating quantitative and qualitative research, especially an overly neat split associated with different philosophical assumptions (see Hayes, 1991). A response-able conversation goes beyond the research products—such as master's theses—to the messiness of the research process, in which "our personalities, our demons, and our predilections" (Neilsen, 1998, p. 9) enter into how we do our research. Socially response-able research literacies include in the research product (the thesis) a record of this messiness. The research conversation in graduate education takes up the ethical and practical implications of producing a research thesis for the public domain, in which the graduate student-researcher records the research process as an integral part of research findings and outcomes. The research thesis becomes a public record of those messy instances of resisting and challenging the research agendas of powerful systems, institutions, and economic forces, with particular attention to the ethical implications for research participants and the researcher's practice of adult education.

This article begins by providing a theoretical framework for teaching and learning research literacies. I then describe my adaptation of the research methodology—appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)—to a classroom demonstration of a research project. Finally, I describe the simulated research process of appreciative inquiry that I use as a classroom activity with successive cohorts of graduate students, and I indicate some of its implications to teaching and learning research literacies for distance-delivered graduate education. In the context of my teaching practice, the research conversation begins in a three-week residential orientation when a cohort of 8 to 12 graduate students in adult education come to the university campus in Nova Scotia from across Canada. I co-facilitate the classroom portion of this orientation, in which six group contact hours (maximum) focus explicitly on conducting an original adult education research project, the product of which is the thesis. In this self-directed graduate program delivered at a distance, our conversations continue primarily by e-mail on a one-on-one basis between faculty adviser and student. Accordingly, the teaching and learning challenge for this three-week orientation is to develop a focused

and compressed launch to the response-able conversations that are central to Neilsen's (1998) conception of research literacies:

> If I am truly to be response-able, the most productive conversation ought to occur . . . among all of us collectively engaged in such research. If I am truly to be a response-able teacher, the conversation must engage us all equally in change, in interrogating our identities and our role in institutions. . . . And if I am truly to be a response-able human being, I must begin to account for the many identities I live, the shifting power relations I participate in, and watch carefully the ways in which they dis-able others rather then enable them. (p. 110)

Background to the Study

I am response-able to graduate students who conduct research projects in a wide range of workplaces and practices as part of fulfilling requirements for their master's degree in adult education. These diverse workplaces span community colleges, health education, human resources development, universities, police forces, voluntary and public service organizations, counselling, the Canadian Forces, churches, activist groups, and many, many more.

The playful nuances of Neilsen's (1998) "response-ability" offer a practitioner-friendly shorthand to the moral and dialogical approach to writing a research thesis. The early written assignments, such as a literature review and a research report, are folded into the thesis. In my role of supervisor, response-ability becomes my touchstone for research literacies developed through the teacher-student relationship. For the purposes of this article, research literacies refer to the multiple social and relational practices implicated in conducting original practitioner research and writing a research thesis. The relational and the responsive animate Bakhtin's (1984) conception of truth and my hope for insinuating practitioners' ways of knowing into the academic and research literacies of writing a thesis: "Truth is not to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction" (p. 110). A dialogical understanding of the research process is consistent with Usher, Bryant, and Johnston's (1997) challenge to (re)write adult education research so that it engages the researcher-writer as a reflective practitioner. This model of research attends to the reflexivity of the researcher as a sense-making agent. By extension, teaching research "as writing the self and the world should encourage the production of a text which is alien neither to author nor audience" (p. 213). Teaching research literacies as a social practice encourages the researcher to take "a personal interest in the outcomes of research in terms of how it is read by others" (p. 216).

Situating Research Literacies in the University

At first mention, the term "literacy" may not draw strong associations with institutions of higher learning. Rather, the term tends to evoke a deficit model associated with adult basic education or workplace literacy, in which "lack" of skills in reading and writing constitutes literacy learners (see Laclau, 1990, on "lack" as constitutive of "Otherness"). By contrast, accomplishment in reading and writing constitutes the "*research* literacies" of higher education literacy learners. "Lack" of reading and writing skills does not define graduate students as literacy learners. Indeed, the application and selection process to the research-based master of education program calls for prerequisite writing skills. The research process relies on writing, and accordingly applicants are asked to compose a written statement of their philosophy of adult education. Usher et al. (1997) articulated the relationship between writing and research: "Writing is the essence of research. It is a practice which demands to be written, one of inscribing the world by constructing a plausible account of how it works" (p. 222). However, the polarizing of the skills approach and the social practice approach to literacies in the literature on workplace literacy (see Blunt, 2001; Hull, 1997) is echoed in the opposing of the technical-rational approach to the narrative approach in research literacies for adult education (e.g., Usher et al., 1997). This opposition underpinned Neilsen's (1998) call to "an act of responsible scholarship, the final push to remove the vestiges of Cartesian thought and Western scientism that have allowed us all [as teachers, learners, and researchers] to escape response-ability" (p. 10).

Research Literacies as Social Practice

In the context of the workplace, Hull (1997) defined literacies in the plural and as social practice. Literacies "as socially constructed and embedded practices based upon cultural symbol systems and organized beliefs about how reading and writing might be or should be used to serve particular social and personal purposes and ends" (p. 19) also applies to research literacies. To understand research literacies is also "to ask what version of literacy is being offered, and to take into account the sociocultural, political and historical contexts in which that version is taught and practiced" (p. 19). Reflexivity, a concept central to qualitative research literacies, calls on researchers to account for the particular versions of their research. Reflexive researchers theorize on their personal contexts, that is, subjective life experience and choices of interpretive frames, that enter into each version of their research (see Chiseri-Strater & Sunstein, 1997; Neilsen, 1998; Richardson, 2001). Research literacies in the context of graduate education must take into account the technical-rational model, exemplified by Fitzpatrick, Secrist, and Wright's (1998) elaboration of the step-wise and formulaic activities that cul-

minate in the thesis. The use of lists often signals a technical-rational model. Hayes (1991) divided the process of adult education research into "identifying a problem, establishing a conceptual framework, specifying the phenomenon to be studied, selecting and using a particular method of data collection, and analyzing data" (p. 43). She lists the wrong ways to read a research report and in turn the three steps that constitute a better way to read research. The social practices and response-able conversations that attend these step-wise activities also constitute research literacies.

Introducing Research Literacies in Graduate Education

To exemplify research literacies as an integral part of instruction in a research-based graduate degree, I provide an account of a program initiative for introducing graduate students in adult education to research literacies during their three-week residential orientation. During this orientation, I demonstrate a dialogic research method, which engages students as participants in a research project related to practitioners' writing, where I am cast as the principal investigator and the graduate students as research participants. The group dialogue, which is at the core of the data collection self-contained within a one-hour class, also serves as an introduction to the research ethics procedures that Canadian universities have instituted since 1998 to comply with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada).

Research with "Human Subjects"

A participatory inquiry into practitioners' "good" writing, in which I assume the role of the principal investigator and students assume the role of research participants, is the focus of my classroom demonstration of doing research. To elaborate, I provide a composite of events and data from various cohorts of graduate students, ranging from 8 to 12 participants in each cohort. In advance of the classroom demonstration and in anticipation of the University Research Ethics Board application that graduate students must have approved before beginning their own research projects, I alert each group to how the classroom demonstration of research as "curriculum" requires me to modify my research practices as the principal investigator. To comply with the Tri-Council terms of "minimal risk," I stop short of recounting students' personal writing-stories, that is, stories of our lives as writers in our adult education practice that "direct us to understand ourselves reflexively as persons writing from particular positions at specific times" (Richardson, 2001, p. 35).

The constraints of demonstrating research in a curriculum situation trigger questions and conversation on the Tri-Council's definition of minimal risk. The definition strikes me as a circular and unreflective analysis of the personal risk to research participants. What guidance does the Tri-Council definition offer to researchers in discerning the risks involved in the "everyday life" of qualitative research, which entails giving research participants a voice and inviting them to tell their deeply personal experiences in a reflexive way?

> If potential participants can reasonably be expected to regard the probability and magnitude of possible harms implied by participation in the research to be no greater than those encountered by the participant in those aspects of his or her everyday life that relate to the research. (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 1998, C1:1.5)

The Tri-Council policy requires University Research Ethics Boards and research applicants to determine minimal risk in advance of conducting their research projects involving human participants. Examples of minimal risk include: the topics are non-controversial and unlikely to cause discomfort or emotional upset; the methods are non-invasive, such as questionnaires or interviews; and no deception is involved. As an adult education practitioner, I favour experiential learning activities that involve storytelling and story receiving. However, I know from experience that we cannot always anticipate the discomfort or emotional upset that will emerge in the telling and receiving of a story, even a seemingly safe one. My introduction to research literacies takes up the moral imperative for researchers to return to their participants throughout every phase of the research up to and including publication to reaffirm informed consent. Through the connected knowing embedded in the dialogical research of my classroom inquiry into practitioners' writing, I seek to expand the ethical dimensions of research literacies beyond compliance with the Tri-Council policy.

An undergraduate degree is a prerequisite for entry into the master's program in adult education where I teach; however, many practitioners are returning to academic study after a long hiatus, and most have not conducted and written a formal research inquiry in an academic context. Many practitioners have not written a literature review before. "Practitioners' Ways of Writing" in the title of this article is a deliberate echo of *Women's Ways of Knowing* (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986) and takes notice that well over half of these practitioners re-entering the academy are women. Experiential, embodied, situated, and connected knowing frames both practitioner and feminist epistemologies (e.g., Michelson, 1998; Neilsen, 1998; Tisdell, 1998). I take response-ability for telling graduate students at the outset of the classroom research activity that my use of this experiential learn-

ing method seeks to validate their practitioner ways of writing and at the same time insinuate their best practices of writing into the crafting of the research thesis.

After attending the three-week orientation, the graduate students then return home and to their practice to rework their learning plan, conduct a research project that addresses their learning goal, and write their research thesis. A practice-based research project forms the core of their inquiry and their thesis. In my research inquiry into "good" practitioners' writing, I include the faculty members who co-facilitate the orientation module as practitioners who write.

Appreciative Inquiry into Practitioners' Ways of Writing

Appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) is a participatory action research methodology that usually is associated with an organizational development intervention. For my classroom demonstration of a research project, I adapted this methodology to engage graduate students in their capacity as adult education practitioners in appreciating their own and each other's "best" writing.

Appreciative inquiry engages research participants in telling stories of their "peak experiences" and formulating "provocative propositions" for action. John Shotter (1993) challenged researchers to interweave "academic discourses and conversational realities." I anticipated that appreciative inquiry with its emphasis on telling personal stories of lived experience, when directed to the lived experience of good writing, could accomplish this flow of meaning among the many different practices and genres of writing represented by the adult education practitioners of the graduate student cohort. I hold with Bazerman (1994), Shotter (1993), and Voloshinov (1973) that writing is inherently dialogical and that the processes and artifacts of writing constitute a mediated conversational space "shared by both addresser and addressee" (Volshinov, pp. 85–86).

Appreciative inquiry engages learners in imagining possible worlds, the best of "what is" (the stories of peak experiences) moving to "what might be" (predictions) to "what shall be" (decisions) and "what should be" (moral positionings). The methodology of appreciative inquiry resonates with theories of rhetoric. Bruner (1986) invited learners to engage in "subjunctive talk" that relies on modalities (e.g., can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, and would) to imagine the possible. Lyne (1990) understood rhetoric as "talk 'on its way' from 'is' to 'ought,' making that connection only in the play of language" (p. 38). I anticipated that my research demonstration would begin the process of engaging graduate students in imagining the best possible writing, with "best" referring to writing that is both beautiful

and response-able. Response-ability to readers, and to the people and places represented in the master's thesis, spans the ethical and the aesthetic.

Bushe and Pitman (1991) characterized appreciative inquiry as "stalking the flow" of the whole and "amplifying through fanning" (p. 2). This evokes a sense of the play of language between the ethical and the aesthetic. "The most powerful flows are ideas and processes that further people's most important, personal goals. When we can align organizational action with personal goals, we create enormous power and energy for collective action" (p. 2). Appreciative inquiry challenges Heron's (1996) contention that "practical knowing" or "knack" is ineffable. My classroom demonstration of inquiry into practitioners' writing harboured a research purpose of challenging the contention that knack is "beyond language."

> Knack is at the heart of "knowing how" and that it is "a *knowing of the excellence of its doing* [that] makes it a knack. This is a criterion of quality that is intrinsic to action and is ineffable; for each specific knack, it is beyond language and conceptual formulation. (Heron, 1996, p. 44)

In adapting appreciative inquiry to my classroom demonstration of a research project, I was on the alert for any challenges to the claim that the knack of writing or "knowing the excellence of its doing" was "beyond language." Appreciative inquiry inaugurates rival discourse that this "knack" is *effable*, that is, practical knowing can be appreciated in narrative genres and in the "play of language" (Lyne, 1990, p. 38).

I began with the hunch that prescriptive conceptions, the should-and-must categorical, step-wise approaches to learning to write (see Hansman & Wilson, 1998), could not make sense of the knack of writing. Wolcott (1995) referred to these hunches or tentative claims as bias. "I regard bias as entry-level theorizing, a thought-about position from which the researcher as inquirer feels drawn to an issue or problem and seeks to construct a firmer basis in both knowledge and understanding" (p. 186). I accept that "writing is the essence of research" (Usher et al., 1997), and I pose the possibility that it is the knack of writing that separates researchers from practitioners. Levine (1997) insisted that expert practitioners do many of the things that researchers do but "in a very fluid and intuitive way" (p. 1). He named a set of distinct skills for expert practitioners, including:

> the skill of *systematically observing their own practice*, the skill of *drawing understanding from their observations through a process of reflection*, the skill of *making decisions based upon their reflection* and finally, the skill of actually *implementing those decisions*. (p. 1, original italics)

But this practical knowing is typically not "written down," and it seemed to me that telling personal writing-stories (Richardson, 2001) could explicate

through language the knack of practitioner writing that could be translated into research literacies.

> Narrativity links the idea of authorship to that of agency, i.e., the researcher as an active teller of plausible tales of discovery and invention and not simply—as conventional conceit would have it—a passive witness and reporter of events. (Usher et al., 1997, pp. 222–223)

The Genres of Practitioner Literacies and Research Literacies

I appreciate Bazerman's (1994) call for teachers and learners to become familiar with the genres of the systems they participate in. Genres are "kinds of statements . . . recognizable as speech acts, doing various kinds of work" (p. 32), and in the educational environment of a research-based degree in adult education, the oral and written are intermixed, for example, assignment handouts, lectures, group discussion, at-home essay questions, teacher feedback, and one-letter or one-number evaluative communications. Some of the genres that support the distance education master's thesis attach as readily to practitioner literacies as to research literacies. Indeed, many of the practitioners in graduate student cohorts are familiar with the genres of teacher/supervisor feedback, reflexive journal, learning portfolio, web pages, field notes, interviews with participants, letters, and e-mail messages. The thesis stands as the ultimate genre of the master's degree in adult education granted at convocation. Gaining familiarity with research genres enacts response-ability, as teachers and learners can then "make a kind of sense of complex interactions and . . . locate his or her actions in relation to the communicative actions of multiple others" (Bazerman, 1994, p. 32). My earlier research sought to explicate the genre of the research thesis: by tracing reflexively the dialogue between reader and writer in my own experience of writing a master's thesis in the 1970s and a doctoral thesis in the 1990s (Lander, 2000), and in my current position of faculty adviser, by responding in the margins to drafts of graduate students' theses (Lander & English, 2000).

Exemplars in Writing Research

To be response-able researchers, our writing must explicate how we do our work by laying out our inquiry in exemplars (see Chenail, 1995; Lindlof, 1995; Mishler, 1990; Neilsen, 1998; Smith, 1996; Vaill, 1998). Exemplars go beyond "examples" in the discourse of qualitative research. Examples suggest one choice is as good as another, whereas researchers and thesis writers choose exemplars that are most *relevant* to the phenomenon, that "represent" the phenomenon, and that animate the participants' and the writer's own voice (Lindlof, 1995, p. 268). This article nests two phenomena within each

other, and thus presents exemplars that represent "best" writing from practitioners' perspectives and those that represent the research literacies taught and learned during the classroom demonstration of a research project. The overlap of practitioner and research literacies also features in these exemplars. In declaring my double purpose and the ways the phenomena of practitioners' writing and research literacies are entangled, I seek to bring an authentic presence to my research. This parallels Neilsen's (1998) assertion: "If we aim to change our worlds in small ways by the work we do, we owe those worlds as authentic a presence as we can bring" (p. 10). Usher et al. (1997) assigned agency to "exemplars," suggesting that faculty advisers "need to act as exemplars of how they work through their own equivalent research experiences and to share their feelings about research" (p. 222). It seems to me that the exemplars of practitioner writing that emerged from my classroom activity of appreciative inquiry also promised to "re-present" knack in Heron's (1996) sense of "the knowing of the excellence of its doing" (p. 44).

In my teaching practice, I am attracted to the research literacies favoured by Neilsen and Mishler, particularly the use of exemplars to expose the research practices of the researcher. The dialogic thrust of appreciative inquiry with graduate students involved me in exposing my own language-based research practices that framed my demonstration of appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing. I urged students as research participants to be alert for exemplars of the knack of writing, that is, knowing the excellence of the doing of writing, throughout the classroom research project, and thus to engage in reflective practice. The reflective practitioner's (Schön, 1983) way of coping with "divergent" situations of practice is termed reflection-in-action and challenges the ineffability of Heron's "knack" by providing language-dependent exemplars.

> The practitioner may surface and criticize his initial understanding of the phenomenon [e.g., practitioner writing or research practices], construct a new description of it, and test the new description by an on-the-spot experiment. Sometimes he arrives at a new theory of the phenomenon by articulating a feeling he [*sic*] has about it. (Schön, 1983, p. 63)

Lindlof (1995) attached exemplars to the purposes of data analysis, as "embodiments of an inductive construct" (p. 229); he also foregrounded the coding purpose of exemplars, but akin to Neilsen and Mishler, he recognized the rhetorical and narrative thrust of exemplars. "Exemplars make a text 'eventful'" (p. 267). "Exemplars are very important to the crafting of a rhetorically persuasive research text" (p. 229).

If you accept as I do that writing is research (see Richardson, 2000, 2001; Usher et al., 1997), then exemplars of my research practices need to co-exist

with exemplars of practitioners' writing that emerge from appreciative inquiry. This doubling of exemplars serves to expand "data" to include any meaning-making activity within the research process. This approach double layers the rhetorical potency of exemplars that Atkinson (1990) identified: "Such 'forceful' examples are provided as rhetorical devices which may help the readers enter into the author's argument" (p. 91). Accordingly, I offered to graduate students my tentative interpretations or bias in the formulation of my research question alongside all of our exemplars of practitioners' writing and research literacies as social practice. Mishler (1990) preferred to differentiate qualitative and interpretive approaches from hypothesis-testing experimentation with his terminology of "inquiry-guided" research. Appreciative inquiry is clearly inquiry-guided research in which exemplars emerge throughout the process.

> Inquiry is recursive and reflexive, an interplay of shifting semiotic processes. . . . Re-search. Search, search again. Inquire, enquire. Ask. Watch. Learn. Research is the attuned mind/body working purposefully to explore, to listen, to support, to transgress, to gather with care, to create, to disrupt, and to offer back, to contribute, sometimes all at once. (Neilsen, 1998, p. 264)

Appreciative inquiry also supports Hollway and Jefferson's (2000) preference for the narrative approach over semi-structured interviews in which the researcher sets the agenda, that is, the researcher asks the questions and the participants respond to the themes and topics that the researcher selects. "The difference between a story and report (of the kind that is often elicited in the traditional research interview) is that, in telling a story, the narrator takes responsibility for 'making the relevance of the telling clear'" (p. 31). Appreciative inquiry positions research participants as storytellers and story receivers rather than respondents.

The Classroom Demonstration of Appreciative Inquiry

Appreciative inquiry engages the whole of the organization or, in this case, the whole learning cohort of graduate students in telling and re-telling, creating and re-creating their peak experiences of writing and collaboratively posing provocative propositions for action. I invited students to bring samples of their "best" writing from their practice, and in the telling of the story around the artifact, I anticipated that participants would become familiar with a variety of practitioner genres and, inevitably, uncover differences in genres between practitioner writing and academic writing, particularly research literacies. This invitation served as a program design feature in my

demonstration of the research process and at the same time an exemplar of research literacies in its own right. Zussman (1996) valued this practice in autobiographical research: "Memory is . . . not only located in the recesses of our minds but also generated by 'retrieval cues' that are themselves lodged in other people, in places, and in memorabilia" (p. 147).

A Community of (Research) Practice

In the context of doing research within graduate students' orientation to the master's program in adult education, I was deliberately orienting these adult learners to the community of practice (of research literacies) that would play out in their own inquiry-guided research and thesis writing. Lave and Wenger (1991) introduced "communities of practice" to illuminate the concept of situated learning and the engagement in social practice as the fundamental process by which we learn and become who we are. This profoundly contextual approach assumes that the practices of learning, knowing, meaning-making, and forming identity(s) are generated by teachers and learners interacting response-ably with each other and negotiating their social relations through mediated cultural tools, including speaking, reading, and writing. Wenger (1998) elaborated on these practices as "the property of a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a shared enterprise. It makes sense, therefore, to call these kinds of communities *communities of practice*" (p. 45).

What then were my combined teaching, learning, and research practices that inaugurated the community of practice with graduate students? The doubling of an actual research project—appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing—with the instructional purpose of teaching and learning research literacies afforded opportunities for reflection-in-action. I sought to make available, as reflective texts, the multiple social practices that unfolded in the demonstration of my research project. I had to come to terms with my own vulnerability in the nexus of power and knowledge as I invited students to examine and critique my research assumptions. I framed the activity so students as research participants were expected to critique the teacher's ways of writing and ways of knowing. In order to make sense of Neilsen's (1998) response-able conversations that occur "among all of us collectively engaged in such research" (p. 110), I knew I had to take account of the power relations that attend the research process. Among the research literacies as social practice that I opened up as a reflective text was the double-edged power I exercised as both researcher and faculty adviser, even in this mode of "demonstrating" a research project.

The Process of Informed Consent

Many of my research practices were constructed in advance of the one-hour appreciative inquiry; I had directed my energy to adapting appreciative inquiry that focuses on the "best" organizational practices to appreciative inquiry that focuses on practitioners' "best" writing. My research practices functioned as cultural tools of situated learning in a community of research-oriented practice. The graduate students received a daily schedule of the three-week orientation, which included a cryptic item at the beginning of the second week called "Practitioners' Writing." At the end of the first week, I introduced my research project as appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing. The orientation module engages graduate students in framing their own learning goals and in thinking of possibilities for their own research projects to support their learning goals. The three A's of structuring a research goal—Action, Area, and Aspect—framed my demonstration research project for addressing my learning goal as a teacher. I told student cohorts that I had designed the appreciative inquiry research project to address my learning goal: "to honour [*Action*] practitioners' ways of knowing [*Aspect*] in graduate students' adult education research [*Area*]."

In advance of the one-hour classroom activity, I invited graduate students as prospective research participants to read the consent form that I had composed—and that I *would* use if I were to seek official approval for this research project through the University Research Ethics Board. I clarified the difference between a demonstration of a research method and project as part of the curriculum and the conduct of this research as my actual research project. I alerted them to the potential difficulties of a research project involving a faculty adviser as principal investigator and her graduate students as research participants. As the faculty adviser responsible for grading assignments and for signing off on the thesis, the final step in awarding the master's degree, it would be difficult to overcome at least the perception that I might be exerting undue influence on "human subjects" to participate in my research. Graduate students, like their faculty advisers, must apply for research ethics approval from the university. I posed other problematic research relationships as a departure point for graduate students to reflect on structural inequalities that might be present with potential research participants in their own practice. A perception of a power imbalance, such as a researcher conducting research with participants who report to him/her as supervisor or with participants from a therapist-client relationship, could stand in the way of approval from the University Research Ethics Board even if their own organizations approved the research.

The informed consent process in advance of the classroom activity included an invitation to students to participate in my research project by

preparing to tell each other the story of their "best" writing experience coming out of their practice. In my early classroom demonstrations, I incorporated the invitation and description of the research project into an informed consent form on one page (legal-sized paper). However, I have adjusted my practices around informed consent for this classroom activity over the course of conversations with successive cohorts of graduate students. The earlier cohorts suggested that my consent form was too long and the font too small (I had used a 10-point font in order to squeeze everything onto one page). Students *qua* research participants suggested that my use of academic language could alienate a potential research participant—and indeed in my early use of this classroom demonstration, at least one student did not sign the consent form and did not agree to tell her personal story of writing. This is an exemplar of reflection-in-action unfolding in a response-able conversation about research literacies. A "provocative proposition" that emerged out of the classroom demonstration of appreciative inquiry was a collectively evolved action plan for the researcher to pitch the "invitation to participate" and the "informed consent form" in language that was familiar and respectful of prospective research participants. Clearly, the language of this form can signal risk to a prospective participant; this is the potential for discomfort and emotional upset that the Tri-Council policy lays out in the definitions of research practices harmful to human subjects. In our conversations on research literacies as social practice, some graduate students/ research participants who work with low literate adults described how they arrange to audio-record informed consent: participants receive a copy of an oral signature of both researcher and participant in the form of an audiotape. In my later efforts to use this classroom activity, I moved to two stages of informed consent. I provided graduate students with a one-page personalized letter of invitation (letter-sized paper and 12-point font), which offered an informal description of my research, why the research mattered to me, and how their participation would help me and could perhaps benefit them. The invitation included a brief explanation of the concept of informed consent and invited them to sign the attached consent form if they were willing to participate. The much shorter, easier-to-read attached form then laid out the protocols for protecting confidentiality and the options for participation and/or withdrawal, with a line for the signatures of both researcher and participant.

In this community of research-oriented practice, I expanded Bazerman's (1994) understanding of teacher response-ability to include researcher response-ability: "It is within the students, of course, that the learning occurs, but it is within the teacher, who sits at the juncture of forces above and below and sideways, that the learning situations are framed" (p. 62). At the beginning of each classroom demonstration, I gathered up the signed consent

forms and reviewed the terms for participation that they had agreed to. Some participants exercised the option outlined in the form to refrain from telling their own "best" writing experience while consenting to respond to others' writing-stories. Modelling the practices of a "real" approved research study, I asked participants to confirm their "informed consent" to audio-record our conversation and to transcribe the audiotapes. I noted the importance of confirming this consent verbally before turning on the audio-recorder, to allow participants to withdraw their consent in the light of understanding more fully the implications of their written consent. For demonstration purposes, I simply went through the motions of using a tape recorder and omni-directional microphone without turning on the power.

Research Props as Social Practices

Why go to the trouble of organizing and setting up equipment that I would not be using in my "pretend" research? I anticipated that authentic and visible research props would help to transport students to the actual social practices around electronic equipment, including the experience of research participants who might feel threatened if they had not encountered a particular device before. I declared that one of the teaching-learning purposes of this research activity was to sensitize them to the assumptions and practices of research interviewing by sitting them as the "subjects" on the other side of the microphone (see Larson, 1997). In the course of our inquiry as reflection-in-action, participants offered culturally situated examples of the use of electronic equipment and the practice of informed consent. A few participants suggested that informed consent does not pose much of a threat for health-care practitioners, given that they are called upon frequently to sign informed consent documents. Other conversations turned to the experience of northern communities, especially First Nations communities who have been the focus of extensive and exploitative research and for whom the very presence of videotaping equipment signals risk. The research props highlighted the social practices that attend the "things" of research, particularly the trust relationship between researcher(s) and research participants.

Still in "demonstration" mode and acting out the practices outlined in typical adult education research applications approved by the Research Ethics Board of the university, I advised students that I would provide each of them with a copy of the transcript of their writing-story and others' responses to it. At that time, they could either withdraw their words or consent in writing to my publishing my analysis and interpretations interlarded with their own "raw-data" interpretations. Students had read all of these statements beforehand in the consent form, including the agreement that I would keep their name and the names of their workplaces confidential by using fictional names. I promised that I would secure the audiotapes and transcripts in a locked filing cabinet and that only I would have access to their writing-stories.

The Ethics of Representation

Before entering into the research demonstration proper, I provided exemplars from my own research practice of ethical dilemmas that had little to do with compliance with the Tri-Council policy and everything to do with entering, developing, and ultimately leaving a research relationship. Fine, Weis, Weseen, and Wong (2000) countered institutional policy directives with the question, "Who's informed and who's consenting?" (p. 113). They also recognized that ethical writing practices are part and parcel of research; they insisted that we ask ourselves a set of supplementary questions, remembering that "we all write what we write in a world not (necessarily) prepared to hear" (p. 126). A personal research experience drew me to one question out of Fine et al.'s list of 10. I offered graduate students an exemplar from my own research related to these questions around fear.

> Who am I afraid will see these analyses? Who is rendered vulnerable/responsible or exposed by these analyses? Am I willing to show him/her/them the text before publication? If not, why not? Could I publish his/her/their comments as an epilogue? What's the fear? (p. 127)

My exemplar related to a piece of autobiographical research that I had published in a freely accessible electronic journal. One of my research participants (a childhood friend who is a farmer and not an academic) e-mailed me to ask for the web address of the journal article. I e-mailed the address to him immediately, thanking him again for participating. I did not attempt to prepare him for what he was going to read about himself. His words featured predominantly—and anonymously—in my analysis, and although I thought I had re-presented him favourably, I was not at all sure how he would respond because I had not shared my analyses with him at any stage of the writing process up to and including publication. I spent a fretful and fearful week before hearing back (secondhand) that he was okay with my interpretations and intrigued that his words now appeared on the Internet for all the world to see.

After my cautionary tales about informed consent and my reminders to graduate students of their options for participating—including "passing" on my invitation entirely—I reviewed the description of the research project that accompanied the informed consent. In addition to inviting students to tell a story of their "best" writing, I had requested that they jot down keywords that made their writing "best." Also, I had prepared students to respond to each other's stories with keywords of "excellence" that these writing-stories generated for them.

The assigned readings in advance of the two-hour appreciative inquiry were included on the orientation schedule: Bushe and Pitman (1991) on the

process of appreciative inquiry; and Weick (1996) on the scholarship of integration in which he gives the edge to personal stories from practice. One student's observation emerged in the classroom demonstration of appreciative inquiry and stands as an "exemplar" of research literacies as social practice. Mezirow's (1978) article on "perspective transformation" happened to be a reading assignment on the schedule the same day as my classroom demonstration of research. This particular graduate student addressed me in the presence of the group to the effect, "I figured out what *you* meant 'best" writing *should* be by reading those two articles. One was readable and full of real life examples—his own and others [Weick]. The other was heavily theoretical and impersonal [Mezirow]." This was a forceful reminder to me to declare my bias and tentative interpretations up front and to include in my invitation to participants that they put my assumptions to the critical test. This was another reminder that "we must be conscious of ourselves as the key instruments of the research project. . . . We believe that as a researcher you position or situate yourself in relationship to your study in at least three ways: fixed, subjective, and textual" (Chiseri-Strater & Sunstein, 1997, p. 57). Over the course of successive cohorts, I have learned to declare my positioning up front when I conduct appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing:

1. My age, gender, class, and race (fixed positions) influence what I think is "good" writing. For example (gender), I gravitate to women's writing and tend to appreciate autobiographical and narrative ways of writing as embodied knowledge that is superior to writing that is organized more abstractly as an argument.
2. My life history and personal experiences with writing (subjective positions) affect my interpretations of "good" writing. For example, my early work experience as a teacher of English as a second language I suspect makes me more alert to grammar and use of tenses.
3. My language choices (textual positions) such as writing in the first person and fracturing words—for example, response-ability, effable—will determine whose voices will be featured in my finished research article and how the voices of "good" writing will be re-presented. My post-structural language choices may also estrange, even antagonize readers, who are not "prepared to hear" descriptions of the world using unfamiliar language and foreign research protocols.

Facilitating Research Literacies

In my introduction to appreciative inquiry, I told the students my "best" writing-story from practice and the keywords that made my writing "excellent" from my perspective. Clearly, appreciative inquiry does not encourage humility. I was deliberate in telling my "best" writing first and in drawing

on an unspectacular practitioner writing-story—clearly, the adult learning principles of creating a safe environment and beginning with concrete experience (see Vella, 1994) double as research literacies. My best writing was a letter of apology to a summer visitor to university residences, dating back to the time when I managed summer conferences at the university. I cited keywords and phrases such as: emphasizes service over services; creates relationship with reader; ethic of care; responsive, respectful, and responsible to the reader; and accountable to the larger practice context. In the context of situated learning and communities of practice, my utterances of the excellence of my writing could be considered "legitimate peripheral participation" and "cognitive apprenticeship" (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which characterize the processes by which newcomers are initiated into a community of practice. I do not believe that either my research practices or my writing practices "reproduced" the existing membership of a community of practice; rather, the "goodness" of research practices and practitioner writing practices evolved through the process of appreciative inquiry. My hope is that practitioner writing practices and research writing practices—some of which are conflated given that writing is the essence of research—will insinuate themselves into academic writing as a result of this process of collectively assigning value to practitioner writing practices and to research literacies.

The apprenticeship metaphor applies to my teaching and research practices insofar as I invited learners to try out alternative ways of writing research that might compete with their previous conceptions of academic writing. The genres of practitioner writing that emerged in the stories of "best" writing across the various cohorts of graduate students are not reproduced in mainstream academic literacies and research literacies. The genres re-presented in my classroom activity of appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing included such writing-stories as: a newspaper editorial; an e-mail message to a senior administrator advocating for an adult learner-student; a published book on strategic planning for community education; a tri-panel colour brochure on government services in environmental education; an instructional manual complete with diagrams for occupational health and safety in the construction business; a thank-you to university residence staff in the form of lyrics put to music and guitar accompaniment; a report on practice in the newsletter of a professional association; and a mission statement for a community-based literacy program. Smart (1993), like Wenger, viewed genre as a community invention, that is, "a broad rhetorical strategy, enacted collectively, by members of a community in order to create knowledge essential to their aims" (p. 124).

On 3-M post-its, I asked my research participants to write keywords and phrases re-presenting "excellence" in their own and each other's writing. I had three large, overlapping Venn circles, and participants first placed their

post-its randomly on the circles and then sorted like categories into each circle with the overlapping categories in the middle. My emerging interpretations based on the keywords and phrases of what makes practitioner writing "excellent" have me rethinking my bias that the knack of writing would not be associated with step-wise, prescriptive categories. Repeated prescriptive responses to each other's writing fell into one circle in some cohorts and included "grammatically correct," "concise," "clarity," "to the point," "well-organized," and "effective use of white space in the layout." These prescriptive approaches to good writing did not however get placed in the overlapping area of the Venn circles. In some cohorts, the overlapping area included such post-its as "heart," "purposeful," "synthesis of ideas, feeling and knowledge (as info)," "reality-based," and "based on lived experience." This outcome supports Sullivan and Porter's (1993) critique of "the theory-practice binary as it operates in professional writing research, moving toward a notion of research as *praxis*. . . . [which] refers to conduct that negotiates between positions rather than grounding itself in a particular position" (p. 221).

Implications for Teaching and Learning Research Literacies

My emerging major interpretation from the classroom demonstrations of appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing is that *both* prescriptive approaches to writing *and* the narrative approach to writing from the heart and lived experience are reciprocal processes in practitioners' "best" writing. I have related how I adjusted my own research and writing practices as a result of these classroom demonstrations. Significant changes to my own research practices—and to my practices for teaching research literacies—emerged out of these demonstrations. I offer these changes to my teaching practice in support of my claim that this classroom activity is an effective introduction to teaching and learning research literacies. The faculty advisers and graduate students as research participants engaged in response-able conversation and reflection-in-action as we collectively scrutinized the research assumptions of various research practices related to the classroom activity and to other research experiences. As the master's program allows for a five-year candidacy, I await further evidence of practitioners' "best" ways of writing insinuating themselves into the research thesis. I await further evidence that the classroom activity of learning research literacies transfers to the distance education format that relies on self-directed learning and a one-on-one teacher-learner relationship. How do they [we] know that they know? (Vella, Berardinelli, & Burrow, 1998). Students' theses will also provide the ultimate evidence of "transfer" and "impact" from this experien-

tial approach to teaching research literacies.

The Tri-Council requirement for universities to review research ethics applications for the qualitative research projects that form most theses in adult education involves a rigorous and response-able procedure for both faculty advisers and graduate students. Under the Tri-Council definition of minimal risk, I do not have the option of revealing the exemplars of practitioners' writing-stories that emerged in the curriculum demonstration of my research project. Nor have I conducted a sustained evaluation of adult learning (e.g., Vella et al., 1998) that can be tied to these demonstrations of appreciative inquiry into practitioners' writing. Impact is the term that Vella et al. assigned to the enduring and broad-based learning that occurs at a personal and organizational level as a response to a learning event. Richardson (2000) expressed the desired learning outcomes (impact) of telling writing-stories related to the ethics of representation. Graduate students' theses, which are completed between two and five years after orientation, will become my textual resources for evaluating adult learning in terms of the impact of teaching research literacies—and on this basis:

> Writing-stories sensitize us to the potential consequences of all of our writing by bringing home—inside our homes and workplaces—the ethics of representation. Writing-stories are . . . about ourselves, our workspaces, disciplines, friends, and families. What can we say? With what consequences? Writing-stories bring the danger and poignancy of ethnographic representation up close and personal. (Richardson, 2001, p. 932)

I will continue to include this research demonstration of appreciative inquiry in the introduction to the master's program in adult education. Already I have witnessed graduate students' heightened sensitivity to research literacies at an individual and community level, especially inclusive research practices, and attention to researcher reflexivity and the ethics of representation. Students' submissions of writing-stories are "up close and personal." Their applications to the University Research Ethics Board anticipate the needs and fears of their prospective research participants and use language that is familiar in their informed consent forms. These early indicators hold promise for ethical representations in the research thesis.

And my research purpose related to knack as knowing the excellence of doing writing? I can report that research participants—both graduate students and co-facilitators, including myself—used spoken and written language to make explicit the knack of practitioners' writing and, in turn, the knack of research literacies.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, P. (1990). *The ethnographic imagination: Textual constructions of reality*. London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bazerman, C. (1994). *Constructing experience*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.

Blunt, A. (2001). Workplace literacy: The contested terrains of policy and practice. In M. Taylor (Ed.), *Adult literacy now!* (pp. 89–108). Toronto: Irwin.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bushe, G., & Pitman, T. (1991). Appreciative process: A method for transformational change. *OD Practitioner*, 1–4.

Chenail, R. (1995). Presenting qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report,* 2(3). Retrieved 13 February13, 2001, from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html.

Chiseri-Strater, E., & Sunstein, B. S. (1997). *Field Working: Reading and writing research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Blair Press.

Cooperrider, D., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organization change and development*, Vol. 1 (pp. 129–169). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 107–131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitzpatrick, J., Secrist, J., & Wright, D. J. (1998). *Secrets for a successful dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hansman, C., & Wilson, A. (1998). Cognition and practice: Adult learning situated in everyday activity. *Proceedings of Adult Education Research Conference* (AERC), 1998. Retrieved February 13, 2001, from http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/1998/98hansman.htm.

Hayes, E. R. (1991). A brief guide to critiquing research. In R. G. Brockett (Ed.), *Professional development for educators of adults* (pp. 35–47). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heron, J. (1996). Quality as primacy of the practical. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(3), 41–56.

Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: Free association, narrative and the interview method*. London: Sage.

Hull, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Changing work, changing workers: Critical perspectives on language, literacy and skills*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.

Lander, D. A. (2000). Mixed metaphors for reading and writing the qualitative thesis in adult education. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 32*(2), 148–165.

Lander, D. A., & English, L. M. (2000). Doing research "with": Reading and writing our difference. *Reflective Practice, 1*(3), 343–358.

Larson, C. (1997). Re-presenting the subject: Problems in personal narrative inquiry. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 10*(4), 455–470.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). S*ituated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Levine, S. J. (1997). Research and the practitioner: Toward an expanded conceptualization. *Proceedings of the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing and Community Education*, Michigan State University, 1997. Retrieved February 13, 2001, from http://www.canr.msu.edu/aee/research/levine.htm.

Lindlof, T. (1995). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lyne, J. (1990). Bio-rhetorics: Moralizing the life sciences. In H. W. Simons (Ed.), *The rhetorical turn: Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry* (pp. 35–57). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mezirow, J. (1978). Perspective transformation. *Adult Education, 27*(2), 100–110.

Michelson, E. (1998). Re-membering: The return of the body to experiential learning. *Studies in Continuing Education, 20*(2), 217–234.

Mishler, E. (1989). [Review of the book *Working Knowledge: Skill and Community in a Small Shop*]. *American Craft, 49*(2), 22.

Mishler, E. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(4), 415–442.

Neilsen, L. (1998). *Knowing her place: Research literacies and feminist occasions*. Great Tancook Island, NS: Backalong Books.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 923–948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, L. (2001). Getting personal: Writing-stories. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(1), 33–38.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Shotter, J. (1993). Harré, Vygotsky, Bakhtin, Vico, Wittgenstein: Academic discourses and conversational realities. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 23*(4), 459–482.

Smart, G. (1993). Genre as community invention: A central banks' response to its executives' expectations as readers. In R. Spilka (Ed.), *Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives* (pp. 124–140). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Smith, D. (1996). Telling the truth after postmodernism. *Symbolic Interaction, 19*(3), 171–202.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (1998). *Tri-Council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans*. Ottawa: Author.

Sullivan, P., & Porter, J. E. (1993). On theory, practice, and method: Toward a heuristic research methodology for professional writing. In R. Spilka (Ed.), *Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives* (pp. 220–237). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Tisdell, E. J. (1998). Poststructural feminist pedagogies: The possibilities and limitations of feminist emancipatory adult learning theory and practice. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*(3), 139–156.

Usher, R., Bryant, I., & Johnston, R. (1997). Writing and learning about research. *Adult education and the postmodern challenge: Learning beyond the limits* (pp. 212–232). London: Routledge.

Vaill, P. (1998). Adult education as paradigm leadership. *Spirited leading and learning: Process wisdom for a new age* (pp. 133–148). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vella, J. (1994). *Learning to listen, learning to teach: The power of dialogue in educating adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vella, J., Berardinelli, P., & Burrow, J. (1998). *How do they know they know? Evaluating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Voloshinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weick, K. (1996). Speaking to practice: The scholarship of integration. *Journal of Management Inquiry 5*(3), 251–258.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wolcott, H. (1995). *The art of fieldwork*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Zussman, R. (1996). Autobiographical occasions. *Contemporary Sociology 25*, 143–148.

BIOGRAPHY

Dorothy Lander is an associate professor in the Department of Adult Education at Saint Francis Xavier University. She is a faculty advisor to graduate students in a distance education program leading to a master's degree in adult education. She holds a master's (StFX) and a doctoral degree (University of Nottingham) in adult education. Her research interest in practitioners' ways of knowing extends her earlier practice as a university service operations manager.

Dorothy Lander est professeur agrégé dans le département d'éducation aux adultes à Saint Francis Xavier University. Elle est conseillère pédagogique des étudiants gradués faisant partie d'un programme d'éducation à distance menant à une maîtrse en éducation aux adultes. Elle detient une maîtrise (StFX) et un doctorat (University of Nottingham) en éducation aux adultes. Son intérêt de recherche dans les styles de connaissance de praticiens prolonge son ancienne carrière comme gérante de soutien logistique.