ANALYSIS BUDDY PROCESS WRITING 2: KATE

Kate read the transcripts very, very differently than I -- or Melanie -- did, although that's to be expected as we're three different people. She read them with her "experienced teacher" hat on the entire time, as if she were sizing interviewees T and R up as potential mentees, and her comments could have been construed as teaching advice rather than research analysis. They'd have been right at home at a "how could subjects T and R improve their teaching?" case study discussion in a teacher training course.

Because of this approach, and also because she only had the words and no description of delivery/appearance/personality, she painted a different picture in her mind than I had in mine after talking with T in person. Interview subject T was an insecure teacher -- "not even confident enough to ask questions yet" -- who needed 1:1 mentorship to be forced to come out of her comfort zone, because she was avoiding "digging deeper" in her teaching. I noted that T had appeared very confident during her interview, but admitted that could in fact be a sign of comfort rather than excellence -- T had reached a low plateau, and could improve only by going through a place she couldn't push herself into on her own.

Kate critiqued teacher T on the basis of what she (Kate) thought was "good teaching." A had said she let students know about her unorthodox teaching methods up front so they can switch sections if they wanted to, and I (Mel) had read this as a positive: blunt honesty, student choice. However, Kate critiqued it heavily for not being student-centered, because she would have found a way to work with the students in her existing section. Neither of us is "right" or "wrong" -- it's actually interesting to see the disagreeing voices, the multivocality. I will be allowing multiple people to publicly analyze my dissertation data, and hope that exactly this sort of multivocality will emerge, and that seeing others' positions will help us realize where our own assumptions stand.

Similarly, Kate critiqued subject R for spending half her (condensed) interview "whining" about the deficiencies of the course she'd inherited. Kate agreed with R's approach in the second half -- "yes, that's how I would design my course too" -- and I think she may have mixed up "this is

good/rich data" with "I share the perspective of the subject." (You can disagree with what a subject says, *and* it can be excellent data.) I'll also need to watch out for -- and comment on -- exactly that phenomenon when other people (especially those without qualitative research training) are commenting on and analyzing the data.

In order to that, I'll need to have high levels of meta-awareness and stepping-back distance when others are going through my data. I easily slip into "I am Mel, and here is my opinion" -- which is not a bad thing! But I need to make it clear when I am speaking from my personal belief, and when I am trying to step away from what I think is "my default perspective" to see multiple perspectives or try on the perspectives of others. It'll still be my perspective. It can never be a "neutral" perspective. But I can try more consciously to be aware of and step out of my normal modes of thinking and be closer to "moderator mode" than "another participant" -- although I also am not fond of the whiff of separation/privilege/authority that creates.