

CHAPTER 5.

INTERPRETING RESEARCH WITH PARTICIPANTS: A LIFESPAN WRITING METHODOLOGY

Collie Fulford

University at Buffalo SUNY

Lauren Rosenberg

The University of Texas at El Paso

The methodology we share across these two chapters is rooted in our ongoing relationships with participants. It is through our research interactions, in combination with what we gain from other scholars committed to continually interrogating and revising their research practices, that we approach our writing research. We are two literacy researchers in rhetoric and writing studies who practice close-up investigations of ordinary adults' writing practices in disciplinary (Collie) and non-disciplinary (Lauren) settings. We choose to study adult learners because they have had opportunities to separate from compulsory education. Whatever connections to literacy education they pursue are ones they seek for purposes other than getting a high school diploma with its promise of entry into the workforce. Whether the participants in our studies come to us through their engagement with higher education as nontraditional students (Fulford, 2022), or whether they have come to literacy education for their purposes on their own terms (Rosenberg, 2015), the participants we engage with are adults who have had many life experiences aside from attending school. We learn from their multi-layered perspectives as parents, workers, and members of various communities; in addition, they offer us knowledge as adults who have had degrees of distance from mainstream academic pathways. Although we begin this chapter by introducing ourselves as researchers who study adult learners, we also flip this positioning: We conduct qualitative case studies and interviews with adults who are experts in—and on—their own lives and who have made very conscious decisions regarding their writing pathways. As researchers, we learn from them the reasons that writing matters—and continues to matter in new ways—across the lifespan.

In this chapter, we demonstrate that involving participants in collaborative meaning making is an established research practice that is well suited to lifespan

writing studies conducted with adult participants and adult co-researchers. Collaborative interpretation is especially apt for interview-based studies. This is demonstrated in works spanning from at least the 1980s to the present. Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman (1988); Berry, Hawisher, and Selfe (2012); Halbritter and Lindquist (2012); Micciche and Carr (2011); Prior (2018); Roozen and Erickson (2017); and Selfe and Hawisher (2004) are representative of interview-based studies that involve participants as interpreters of their own literate experiences. In addition to co-investigative research, we review longitudinal writing studies that have helped to shape our understanding of writers continuing to develop across their educational trajectories, such as Herrington and Curtis's *Persons in Process* (2000) and Compton-Lilly's (2003) series of books that began with *Reading Families*. After reviewing some of the prominent scholarship that attends to participant and researcher interactions, we turn to our own methodology for lifespan writing research, which we articulate as an approach to conducting the studies themselves rather than a set of methods that can be put into action. We aim to offer adaptable models that others can take up and our frank assessments of the concerns, limitations, and possibilities of such approaches. We identify several practices we use for interpreting or reinterpreting texts, interview transcripts, and findings with participants. We conclude by providing a set of guiding principles for lifespan writing researchers.

ROOTS OF OUR PARTICIPANT-LED METHODOLOGY

Our methodology has emerged from our work using narrative inquiry, poetic inquiry, case study and interviews (Fine, 2018; Seidman, 2019), and feminist principles for ethical interactions with participants (Kirsch & Ritchie, 1995; Royster, 1996; Royster & Kirsch, 2012; Tarabochia, 2021). The resulting methodology that we articulate here is a fusion of those we were trained in and those we have developed throughout our careers. As we refine our methods, we continue to learn from the actual encounters we have with participants and our reflections on those encounters as they deepen and change. We encourage new researchers to search for their own place among and with the methodologies that inform them, to modify rather than accept methods wholesale. Because the work we do is participant focused, the sites and individuals have to influence the methods, a position we emphasize throughout this work.

Before delving into our histories, we pause to parse out the distinctions between methodology and method as we employ the terms in our work. When we speak of a methodology, we are connecting the theories that guide us with the principles we embrace as practitioners of lifespan studies. This leads us to design a particular pathway into the project that shifts to meet our goals of

foregrounding co-interpretive practices. To achieve this, we concentrate on yielding and watching, reflecting and revising, fine-tuning and testing our objectives to see how they appear in relation to the values we claim to uphold. When we speak of methods, we are making plans. How are we going to do it? How will our interview process change to suit the methodology? What roles will participants have in analysis and revision? The methods develop from the methodology, and then we consider them in a kind of back-and-forth as we continually check ourselves (are we doing what we said we would do?).

We begin with our own history. Both of us were trained as researchers in Composition and Rhetoric at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst where we studied qualitative research methods with Anne Herrington in the early 2000s. Anne and Marcia Curtis's book, *Persons in Process: Four Stories of Writing and Personal Development in College* (2000), had recently been published. In addition to studying the methods and methodologies of numerous qualitative researchers in the field, Anne had us practice discourse analysis in class using some of the data she and Marcia had analyzed in their study. As part of learning how to become qualitative researchers, we were taught to "linger" with participants' texts, a term that Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa E. Kirsch (2012) would reflect on years later as a key element of "strategic contemplation" (*Feminist Rhetorical Practices*). We were energized by Anne's enthusiasm over raw data as something that could be interpreted individually and collaboratively. We continue to admire *Persons in Process* for its close up, careful attention to participants' lived experiences as they intersect with their academic lives. Looking back on the development of Herrington and Curtis's longitudinal project, we note that they never intended for it to become longitudinal: "We did not plan to follow these students' experiences any further than their first year. [W]e felt we had more than enough information to work from and more than enough of a challenge to determine how to proceed" (p. 9); yet, they found that their sustained interest in participants' ongoing development as writers and as people, especially in response to questions from audience members who listened to them present their findings at a conference, propelled the two researchers to extend their study: "We did not have an answer, but we did have a new resolve to pursue the telling of Nam's, Lawrence's, and Rachel's stories and make them the center of this book. . . . We had stumbled—or been pushed—instead into what could be called a "longitudinal" study of four students . . ." (p. 11).

We linger on our recollections of being trained by Anne to highlight our own receptivity to the notion of research participants as "persons in process." Throughout our subsequent careers, we have continued to be interested in relationships with participants as co-interpreters of our studies and co-creators of knowledge. (See Fulford, 2022; Rosenberg, 2020; Rosenberg, 2023; Wymer, Fulford, Baskerville, & Washington, 2012; Wymer & Fulford, 2019.)

Interpreting research with participants in lifespan literacy studies is an extension of established interview practices that honor participants' perspectives on their own lived experiences. Seidman's discussion of phenomenological interviewing, for instance, guides researchers to develop protocols that invite participants not only to describe but also to reflect on the meanings of their own experiences (2019). In this way, the subjective points of view of both researcher and researched contribute to the meanings made from the latter's histories. A tradition exists within writing studies for involving students in the interpretation of their own literacy experiences. Some of this has resulted in co-authorship, which can be a conventional academic practice for acknowledging contributions. This approach may be particularly relevant for graduate students whose professional identities and academic aspirations tangibly benefit from such arrangements. Early instances of this approach are reported in an article by Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman (1988) and a chapter by the same team (1991). Ackerman was covertly (at the time) the case study participant "Nate" whose experiences navigating new literacies during his initial years of a Ph.D. program are the subject of both publications. Ackerman took part in analyzing his own textual productions and experiences, but his complete relationship to the case was not disclosed until 1995 in a postscript to a subsequent publication (Ackerman, 1995). In contrast, a collaborative essay between Micciche and Carr (2011) while Carr was still a graduate student illustrates frank explanation of the co-authorship relationship:

In an effort to construct a multivoiced account of the need for graduate writing instruction and the difference it makes, the essay includes commentary by Allison Carr, who enrolled in my spring 2008 course when she was a master's student Allison's remarks, which consist of writing completed during the course and some written a year later, appear in text boxes throughout the essay. Her writing is sometimes in direct dialogue with my ideas and other times operates as an open-ended reflection on issues relevant to graduate student writers. (pp. 480-81)

In the years between Ackerman's and Carr's co-authoring with their respective faculty investigators, it has become expected for researchers to disclose participants' degrees of involvement in interpreting their own cases. However, the CCCC Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Research in Composition Studies (2015) acknowledge that there is considerable disciplinary and institutional variation in how we define the terms co-author and co-researcher: "In some cases, participants . . . should be considered co-researchers and/or co-authors. Determining who should be a co-researcher and/or co-author depends on

disciplinary convention, institutional regulation, and local expectations.” The guidelines further note that the status of participants may change during a study or be designated as collaborative from the start.

CENTERING INTERPRETIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Our own approach to longitudinal writing studies, while influenced by the work of scholars invested in exploring longitudinal, latitudinal, and heterogenous development of writing, is inspired by a feminist activist ethos. We cannot position ourselves as researchers without acknowledging the principles of Royster and Kirsch (2012) and the many femtors who guide our research ethics and stand alongside participants in their own studies (Glenn, 2018; Kerschbaum, 2014; Kirsch & Ritchie, 1995; Moss, 2003; Ratcliffe, 2005; and Royster, 1996). We call attention to recent contributions by feminist educational researcher Michelle Fine (2017), who writes about the responsibility of critical qualitative researchers: “[W]e are obligated to animate the histories, structures, policies, ideologies, and practices that have spawned [participants’] social exclusion, and perhaps have fomented their deep commitments to justice. ‘Voices’ alone will not suffice” (p. 12).

We recognize Fine’s commitment to participants as essential to an ethical research methodology. Our work is not merely to document stories and shifts in writing development throughout our qualitative longitudinal studies. We have a greater responsibility to participants and our field than simply sharing models and their implications for further studies of writing development. Fine’s ethos inspires us to attend deeply not only to our processes but also to the ends that our research achieves. We are always asking: how does this research serve the people and communities that it is about? We work towards social change, interpreting with participants and individually in our analyses with the goal of making education more equitable. Our commitment to writing research looks toward the possibilities that writing (our own and our participants’) offers for challenging oppressions and intervening in unjust social, racial, and class systems. The most significant goal is to circulate and synthesize the material we collect for Freirean praxis, that is, to actively seek changes to benefit the lives of participants. This is also what we offer to future researchers. Part of our interpretation of the writing practices of our participants (whether the analysis is done by the researcher alone or collaboratively with those who are researched) is tending to the relationships fostered within and outside of the research relationship, while together we do the work of interpreting their writing development.

Participants’ interpretive relationships to research projects about them can vary considerably, as can the ways we name and mark their roles and

contributions. When making such determinations, it is important to consider the nature of participants' actions within each project, the extent of their responsibilities, and their desires for visibility or anonymity, among other factors. What follows are a few categories of participants' active interpretive roles with our caveat that researchers are continually seeking meaningful, ethical, and accurate ways to acknowledge participants' collaborative positions in our projects.

CO-RESEARCHERS / PARTICIPANT CO-RESEARCHERS / COLLABORATORS

Roosen and Erickson (2017) indicate that when they engage with the people in their studies, the prevalent term "participant" does not capture the nature of the close reading and collaborative discussion about what texts and literacy experiences mean. Following Ivanič (1998), they identify the five individuals in their study as "participant-co-researchers," or often simply "co-researchers." These contributors are referred to by pseudonym and are not listed as co-authors, but they are repeatedly acknowledged as interpreters of their own texts and lives. Halbritter and Lindquist (2012) use both "participant" and "collaborator" when describing participants who contribute to data collection and self-narration in their studies of outsider literacy narratives. They realized that "to collect such stories, we would need to do more than ask our students simply to tell them: we would need to go find these stories—together, researchers and students" (p.173). In their variation on Seidman's interview sequencing, Halbritter and Lindquist engage collaborators in generating their own videotaped data, then co-creating documentaries of their literacy experiences.

PROXIMAL PARTICIPANT CO-RESEARCHERS

Investigators whose academic statuses or other identities are different from their participants can greatly benefit from listening to and learning from co-researchers who have closer life proximity to participants. For example, methods described in *The Meaningful Writing Project* (2016) include a practice that Collie uses when conducting research about student writers, that is to invite co-investigators from among or close to the population being studied. Eodice, Geller, and Lerner engage first-year seminar students, writing center peer consultants, and graduate students in data collection and analysis in their multi-institutional study of undergraduate seniors' most meaningful academic writing experiences. The authors justify this near-peer approach: "We could think of no better way to capture the perspective of undergraduates—and to value those perspectives—than to have undergraduates play a key role as co-researchers, particularly as interviewers" (p. 10). Student-researchers are credited by being named in an addendum to the book.

The line between participant co-researcher and proximal participant co-researcher can become blurry as activities and relationships change. For instance, in Collie's research about and with adult student writers at a historically Black university, two participants requested that they shift into the role of co-investigators in subsequent projects (Fulford, 2022). These co-investigators' perspectives from both sides of the researcher-researched divide provided unusually rich interpretive contributions because of their sustained investment in the project and its implications for their communities. Collie came to regard them as partners whom she could consult even after their formal involvement in studies ended. These co-researchers leveraged the findings and the research process as advocates for the adult student population at their university.

CO-AUTHORS / PARTICIPANT-CO-AUTHORS

Micciche and Carr's (2011) essay is an example of co-authorship in which Carr's literacy experiences as a graduate student and her reflections on them are foregrounded and formatted somewhat differently from Micciche's, the faculty author. Selfe and Hawisher (2004) also mark student co-authors' contributions. They choose the term "co-authorship" with case study participants because "we . . . came to the realization that the project we had undertaken was no longer our own. It belonged, as well, to the people we interviewed and surveyed—their words and their stories were continual reminders that they had claimed the intellectual ground of the project as their own" (p. 13). Although most participants reflected positively about becoming named authors, Selfe and Hawisher acknowledge that some wanted to preserve their anonymity and some questioned whether their actions merited co-authorship. Selfe and Hawisher are forthcoming that this method, especially with a large study, is "fraught with difficulties" (p. 23). Yet instead of shying away from its ambiguities, these researchers found ways in a subsequent multi-year study (Berry, Hawisher, & Selfe 2012) to invite deeper co-participation, to engage their students in the narration and meaning making in even richer ways that enabled more ownership of the text. To signify co-authorship in both books, case study participants who contributed are listed as co-authors on their respective chapters. Block quotations from the student co-authors are formatted as we are accustomed to seeing quotations from participants.

PARTICIPANT-AUTHORS

In *The Desire for Literacy* (Rosenberg, 2015), Lauren studied the emerging writing practices of four adult learners who had the opportunity to pursue literacy only when they reached older adulthood. As the participants composed more,

and when their writing became the center of discussions between them and Lauren, she began to refer to them as “the participant authors in my study” (p. 107), to emphasize that the participants *were* authors, an identity that resisted the subjectivity of the nonliterate Other. She observed that in their writing, the participant authors “tend not to self-censor, avoid, or look towards positive representations of their experiences. . . . Articulating an accurate representation of self is most valuable for these people who previously have not had the privilege of self-representation through writing” (p. 107). By calling the participants “authors” or “participant authors” when she wanted to call attention to their writing or to their civic intervention through writing, Lauren was able to shift the representation of the adult learners in her study. They were participating with her by sharing their interview remarks and writing samples and they were also participating as the authors of their writing. Those comments, and the texts they produced, were the subject of their research conversations as well as the core of Lauren’s analysis. She explained, “In this way, subaltern voices can be acknowledged as those of authors rather than subordinated others,” as researcher and researched “engage in mutual contemplation of their experiences and their writing” (p. 147). The acknowledgement of participant/author/participant-authors’ changing roles follows the CCCC (2015) guideline for indicating shifts within the write up of research.

When we trouble the terms participant “co-author,” “co-researcher,” “co-interpretter,” or “participant-author,” and when we talk about interpreting experiences, transcripts, and materials with participants, we draw from various established and emerging methodologies. Researchers new to these practices can refer to a spectrum of participant involvement in interpretation as they design—and redesign—lifespan writing research. We have access to layers of co-authorship when we are open to changes to our studies. We encourage others to lean into the messiness, toward participants becoming co-authors in narration, meaning making, and the uses of findings.

TRAJECTORIES AND TEMPORALITIES

This review of different categories of participants in interpreting roles illustrates some of the range of possibilities for working with research participants across the boundary of researcher-researched. In all of these styles of research interaction, we value the efforts researchers are making toward more substantial engagement with participants as interpreters of data. We also acknowledge the limitations of traditional research relationships. When we argue that we learn from and with participants, we mean that we are committed to finding new ways to deepen those methods of learning together.

Within writing studies, one lens that we find helpful is Paul Prior's (2018) "trajectories of semiotic becoming," which carries Jay Lemke's science education research on life scales into a lifespan development of writing framework. Noting that moments of learning, including shared moments, are significant to our sense of being, Prior describes semiotic becoming as occurring "not inside domains, but across the many moments of a life. Becoming happens in spaces that are never pure or settled, where discourses and knowledge are necessarily heterogeneous, and where multiple semiotic resources are so deeply entangled that distinct modes simply don't make sense" (par. 6). This notion of becoming, of crossing domains of experience, is central to our understanding of lifespan writing. In our methodology of interpreting experiences with participants, we presume that participants are always crossing domains of experience, and that they are often aware of those crossings, although they may not have been asked to examine the interrelationships among experience, identity, and ways of knowing.

Roozen and Erickson (2017) build upon Prior's work by looking into the writing trajectories of various age and discipline-concentrated students, noting the crisscrossing influences that drive their academic and life pathways. By examining case studies across areas of expertise, identities, and age as they share interviews and multimedia artifacts, the authors add to the body of scholarship on lifespan development of writing as occurring longitudinally and latitudinally in a complex fabric of experience.

Among the authors included in this volume, we value the contributions of our colleagues theorizing new methodologies for lifespan research, especially Compton-Lilly's (2017) in which she extends her previous studies of a group of students' literacy learning from childhood through adulthood. In *Reading Students' Lives* (2017), Compton-Lilly builds a case for centering time as a significant element of educational research. She zeroes in on the temporality of literacy development, arguing that literacy learning is constrained by the "temporal benchmarks" of schooling (pp. 119-120), at the same time that learning pathways are multiple and intersecting, and often benefit from their ongoingness. Learning trajectories can be problematic when they are *unchanging* (for example, when educational research measures student success by performance on achievement tests over grade levels), as well as challenging when the multiplicity of a learners' trajectories (home and family influences, competing ways of meaning making, and the effects of microaggressions) are under-recognized or ignored. She notes in conclusion the importance of timescale analysis, which "calls attention to events and the construction of meaning across multiple timescales as historical pasts, lived pasts, and ongoing experiences converge as children construct and reconstruct meanings related to self, literacy, and schooling" (p. 119).

While Compton-Lilly's research focuses on children and their families negotiating the school system through childhood and into adulthood, our longitudinal research centers different populations of adult learners when they negotiate the meanings of education in their lives. Drawing upon the contributions of Compton-Lilly, Prior, Roozen and Erickson, and others, we note the intersecting trajectories of adult participants' many identities and social roles. Reflecting on her case studies of students' temporal pathways, Compton-Lilly recognized, "In each case, ways of seeing the world came together, collided, sedimented and conflicted across time as people drew on the past within a lived present that was constantly being reconstructed relative to possible futures" (p. 120). This work on trajectories of learning previews the methods we use for co-interpretation. When we work with participants, we are drawn into their ways of knowing and being and becoming. Our relationships with them are about the mutuality of being together in a moment of co-constructing knowledge.

DWELLING WITH PARTICIPANTS: WHAT THIS OFFERS LIFESPAN WRITING RESEARCH

A methodology of interpreting with participants offers lifespan writing studies a fluid and organic means of reconsidering research interactions. By this, we mean that the process of engaging with participants in discussions of their writing can change from the original project design, and that it does change, based on conversations with participants about how they understand their texts and transcripts. Our methodology of dwelling together responds to shifts in both participants' and researchers' life conditions. It also varies depending on the moment of the interaction. Both of us have longitudinal relationships with participants that involve periodic revisits to check in about the research. Each moment is distinct. Each time we approach the research situation, we (researchers and participants) come to it with slightly different perspectives. Events in our lives, reflection, self-analysis, changing conditions in the world around us and in our communities—all these factors influence the research moment. It is from that understanding that we engage and listen to the stories and analysis participants share. The relationships we form through these co-interpretive methods advance our findings. The depth of engagement we can achieve throughout relationships, revisiting, and dwelling with participants is a form of validity that we cannot approach through traditional research methods. We are able to learn things that we cannot with more bounded designs and roles.

Our methodology particularly lends itself to longitudinal work because it references research done previously while re-examining themes and throughlines in the analysis when they emerge. We see this revisiting with participants as a form

of member checking in action. While conventional member checking can be as perfunctory as offering participants drafts and transcripts to review for accuracy, we're talking about truly checking in with participants in collaboration. When this works well, there are two minds focused on the material. Lifespan Writing Research as a subfield may create more consequential research because participants will have other uses for our findings and may bring them to other publics. Another benefit of gaining insider knowledge from participants is that it can reveal holistic and multiple perspectives that mitigate the limited cultural and personal knowledge of solo researchers. This helps us address the risk of speaking for participants (Kirsch and Ritchie, 1995, p. 8). With this approach, meaning making belongs both to the researcher and the researched, potentially amplifying the value of the project for all involved. As participant/co-researchers have their own insights and make their own discoveries, they may find uses for the findings and realizations that differ from scholarly end products. What we have learned from participants' insights is even more than what we have learned from published scholarship.

We also are aware of contradictions and other limitations that arise with this methodology, some of which involve dealing with disciplinary and institutional conventions. As researchers who work primarily with case studies that involve interviews and writing samples as data, our primary interpretations are with the people who participate in our research as we relate to their transcripts and texts. One of the concerns we have as we conduct these studies is with navigating our institutional review boards (IRB). Longitudinal writing studies sometimes exceed the limitations of the IRB. At times, we have found that the IRB has become perfunctory for us as our research takes us in directions that involve collaborating with participants in ways we couldn't have predicted when we drafted the protocol. We discuss this subject in detail in the next chapter.

We conclude this chapter by framing some of the ways that our work pays attention to the overlapping roles and responsibilities of researchers, research participants, collaborators, co-constructors of knowledge, and our growing understanding of what's important for the subfield of Lifespan Writing Research. Our common objective is to study relationships between everyday non-school practices and more formal academic practices so that we can better understand the many factors that contribute to how adult learners develop as writers and the power that their writing has in their lives. Rooted in our studies with adults in various learning settings, we peer into a few examples from our interview-based qualitative case studies to look at how our research designs are influenced by interactions with participants. We ask these central questions:

- How do participants' experiences, material needs, and interpretation of the study affect our research plans?

- In what ways does the reshaping of research in response to participants inform our practices as lifespan writing researchers?

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR INTERPRETING RESEARCH WITH PARTICIPANTS

We offer a set of guiding principles for lifespan researchers that summarize the writing we have done in this chapter. In the next chapter, we demonstrate how these principles apply in our own projects.

1. **Researchers and participants are both experts.** We want to emphasize that participants are experts in their own lives. Our knowledge as researchers is shaped by their expertise. Differences of being and ways of interpreting the world influence our research. For instance, our understanding of racial difference is shaped by participants' willingness to explain their experiences. Researchers can develop a deliberate, self-conscious listening practice by yielding their position to the narratives expressed by participants.
2. **Researchers and participants can dwell together in interpretation and writing.** For us to engage our studies responsibly, with respect for the many interlocking perspectives that shape participants' subjectivity, we interpret experiences together with our participants, sometimes co-writing. It is important to develop informal methods and to inhabit spaces of inquiry where we share the research in ways that matter both to participants and researchers. We show them that their words are being taken seriously, and they influence our interpretations and the ways we write about them.
3. **Research design is best when it is flexible.** Taking participants' interpretations seriously means being open to reconfiguration as we document necessary procedural changes. We invite organic developments and expect changes because our projects continue to be shaped by our co-interpretation with participants whose roles in the research can change across time. Even tautly planned projects are at their best when they are intentionally designed to shift in response to organic developments and unexpected results. Altering an IRB-approved procedure in response to participant-led insights and directions may feel risky and cumbersome, but the larger risk is in missing the opportunity to reshape the study.

For researchers who see the value in co-inquiry but who are not yet experienced in the practice, we recommend setting the stage starting with research design and initial interactions with participants. For instance, we suggest drafting semi-structured interview protocols that ask participants to reflect on and

thus make their own meanings about their lives, literacies, and written artifacts. During interviews, a researcher may experiment with yielding to where a participant takes them, showing openness to pathways in the discourse that may exceed their design. Member checking is another place to frame as an open practice in which the conversation is about building relationships, not just fact checking. Those being supervised by a faculty advisor may want to discuss further ways to open the research design to participant feedback.

In our next chapter, readers will become acquainted with how we enact these principles in multiple moments during our studies when we put our co-interpretive methodology into action. We believe that the approaches we have promoted in this chapter, which we are actively using in our own qualitative studies of writing, can offer lifespan researchers organic, flexible, participant-centered means of engaging with research. Through ongoing interaction with participants, and by inviting them—not just once, but across time and phases of our studies—to contribute to the work, we demonstrate our commitment to their writing lives.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, J. (1995). Postscript: The tactics of Nate. In C. Berkenkotter & T. N. Huckin (Eds.), *Genre knowledge and disciplinary communication* (pp. 145-50). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T. N., & Ackerman, J. (1988). Conventions, conversations, and the writer: Case study of a student in a rhetoric Ph.D. program. *Research in the Teaching of English* 22(1), 9-44.
- Berkenkotter, C., Huckin, T., & Ackerman, J. (1991). Social context and socially constructed texts: The initiation of a graduate student into a writing research community. In C. Bazerman and J. Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities*. (pp.191-215). University of Wisconsin Press. <https://wac.colostate.edu/books/landmarks/textual-dynamics>
- Berry, P. W., Hawisher, G. E., & Selfe, C. L. (2012). *Transnational literate lives in digital times*. The Computers and Composition Digital Press; Utah State University Press. <https://ccdigitalpress.org/book/transnational/>
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2015). Guidelines for the ethical conduct of research in composition studies. National Council of Teachers of English. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/ethicalconduct>
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2017). *Reading students' lives: Literacy learning across time*. Routledge.
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2003). *Reading families: The literate lives of urban children*. Teachers College Press.
- Eodice, M., Lerner, N., & Geller, A. E. (2016). *The meaningful writing project*. Utah State University Press.

- Fine, M. (2018). *Just research in contentious times: Widening the methodological imagination*. Teachers College Press.
- Fulford, C. (2022). Rethinking research in English with nontraditional adult students. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture* 22(1), 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-9385488>
- Glenn, C. (2018). *Rhetorical feminism and this thing called hope*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Halbritter, B., & Lindquist, J. (2012). Time, lives, and videotape: Operationalizing discovery in scenes of literacy sponsorship. *College English*, 75(2), 171–198. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24238138>
- Herrington, A. J., & Curtis, M. (2000). *Persons in process: Four stories of writing and personal development in college*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursual construction of identity in academic writing*. John Benjamins.
- Kerschbaum, S. L. (2014). *Toward a new rhetoric of difference*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kirsch, G., & Ritchie, J. S. (1995). Beyond the personal: Theorizing a politics of location in composition research. *College Composition and Communication* 46(1), 7-29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358867>
- Micciche, L. R., & Carr, A. D. (2011). Toward graduate-level writing instruction. *College Composition and Communication*, 62(3), 477-501. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27917909>
- Moss, B. J. (2003). *A community text arises: A literate text and a literacy tradition in African-American churches*. Hampton Press.
- Prior, P. A. (2018). How do moments add up to lives: Trajectories of semiotic becoming vs. tales of school learning in four modes. In R. Wysocki, & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Making future matters*. The Computers and Composition Digital Press; Utah State University Press. <http://ccdigitalpress.org/book/makingfuturematters/index.html>
- Ratcliffe, K. (2005). *Rhetorical listening: Identification, gender, whiteness*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenberg, L. (2015). *The desire for literacy: Writing in the lives of adult learners*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Rosenberg, L. (2020). "Revisiting participants after publication: Continuing writing partnerships." In T. Phillips & R. J. Dippre (Eds.), *Approaches to lifespan writing research: Generating an actionable coherence* (pp. 97-110). The WAC Clearinghouse; University Press of Colorado. <https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2020.1053.2.06>
- Rosenberg, L. (2023). Following participants as leaders in long research. In A. K. Hea, & J. Fishman (Eds.), *Telling stories: Perspectives on longitudinal writing research*. Utah State University Press.
- Roozen, K., & Erickson, J. (2017). *Expanding literate landscapes: Persons, practices, and sociohistoric perspectives of disciplinary development*. The Computers and Composition Digital Press; Utah State University Press. <http://ccdigitalpress.org/expanding/>

- Royster, J. J. (1996). When the first voice you hear is not your own. *College Composition and Communication* 47(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358272>
- Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical practices: New horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Seidman, I. (2019). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Selfe, C. L., & Hawisher, G. E. (2004). *Literate lives in the information age: Narratives of literacy from the United States*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tarabochia, S. L. (2021). From resilience to resistance: Repurposing faculty writers' survival strategies. *Peitho*, 23(3).
- Wymer, K., & Fulford, C. (2019). Students as co-producers of queer pedagogy. *Journal of Effective Teaching in Higher Education*, 2(1), 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.36021/jethe.v2i1.29>
- Wymer, K., Fulford, C., Baskerville, N. & Washington, M. (2012). Necessity and the unexpected: SoTL student-faculty collaboration in writing program research. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2012.060120>