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Eleven Perspectives on Parallactic Praxis

Carl Leggo

University of British Columbia

carl.leggo@ubc.ca
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Parallactic praxis is a celebration of the hard work that is heart work. In University commons divided: Exploring debate & dissent on campus, Peter MacKinnon (2018) notes that “intellectual work is hard work, and those committed to it must take the time to inform themselves carefully, to think their way through complicated questions, and to test their thinking in the marketplace of ideas” (p. 57). In Parallactic praxis Pauline Sameshima, Patricia Maarhuis, and Sean Wiebe understand MacKinnon’s perspective on intellectual work as hard work. They take up MacKinnon’s call for scholarship and practice that “requires disciplined, patient effort, and a determination to engage and listen to others” (p. 57). Moreover, they agree with MacKinnon’s claim that “universities exist to develop the human intellect, to enable discernment and the search for truth, and to resist ignorance, intellectual laziness, and coercion” (p. 104). Parallactic praxis is a sophisticated book that presents a comprehensive overview of the concepts and principles of parallactic praxis as well as engaging exemplars of research design that address urgent issues and questions including methamphetamine addiction, interpersonal violence, Indigenous mental health care, learner-centered pedagogy, cervical cancer screening, dementia studies, teacher education, technology and inclusive education, literacy, knowledge generation, and veteran post-traumatic stress syndrome.
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Perplexing Pedagogy: Pensées

if lost in mystery
something emerges
a time you learned something almost
always begins with letting go

at the end of the day, writing is about desire,
the heart, breathing and not breathing

I will learn to live attentively in tentative times
I will learn to live the tenuous in tensile times

under the sky where possibilities defy calculus
I am a radical rooted in earth, heart, and wind

I attend to the familiar with unfamiliar words
I attend to the unfamiliar with familiar words

if we don’t see the value in our lived stories,
we won’t see the value in others’ stories

seek words infused with the heart’s rhythms
efficacious, capacious, effervescent words

I come alive in my writing where
I see, hear, know promises

no day is complete without
reading and writing poetry!

I am in process,
I am content

Parallaxic praxis is a memo to the world to remember to listen, to hear one another. In her poignant novel about racism, immigration, and colonialism, In another place, not here, Dionne Brand (1997) writes: “Already their stories were becoming lies because nobody wanted to listen, nobody had the time. That’s what happens to a story if nobody listens and nobody has the time, it
flies off and your mouth stays open” (p. 60). According to Brand, “you end up being a liar because what you say doesn’t matter. And there’s no tracing or lasting to your stories” (p. 60). Parallaxic praxis is about learning how to listen to the stories of others, so those stories sing with truthfulness about lived and living experiences.

It’s All Greek to Me

antiphona
aporia
catechization
dialogue
ekphrasis
ethics
evanagnostos
métissage
mimesis
palimpsest
parallax
poiesis
praxis
sorites
trauma

And that is a significant strength of Parallaxic praxis—it offers richly evocative concepts that are full of possibilities for revisiting traditional practices, and shaping innovative approaches, and honouring the intricacies of interconnections among distinct disciplines that should never be held separate.

Parallaxic praxis is a confession of desire. In Ecology of everyday life: Rethinking the desire for nature, Chaia Heller (1999) notes that “informed by a
capitalist sensibility, desire is often reduced to yearnings for an accumulation of private property, both material and symbolic” (p. 5). Therefore, “rarely do we view desire as a yearning to enhance a social whole greater than our selves, a desire to enrich the larger community” (p. 5). Heller calls for “a desire for a more healthful and sensual expression of everyday life” (p. 6) as we nurture “the ability to synthesize reason and passion” (p. 9). Heller wants to create “a new relationality, an empathetic, sensual, and rational way of relating that is deeply cooperative, pleasurable, and meaningful” (p. 93).

Parallaxic praxis resonates with Heller’s hopeful understanding of desire and love: “It is in the space between individuals, within the hearts of individuals, that Eros flourishes. Eros, then, represents an embodied quality of social relationships—an attraction, passion, and yearning of one self for other selves” (p. 94).

6

A Poem Is

a heart beat  a light breath
a dream hanging on the line
stretched between poles we cannot see
falling in love with the alphabet
growing intimate with grammar and syntax
a game of peek-a-boo  scribbles in snow
a call, filled with hope somebody will hear
a message in a bottle dropped in the sea
attending to the familiar with unfamiliar words
a love note sent to creatures light years away
words infused with the heart’s rhythms
words, efficacious, capacious, effervescent words
enjoying the sunlight through the study blinds
learning to live attentively in tentative times
cedars dancing in my neighbor’s backyard
Parallaxic praxis is a sacred testimony. In her moving memoir *Gently to Nagasaki*, Joy Kogawa (2016) asks, “Do we write to be free of our ghosts or to welcome them?” (p. 190) For Kogawa, the world is “an open book embedded with stories. We hear them if we have ears to hear” (p. 149). She knows that her “story is from the belly of the dark” (p. 47). She is both “forbidden to tell it and commanded to tell it” because she knows “that to speak is to slay and not to speak is to slay. What is needed is right action” (p. 47). Therefore, she concludes that “for my part, I hold with a fierce and painful joy my trust in a Love that is more real than we are” (p. 42). This is the spirit of parallaxic praxis.

Parallaxic praxis is a political manifesto that champions interdisciplinarity in scholarship and social activism . . . . Parallaxic praxis is a love song! In “Everyday life at the corporate university,” Jane Juffer (2009) refutes binary oppositions in order to promote “the intersections of globalization, job training, cultural production, and ethical engagement” (p. 147). According to Juffer, “the challenge is to truly think in interdisciplinary terms . . . , which requires one to think about the ethical possibilities *in the relationship between* the humanities, business, education, engineering, information sciences, health services, and other fields” (p. 153). In a likeminded way, Andrew Ross recommends that “we are living through the formative stages of a mode of production marked by a quasiconvergence of the academy and the knowledge corporation” as they mutate into “new species that share and trade many characteristics” (p. 182). Parallaxic praxis sings with enthusiasm for social activism and change.

While I read *Parallaxic praxis* I lingered with many questions including:

1. In parallaxic praxis, what are the differences between collecting, representing, interpreting, and disseminating research?

2. What is the difference between using the arts to make sense of research conducted using traditional social science methods, and using the arts to research traditional social science issues and questions?

3. What is the relationship between ethics and aesthetics?

4. What is data?
5. What is the difference between rendering and surrendering?

6. What are the criteria for assessing Arts Integrated Research?

7. How can we make Arts Integrated Research more persuasive and useful?


9. Should we develop criteria for assessment from social science methodologies and practices, or from artists’ methodologies and practices?

10. What is Arts Integrated Research good for?

Lunatic Scholars

education research and practice
should always charge us with insights
(in legal electrical business military ways)
living with the flux, listening to ducks
laughing on the dike, an encouragement
not to duck the flux, to laugh too
dance a highland jig, even if we don’t
know how, right in the middle of
the flowing, furling, flashing flux
leave the models and wall charts
and kits and formulas to others
who wear suits or pretend they do
we become masters like Ted T. Aoki
is a master, always pushing boundaries
we have not yet seen or been
to inscribe our own insights
we do not need to repeat
everything others have done

our hang-ups are the stories
we seldom tell, the handicaps
that trip up our successes

the hang-ups are our humanity,
at least as integrally who we are
and are becoming, as any gifts

perhaps the classroom needs
to be a place where human beings
hang out with their hang-ups

instigating a revolution,
a twisting turning, to and fro,
in the heart of pedagogy

why do scholars speak so quietly?
why do scholars mumble rumble stumble?
why do scholars amble in their preambles?

if you are going to be witty, ironic, comical,
be prepared (in the best Boy Scout ethic) to be
misunderstood, misinterpreted, misrepresented

write with a kind of reckless, ruthless,
ruminative, revelling resolve

to defer solution and resolution
Parallaxic praxis is a love song! In a remarkable book titled *Three moments of love in Leonard Cohen & Bruce Cockburn*, Paul Nonnekes (2001) spells out a profound definition of love:

> Structures of love are created not through the fixing of desire in secure borders and boundaries, but through establishing frameworks of intersubjectivity, the activity of subjects reciprocally recognizing each other's independence and freedom, recognizing each other's difference, establishing a big space for the entertaining of diversity. (pp. 174-175)

Like the authors of *Parallaxic praxis*, Nonnekes understands “love as movement forward, not staying in one place, not being stuck or fixed” (p. 56). For Nonnekes, “love must move outward into the complicated world of social relations, of politics and power, of intersubjective conflict” (p. 66). Nonnekes calls for “the prophet-poet” (p. 178) because “the prophetic voice of the poet is outside the established system” (p. 129). Nonnekes calls for “an activist community fighting for change, for a better world” (p. 94); he calls for “a community of love” (p. 93). Even if “everything is falling apart, yet love rules” (p. 178) because love “is the active agent in human desire. It is what keeps us burning for something more than what presently exists. Burning for love, for justice and the overcoming of evil” (p. 60). The authors of *Parallaxic praxis* are all committed to “burning for love.” And we are all bountifully blessed by their commitments!

**References**

Chapter 1

Introduction

How the book is organized:

- Model Overview
- The Catechization Process
- Theoretical Foundations
- Ethics
- Examples

Parallaxic Praxis is a multi-modal, transmethodological research framework utilized by interdisciplinary teams to collect, interpret, transmediate, analyze, and mobilize data generatively. Parallaxic praxis is used as a noun to refer to the model and also as a verb to describe the research practice. The methodology leverages the researchers’ personal strengths and the collective expertise of the team including the participants and community when possible. The reparative and residual research design benefits include the use of multi-perspective analysis, multi-modal investigations, informal and directed dialogic conversations, innovative knowledge creation, and models of residual and reparative research. Relying on difference, dialogue, and creativity propulsion processes; and drawing on post-qualitative, new materiality, multiliteracies, and combinatorial, even juxtaposing theoretical frames; this model offers extensive research possibilities across disciplines and content areas to mobilize knowledge to broad audiences.

The model originated in a methamphetamine addiction and recovery project in 2007. The first iteration of the model (Sameshima & Vandermause, 2008) was developed in collaboration with a team from multiple departments spearheaded by Dr. Roxanne Vandermause in the Nursing Department at Washington State University (see Women and Meth Project example, this volume). The model’s intent is to stimulate a fuller and richer understanding of the research project and to advance clinical, methodological, and social change. The model has since been used in various disciplines and for a range of research projects. For example: human immunodeficiency virus research (Defechereux, 2017), responses to experiences of interpersonal violence (Maarhuis, 2016), Indigenous mental health care (Saunders, 2015); learner-centred pedagogy (Ingalls Vanada, 2017); cervical cancer screening (Sameshima et al., 2017); dementia studies (Wiersma et al., 2015); teacher education identity studies
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(Stock, et al., 2016, reprinted in this volume), technology and inclusive education (Marino et al., 2009), knowledge generation (Wiebe & Sameshima, 2017, reprinted in this volume), veteran post-traumatic stress syndrome (Upshaw, 2018), literacy (MacLaren & Becker, 2018), and more.

The research framework of Parallaxic Praxis grew out of the work from the book Seeing Red, A Pedagogy of Parallax (Sameshima, 2007a) and draws from a variety of traditions, some, often believed to be disparate. The tenets of arts integrated research utilized in this model are rhizomatic extensions of arts informed inquiry (Cole & Knowles, 2000, 2008); arts-based educational research (Eisner, 1991; Barone & Eisner, 1997; 2012) and a/r/tography (Irwin, 2004). These three methodological approaches each include creative tenets and yet differing epistemologies (Tsun Haggarty, 2017). Thus, we use the term arts integrated research to refer to research design that includes creative or generative construction as part of the research design without implied attachment to disciplinary or epistemological alignments.

**Arts Integrated Research**

We use the term Arts Integrated Studies to refer to research projects in which the arts are used specifically as a generative mechanism in the research design process. The arts can be used to advance scholarship by a researcher working independently, by an artist-researcher working with a team, by a research team collaborating with an artist, or any combinatory practice.

Integrating the arts in research methodology affords scholars new lenses for viewing, analyzing, representing, and disseminating research (Sameshima, 2007a). As marketers and mathematicians use bar graphs, infographics and schematics to demonstrate relationships between numeric data, artist-researchers render research data into stories, plays, documentaries, movies, paintings, posters, poetry, and so forth to better discern and represent relational connections. Art-making can happen at any point in the research process and produces artefacts to purposefully generate data and further analyze data, offer new perspectives, generate models of theories, and so on. During the research process art-making is also used to mobilize knowledge across the audience spectrum and to use as teaching tools for students in formal and informal educational settings (Cole & Knowles, 2001). Using the arts to research and disseminate results is synergistic—humans make sense of the world through their writings, music, artworks, and various forms of representation (Barone & Eisner, 1997).

Integrating the arts as a teaching method in educational settings has demonstrated increased learning engagement and content knowledge (Burnaford, April & Weiss, 2000; Gelineau, 2004). Arts integrated studies require:
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1) theorizing through metaphors using theoretical frameworks in education, cultural studies, philosophy, psychology, history, and other disciplines; 2) strong foundational understandings of various traditional qualitative methods; and 3) personal study in art skill development or collaboration with arts experts. This theoretical framework is grounded in multiple perspectives including Stuart Hall’s (1973) notions on coding and encoding; Roland Barthes’ (1996) polysemic readings (having different meanings) of texts—including non-word-based texts; and Mikhail Bakhtin’s (1981) ideas on utterance, heteroglossia, and carnival. Arts integrated studies use a constructivist and post-qualitative theoretical framework with a dynamic and multi-viewed approach. Constructivist epistemologies focus on schemata or knowledge systems that position knowledge generation as relational—that meaning occurs through interaction between experience and thought and that meaningful reality is socially constructed (Crotty, 2003). Thus, knowledge generation and meaning-making are always continual, ontological, and incomplete.

Interdisciplinary Research

Interdisciplinary research accesses vocabulary, tools, techniques, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks from two or more specialized knowledge fields. As various academic disciplines each have their own ways of organizing and framing meaning, artistic disciplines (creative writing, visual arts, performing arts, film, new artistic practices, and more) also each have their own ‘language.’ Interdisciplinary arts integrated work can expand innovation capacity by encouraging dialogues to develop among scholars with different lexicons, semantic fields, disciplinary expertise, epistemologies and ontological framings of the world (Sameshima, 2007a; Sameshima, Vandermause, Chalmers & Gabriel, 2009).
The Concept of Parallax

Parallassein, the Greek word for parallax, means to change, to cause to alternate, to vary (dictionary.com, 2018). The noun refers to “the apparent displacement of an observed object due to a change in the position of the observer.” For example, in Figure 1.1, the three perceived views (lower right) of the same object produce a different looking object embedded within three different contexts. This notion of perspective as determined by discipline, modality, language, time, space, light, and a multitude of other variables is significant in conceptualizing understanding. “The concept of parallax encourages researchers and teachers to acknowledge and value their own and their readers’ and students’ shifting subjectivities and situatedness which directly influence the construct of perception, interpretation, and learning” (Sameshima, 2007a, p. 2).

The Model

The model’s name is drawn from a pedagogy of parallax (Sameshima, 2007a), that all that is known is partial and the known is always in relation; and the notion of praxis, the embodied form of engaging, realizing, and applying theory in practice.

---

**Figure 1.2.** Parallaxic Praxis, Generic Model.
The Parallaxic Praxis model (see Figure 1.2) can be used both as a research conceptual framework and an educational model to structure inquiry through relation, dialogics, and multi-modal means of generating data, accessing and engaging with data, analyzing thoughts, materializing and representing learning, provoking imagination, and disseminating research. While the framework/model appears linear here (beginning at the top of the graphic), the model is cyclical, moving from top to bottom and returning to the top as new questions are generated. It is important to note that the model is not prescriptive. To be effective, parallax relies on multiple viewpoints that are genuinely personalized and designed with consideration for the researchers, the participants, and the local needs and goals of the study. There are three organizational phases in the model framework: Data, Analyses and Renderings.
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Phases of the Model

• In the DATA PHASE, researchers collect data in traditional and non-traditional ways.

• In the ANALYSES PHASE, researchers from different fields interpret the data through their disciplinary expertise.

• In the RENDERING PHASE, the completed artifacts created during the previous phase are used as touchstones to provoke thinking and generate discussion.

Phase I – Data Collection

A wide range of data collections can be utilized in this phase. Data may consist of raw numerical data, audio or transcribed interview transcripts with individuals or focus groups, collections of texts, collections of artefacts, and more. Because this is a cyclical model, the first analyses of original data can itself become the focal data in the next cycle.

Examples of original data included in examples in this book include: a participant’s interview transcripts (Women and Meth Project); 90 cloaks made by pre-service teachers (Teacher Identity Project); participant decorated t-shirts (Clothesline Project); or an author’s select writings (Nuno Scarf Project).

In this model, the arts can also be used in the data collection process to improve the quality of the data. For example, in a project addressing barriers to cervical cancer screening, the use of crafting during the research focus sessions created improved dialogic conversation by displacing positionalities of researchers and participants (Sameshima et al., 2017).

Phase II – Analyses

In the Analyses Phase or artefact-making stage, researchers through different fields, lenses, methodologies, or modalities interpret the data through their independent disciplinary lenses. The analyses phase may include coding the raw data, grouping co-occurring themes, and looking for connections and commonalities. In this phase, analysis refers to indwelling, deep engagement, the study of the data and the creation of artefacts based on the original data. An artefact could be a graph, a chart, a narrative timeline, a painting, or more.
Quantitative, qualitative, and post-qualitative analyses take place in this phase of the model. As mentioned above, in this phase, data is distilled, reiterated, or translated into other forms. The Analyses Phase is the creation of artefacts based on the data set.

In the translation/making process, a researcher is inherently fully engaged in the nuances and meanings of that data. For example, an audio interview with a participant is layer one. Transcription of the interview is layer two. While some researchers hire transcriptionists, the act of translating the oral to text is a form of analysis and indwelling. The transcriptionist will inadvertently fill in minor words that may be inaudible but which complete expected sentence construction. In this process of creating the artefact of the interview text from the recording, the transcriptionist provides one perspective of the original data. In this model, there is not only one meaning or one truth. The artefacts are creations of how the data is experienced through a particular modality in relation to the researcher in time and space. Layer three could be a graphic chart demarking key co-occurring themes from the data set. Layer three could be a metaphoric or literal snapshot painting from the interview transcripts. Layer three could be a found poem based on key events in the transcript.

The express intent of artefact making is a translation of a snapshot of part of the data. Likened to a therapist summarizing a client’s concerns, the artefact is a mirror of part of the data through a different modality. This translation becomes another way of understanding the data. Wiebe and Morrison-Robinson (2013) suggest that expanding imaginations across multiple domains enables social tendencies that privilege economic valuing to be redressed. Through transmediative processes wider semantic fields of language are engaged and generative possibilities for knowledge creation are enhanced.

The making of the artefact creates new understanding for the researcher, the team, and the audience, resulting in co-learning, knowledge production, and later, research dissemination. The aim is to look at the data from various disciplines, lenses, and modalities as a means to complexify the interpretive possibilities and to generate collaborative dialogic analyses in the next phase of this model. Teams may utilize arts-based research (Barone & Eisner, 2012); arts-informed inquiry methods (Cole & Knowles, 2001); poetic inquiry (Prendergast, Leggo & Sameshima, 2009); a/r/tography (Irwin, 2004); heuristic inquiry (Djuraskovic & Arthur, 2010), or other processes to create interpretive renderings in response to the data collected. These multiple perspectives are created as a means to generate an enlarged investigative field.

The Analyses Phase is a method of fractalling the boundaries of the original data collection. The process offers traditional and metaphoric ways to view the data, thus opening up larger semantic fields for discussion particularly among
broad community audiences and various stakeholders. Metaphors work by reordering the relations of a semantic field by mapping them onto the existing relations of another semantic field (Stern, 2000). Translating data into other modalities invokes polysemy (phrases and words having multiple meanings) and pluralism (multiple interpretive views). The making of the artefact is a reparative gesture in that the artefact demonstrates to the participants that their stories are heard and acknowledged. These artefacts aim to provoke further rhizomatic understandings, challenge conceptions, and generate the emergence of more questions (Sameshima, Vandermause, Chalmers & Gabriel, 2009).

Eisner (2008) suggests that “something that mediates the researchers’ observations and culminates in a form that provides the analogous structure” (p. 7) can be a means to generating the articulation of the unsaid.

Phase III – Renderings

In the Rendering Phase, the various artefacts created during the Analyses Phase are used as juxtaposed touchstones for the research team to discuss their personal experiences of the data, the methodological processes, the metaphoric and symbolic references, and the creative practices utilized. These independent renderings of the data are discussed with the team informally or more formally using a dialogic process called The Catechization Process. The renderings can also be used as pedagogic tools in formal and informal settings to mobilize knowledge and generate discussion.

Individual renderings (i.e., a paper, a poem, a poster, a graphic from survey data, an artwork, and more) can be very useful in generating discussion; however, when there are several types of artefacts, the juxtaposition and correlation of ideas between and across artefacts and the modes of creation extend the semantic and imaginative fields for further reflective analysis. This dialogic area is where the colliding chronotoposes (time-space) of discourse and modality generate new forms, frames, assumptions, categories, and patterns. Bakhtin (1981) explains the chronotope as “the place where knots of narrative are tied and untied” (p. 250).

The renderings are used by the team, participants, and wider community as catalysts to stir conversations on the issues surfaced in the Analyses Phase. While the Rendering Phase could simply be an informal sharing and discussion of the artefacts created from the analysis with the research team; it could be a Philosopher’s Cafe where there is sharing with a focus group; it could be a meeting with participants as a type of member check; it could be an exhibition of the works; or it could be a very specific process of dialogue called the Catechization Process explained in the next chapter (also see examples in this volume: Stock, Sameshima, Slingerland, 2016; Wiebe & Sameshima, 2017).
The Catechization Process is a synthesizing analysis of the various renderings made. The Catechization Process uses questions to move the dialogue and learning forward and is a formal systematic approach of discussing the renderings. Invariably, the Catechization Process creates new questions and wonderings, leading the researchers back to the data in a recursive research loop.
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Glossary

Select terms suggested by students:

*Aesthetic:* the physical beauty of an object or work; the focus on the physical appearance, underlying principles

*Agonism:* struggle between adversaries; a philosophy where conflict is important to politics and societal change

*Answerability:* responsibility for explaining or justifying one’s actions

*Antiphona:* a refrain that repeats, the ways in which the commonalities between rendered works echo one another or come together to teach the viewer/researcher something new

*Artefact vs. Artifact:* The use of the word artefact throughout the book is intentional. While many sources indicate that the difference in spelling is geographic with British English preferring artefact and North American English preferring artifact, the word artefact is used in this book to specifically refer to constructed objects that reference a part, a residual, or an abstract object, perceived through context. An artifact is generally considered a complete object, a whole. An artefact is an object made by a human being or is something that results from a preparation or investigation

*Aporia:* challenges or puzzles regarding the rendered work that challenge closure in thinking

*Assemblage:* a gathering, accumulation, or remixture

*Bacchanalian:* a drunken revelry

*Bricolage:* the construction of a creation from a variety of available objects

*Catchization:* question or examine closely or methodically; to move knowledge forward through questioning systematically or searchingly

*Dissonance:* tension created as a result of two clashing or dis harmonious elements

*Ekphrasis:* a device where something is recreated in a different medium; i.e., a painting translated into a poem

*Etiology:* the cause or reason for something; investigation of the cause of something

*Evanagnostos:* the legibility of the rendered work; how well the audience can read the rendered work

*Found poetry:* poetry created from previously available text; i.e., creating a poem from interview transcripts by using the participant’s words

*Hermeneutic:* methodology of interpretation of human actions, specific texts or other literary texts

*Heteroglossia:* the presence of multiple expressed viewpoints located in a text or an artwork; notion that all conflicting perspectives have value
Heuristic: an approach to learning where the answer is found using hands on, trial and error based inquiry processes

Intertextuality: interconnection and how different words influence interpretation; how the rendered works speak to each other, the researchers and the data they represent

Juxtaposition: the placement of objects side by side, often to create contrast or comparison between the objects

Liminal: transitional, borderline, at the edge, in progress, just beginning or forming

Mimesis: imitation or making a likeness; a mirroring or reproduction of data found in the rendered artwork

Narrative: the story created by the data collected in a study

Ontological: beliefs about what exists and how reality is categorized. An epistemological position refers to a stance the researcher adopts toward the nature of knowledge or how something is known

Palimpsest: traces of different perspectives that come through the underlayers of a work

Parallax: the change in an object/view point due to a change in perspective by the viewer

Polysemy: phrases and words that have multiple meanings

Poiesis: a moment when the rendered work has meaning added to it through discussion and interpretation; the process of a work being moved from a static object to an interpretive body

Portraiture: a method of thinking about and producing rich representations of phenomena

Post-Qualitative: inquiry that seeks to move outside the normalized structures of qualitative research methodologies and humanist epistemologies, and ontologies

Praxis: the process in which the learned is put into practice; the embodied form of engaging, realizing, and applying theory in practice

Punctum: to wound; the emotional connection that occurs when looking at a visual

Reparative: effecting repair, balance, returning

Residual research: research benefits that continue to occur without the researcher present. i.e., Similar to royalties from a book publication, permanent research art exhibitions can create reminders in communities of community involvement

Sorites: a significance found in the data or rendered works

Transactive: an object that interacts with a viewer in a reciprocal or influential manner
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