

This article was downloaded by: [Indiana University Libraries]

On: 04 June 2013, At: 21:09

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tqse20>

The materiality of fieldwork: an ontology of feminist becoming

Sara M. Childers^a

^a Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA
Published online: 07 May 2013.

To cite this article: Sara M. Childers (2013): The materiality of fieldwork: an ontology of feminist becoming, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26:5, 599-609

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.786845>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

The materiality of fieldwork: an ontology of feminist becoming

Sara M. Childers*

Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

(Received 1 May 2012; final version received 7 October 2012)

Through the materiality of fieldwork at a high-achieving high-poverty high school, I discuss how the collision between practices of feminist methodology and the materiality of fieldwork forced me to rethink the “feminist” in feminist research. Using the work of Karen Barad, this material–discursive account of methodology as ontology looks at feminist research as a constitutive intra-action between the materiality of the field and discursive representations of “what count” as feminist research. I discuss “the matter” of feminist research, or how representations of it in the literature rubbed up against its practice. I illustrate how “the matter” of inquiry – bodies, buildings, books, desks, policies, theories, and discourses – was agential and affective. “Doing” of feminist research is an ontological engagement where the force of the material was simultaneously (re)constitutive of feminist methodology, theory, and practice. By engaging with these entangled intra-actions, I hope to narrate an ontological event of feminist becoming.

Keywords: feminist; ethnography; materiality

This paper is concerned with two connected issues: (1) articulating an ontology of research where the “materiality” of the field, or the physical as well as the discursive, are viewed as equally constitutive forces that shape our ontological and therefore methodological engagements as constant, iterative processes; and (2) how such a process lends itself to feminist research as endless becoming, where the boundaries of feminist research are continuously pushed and disrupted by the materiality, and what it means then to come through such disruptions of feminism and (re)claim a position as a feminist researcher.

Through the materiality of fieldwork at a high-achieving high-poverty high school, my direct confrontation with racism in public schooling, and the intra-action with the students, parents, and teachers whose bodies bore the effects, I will attempt to delineate how the collision between practices of feminist methodology and the materiality of fieldwork forced me to rethink the “feminist” in feminist research. First I will discuss “the matter” of what counts as feminist research, or how representations of feminist research in the literature rubbed up against the materiality of fieldwork. Then I will illustrate how “the matter” of inquiry – material–discursive productions of bodies, buildings, books, desks, policies, theories, and discourses – was agential and affective in relation to “the doing” of feminist research, and how

*Email: schilders@bamaed.ua.edu

the force of the material was simultaneously constitutive of feminist methodology, theory, and practice. This material-discursive account of methodology as ontology looks at feminist research as a constitutive and compulsive intra-action between matter and discourse. By engaging with these entangled intra-actions, I hope to narrate an ontological event of feminist “becoming” (Deleuze, 1990).

I will briefly untie this entanglement to think about how the theory, methodology, fieldwork, and daily life of researchers and participants can all be thought of as material agents that are affective in the becoming of feminist research. What count as the empirical materials for this piece include not only “data” from the field study, but also narrative “data.” My goal though is not to center myself or my experience, but to use it to narrate methodology as ontology, or as entangled practices that slip and slide against personal histories, ways of knowing, and the lived experiences that collide with and wreck preconceived notions of what counts as feminist research. I attempt then to present an “autoethnography of methodology” (Childers, 2008) and ontology, rather than an autoethnography of myself.

I argue that when the materiality of our engagements with the world is taken seriously, it becomes apparent that feminist theory and methodology move promiscuously through and beyond gender. What changed my vision regarding what counts as feminist research was the conflict and contradiction affected by the material, when faithful representations of the “feminist” fell apart against the “real” empirical materiality of doing research. Worded differently, what I thought feminist research was could not stand up against its becoming.

A “matter” of feminist research

Feminist research, be it qualitative or otherwise, is an engagement with the material, but material engagement tends to be downplayed in discussions of the development of methodology, the application of theory, or conducting a study. The materiality of fieldwork never really left, it always mattered, but in coming around the postmodern turn to the crisis of representation, the material also lost status in the name of other political projects – in the case of feminism, demonstrating how sex and gender are discursively determined constructions which have the potential to limit women’s political subjectivity, and this is a critique that is still necessary. But at the same time representations of what counted as feminist research in the literature and in my training also set up a boundary. I found rather quickly that feminist research in practice exceeded any definition, and when working in this space outside the boundaries of what counted as feminist research, I felt like I was cheating on feminism.

Cheating on feminism

My base training in feminist theory began in a department of women’s studies which integrated ways of doing research on/with/for women with theories of knowledge from multiple feminist perspectives that did not take for granted the distinctions imposed through ability, class, race, sexuality, or the intersectionality of differences. Feminist epistemological claims and women’s ways of knowing were at the center of knowledge production. Women’s bodies in all their complexity were the pivot point for a critique of sexual difference. Feminist research and theory therefore undoubtedly engaged at every turn women, gender, sexual subjectivity, and their intersectionality with other markers of difference.¹

I was supported through my master's and doctoral degrees by many feminist mentors and was funded as a graduate assistant by a women's policy office on campus. Due to my political investments in feminism and my early training, women and gender were for me anticipated subjects of inquiry. As I began my doctoral study in an educational foundations program, I developed an intense interest in educational anthropology and sociocultural policy studies in education. Much in the same way that I was "turned on" by issues of gender and feminist/poststructural theory, I experienced a passionate engagement with school ethnographies and critical policy studies methodologies inside and outside of feminist research. The notion of "policy as practice" (Sutton & Levinson, 2001) constantly circulated in my work and became a new frame for my thinking about teaching and learning. I began to develop what I viewed as a very complementary package of cross-disciplinary frameworks – post-structural theory, critical feminist and critical race theories, feminist methodology, ethnography, policy analysis, queer theory, and qualitative inquiry. As I took a more defined interest in educational policy and not necessarily its gendered implications, I could not help but wonder: by shifting my scholarship away from an interrogation of gender was I cheating on feminism?

The slight but constant discomfort, like the beginnings of a headache that is easy to ignore, rested with representations of what counts as feminist in feminist research. If one reviews the literature in feminist curriculum studies, policy studies, or methodology (see editor's introduction, this issue), areas within which I work and feel solidarity, each is often clearly defined by the specific focus on issues of gender, women, girls, and/or sexuality. While applications of feminist theory and research might be viewed as diverse and multiple in practice, in the discourse they are most commonly bonded by these foci.

Proponents of each of these feminist subfields have taken great care to delineate what sets particular feminist ways of doing research and seeing the world apart from others, and I am in no way discrediting the need for such work to maintain its political goals. In the process of looking to these fields to define my methodological position, I realized that my investments, when not within the discursive representations of feminist research, directly missed the mark of what was defined by feminist researchers and theorists as a feminist methodology. While there were of course educational issues percolating at the surface of a local high school that could bring me back to a gendered representation of feminist research, these issues were tangential to other larger issues that emerged and demanded attention. As a result of the displacement of gender in my research, I started ambivalently bracketing the term [feminist] in reference to my own work.

The force of the collision between the discursive representations of feminist work and my own practice was unsettling. Though Elizabeth St. Pierre and Wanda Pillow (2000) in their edited collection *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education* spoke against the need to "prove" one's work as educational research or feminist research, it was one text in a sea of others keen on articulating a feminist position. In spite of all the wiggle room, fluidity, and contextuality allotted by post-structural theory, I became stymied by the self-questioning of my own positionality within feminist research, its excesses, and by my desire to locate myself within these disciplinary boundaries. This desire was fed by the anticipated "real" consequences of assuming a position from which to speak, of claiming a subject position inside feminist research that potentially was illegible to the feminist mainstream. Could I call this work feminist when I clearly lived outside

recognizable mainstream definitions of what it meant to do such work? Without the markers of gender/women/girls/sexual difference, if I wanted to publish in a feminist journal, would it be legible and accepted as such? The politics of academic location and identity were important. I presented an early iteration of these thoughts at a conference in 2008, and the trepidation I experienced as I justified claiming the feminist in my not-so-feminist research was strange and overwhelming.

While I struggled with what to call the work I was doing, I moved forward with the research. It was “the doing” of research, experiencing the ontological practices of methodology, that helped me to think through and move through this quandary. Post-research, reading more theory that I did not have in my grasp at the time, I have found that new feminist materialism, particularly the work of Karen Barad (2007), helps me to think beyond fixed definitions of what feminist research can be to its constant becoming. If feminist theory and methodology is always in excess of itself (Derrida, 1997), a fiction (Visweswaran, 1994), and a productive failure (Lather, 2007), then I am not interested in how discursive representations of feminism contain my work; rather I shift to thinking about the complex entanglements through which feminist research becomes.

Making the material mean more

Via what has come to be called “new feminist materialism”², the material is brought back into the equation, and its subtle shift allows me to bring into an account of feminist research the materiality of the field. I am not only interested in how feminist methodology and theory shape my approaches to fieldwork, but also how the materiality of the field acts back on feminist methodology to produce something other than what we think it to be. Barad implores a return to matter – to make matter “matter,” and I am very interested in the implications of this for thinking about feminist research. Therefore, in this account, the materiality of the field includes such things as human bodies, buildings, desks, books, spaces, policies, theories, practices, and other animate and inanimate objects. These materials are granted agential nature and undeniable affectivity, or an undeniable force in shaping inquiry. The material then carries equal weight with discursive constructions of feminist research and together they mutually constitute the “matter” of fieldwork.

It is important to emphasize that neither matter nor discourse is prior or privileged in this new feminist materialism; matter and meaning are mutually articulated, and discourse itself is material. As Barad explains, “Matter is not a linguistic construction but a discursive production; discursive practices are themselves material reconfigurings of the world through which the determination of boundaries, properties, and meanings is differentially enacted” (2007, p. 151). Discourses become “material” or agential and provocative, not as mere constructions but as affective agents that have the capacity to reconfigure and to be reconfigured by feminist research and the feminist researcher.

My knowledge of feminist research and my practice of feminist research then are not separate, but as Barad argues, complex “intra-actions” of simultaneous co-constitution. This idea prompts then a move away from a notion of the feminist as tied to representation, to a notion of the feminist as what Barad refers to as onto-epistemological, “a knowing through being,” (Barad, 2007, p. 185) or what I have been referring to as the all-encompassing “doing” of inquiry. It becomes less about the object of study – women, gender, or sexuality – and more about the ontological

practices of knowledge production. This shift to a broad materiality that grants agential status to both matter and discourse, and positions them as simultaneously constitutive allows for a shift to feminist research as an ontological account of feminist becoming. Therefore, what structures my account of the materiality of fieldwork and the matter of feminist research is a constitutive relationality, or intra-action, between theory, methodology, the researcher, the participants, and the agential nature of the field site in which I work.

Feminist intra-actions: when bodies and theories collide

Most of my work has focused on how “urban” students form their subjectivity in relation to policy, curriculum, and instruction and how issues of race and class are implicated in marking students as “other.” Thinking back to how I came to this work, it was a direct result of the materiality of fieldwork conducted during an 18-month ethnographic case study at Ohio Public High School (OPHS). Though initially I gravitated to this school because of my interest in policy analysis, the materiality and affectivity of coming to a research project through theory, training, and living in the world had a deeper impact on the trajectory of my research.

My training in qualitative inquiry, feminist, and otherwise, focused a great deal on the crisis of representation and the potential violences of my research. Authority, voice, empathy, emancipatory aims, consciousness, and agency all are at stake in doing work with/about/for folks different from ourselves. The complications of “writing culture” (Clifford & Marcus, 1986), “racing research and researching race” (Twine & Jonathon, 2000), and extremely complex critiques made by feminists of color such as Collins (1990), Anzaldúa (1999/1987), hooks (1981), and others about the necessity of non-white, non-heteronormative feminist standpoints asserted by non-white and queer Feminists, forced me to consider how my outsider status as a white woman raised in a small town in West Virginia affected my research. Insider/outsider status goes beyond racial identification, but I purposely decided to avoid research topics that focused on non-white racial inequality in education. With this in mind, I decided to focus on policy as practice not only because I found it provocative, but also with hopes that it would provide a neutral subject matter where my white positionality and privilege would have a less severe effect. I had also taken an interest in this high-profile local high school that appeared to be subverting the constraining effects of the US educational policy of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to support the achievement of its students, and I thought this critical case could be palpably and richly documented ethnographically.

Ohio Public High School was a nationally recognized high-achieving, high-poverty lottery³ school in Central Ohio that served a predominantly African-American population. The demographics of the student body at OPHS closely mimicked the demographics of the district; the high rate of academic achievement did not, which was why OPHS was often cited as an example of the success possible in urban schools. According to the Ohio Department of Education, 65.5% of the students at OPHS were identified as African-American, 2.5% as Hispanic, and 3% as of Asian or Pacific Islander backgrounds. About 98.5% of OPHS students graduated in 2007 as compared to 73.9% of students in the district. Of the 19 high schools in Columbus City Schools, six exhibited graduation rates at or below 67.9%, with a lowest graduation rate of 49.6%. OPHS had the highest rate of graduation in the district, and this rate was met by only one other school. According to the school website,

96% of its 2007 graduates attended two- or four-year colleges and earned nearly \$7 million in scholarships to 50 schools, including top Ivy League institutions.

Because of its astounding success, it offered a critical case study of how one high school exceeded achievement standards in the climate of accountability and high-stakes testing when other district schools were struggling to meet minimum benchmarks. It also served as a rare case study of a school that interpreted and appropriated district and national education policy in unique ways that appeared to contribute to the academic success and achievement of its students and to avert the constraining effects of high-stakes testing and accountability. OPHS provided the opportunity to think about the possibilities public schooling might hold for creating a climate of success that allows students to become academically engaged with the exploration and construction of knowledge “on their own terms.” I was interested in documenting how these radical curriculum and instruction practices were subversions of NCLB. In spite of the demographic make-up of the school, I thought policy analysis of *successful* practices would provide distance from the racial issues of US public schools.

My naïve attempt to neutralize my racial positioning quickly fell apart. The school’s image of “success for all students” became more complicated during fieldwork as I learned of internal racial stratification across the curriculum where students of color were overrepresented in the basic level courses while Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses were majority white. I recognized how this stratification was deeply intertwined with local policy decisions and practices. Racial tracking was also a policy practice, one that carried negative effects for students. In spite of my whiteness and what it meant for me as a white woman to represent the lived experiences of students, teachers, and parents different from myself in many ways, I found it ethically deplorable to not address the inequality that I witnessed.

This was not just an ethical move driven by a deep commitment to anti-racism, though that was part of it. I allowed the materiality of the field to heavily guide my emergent project. As OPHS was designated by the district as an “urban”⁴ school, urban had material meaning – a school that was physically falling apart, located in an undesirable urban neighborhood, and filled with low-income students of color, mostly African-American, who also came from other undesirable neighborhoods in the city. “Urban” education has racial and socioeconomic meaning in the USA. Though the generic term “urban” education is most often used, race and class function in meaningful ways within and through the bodies of its students. Urban students, their raced and classed bodies have been historically and socially coded by the language of risk, disadvantage, and deprivation. The notion of urban capitalizes on and solidifies historic and racialized narratives of the always failing, culturally deprived student of color, and due to the historical context of segregation in the USA, more specifically the African-American student, it excludes the history of successful African-American education, the failures of integration, and the implications of these failures for urban education today.

Deficit discourses permeated talk about this school and mingled with its materiality. Newspaper articles rang with praise as the school received numerous awards for working with “urban” students, where the term urban capitalized on deficit notions of urban student identity. It was students’, teachers’, and parents’ material engagements with school inequality and the material enactments of policy that produced and maintained such inequality that moved my practice. Their bodies

mattered in the discursive constructions of urban identity, and the discursive-materiality of what it meant to be an urban student, parent, or teacher at an urban school had an ontological impact, or affectivity, on the becoming of my feminist work.

Elizabeth Wilson defines affectivity as “the capacity to move and be moved – a more general capacity, intensity, or virtuality that animates matter as such” (Kirby & Wilson, 2011, p. 228). Fieldwork is an affective event where the materiality of the field rises up to meet us, rubs up against us, pushes back on our interpretations. I am most surprised as I look back by the affective force of schooling that I had discounted, how the dilapidated school building intersected with my memories and emotions of schooling, intersected with my scholarly knowledge about schooling, intersected with my politics, intersected with my theoretical investments, intersected with feminist/post/critical methodologies that materialized in my ontological engagements with participants and the field site. It was not just how students’ raced bodies were rocked by inequity, but also the agential human and non-human matter that bore this material–discursive connection with which I intra-acted that had the capacity to move my practice of research in multiple ways. “Matter” does matter in the ontology of our methodologies. And I want it to matter more.

The same deep feminist concern about the crisis of representation that drove me away from dealing with race, also held me accountable as I studied this urban school. In the process, feminist theory/methodology materialized as a feminist becoming that engaged what counted as feminist research differently.

Feminist theorizing as a material–discursive becoming

I reconceptualize feminist theory and methodology not just as static practices circumscribed by static discourses, but as mutually constituted material–discursive processes. Feminist research is dynamic; it is what happens when theory, methodology, and action intra-act in the world. “Theorizing, like experimenting is a material practice” (Barad, 2007, p. 55). Feminist theorizing, part and parcel of the practices of research, is an entangled material–discursive practice that expands the field of vision and intra-actions that count. I situate theory as agential “matter” that effects and is affected by its material engagements. Theory then is not just something I think or read about, already positioned and socially constructed. Feminist theory as matter might supersede any preconceived discursive boundaries, effect knowledge production outside its prescribed domains, and be changed in the process.

Theory as “matter,” or the result of material–discursive practices, might be thought of as something with the capacity to affect me as researcher, not only affecting my thinking, but to have an affective relationship with my body as material; theory also as something that can be acted upon by the material. Theory as material then resituates this from a question of epistemology to a question of social ontology. I want to keep hold of how the material and discursive are co-constituted – feminist research is a material–discursive becoming, a knowing through being, an ontology of methodology.

Feminist theory and methodology have left an indelible mark on my work that is ontological; I respond to the world, to the field, and to participants differently because of that training. The very debates in feminist research that pushed me away from studying the effects of racial inequity in schools also became useful in bringing me back. Once the materiality of the field drove me back to confronting race and dealing with my outsider position, it was also feminist work that held my feet

to the fire. I acknowledged a different privilege, one where white researchers use insider/outsider critiques to run from addressing racial inequality. White identity could serve as another easy way out, another privileged position where I could seek solace in the idea that my representations and interpretations would themselves be inaccurate and too vested with authority to be ethical. This sort of white privilege, relinquishing responsibility to address the inequity I witnessed, was equally damaging within the context of this study in that it perpetuated white supremacy by ignoring it.

The ontological work invested in written representations of research is a site to analyze the feminist becoming of theory and methodology in relation to a subject matter outside the discursive constraints of what counts as feminist work. Writing was an ontological practice that constituted the materiality of research. My writing was driven by ethical imperatives as well as that affective engagement where I talked to students whose stories bore the material effects of inequity, observed from old desks under a falling ceiling in an old school, and witnessed a great many moments of success and achievement.

I determined that there were at least three ways I could represent what I learned while at OPHS: (1) an uncritical representation of educational excellence that focused solely on the positive policy practices at OPHS and avoided any analysis of racial inequality; (2) a critical representation of racial inequity that took the school to task for the overrepresentation of African-American students in college preparation courses and the racialized practices at work in the school, but ignored the success that was also happening so that such success could not be used as a vehicle to elide or justify the inequality; or, (3) a post-critical engagement that struggled to adequately represent the complications of both equity and excellence, one that acknowledged both the successes and the failures, and the productive effects of race, history, policy, and practice. It was in the space of these anxieties and dilemmas about representation that feminist post-critical methodologies and theories intersected and guided a research project that had nothing to do with gender, women, or sexuality.

I engaged a feminist post-critical methodology (Lather, 2007). Post-critical methodologies serve as tools for moving through what Lather (1998) calls “stuck places” and what Spivak (1999) via Derrida refers to as “aporias,” places of doubt, non-passage, and effacement. This allowed me to situate the issue of racial representation as an aporia, a methodological trouble spot where I wrestled with attempts at adequate and ethical representation. As an aporia, I took my whiteness and research authority seriously rather than resisting taking it on at all.

Feminist post-critical methodology also requires that researchers trouble voice, agency, and emancipatory goals to move beyond constructions of essentialized, romanticized subjects. Though it did not give me the tools to do this work, it held me accountable. It also critiques the imperialist notion of the liberatory researcher and problematizes emancipatory space and aims in research. Feminist post-critical methodologies required me to address head-on my complicity in the representations of racial inequality in my fieldwork. It held me accountable for directly addressing representations of urban students in ways that might resist essentialized or romanticized portrayals of their daily lives.

As an ontology, it hinged on self-reflexive “double(d) practices of representation” (Lather, 2007, p. 47) that engaged both doing the research and troubling it simultaneously. Getting out of stuck places of researching racial inequality as a

white woman meant performing research as a double(d) move, moving forward with “the doing” of the research while wrestling with my own inadequacies to do such work. While the post-critical privileges loss and failure as a consequence of trying to tell other people’s stories, those feminist debates around ethicality of voice and narrative constructions of research moved me beyond accepting loss and failure. Reflexive admission that my representations were partial, full of complications, and from an outsider location was not enough. The ethical engagement with the materiality of the field moved me to adapt other frameworks and try to do some justice in writing about this school.

I tapped into other theoretical frameworks and methodologies to continue to wrestle with my ethical accountability. I utilized Critical Race Theory/in Education (CRT) as a framework to define and bear witness to structural inequities and racialized experiences that marked the connections between identity and achievement at OPHS. CRT is a highly theorized and complexly articulated framework that I only briefly discuss here (see Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Taylor, Gillborn, & Ladson-Billings, 2009). It explicitly names and defines practices of racism and white privilege, and as a framework held me accountable to analyzing racialized practices of schooling theoretically and substantively. Post-structural theories of deconstruction and discourse analysis were crucial to recognizing the power relations held within these material experiences. CRT and post-structural theory together, while not always thought of as compatible, worked to unhinge deficit notions, to unfix urban students from identity constructions, and to see the complicated ways they live and learn in schools.

Feminist theory, enmeshed in the entanglements of research, became a material-discursive practice. Theory was material, affective, and affected by material engagements. And this entanglement engaged feminist theory/methodology/research as becoming outside any artificial discursive boundaries of what might count as “the feminist” in feminist research.

Conclusion

Rather than cheating, I prefer to think of these feminist entanglements as promiscuous, loyally disloyal, and wonderfully infectious. The materiality of fieldwork pushed me to think differently about representational and discursive boundaries circumscribing what counts as feminist research to see the *force* of a material-discursive feminist inquiry and the agential potential for it beyond gender. I argue that my feminist training has significantly shaped not only the way I see the lives of women and girls, but how I engage the world in its complexity, and this way of knowing through being is feminist in its becoming. Feminist theory and its companions of epistemology and methodology are lenses that I “cannot not” think with. Feminist methodology, as an onto-epistemological practice, is a way of seeing the world that is “in my bones” and promiscuously infiltrates and complicates my analysis of everything, not just the subject matter most often attributed to feminism.

With the feminist material (re)turn to matter and a emphasis on the material-discursive entanglement, what feminist methodology becomes is open to other radical possibilities and unresolvable tensions. What are the political implications of (re) thinking feminist theory and methodology in relation to a willful displacement of its foundations when politically necessary? I recognize the danger here of diffusing the political aims and goals of feminist inquiry. How is feminism identifiable then

if gender, women, and sexuality are not its center? Yet, I also recognize the political potentiality, when our politics is sometimes about displacing our center in the name of doing “different knowledge differently” (St. Pierre & Roulston, 2006); feminist research then as “nomadic and non-sedentary” (Deleuze, 1990, p. 60), or always moving, shifting, infiltrating, and changing in relation to the world both inside and outside of normalized contexts and explicitly articulated feminist positions, infiltrates new spaces. It becomes visible that feminist methodological training, theory, and research can have much broader impacts and be undeniably useful to multiple knowledge projects, as opposed to being peripheral to knowledge production, particularly in the academy, due to its specificity (for example see Tuana, 2008).

As illustrated amongst the contributions to this special issue, this sort of promiscuous, nomadic feminism never ceases to circulate, infiltrate, and reorganize boundaries. What counts as the feminist as it becomes with the materiality of the world offers the opportunity to see feminist theorizing and research as powerful, agential, and undeniably necessary for thinking about and changing the world in which we live.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Becky Atkinson, Stephanie Daza, Susan Hekman, Patti Lather and Jeong-eun Rhee for their feedback and support of this article.

Notes

1. This is not to say that feminist research/ers have not been invested in other types of projects. I am suggesting that those projects are not typically recognized or explicitly articulated as feminist. They still construct an outside of mainstream feminist research. See Editors' Introduction, this issue, for further discussion.
2. For an overview of new feminist materialism see Hekman (2010) and Jackson and Mazzei (2012).
3. As part of the choice initiative under NCLB, Columbus City Schools created a lottery process. Students who completed an application were randomly “drawn out of a hat” for enrollment. OPHS typically had lottery applications for close to 1000 students each year vying for 150 freshman seats.
4. OPHS is designated by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) as a high-achieving, high-poverty urban school located in a Major Urban District. It has been recognized each year as an Urban School of Promise by ODE since 2004.

Notes on contributor

Sara M. Childers, PhD, is an assistant professor of qualitative research in the Department of Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling in the College of Education at the University of Alabama. She received her doctorate in Social and Cultural Foundations of Education from Ohio State University. Her research utilizes qualitative methodologies, including ethnography, sociocultural policy analysis, critical race, feminist, and post-structural theories. Previous and current projects have looked at both the successful policy negotiations by students, parents, and teachers in public schools, as well as how racial inequality effects these negotiations.

References

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1999/1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Press.
- Barad, Karen. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Childers, Sara. (2008). Methodology, praxis, and autoethnography: A review of getting lost. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 298–301.
- Clifford, James, & Marcus, George. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle, Gotanda, Neil, Peller, Gary, & Thomas, Kendall. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1990). *The logic of sense*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. (1997). *De la grammatologie [Of grammatology]* (Correct ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hekman, Susan. (2010). *The material of knowledge: Feminist disclosures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- hooks, bell. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. New York, NY: South End Press.
- Jackson, Alecia Youngblood, & Mazzei, Lisa. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Using epistemological frameworks in the production of meaning*. London: Routledge.
- Kirby, Vicki, & Wilson, Elizabeth A. (2011). Feminist conversations with Vicki Kirby and Elizabeth A. Wilson. *Feminist Theory*, 12, 227–234.
- Lather, Patti. (1998). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lather, Patti. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a doubled science*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1999). Appendix: The setting to work of deconstruction. In Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Ed.), *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present* (pp. 423–431). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth, & Pillow, Wanda. (Eds.). (2000). *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth, & Roulston, Kathryn. (2006). The state of qualitative inquiry: A contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19, 673–684.
- Sutton, Margaret, & Levinson, Barry A. U. (Eds.). (2001). *Policy as practice: Toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Taylor, Edward, Gillborn, David, & Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (2009). *Foundations of critical race theory in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tuana, Nancy. (2008). Viscous porosity: Witnessing Katrina. In Stacy Alaimo & Susan Hekman (Eds.), *Material feminisms* (pp. 188–213). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Twine, Francis Winddance, & Warren, Jonathon. (Eds.). (2000). *Racing research, researching race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Visweswaran, Kamala. (1994). *Fictions of feminist ethnography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.