Becoming Openly Faithful
Qualitative Pedagogy and Paradigmatic Slippage

Kelly W. Guyotte and Aaron M. Kuntz

Abstract In this article, the authors consider the implications of teaching and enacting inquiry as an indeterminate event, one that interrogates the assumptions of paradigmatic fixity with the hopes of being other than we are. To do so, the authors articulate a sense of openly faithful pedagogical practice, blurring the boundaries of the classroom and inquiry site and promoting the possibilities inherent in "slippage." The indeterminacy invoked in slippage creates opportunities for students to (re)consider the assumptions they carry, to individually and collectively critique, interrogate, and/or productively embrace such assumptions in a recursive project of ongoing positioning. Slippage is considered within a framework of ethical responsibility, with the authors' asking: What does it mean to nudge students to slip and how might we do this ethically? Slippage, then, is a productive act, one that creates movement and vibrations with new possibilities for becoming differently.

Keywords: *inquiry, pedagogy, ethics, slippage*

What does it mean to nudge students away from certainty, distancing them from learned assumptions of static knowledge? How might we productively position inquirers within a space that values epistemological slippage over stasis? More importantly, how do we encounter these questions ethically, not overemphasizing our theorizations at the expense of student subjectivities? As research faculty who play multiple roles within and beyond the classroom, engaging with such questions brings us to (re)consider our responsibilities in teaching qualitative inquiry. Situated in a College of Education, we encounter graduate students whose respective disciplines are rooted in positivism and postpositivism alongside students donning interpretive, feminist, critical, and postmodern lenses, all arriving in our classrooms with particular assumptions about ontology, epistemology, ethics, and, of course, qualitative inquiry. Further still, these perspectives come to inter/intra-act[1] with our paradigmatic positions as engaged faculty who privilege a self-reflective sense of inquiry in

the name of social justice. Indeed, Denzin's (2010) assertion that in research, "paradigm proliferation is alive and well" (p. 41) aptly describes our daily encounters with students and faculty colleagues at our university and within our field. The overarching concern we have for this article extends from how we are to engage paradigmatic proliferation in the classes we teach and the pedagogies we enact.

The challenges inherent in encountering such multiplicity proves daunting, particularly as we embrace a pedagogy that locates paradigmatic positioning not as static but fluid, not as product but process (position*ing,* not position*ed*). In this sense, paradigms might be said to proliferate, but their multiplications are never complete nor identical—positioning is forever unstable. At the same time, we are of the mind that locating oneself within a changing landscape of assumptions about knowing, being, and coming-to-know is helpful, even important. Though categories slip and boundaries display a "viscous porosity" (Tuana, 2008), such organization certainly impacts inquiry practices and logics in innumerable ways. We begin to address this tension with an overarching assumption: If students come to recognize that positionalities are not fixed, there emerges the possibility for epistemological and ontological shifts, or what we conceptualize as *slippage.* Rather than asking students to define what they *are* (postpositivist, poststructuralist, etc.)—a rather determined activity that mistakes fixity for clarity, identity for certainty—we ask students to give language to how they come to know and become, thus opening the possibility for knowing/being otherwise.

As such, slippage also makes possible paradigmatic shifts (becoming what we are not/what we are *not yet*) and encounters of difference. In the qualitative classroom, slippage creates opportunities for students to (re)consider the assumptions they carry, to individually and collectively critique, interrogate, and/or productively embrace assumptions in a recursive project of ongoing positioning. Importantly, slippage does not connote absence or removal; though perhaps blurred, paradigmatic boundaries still call forth very material consequences. How, then, might we create an educational space that recognizes, challenges, and productively disrupts assumptions of being, knowing, and coming to know that, in many ways, mark a paradigmatic placing? In short, how do we productively operate in the "Big Tent" that Denzin (2010) recognizes as necessary for inquiry that works for social justice? The ethical implications are not lost in such a pedagogical undertaking as students are asked to become open while their previously held assumptions are made vulnerable to change within institutional contexts that do not always value vulnerability and openness.

In this article, we consider slippage within a framework of ethical responsibility,[2] exploring what it means to nudge students to slip and how we might do this ethically. Our exploration is grounded in experiences teaching a core qualitative inquiry

sequence at our research university as well as our respective pedagogical activities in the classroom. Certainly, others have discussed the pedagogical challenges that arise when students from various fields of study come together in the qualitative inquiry classroom (Booker, 2009; Denzin, 2010; Hazzan & Nutov, 2014; Preissle & deMarrais, 2011). In what follows, we focus on the ethical consequences and material implications of paradigm proliferation in the classes we teach.

As a means for tackling this challenging scenario, we begin by addressing issues inherent in qualitative pedagogy, asking what responsibility we have as faculty to recognize, challenge, and respect the claims students make about knowing and being (even knowing-being). Following this ethical discussion, we consider the implications of *slippage*, a term usefully examined by Jacques Derrida and referenced by Gilles Deleuze. Derridian notions of putting a text under stress usefully create opportunities for once-fixed claims to slip—texts no longer holding still as they interact with the critical reader. Deleuzian approaches to meaning-making offer the productive possibilities inherent in disequilibrium, when the grounding upon which claims are made begins to move and vibrate with new possibilities for being other than we are. In both senses, slippage connotes the potential for difference. With the productive intersections of slippage in mind, we turn to offer examples for how slippage has manifested in our qualitative courses. Lastly, we end our discussion with the implications of slippage for pedagogical practices in the inquiry classroom more generally.

Faithfulness, Ethics, and Responsibility in Teaching/Inquiry/ Teaching Inquiry

The term *qualitative pedagogy* is attributed to Kathleen deMarrais and serves as a useful means for bringing to the fore those theories and practices that comprise our teaching and learning in the inquiry classroom (Preissle & deMarrais, 2011). Envisioning the intra-acting nature of research practice and teaching research, Preissle and deMarrais (2011) explained: "Our position is that we ought to teach our research practices in ways faithful to how we practice research and scholarship" (p. 32). What, then, might it mean to be "openly faithful" to our inquiry work both within the classroom walls and without? With this question in mind, we find ourselves holding steadfast to the inseparability of ethical values from our encounters with and in the world; therefore, how we teach qualitative inquiry is rooted in an ongoing series of ethical deliberations. Indeed, ethics remain entangled[3] with our pedagogical practices, research practices, and living inquiries, all manifesting in important ways within the inquiry classroom.

Thus, a productive extension of Preissle and deMarrais's claims regarding faithfully linking teaching and research practices is the recognition that one does not precede the other—that is, we do not first research/inquire and then teach in ways congruent with such acts of scholarship. Rather, our earlier assertion that there exists an intra-active relation among practices of inquiry and practices of teaching remains important here—we actively make sense of our research activities within the classes we teach. In this way, the dialectical relation of inquiry with teaching allows us to better understand how we make sense of both: research acts known within teaching practices and teaching practices understood within our research acts. Hence a newly dynamic sense of being openly faithful emerges in which we are better able to understand our teaching within our research and our research within our teaching, which makes for a delightfully messy intra-action of research/teaching/ethics.

We come to the researching-teaching of qualitative inquiry from an ethical determination that we can be other than we are. In this way, we situate the inquiry classroom as a relational space where connections among habituated ways of knowing, coming to know, and being are more fluid than fixed, more open than determined. A unique responsibility emerges with this orientation. As such, we design our inquiry curriculum to situate ethical deliberations with/in sociohistorical claims on what can be known and how we can access this knowledge. For us, foregrounding the ethical in our pedagogical practices is a political act, one that resists simplistic considerations of ethical deliberation as concluding with a single definitive answer or claim. In this way, articulating our ethical engagements within the classroom setting is a means by which we take on the challenge of being openly faithful to our inquiry practices within the qualitative classroom; ethical deliberation *is* an element of inquiry practice.

Unfortunately, it often seems that the ethical questions we ask when teaching qualitative research are offered as a means to conclude methodological conversation (e.g., Is the study ethical? Did the researcher act ethically?). In this sense, ethical considerations align with more procedural or technical questions (e.g., ethical review boards as giving the "last word" on *what* is ethical, effectively nailing down rather than opening up ethical deliberation). To consider the ethical, we believe, is to situate our work in educational inquiry as more than technique, as more than procedural. Thus, our classes begin with an interrogation of the ethical, rather than an assumption that ethical practice is already known or somehow intuited. Ethical questions are deliberated upon yet never fully answered.

To begin ethically, we must locate how students are ontologically and epistemologically situated as they enter our classrooms and consider the ways in which our

assumptions might converge productively as we move together in inquiry. In other words, ethics, ontology, and epistemology converge in our processes of becoming and the classroom space is no different. Barad (2007) valued the inseparability of these constructs, discussing ethico-onto-epistemology as "an appreciation of the intertwining of ethics, knowing, and being" where "becoming of the world is a deeply ethical matter" (p. 185). Here, we appreciate Barad's emphasis on relationality— a dynamic, (inter)disciplinary, constant reconfiguring within and among various bodies. In keeping with Barad, we consider our early work in our curriculum as relational work. As relational thinkers we do not find that ethical considerations can ever happen in isolation (certainly one may pause and deliberate on one's own, yet one must find a way to engage, to situate one's ethical stances relationally). Thus, a key goal of our qualitative course sequence might be viewed as possessing a relational aim: developing and articulating the many ways in which we relate and the multiple possibilities inherent in such relationality. In short, our courses emphasize an ethical becoming that encounters inquiry as a mechanism for social change.

Importantly, our discussions with students regarding ethical inquiry aims not to come to some type of classroom-based synthesis (a vestige of dialectical thinking that often erases difference) but rather a recognition of ethical differentiation (the acknowledgement of difference that is the hallmark of dialogic thinking). Yet these differences, unique though they may be, are not untethered or fully distinct. They are, instead, relationally known, bound by the shared space of the classroom. We can learn from the relational stances of researchers/inquirers, we can ask one another to relate differently, and we can model dynamic ethical relationality in the classroom. From that positioning we might consider how we move differently about the world, how we come to ask different questions, how we might open ourselves faithfully toward an entangled living-teaching-inquiry, how we might shift our perceptions within and between paradigms and nurture those shifts among students, and how we might ready ourselves for the productive potential of slippage.

Slippage

Slippage, for some, evokes memories of a deconstructionist Derrida as he focused on difference/différance of textual meaning. Derrida (1970) challenged the centrality of text—a balanced fixedness that reinforced structure, order, and, therefore, meaning—and suggested rupturing the center of text so it begins to take on other qualities: text as always already unstable, fluid, forever emergent. In this way, slippage causes a text to collapse under its own weight; the presumed logical

formations that gave it its structure no longer hold. Like Derrida, Deleuze (1997) wrote about language holding the potential of disequilibrium or variation where it "begin[s] to vibrate and stutter" (p. 108). Deleuze emphasized the politico-ethical side of language through what he terms *major* (standard/hegemonic) and *minor* (nonstandard/deterritorialized) languages. Through stuttering, the writer does not simply combine major and minor languages, rather s/he/they seeks an opening through which the major language might be minorized, "making the language take flight . . . ceaselessly placing it in a state of disequilibrium" (Deleuze, 1997, p. 109). Without static structure and balance, slippages prevail. Derrida and Deleuze also problematized notions of binaries such as signifier/signified or even stability/instability as they often lead to unproductive places where, for instance, slippage might stand in *opposition to* a privileging of balance. Rather than simply view the disequilibrium in stuttering as a lack of linguistic stability, it emerges as a productive "failure" of a balanced/hegemonic language in which new creativities and possibilities enfold. Slippage makes possible what was not yet there, boxed out by certainty.

However considered theoretically by Derrida and Deleuze, it is perhaps important to note the cultural emphasis on "slipping" as negative, as an accidental circumstance in need of immediate correction. In our curricular thinking, we take pains to break the confected slip-balance binary (the former implicitly marked in the negative, the latter as positive) in favor of the productive possibilities inherent in moments of disequilibrium brought on by slipping. As explored by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), in erupting this binary we envision a rhizomatic entanglement between slipping and balancing because it is through moments of slippage that we come to know balance and through balance that we become awakened to our slippages. Though slippages might disrupt our equilibrium, such movements act as pulsing intensities that productively shift our very grounding(s) in static place and, instead, nudge us toward a more embodied process of ever realizing emplacement.[4]

Operating according to the processual logic that informs embodiment and emplacement (Kuntz, 2015), our pedagogies of slippage situate the goal of classroom practice as one of productive becoming, refusing Cartesian separations of knowing and being. In this way, pedagogical slippage aligns with Maggie MacLure's (2015) determination that critique must operate differently when enacted from an onto-epistemological orientation. MacLure writes that when "critical is construed as a practice of unmasking, demystifying, exposing error, or dispelling illusion, it presupposes a corrective technique" that advocates for "a greater moral authority or a smarter take on what's really going on" (p. 97). Against this negative claim of

critique, MacLure notes the new materialist presumption that "we who might pull the rug or lift the veil do not pre-exist the entangled movements out of which subject and objects, agents and patients, emerge" (p. 97). Thus, pedagogical practice might find form akin to the notion of *immanent critique*, "caught up with the movements and process in which it is entangled" (p. 107). To bring MacLure's sense of productive critique into dialogue with deMarrais's qualitative pedagogy, we conceive of critical pedagogical practice as openly faithful entanglements with the necessary immediacy of the ethical. In other words, *critical* qualitative pedagogies prioritize the ethical as entangled in living inquiry; the ethical is not determined *a priori or posteriori* to research, it is enacted in the moment of inquiry.

Inquiring into slippage as a critical qualitative pedagogical practice, we thus embrace inquiry work as an interconnected ethico-onto-epistemological becoming. In this way the Self is not a static being but is incessantly enacted through our encounters in/with the world—in relation to other bodies, intra-acting with human and nonhuman entities (Barad, 2007). Slippage becomes ethically relational for us as we both *nudge* and *move with* our students. These movements may require embracing discomfort as we open ourselves to a more fluid process of becoming pedagogical/becoming inquirer. They may also require a release of previously held beliefs or assumptions or, at the very least, a willingness to do so. How can we ask students to open themselves to shifting paradigms if we do not create possibilities for opening within ourselves? Thus, even before we slip, we remain ethically bound to ready ourselves for such potential.

This notion of readiness brings us to consider how slippage affects our bodies, how pedagogical movement entails a corporeal affect of paradigmatic slippage. From the outset, we acknowledge slippage as perhaps performing differently on our bodies than the bodies of the students we teach. Our scholarship and experiences with/in qualitative inquiry have positioned us as figures of institutional power in the classroom—teachers who stand or sit at the front of the room, certain titles ascribed to our names, cultivating learning environments that resonate with our pedagogical stances. In other words, we cannot dismissively toss our power and privileges aside as we conceptualize slippage as a relational movement. The inherent inequities in our respective institutional positions lead us to consider a deeper level of vulnerability required of students as they encounter the vibrating bodies of a curriculum and pedagogy we initially conceptualized. Writing about the responsive qualitative pedagogue, Preissle and deMarrais (2011) indicated the need for "qualitative researchers [to] position themselves as learners and researchers, more skilled and experienced than the students, but on similar journeys to understand the world" (p. 35). How,

then, might we productively disrupt the learner-teacher binary even as we recognize the privilege of our space (as teachers, as experienced researchers) within the classes we develop and teach?

Given these questions, we think it important to pause to consider the possible privilege invoked in slippage, in the capacity to reposition oneself (or ask that others undergo some repositioning). As such, we focus next on two circumstances regarding privilege and slippage, both in need of critical interrogation. (There are, of course, an array of alternative circumstances all worthy of investigation—these two examples seem most typical in the courses we teach.) The first involves the privilege of refusal, of claiming paradigmatic stasis. Here, one perhaps dismisses critiques of one's assumptions governing knowing, coming-to-know, and being because these challenges inevitably question one's assumed status within social institutions. Often, this privilege is invoked as a stand for "clarity" or "commonsense" in contrast to the messiness of theories aimed at social change. The second privilege we often question manifests differently—this is the privilege invoked in slippage itself. In this sense, one perhaps has the time, space, energy, and experience of safety to engage in paradigmatic questioning and alteration. In both instances, we question our respective roles as ethical inquirers, those propelled to simultaneously *nudge* and *question-the-nudge* by our goals for social justice work in educational inquiry.

To begin, let's consider the privilege in refusing slippage, digging one's heels into a paradigm: paradigmatic stasis. Instead of allowing our privileges and tendencies toward slippage to prevail, we might consider paradigmatic stasis as a privilege itself, a collapsing of the very binaries that slippage seeks to disrupt. In teaching qualitative inquiry courses, we recognize that many students (and scholars) feel comfortable residing in familiar onto-epistemologies, perhaps inquiring in ways that align with research traditions in their respective disciplines (or their perceptions thereof). Perhaps there are those who are resolute in their positionalities, unwilling to unhinge "fixed" identities.

In the classroom, we sometimes find the privilege of paradigmatic stasis extends from students who feel challenged by alterations to the normative status quo of inquiry, a methodological standardization of position that privileges some paradigmatic alignments over others. Most often, students will articulate this privilege as a desire for clarity, or what Kuntz and Petrovic (2011) note as claims for "plain speak" (p. 186). In this case, our immediate response might be to encourage students to release their hold on normative ways of being and knowing as a mechanism to get them to "see" or "be" differently. This would be to encounter the student on the individual level, emphasizing individual alterations to normative assumptions.

Perhaps differently productive would be to question the privilege of stasis and clarity (or coherency), to situate such claims within a historical context that impacts contemporary possibilities for inquiry. In this circumstance all actors are impacted by the perils and conveniences of slippage and stasis; the individual is not extracted from the collective. Here, paradigmatic stasis is never an isolated individual claim, but, instead, a *political refusal* with a host of ramifications that require critique. Digging one's heels in is a political act, one that could be made to stutter in the classroom space. Equally important, nudging our students to slip is no less political and certainly takes on ethical import.

Given the ethical and political dimensions of slippage, it remains important to consider the pedagogical act according to alternative forms or articulations of privilege. That is, might there be a degree of privilege inherent in the space to slip? In our rush to embrace postmodern fluidity (and the onto-epistemological collapse of becoming, signaled by new materialist orientations to methodology), do we not have a responsibility to honor resistances to our pedagogical nudges in the courses we teach? These questions often arise in our curricular planning and pedagogical discussions. Having one's perspective critiqued (even implicitly) can he hard, it can feel violent. Perhaps more difficult to endure are interrogations of seemingly fixed orientations toward knowing, coming-to-know, and being (those that one might identify as post/positivistic in origin) that provide a sense of grounding for otherwise marginalized groups. Who are we to nudge away such epistemological and ontological formations, especially as they perhaps manifest as political tactics in an oppressive system? Then again, given our adherence to the productive possibility of critique, who are we not to? Greeting all who enter the inquiry classroom, these questions point to the ethical tensions and dilemmas that go hand in hand with teaching practices that recognize the Big Tent of paradigmatic proliferation as well as those with a social justice bent. As we consider the classroom, we now turn to two specific examples from our pedagogical practices that speak to our attempts to remain openly faithful to change in/with inquiry spaces.

Cultivating/Embodying Slippage—Two Examples

In what follows, we consider what it means to provoke through nudging students toward slippage. The nudge, we believe, is an intentional and hopeful urging toward different ways of being/thinking. Here we present specific examples of how slippage is both cultivated in, and embodied through, our ongoing quest toward becoming openly faithful in our living-teaching-inquiries.

Slipping artfully. With a background in the visual arts and visual arts education, Kelly's qualitative pedagogy entangles with an aesthetic and embodied onto-epistemology. We experience the world through various senses, our bodies intuit and respond, even as we enact various expressive modalities to make sense of (Barone & Eisner, 2012), and further inquire into, our becomings. Like most art educators, Kelly believes that the notion of language is not limited to written and spoken text; rather, it enfolds visual imagery, orchestral music, sound, bodily movements, etc.—all languages of the flesh (Snowber, 2011), replete with possibilities. In qualitative inquiry, researchers are often encouraged to "follow hunches" (Charmaz, 2014), inquire intuitively (Anderson, 2000), and, in the case of arts-based research, to allow our living inquiries to manifest through aesthetic creations (Barone & Eisner, 2012).

With this in mind, Kelly's aim is not to cultivate a class full of artist-researchers, rather she nudges students to (re)consider the creative possibilities in inquiry, including approaches to methods, methodology, writing, and (re)presentation. Through a dialectical engagement of artful theory and artful teaching practice (Shields, Guyotte, & Weedo, 2016), she exposes students to alternative forms of inquiry as required course readings—poetry, arts-based research, narratives, graphica—and encourages students to consider what such modes of inquiry and (re)presentation might afford. She invites students to create their own images and found poetry and uses artwork as entry points into dialogue about data and various facets of the research process. When discussing postqualitative theories, for example, she asks students to create *post*-cards as a means to work through image and/or text to inquire into an interview experience. As emergent artifacts, post-cards move—they are fluid—and communicate in and through multiple spaces and modalities. Post-cards (re)present experience, connecting writer/creator and reader/viewer (Hofsess, 2015). In class, Kelly poses questions such as: How and when do you perceive the material (physical) spaces/objects/bodies affecting the interview? How do you problematize certain dominant discourses as they emerge through the interview? The intent of this task is for students to think *through* materials (Eisner, 2002), themselves becoming part of a multiplicity through artmaking (the materials an extension of their bodies; Garoian, 2013) while also working differently through a visual language rather than the normativity of writing. In encouraging students to think differently through the arts, Kelly nudges students to slip into new ways of inquiring, (re)presenting, and becoming in the qualitative world.

The notion of slippage has also manifested in Kelly's ethico-onto-epistemological movements while teaching qualitative inquiry courses over several semesters.

A self-proclaimed constructivist, she began to seek readings that would broaden her theoretical and methodological knowledge in the postqualitative traditions of qualitative inquiry. For her, content and pedagogy are entwined—how we teach and what we teach should be approached with a thoughtful attentiveness toward one another. As reflected in the post-cards above, when she engages with postqualitative inquiry in the classroom, she nudges students to consider the ethico-onto-epistemological underpinnings of such inquiry and strives to honor these positions in her practices.

Through engaging with scholarship on postqualitative inquiry, Kelly felt her world shift dramatically as a teacher/researcher/artist. She became enamored with new theories and found herself in a new paradigmatic space. *She* slipped. As an ethical and becoming-relational movement, Kelly discusses her paradigmatic (re)considerations with the students she teaches, not as a means of endorsing one paradigm over another, but to emphasize the permeability of paradigmatic boundaries. Further, she hopes that her willingness to be provoked, to become different, resonates with students as they too move tentatively within the Big Tent of our qualitative landscape. It was through her very attempts to nudge students toward more fluid possibilities for knowing-in-being that slippage emerged as a productive imbalance in her inquiries, thus helping her realize a more openly faithful pedagogical practice.

Slipping statements. With a background as a writing instructor, second author Aaron finds value in Laurel Richardson's (2000) articulation of "writing as inquiry." Through writing, one might inquire into the assumptions and logic structures that inform how one understands, moves within, and lives the world. As a beginning, Aaron often asks students to complete a series of statements: "I believe . . . "; "By this I mean . . . "; "I base this on these assumptions . . . " Though perhaps an obvious point, to engage in this task students must make a statement of belief, work to restate this belief in other (new) words, even as they recognize that such beliefs operate according to a series of assumptions (articulated as the third statement). Through repeating this activity several times over the course of the semester (regarding general statements on research [e.g., "I believe good/ethical research is/does this"] as well as more specific assertions regarding a research project or process ["I believe my data mean/take on this"]), Aaron hopes students will engage in a series of deliberations.

To begin, students are asked to take a stand through stating and subsequently restating some belief. All too often it seems that graduate school encourages the

colluding techniques of *political fence-sitting* and *textual pointing*. In this sense, students seem oddly rewarded for not taking a political stand on social and methodological issues even as they remain adept at pointing to what others say (namely, published authors) over and above their assertions. In this scenario, one can allow the positioning of others to stand in for one's own. This is rather disheartening. Indeed, the ability to thoughtfully articulate where one stands on a particular issue is a skill (one that, as an aside, is necessary for a democratically engaged populace). Because he believes in the political possibilities for social change via inquiry, Aaron asks that students not remain neutral but, instead, use writing as a mechanism to inquire into their positionality. As a result, the third statement ("I base this on these assumptions . . . ") is meant to recognize that all belief statements are built in some way on assumptions (of knowing, coming-to-know, and being).

As students work (and rework) their statements, they often oscillate between vague or ambiguous statements of beliefs and assumptions (that, in trying to say *everything* often say little—or nothing at all) to complaints regarding the limitations of language (how statements and words—the move toward specificity—are disturbingly confining). Working through these concerns, the repetition of this assignment over the course of the semester is meant to nudge students to play—to unfurrow their respective brows and relax into the recognition of belief and positionality.

Further, in his discussions with students, Aaron is open about his hope that class discussions orient toward an interrogation of the assumptions that govern or otherwise make possible statements of belief—a tactical move away from assertions of belief and toward assumptive recognition. Indeed, if some moment of change is to occur, it is perhaps instigated through sustained inquiry into what (and how) we make assumptions about the world. This practice lends itself to an ongoing interrogation of the assumptions that are implied in the empirical and theoretical texts encountered throughout the semester—ongoing engagements of critical reading that are practiced on classroom peers and published texts alike.

Further still (to return to the thread that binds this article), this rather small classroom activity seeks to provoke in students a tendency to *slip* through a micro-practice—a gentle nudge toward slippage within the mundane. As such, repeating this activity throughout the semester does not aim for some linear progression of thought ("in the beginning, I thought/assumed x, now at the end of the semester I have seen the light and think/assume y). The goal of such repetition is more playful, to grant opportunities for dynamic engagements with paradigmatic positioning—possibilities for microslips. It is thus an alternative of sensing and sense-making as possibility—a nudge toward slippage—that is the goal of this pedagogical practice.

Becoming a Responsible Methodologist-Pedagogue in the Big Tent

> It is not easy moving from one interpretive paradigm or space to another—politics, emotions, identities, egos, biographies, reputations, and hard work are involved. New literatures have to be mastered. Old habits have to be let go of, new ways of thinking have to be learned. It can be risky business to move from one paradigm to another.
>
> (Denzin, 2010, p. 42)

In *The Qualitative Manifesto*, Denzin (2010) points to the complexities inherent in paradigm proliferation and presents a social justice–oriented and performative pedagogy that might guide teacher-researchers in and through the Big Tent era. According to Denzin, "Performance is a way of knowing, a way of creating and fostering understanding, a method that persons use to create and give meaning to everyday life" (p. 30). Through a performative pedagogy, Denzin creates a space for students to explore oppressive structures through both personal and political "mystories" (p. 58). The goal, he says, is also to encourage students to take risks in their processes of inquiry. In this vein, through the pedagogical practice of becoming openly faithful (Preissle & deMarrais, 2011), the nudge itself is performative. The nudge enacts students/us; provokes risk taking; and inspires different ways of knowing, creating, understanding, of meaning making in our everyday lives. The nudge, we believe, is an openly faithful performance in the qualitative classroom. Thus, we take up a final question: How does the nudge enact us to become differently as pedagogues?

As the question resounds, our always already foregrounding of ethics provokes us to consider responsibility. Aaron has recently explored what it means to be a "responsible methodologist" (Kuntz, 2015); however, through an openly faithful practice, we now consider what it might mean to become a responsible methodologist-pedagogue. Responsibility in an entangled pedagogical and methodological practice does not abide by fixed conceptions of responsibility. In fact, it remains important to our work that ethical positioning not be rendered as static. With a fluid ethical positioning in mind, we do not take responsibility for the students we teach, nor are we only responsible to them; rather we are also responsible *with* them. We prioritize thinking with students about how the ethical is produced, pushing against conceptual and practiced stasis and suggesting collective movement (of teacher/student) as necessary to a qualitative pedagogy that embraces paradigmatic proliferation. To be openly faithful, then, is to be in incessant tension with students

who are always already performing in different spaces in the Big Tent environment. How we come to meet them where they are, how we come to nudge them, and how the nudge performs on us all, these become the ethical undercurrents that act upon the responsible methodologist-pedagogue. Paradigmatic slippage, then, becomes an opening, a line of flight, a stumbling in/toward disequilibrium, a space of fluidity and possibility in the Big Tent for both student- and teacher-inquirers to explore.

Notes

1. We invoke the prefix *intra* here to signal how assumptions regarding knowing and being manifest *within* paradigmatic positioning, not without (or before). In this sense we find meaningful the critical/new materialist orientation to meaning-making as an event.

2. Though space does not allow a full explication, here we situate our discussion of ethics alongside a Derridian notion of ethical responsibility, a process of accounting for oneself, another, and the indeterminate space of what is yet to come (Derrida, 1995).

3. By *entanglement*, we refer to the new materialist concept of the inseparability of bodies that enact on one another. For us, ethics and pedagogy remain intertwined and co-constituted through our teaching.

4. Critical geographers often distinguish between "place" (bounded within the material environment) and "emplacement" (a sociomaterial process or event).

References

Anderson, R. (2000). Intuitive inquiry: Interpreting objective and subjective data. *ReVision: Journal of Consciousness and Transformation, 22*(4), 31–39.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Barone, T. & Eisner, E. W. (2012). *Arts based research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Booker, K. C. (2009). Shifting priorities: Reflections on teaching qualitative research methods. *The Qualitative Report, 14*, 389–394. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR14-3/booker.pdf

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deleuze, G. (1997). *Essays critical and clinical* (D. W. Smith & M. A. Greco, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Denzin, N. K. (2010). *The qualitative manifesto: A call to arms.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Derrida, J. (1970). Structure, sign, and play in the discourse of the human sciences. In R. Macksey & E. Donato (Eds.), *The structuralist controversy: The languages of criticism and the sciences of man* (pp. 247–272). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1995). *The gift of death* (D. Wills, Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Garoian, C. R. (2013). *The prosthetic pedagogy of art: Embodied research and practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hazzan, O., & Nutov, L. (2014). Teaching and learning qualitative research ≈ Conducting qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, *19*(24), 1–29. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/hazzan1.pdf

Hofsess, B. A. (2015). Do with me: The action orient of aesthetic experiential play. *Visual Arts Research*, *41*(2), 1–17. doi:10.5406/visuartsrese.41.2.0001

Kuntz, A. M. (2015). *The responsible methodologist: Inquiry, truth-telling, and social justice*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Kuntz, A. M., & Petrovic, J. E. (2011). The politics of survival in foundations of education: Borderlands, frames, and strategies. *Educational Studies, 47*, 174–197. doi:10.1080/00131946.2011.554587

MacLure, M. (2015). The "New Materialisms": A thorn in the flesh of critical qualitative inquiry? In G. S. Cannella, M. S. Pérez, & P. A. Pasque (Eds.), *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures* (pp. 93–112). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Preissle, J., & deMarrais, K. (2011). Teaching qualitative research responsively. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and global crises* (pp. 31–39). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

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

Shields, S. S., Guyotte, K. W., & Weedo, N. (2016). Artful pedagogy: (En)visioning the unfinished whole. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *13*, 44–66. doi:10.1080/15505170.2016.1147400

Snowber, C. (2011). Let the body out: A love letter to the academy from the body. In E. Malewski & N. Jaramillo (Eds.), *Epistemologies of ignorance in education* (pp. 187–198). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Tuana, N. (2008). Viscous porosity: Witnessing Katrina. In S. Alaimo & S. Hekman (Eds.), *Material feminisms* (pp. 188–211). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

About the Authors

Kelly W. Guyotte is an assistant professor of qualitative research and co-coordinator of the qualitative research certificate at the University of Alabama. Inspired by her background in the visual arts, her research interests include qualitative methodologies, arts-based and narrative inquiry, STEAM (STEM + art) education, and artful approaches to qualitative pedagogy.

Aaron M. Kuntz is head of the Department of Educational Studies at the University of Alabama, where he teaches graduate courses in qualitative inquiry and foundations of education. His research interests include materialist methodologies, academic citizenship, and philosophy of education. He is the author of *The Responsible Methodologist: Inquiry, Truth-Telling, and Social Justice*. His most recent book, *Qualitative Inquiry, Cartography, and the Promise of Material Change,* is available via Routledge.