Not capturing voices: a poststructural critique of the privileging of voice in research

Charlotte Chadderton, University of East London.

Abstract

This chapter makes a contribution to the debate on the potential, or otherwise, of student voice research to have a social justice impact. It draws explicitly on insights from poststructuralist theories in order to interrogate some of the theoretical assumptions which underpin the concern to privilege and capture 'silenced voices' in research with social justice aims. Most of the poststructural theorists whose work is referred to have not written specifically for the field of student voice, rather they engage more generally with the question of marginalised voices in research. The chapter discusses the impact of poststructural notions of truth, subjectivity and power on issues such as voice, representation and empowerment in research, and draws on data from a recent ethnographic study of Key Stage 4 (aged 15-16) students' experiences of education in secondary schools in Manchester, England, to illustrate some of the tensions which arise. It is argued that a more complex notion of voice as shifting and fluid should be adopted, as well as a notion of researcher as unreliable narrator, in order to try and avoid naive or even potentially damaging research being conducted in the name of student voice research. It concludes with some suggestions for a more complex understanding of student voice research based on these poststructural insights, and argues that this may help us both appreciate the potential of student voice initiatives, whilst being sensitive to the very real limitations.

Key words: poststructural voice; plural and shifting voices; power and representation; the unreliable narrator.

Introduction

Academic research has been implicated in the continued oppression of many social groups through the silencing of subjects' voices (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999; Bishop, 2005). Marginalised

groups such as women; non-white people; Lesbian, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals (LGBT); young people and people with disabilities have been, and continue to be pathologised, dominated and even exploited through both qualitative and quantitative research. Whilst this does not happen in the same way or to the same extent with each group, the fact remains that research plays a role in the marginalisation process. Many recent studies therefore privilege the notion of 'capturing' participants' voices in order to render their perspectives heard (Orner, 1992; Soloranzo and Yosso, 2002: 37) and allow subjects to self-define (Ladson-Billings and Donner, 2005: 283), with the aim of challenging this pathologisation. In such research, the experiences and perspectives of marginalised groups are accepted as the foundation of knowledge (Delgado Bernal, 1998: 558). Such studies tend to be driven by concerns to promote social equality, challenge objectification and stereotypes, make the research process more democratic and contribute to the empowerment of participants. This attempt to challenge marginalisation and empower can be seen in many aspects of what might be called the student voice movement, which encourages young people to share their own ideas about their educational experiences in order to bring about transformation in terms of school improvement or active citizenship. These claims to capture voice and empower, are, however, contested and problematic.

Although some critiques of the call for student voice have been made in the field of student voice (see, e.g. Ellsworth, 1989; Orner, 1992; Fielding, 2004), this chapter draws explicitly on insights from poststructuralist theories in order to interrogate some of the assumptions which underpin the concern to privilege voice. Most of the poststructural theorists whose work is referred to have not written specifically for the field of student voice, rather they engage more generally with the question of the voices of the marginalised in research. Whilst the author is aware that much is omitted from this discussion, and the critique could be expanded, this chapter is intended as a contribution to an ongoing debate, and a call for more complex notions of voice to inform educational research.

Some poststructural insights

Poststructuralist theorists have critiqued the notion that the researcher is able to render participants' voices heard in research, arguing that it is naïve and ultimately impossible. This view is based on three main features of poststructural thought. Firstly, the notion of a universal 'truth' has been problematised. Poststructural theorists argue that reality can be

plural, can have conflicting meanings and meanings vary according to context (Weedon, 1997: 24). It has also been shown that language does not accurately reflect reality (St Pierre, 2000; Peters and Burbules, 2004). Secondly, poststructural theories challenge the notion of a unitary subject (Lenzo, 1995) and a stable, coherent self (St Pierre, 2000). Rather than being seen as the fixed essence of an individual, identities are seen as socially produced, negotiated and performatively and discursively constituted (Butler, 1993, 2004). Subjectivity is considered to be influenced by several competing discourses and therefore as contradictory and shifting. Indeed, the subject is viewed as the site of the battle for power between competing discourses, which the subject always has to negotiate (Weedon, 1997). Thirdly, poststructural theorists have a complex understanding of power as "pervasive, productive, positive" (Peters, 2001: 13), rather than just oppressive. Power is seen as multi-directional, not just unidirectional.

These developments in theory have had a significant impact on the way in which the notion of 'voice' can be understood in research; this chapter discusses just some of them. My aim with this discussion is not to dismiss the notion of privileging voice in research, rather to problematise and complicate it.

Complicating notions of voice

Notions of 'voice' tend to privilege experience as a source of knowledge, a stance which has been challenged by poststructuralists. The privileging of experience was part of a move to expand and disrupt the traditional notion of universal foundations of knowledge (Delgado Bernal, 1998). Women have been at the forefront of the move, arguing that theories which stem from patriarchal perspectives are inadequate to address notions of gender, or more broadly, difference (Flores, 2000). Feminists have suggested that women bring different perspectives based on their experiences of oppression. Instead, there has been a recognition that what counts as knowledge counts as such because of the power (based on position in society) of those creating it- thus knowledge is created, and situated, not inherent or based on reason (St Pierre, 2000; Lenzo, 1995). More recently, feminists from minority backgrounds have argued that the influence of race, class or sexuality, would lead to more diverse perspectives (Flores, 2000). Race theorists have also argued that experience of racism creates a common awareness or viewpoint (e.g. Tate, 1997: 210). Some thus claim the existence of a "racial consciousness" (Barnes, 1995: 341), based on a shared, voiced experience of

oppression (Calmore, 1996) which shapes people's perspectives. Advocates of student voice claim similarly that young people have a unique perspective stemming from their experiences as students (Fielding, 2001; Mitra, 2003).

However, the automatic linking of voice or perspective to experience or identity has been called into question by poststructuralists, on the basis that experience becomes linked to notions of 'authentic' knowledge (St Pierre, 2000; Lather, 2009; Mazzei, 2009) "expressed through a transcendental voice that reflects a direct and unmediated consciousness of experience" (Jackson, 2003: 703). They argue that the privileging of experience is underpinned by the belief that the subject has access to a single coherent reality, and that the subject can both interpret and express this reality. As Jackson (2003) argues

> [The] romanticisation of voices leads to emancipatory researchers' tendencies to idealise and totalise their participants' experiences, ignoring the messiness of their multiple subjectivities and contextual realities (p. 697).

It has also been argued that to assume a unified experience can lead to the essentialisation of individual experience (Peters and Burbules, 2004). The notion of an 'authentic voice' is seen to ignore different and shifting experiences, as well as the complexity of the intersection of a variety of factors which shape both experiences and perceptions of these, including class, age, gender, race, religion, origin and biography. Further, it has been pointed out that experience does not automatically equal awareness, nor does it equal any kind of wider understanding or an automatic ability to locate the experience in a wider context (Weiler, 2001; Crozier, 2003). Moreover, experience can be informed by, for example, racism or sexism, and therefore be used to oppress, rather than to emancipate (hooks, 1994: 85). Thus whilst I am not arguing that lived experience does not offer an important perspective, the notion of fixed links between experience and knowledge needs to be problematised (Weiler, 2001). There is a problem, then, with student voice programmes which are – implicitly or explicitly - underpinned by the notion of voices as 'authentic', unitary or singularly representative.

The second point concerns self-definition. The right to, and possibility of, self-definition, has been seen by many of those privileging voice, as empowering. However, poststructuralists have challenged the notion that a subject *can* actually self-define (Pillow, 2003). Poststructural theorists such as Judith Butler (1993, 1997, 2004) have argued that identity categories do not reflect identities, they create them. Discourses do not describe (pre-existing)

subjects as is widely believed, rather they shape and produce them. This approach challenges the liberal humanist belief that the subject is the author of the discourse she speaks (Weedon, 1997). A person is rendered a subject through discourse, in a process referred to as subjectification. Butler argues that the subject cannot pre-exist its subjectification. The individual subject is therefore both constituted and constrained by discourse. As Mercer (1994, cited by Bhattacharyya, 1997: 241) asks, "Having come to voice, what and whose language do you speak? What or whose language speaks you?" Again, this challenges notions of 'authentic' voice. An understanding of the poststructural subject as discursively constituted, multiple, dynamic, unknowing and unknowable means subjectivity can never be totally understood or captured. While this does not mean the call for self-definition should be dismissed, it does mean that the notion itself should be problematised (Lather, 2007: 38). Thus any student voice programme which is based on the belief that when students offer a perspective, that this is necessarily representative of an essential, unmediated self, which the students themselves are able to understand and express, needs to be complicated.

It has also been argued that meaning can be voiced in other ways besides speech. Different aspects of voices, such as silence or humour, body language, or dress, can tell us something (MacLure, 2009). In interviews and meetings, research participants may resist certain avenues of questioning, leave their meanings unclear, contradict themselves or hide things. In addition, the data can 'speak' to a researcher emotionally or politically (Walkerdine et al, 2001), and she can read into the words and reactions of participants things which are not spoken explicitly. Indeed, a focus on student voice as that expressed through speech alone, or which only takes into account perspectives offered in student voice discussions, can mean that important aspects are easily missed.

Further, it is argued that research is inevitably a representation of others; rather than a reflection of their reality (Pillow, 2003). Even studies which claim to represent the voices of others do just this - they provide a representation. As Walkerdine et al argue (2001), research is therefore inevitably subjective,

> no matter how many methodological guarantees we try to put in place in an attempt to produce objectivity in research, the subjective always intrudes (p. 84).

The story the researcher tells has inevitably been filtered through her own beliefs and values and is therefore to a large extent "dependent upon our prior understandings of the subject of our observation" (Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford, 1997: 237), and secondly, the way the participants position her will influence the data (Siraj-Blatchford and Siraj-Blatchford, 1997). Therefore, it could be argued that she does not collect data as much as generate it through her own involvement. Any student voice projects which claim to be a true presentation of a single reality at a specific school, or of a specific situation, needs to be questioned.

Much social justice research, including student voice programmes, has empowerment or emancipation of marginalised participants as a main aim.

> It is assumed that uncovering what is 'silenced' *can* and *should* lead to emancipation or empowerment for those whose voice is captured in the display of research data (McWilliam, 2009: 63).

Qualitative methods are often seen as more appropriate than quantitative for accessing people's perspectives and feelings. They are thought to be better able to create a non-hierarchical relationship, break down barriers and relax participants by conversing with them rather than interrogating them (Wong, 1998; Gunaratnam, 2003: 87).

However, simplistic views of empowerment have been critiqued, including the view that any student voice project will automatically empower the participants. Much has been written about the ways in which power relations affect the research process itself (e.g. Ellsworth, 1989; Gunaratnam, 2003), including in the specific field of student voice (e.g. Orner, 1992). There is therefore, a growing awareness that different researchers will generate different data from the same participants, due to the influence of factors such as race, gender, age and class. Equally, the intended aim for empowerment has been criticised as patronising. Britzman (1997, cited by McWilliam, 2009: 1) refers to it as a "wish for heroism". Marker (2003) points out that many people do not see themselves as powerless and thus in need of emancipation. Moreover, it has been argued that viewing research as empowering is naïve, as all research can be seen as exploitative and thus involving a power imbalance (Kvale, 2006). This is because the researched always give much more than the researcher – at least while the research is being conducted. What respondents tell researchers is ultimately data (Kvale, 2006). In most cases, key decisions are ultimately taken by the leading researchers

rather than the participants or student researchers (Crozier, 2003; Marker, 2003; Jackson and Mazzei, 2009). When research is written up, participants do not have the opportunity to influence directly the way they are represented. Even where respondents or student researchers are involved in the interpretation of the data, this still does not mean their voices are 'authentic' (Lather, 2001). Attempts to make research more democratic cannot alter the fact that voices are inevitably changed in some way by the research process (Jackson and Mazzei, 2009). It could be argued then, that research actually recentres researchers' voices, rather than enabling participants' voices to be heard (Chadderton, 2009). Any student voice project, then, which fails to acknowledge the politics of representation, or the role of the researchers / organisers, needs to be challenged.

However, whilst power relations do impact upon research projects, poststructuralists argue this is complex, inconsistent and unpredictable (Archer, 2003). Respondents can also resist the research process, by resisting certain avenues of questioning, leaving their meanings unclear, contradicting themselves and hiding things, telling different stories to the ones for which they are asked. In doing so, they challenge the role of research to fix meaning about their lives. Again, notions of authentic voice are brought into question. Some participants might take more control of the research, politicising it and pushing it towards activism (Gunaratnam, 2003: 121). They might also challenge the convention of research to safeguard anonymity, trying to control how their voices are heard. Thus the notion of interviewing being either emancipatory or oppressive (Kvale, 2006) is perhaps misleading. Rather it can be seen as a constantly shifting interplay of dominance and resistance. Student voice projects which aim to further democracy thus cannot only afford to ignore power relations, but also need to take a more complex view of power and empowerment.

The difficulty of fixing meaning

The following example shows how research studies are inevitably a combination of diverse and shifting narratives and subjectivities. Lack of space dictates that I employ a single example, but this example allows a discussion of many of the issues discussed in the first half of this chapter. I draw on data from a recent ethnographic study of Key Stage 4 (aged 15-16) pupils' experiences of education in secondary schools in Manchester, England, which aimed to render the young people's voices heard in order to challenge dominant discourses around young people's disengagement. The data was generated at a comprehensive school for girls

aged 11-18, where the proportion of students eligible for free school meals is well above average. Students are from a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds. The example comes from a discussion led by me (female, late twenties, white) with a group of girls (all of south Asian descent) about their relationships with teachers.

Rahula: All he [Mr Perry] says is…hearts and kisses on everything.

Sadiya: We were doing algebra, on the board, you know, it said x, whatever, I didn't know what it was. It said x times and I go "I don't understand" and he said, "Are you confusing your x's with boys' names, you're right loved up." And I said, "You know what, fuck off, I hate you".

Naseema: Kick him where it hurts! Mr Perry goes red when any girl talks to him, even though this is a girls' school

CC: Right, so what's he doing here then?

N: I know! He goes bright red, like tomato, proper red. And once, you know when we were doing electricity and you have a rod and you have to rub it? (Laughter) All the girls were laughing and he goes, "Girls, this is not a dick!" And then he goes bright red.

(Everyone collapses in giggles)

CC: How do you feel when he says stuff like that to you?

Kalila: I think it's funny! (Laughs) Cos like, it's coming from a man. Our teacher.

N: It's embarrassing!

S: …yeah, he's got this pervy smile (Does some heavy breathing) When we were arguing with him outside, he goes, "There's no arguing, I'm gonna win this argument." I said, "Sir, I'll batter you!" and he went, "I'm 15 stones, I'll crush you!"(Laughs)

S: And I went, "Yeah, whatever." But why are you telling me that you're 15 stone, like I wanna know? That he's gonna crush me?

N: That's assault, you know. Is that assault, "I'm gonna crush you?"

In this example, we only have the girls' description of what happened. We cannot check the accuracy of the account, we cannot know if it really happened like this, or even if it happened at all. The girls may have exaggerated the stories, may have told different stories or different versions of these stories to a male researcher, or an Asian researcher. The way this discussion is represented when I write up the research – and indeed, whether this discussion is mentioned at all - depends to a large extent on my interpretation of it.

Although the girls do not explicitly say so, it seems to me the data suggests that some male teachers sexualise them. Others may argue that this extract represents an example of harmless banter, or they may argue that the students have as much power as the teacher. Because of my feminist politics, and because the discussion resonates with my own experiences of implicit sexualisation from male teachers at school, and because it could be argued that the teachers would not talk like this to male pupils, I interpret it as sexualisation. I read the accounts through the lens of my own subjectivity.

The girls seem to be suggesting that they are erotically marked as 'Other' by some male teachers, whose comments "call up longstanding stereotypes" (Ikemoto, 1995: 307) of a sexual nature. The girls' strong language suggests that these stories have meanings for them beyond the individual incidents. By making references to the body and physicality, the teachers reinscribe the female students into the female stereotype, which views females as defined by their bodies and sexual objects for the male gaze. The use, for example, of the word "crush" by one teacher, carries overt sexual connotations of male control and female submission. The structure of dominant male and submissive female is potentially rendered more unequal by the fact that the teacher is white and the girls Asian. Although this is my interpretation, it is supported by other literature: as Pillow (2004) points out, there is a history of eroticising female and raced bodies.

In choosing this specific example, and giving the interpretation above, as a researcher I am therefore complicit in constructing these individuals' subject positions (Alcoff, 1991; Pillow, 2003), as I am representing them and their stories. My voice is therefore dominant, and presenting this discussion as a reflection of a single reality and the girls' authentic voices would be misleading. It cannot be claimed that these are the girls' true subject positions, that their words represent a single reality, nor that this research allows us direct access to their perspectives. If, however, the data is so unreliable, this begs the question: it is useless to conduct the research in the first place? How does the researcher escape from a kind of paralysis? (Jackson and Mazzei, 2009) How can research based on the principle of foregrounding student voices make a contribution to social justice?

Voices as plural and shifting

The issues outlined above should not lead us to conclude that voices are unimportant. On the contrary, the voices of marginalised groups can and should still be foregrounded in research. The narratives of participants should indeed be the starting point for enquiry (Leonardo, 2004), as an insight into the ways in which individuals understand their lives is crucial to inform an investigation of the oppressive structures in society (Weedon, 1997: 8). However, it should be emphasised that voices should not be viewed as representative of any one group, 'authentic', or as reflections of a person's 'true' identity or reality (Jackson, 2003: 704). Not only is this naïve, it can also be dangerous, in that it risks reinforcing existing stereotypes of oppressed groups by suggesting homogeneity or essential links between (perceived) identity and experience. Instead, research should explicitly acknowledge that voices are plural, dynamic, contradictory and incomplete (Flores, 2000).

> This does not mean that voices are incapable of expressing truth; instead voices only partially tell stories and express meaning since they are bound by the 'exigencies of what can and can't be told… Narratives of lived experience are always selective, partial and in tension' (Britzman, 1991: 13). This tension comes from the struggle to express meanings that are difficult to pin down, irreducible to one essential source, historically contingent, contextually bound, and socially constructed (Jackson, 2003: 704).

Research which aims to privilege marginalised voices should be explicitly acknowledged as a combination of participants' perspectives and the researchers' standpoints - both plural and shifting. The role of the researcher, then, cannot be any more than an unreliable narrator – although this should not be considered a disadvantage. As an unreliable narrator, the researcher presents no single 'truth', only located and partial truths, but perhaps therefore more credible (DeVault, 1995: 628) and less potentially damaging?

Not capturing voices: A post-structural approach to student voice

Whilst this chapter only touches on a few of the assumptions underpinning many student voice initiatives, a poststructural understanding of some of these issues may help us both appreciate the potential of student voice initiatives, whilst being sensitive to the very real limitations (Fielding and McGregor, 2005). An understanding of truths as shifting, of subjectivities as dynamic, fluid, and discursively constituted, and of power as productive as well as oppressive, gives researchers the opportunity to think a little differently about projects or initiatives which aim to privilege student voices.

Most important to any project which privileges student voice is an approach which is explicitly underpinned by an understanding of the plurality and shifting nature of voices. This allows for an awareness of several important factors. For example, it would value student perceptions without seeing these as representative or universal, and would explicitly reject notions of authenticity. It would avoid homogenous notions of the student body, and would also mean that research would be less likely to stereotype or essentialise student perceptions. A poststructural approach, then would have the potential to open up spaces for different or contradictory voices. This offers researchers and practitioners, for example, an awareness of different kinds of non-verbal communication, which would allow research to take into account wider perspectives of the students, expressed in different ways e.g. dress, arts, identities. It would challenge an 'easy' view of school realities as static and universal. Such an approach would also challenge the privileging of only specific voices – normally the most conformist, the 'good' students, the more verbally articulate are those which are heard. An awareness of power relations as complex would allow us to question the oft-made assumption that student voice projects automatically empower the students – but would also banish the view that students are totally powerless. It also has the potential to help researchers and practitioners avoid a situation where privileging student voice is tokenistic, or themes which might bring about real change for social justice are ignored in favour of 'less threatening' topics.

A poststructural approach would acknowledge explicitly that any research inevitably involves representation and subjectivity, that voices do not necessarily 'speak for themselves', nor can they be unproblematically captured or heard, nor can any project make feasible claims to neutrality or objectivity. Keeping in mind the notion of researcher as 'unreliable narrator' would help to avoid such claims. Such an approach might allow for a deeper engagement with democratic notions of student voice, projects which aim not for consensus but ongoing debate, in order that the data gathering processes and the results may possibly be more democratic and participatory. A poststructural approach to student voice research, then, would require a complex understanding of the issues involved, and would not provide any 'easy' answers. However, this more democratic and perhaps less grand approach may be more likely to move towards providing a deeper challenge to growing social inequalities in this neo-liberal age.

Conclusion

This chapter makes a contribution to the debate on the potential, or otherwise, of student voice research to have a social justice impact. I have drawn on insights from poststructuralist theories and interrogated some of the theoretical assumptions which underpin the concern to privilege and capture marginalised voices in research. Although most of the theorists whose work is mentioned have not written specifically for the field of student voice, I have argued that their work is highly relevant for this field, as they engage more generally with the question of marginalised voices in research. I have discussed the impact of poststructural notions of truth, subjectivity and power on issues such as voice, representation and empowerment in research, and argued that a more complex notion of voice as shifting and fluid should be adopted, as well as a notion of researcher as unreliable narrator, in order to try and avoid naive or even potentially damaging research being conducted in the name of student voice research. A more complex understanding of student voice research based on these poststructural insights may help us both appreciate the potential of student voice initiatives, whilst being sensitive to the very real limitations.

References

Alcoff, L. (1991), "The Problem of Speaking for Others", Cultural Critique, Vol. 20, pp. 5-32.

Archer, L. (2003), Race, Masculinity and Schooling, Open University Press, Berkshire.

Barnes, R. D. (1995), "Politics and passion: theoretically a dangerous liaison", in Delgado, R. (Ed.) Critical Race Theory: the Cutting Edge, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Bhattacharyya, G. (1997), "The fabulous adventures of the mahogany princesses", in Mirza, H. S. (Ed.) Black British Feminism: a Reader, Routledge, London, New York, NY.

Bishop, R. (2005), "Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research", in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd Edition), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.

Bragg, S. (2007), "'Student voice' and Governmentality": the Production of Enterprising Subjects?" Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 343-358.

Butler, J. (1993), Bodies that Matter, Routledge, New York, London.

Butler, J. (1997), The Psychic Life of Power, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Butler, J. (2004), Undoing Gender, Routledge, New York, Abingdon.

Calmore, J. O. (1996), "Critical race theory, Archie Shepp, and Fire music: securing an authentic intellectual life in a multicultural world", in Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., Kendall, T. (Eds.) Critical Race Theory. The Key Writings that Formed the Movement, New York Press, New York, NY.

Chadderton, C. (2009), Discourses of Britishness, Race and Difference, Unpublished PhD thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University.

Crozier, G. (2003), "Researching black parents: making sense of the role of research and the researcher", Qualitative Research Vol. 3, pp. 79-94.

Delgado Bernal D. (1998), "Using a Chicana Feminist epistemology in educational research", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 555-582.

DeVault, M. (1995), "Ethnicity and expertise: racial-ethnic knowledge in sociological research", Gender and Society, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 612-631.

Ellsworth, E. (1989), "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 59 No. 3, pp. 297-324.

Fielding, M. (2001), "Students as radical agents of change", Journal of Educational Change, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp.123-141.

Fielding, M. (2004), "Transformative approaches to student voice: theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities", British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 30 No. 2 pp. 295 — 311.

Fielding, M. and McGregor, J. (2005), "Deconstructing student voice: new spaces for dialogue or new opportunities for surveillance?" Paper presented to the Symposium, Speaking up and speaking out: International perspectives on the democratic possibilities of student voice, Annual Conference of the American Education Research Association Montreal, April.

Flores, L. A. (2000), "Reclaiming the 'other': toward a Chicana feminist critical perspective", International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol. 24, pp. 687-705.

Gunaratnam, Y. (2003), Researching Race and Ethnicity: Methods, Knowledge and Power, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.

hooks, b. (1994), Teaching to Transgress, Routledge, New York, London:.

Ikemoto, L. C. (1995), "Traces of the master narrative in the story of African American/ Korean American conflict: how we constructed 'Los Angeles'" in Delgado, R. (Ed.) Critical Race Theory. The Cutting Edge, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Jackson, A. Y. (2003), "Rhizovocality", Qualitative Studies in Education, Vol. 16, No. 5, pp. 693-710.

Jackson, A. and Mazzei, L. (Eds.), (2009), Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research, Routledge, London.

Kvale, S. (2006), "Dominance through interviews and dialogues", Qualitative Inquiry, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 480-500.

Ladson-Billings, G. and Donnor, J. (2005), "The moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship", in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, (3rd ed.), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.

Lather, P. (2001), "Postmodernism, post-structuralism and post (critical) ethnography: of ruins, aporias and angels", in Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (Eds.) Handbook of Ethnography, Sage, London, pp. 477- 492.

Lather, P. (2007), Getting Lost. Feminist Efforts towards a Double(d) Science, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Lather, P. (2009), "Against empathy, voice and authenticity", in Jackson, A. Y. and Mazzei, L. A. (eds.), Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research, Routledge, Abingdon, New York, NY.

Lenzo, K. (1995), "Validity and self-reflexivity meet poststructuralism: scientific ethos and the transgressive self", Educational Researcher, Vol. 24, pp. 17-23

Leonardo, Z. (2004), "The Color of Supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'", Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 137-152.

MacLure, M. (2009), "Broken Voices, dirty words: on the productive insufficiency of voice", in Jackson, A. Y. and Mazzei, L. A. (Eds.), Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research, Routledge, Abingdon, New York, NY.

Mazzei, L. A. and Jackson, A. Y. (2009), "Introduction: The limit of voice", in Jackson, A. Y. and Mazzei, L. A. (Eds.), Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research, Routledge, Abingdon, New York, NY.

Mazzei, L. A. (2009), "An impossibly full voice", in Jackson, A. Y. and Mazzei, L. A. (Eds.), Voice in Qualitative Inquiry: Challenging Conventional, Interpretive and Critical Conceptions in Qualitative Research, Routledge, Abingdon, New York, NY.

Mitra, D. L. (2003), "Student voice in school reform: Reframing student-teacher relationships", McGill Journal of Education, Vol. 38, pp. 289-304.

Orner, M. (1992), "Interrupting the Calls for Student Voice in "Liberatory" Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Perspective", in C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), Feminism and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, London, pp. 74-89.

Peters, M. A. (2001), Poststructuralism, Marxism and Neoliberalism, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, MA and Oxford.

Peters, M. A. and Burbules, N. C. (2004), Poststructuralism and Educational Research, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford.

Pillow, W. (2003), "Confession, catharsis or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research", International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 175-196.

Pillow, W. (2004), Unfit Subjects, Routledge, New York, NY.

Pillow, W. S. (2007), "Past the post or after postmodernism: working the limits of voice in qualitative research", Working draft presented at British Educational Research Association Annual Conference (BERA), Institute of Education, London, September.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2000), "Poststructural feminism in education: an overview", International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 477 – 515.

Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1997), "Reflexivity, social justice and educational research", Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 235-248.

Solorzano, D. G. and Yosso, T. J. (2002), "Critical Race methodology: counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for educational research", Qualitative Inquiry, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 23-44.

Tate IV, W.F. (1997), "Critical Race Theory and education: history, theory and implications", Review of Research in Education, Vol. 22, pp. 195-247.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999), Decolonizing Methodologies, Zed Books, London and New York, NY.

Walkerdine, V., Lucey, H. and Melody, J. (2001), Growing up Girl. Psychosocial Explorations of Gender and Class, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Weedon, C. (1997), Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory (2nd ed,), Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Oxford, Victoria.

Weiler, K. (2001), "Introduction", in Weiler, K. (Ed.) Feminist Engagements: Reading, Resisting and Revisioning Male Theorists in Education and Cultural Studies, Routledge, New York, NY.