



Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>

Committee Update

5 messages

Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>

Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 7:42 PM

To: Jenifer Schneider <jschneid@usf.edu>, James King <jking9@usf.edu>, Thomas Crisp <crisptho@gmail.com>, "Jeffrey Kromrey (Faculty)" <kromrey@usf.edu>, "Danielle Dennis (Faculty)" <Dennis@usf.edu>

Hello, everyone --

I am remiss in thanking you for meeting with me last month and for reading the material I sent you before we met.

Your feedback at the meeting included a couple of points I have been pondering:

Jim King & Danielle Dennis noted the "change in voice" (a very apt description, by the way) in the narrative description of the cartoon and sensed a switch from description to interpretation. Jim suggested putting such comments in brackets (literal), which aligns with Bogdan and Taylor's (1975) methods in gathering, analyzing, and interpreting fieldwork for phenomenological studies and with Spinelli's (1989) Rule of Ephoché, which calls for a metaphorical bracketing by the researcher ... a self-awareness and suspending of expectations and assumptions, as it were, to focus on the data at hand. At the same time, however, Jim also suggested there is a difference between descriptive analysis -- which would definitely require that kind of bracketing -- and narrative analysis. At this point, I would argue that narrative analysis requires some interpretation in order to produce a narrative -- and, therefore, produces a more distinctive "voice" -- but I obviously need to distinguish between the two and to defend one or the other more clearly.

Jeff Kromrey asked what seemed to be an innocuous question about the part of the cannon that looked like some kind of threaded bolt with a wing nut on it. I took the question at face value and talked about what it probably was and maybe finding a diagram of the cannon to be sure. The more I have thought about this question, however, the more it seems to go along with **Jenifer Schneider's** question about why I chose to start with the cannon in my description instead of using a top-to-bottom approach (which I answered in terms of main character/main idea). After thinking about both questions more carefully, however, I think the real question is "How will I be sure I've not missed something in the cartoon?" This leads to another question, "How small of detail needs to be included? Is the bolt/wing nut merely a part of the cannon or is it important in and of itself?" My first thought is that this goes back to the difference between descriptive analysis (each and every minute detail) versus a narrative analysis (story takes precedence over the details) -- kind of a forest or trees question. Again, however, I need to distinguish between the two and defend one or the other more clearly. I also will find some way of marking the cartoons to be sure I haven't overlooked an obvious element.

Because I was concerned about **Tom Crisp's** ability to hear and respond -- with good reason, as it turned out -- I spoke with him in more depth the day before. Tom suggested I look at Rosenblatt's *Literature as Exploration* ... and I think that will inform my thinking about whether I am doing descriptive analysis or narrative analysis. I'm leaning toward narrative analysis simply because these cartoons are stories not diagrams. However, I will include a discussion of both in the next version. Tom also reminded me that this is as much about how I as a researcher change in my perception of the cartoons as it is about what I present in terms of a discussion of the cartoons. What I know going into the study is conjecture is based on a cursory skimming of the cartoons and little thought; what I know when I emerge from the data will be a reasoned

argument based on close observation and reasoned, informed thought. (Hope I captured your words correctly, Tom!)

The consensus was that I need to analyze several cartoons and report back. This aligns nicely with Table 6 (page 53), which says the next step is to move to the Draft 3 phase of the iterative process, to analyze seven cartoons, and then to regroup.

I also need to work some of these thoughts into either Chapter 2 or 3.

Thank you for your input -- back in something less than a flash.

Anne

--

Anne W. Anderson
Literacy Studies
University of South Florida
4202 E. Fowler Avenue EDU105
Tampa, FL 33620
(813) 974-3460 / Fax (813) 974-0938

We read to know we are not alone. ~ C. S. Lewis

We do not write in order to be understood; we write in order to understand. ~ C. S. Lewis

Dennis, Danielle <Dennis@usf.edu>
To: Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>

Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 7:51 PM

Thank you for this update, Anne.

I am very excited to see your progression with this work.

Danielle

Danielle V. Dennis, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Literacy Studies
Coordinator, Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP)
University of South Florida
Department of Teaching and Learning

From: Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>

Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 at 7:42 PM

To: "Schneider, Jenifer (CELS)" <jschneid@usf.edu>, "King, James" <jking9@usf.edu>, Thomas Crisp <crisptho@gmail.com>, "Kromrey, Jeffrey" <kromrey@usf.edu>, Danielle Dennis <dennis@usf.edu>

Subject: Committee Update

[Quoted text hidden]

Schneider, Jenifer (CELS) <jschneid@usf.edu>
To: Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>

Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 9:16 PM

Very good, Anne-- on many levels. 😊

Jenifer J. Schneider, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Literacy Studies
Department of Teaching and Learning
College of Education
University of South Florida
4202 E. Fowler Avenue
EDU 105
Tampa, FL 33620
(813) 974-3460
jschneid@usf.edu

From: Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 7:42 PM
To: Schneider, Jenifer (CELS); King, James; Thomas Crisp; Kromrey, Jeffrey; Dennis, Danielle
Subject: Committee Update

[Quoted text hidden]

Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>
To: "Dennis, Danielle" <Dennis@usf.edu>

Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 9:47 PM

Thank you. Your comments almost always are brief but incisive -- much appreciated.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

We do not write in order to be understood; we write in order to understand. ~ C. S. Lewis

Anne Anderson <awanderson@mail.usf.edu>
To: "Schneider, Jenifer (CELS)" <jschneid@usf.edu>

Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 9:47 PM

Thank you ... on many levels. :-)

[Quoted text hidden]