

Reflective Analysis Summary Assignment:
'Writing Post Qualitative Inquiry' by E.A. St. Pierre
September 26, 2021

By Alyssa Palmer (ID 3513585)
MAIS 601 (Dr. Vallee)

I felt some relief at seeing a woman's name on the article. In previous classes that dealt with philosophy, it was rare to see any but a man's name on an article (or as a philosopher that was respected).

I experimented with asides during my reflective analysis, as St. Pierre mentions using them during her dissertation, and found them to be useful at times, though I think I will have to read her dissertation to see exactly how she used asides in her work. I may use them in future reflections.

Writing as inquiry stated as a real thing was a bit of a revelation as I hadn't thought about it in a conscious way. I use writing as inquiry myself but had never put a name to it; it was just how I always organized my thoughts. And I am starting to appreciate the reflective analysis because it was never even suggested in previous classes and I can see it being useful throughout my degree. I also think that breaking free of dogma and expected ways of thinking and writing may be a challenge itself, as academia can have very formal expectations.

I was stumped by various words and noted down definitions and concepts in a list for future reference and memory. Rhizome in a philosophical sense was one of them; I was aware of the biological/botanical reference but hadn't realized it had a philosophical one as well. I related it to my own writing process, and ways in which I might start 'at the beginning' or somewhere in the middle.

And, as an end to my summary, a sample of part of my reflective analysis with no edits:

The depth and breadth that St Pierre suggests is intimidating. So much to read/learn. It could be the study of a lifetime and yet even after a lifetime one could think they weren't anywhere close to living that study. Or at least that's how it feels. (I could consider my many years of reading Simone de Beauvoir as along these lines, but I don't feel anywhere near immersed.)

I want to be creative. I want that imagination and 'strange' (as St Pierre puts it) but yet I am reluctant to do that jump. Easier/more sensible/safer/etc to use the qualitative methodology that's been, as she puts it, formalized.

"This is the provocation and challenge of post qualitative inquiry—to create different worlds for living. But such experimentation, intensity, and movement are arrested by methods and methodologies, by existing categories, by what we recognize, by the normal, by common sense, by what "everyone knows" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1991/1994, p. 61), by methodology's "dogmatic image of thought" (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 148)." – This really is the crux of it for me, that I want to be able to be creative in this, but yet am being held back by dogma. How do I know I'm doing it right if I don't stick to the expected, especially when I am still new and learning?

Reference:

St. Pierre, Elizabeth Adams. "Writing Post Qualitative Inquiry." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24/9: 603-608.