A Palimpsest of Practice-led Inquiry: A Conversation

Geof Hill
Birmingham City University

Ana Duffy
Queensland University of Technology

Abstract

This paper aims to interrogate a writer-researcher's journey through practice-led inquiry (Gray, 1996) within a broader discourse that acknowledges academic writing as contested. Indeed, the quest of a migrant writer for recognition of their writing in another land requires a deep understanding of the many layers that make up the provenance of their writing practice: A second language, and both their cultural identity and literary background, provide layers of knowledge and experience that fuse to form a 'style' and ultimately a writing 'niche'. The readership of their writing carries its own provenance and therefore the additional bias of 'the home ground'.

As it reads in the title, palimpsest, in its figurative sense, is a notion that implies levels of meaning in a literary work. Although not the first writer to use the concept figuratively, it was Thomas De Quincey who wrote an essay entitled "The Palimpsests" (1845), which would inaugurate "the substantive concept of the palimpsest" (Dillon, 2005, p. 243). Similarly, Barthes (1989, p. 99) referred to a text as a layered discourse,

> an onion, a superimposed construction of skins (of layers, of levels, of systems) whose volume contains, finally, no heart, no core, no secret, no irreducible principle, nothing but the very infinity of its envelopes—which envelop nothing other than the totality of its surfaces.

As a writer surfaces, discriminates, and understands the different layers that fashion their writing, and wields their particular use of English as a second language, their practice becomes more authentic. That authenticity becomes a dual threshold element of an exegesis argument, representing faithfulness to the practitioner, and translating or bridging the gap between first language readers and second language voices.

Introduction

> No estoy seguro de que yo exista, en realidad. Soy todos los autores que he leído, toda la gente que he conocido, todas las mujeres que he amado; todas las ciudades que he visitado, todos mis antepasados. (Borges, in Fermosel, 1981)

> [I am not sure that I exist, actually. I am all the writers that I have read, all the people that I have met, all the women that I have loved; all the cities I have visited, all my ancestors]

Academic writing is a contested construct. What counts as academic writing has changed consistently since academics first wrote. One major change was in response to what is referred to as the "paradigm wars" (Guba & Lincoln, 1982) in the wake of new ways of undertaking

research. Specifically, new research practices that emerged following the paradigm wars, such as practitioner inquiry (Stenhouse, 1981), first person action inquiry (Reason & Marshall, 1987), autoethnography (Ellis & Bochner, 1996) and Practice-led inquiry (Gray, 1996) brought with them changes in the ways in which research was written. Some of these changes embraced alternate modes of writing—such as creative writing—as a way of giving voice to inquiry authors (Galvin & Prendergast, 2016).

This article is written from this new academic writing edge, presenting practice-led inquiry emerging from an academic's reflection on her practice and consideration of the critical incidents that informed not only her practice, but the way in which she wrote about that practice. The article is presented as a conversation between the practitioner and her critical friend (Stieha in Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2014), as chapters in a larger narrative or creative non-fiction.

An approach to practice led inquiry utilising *Palimpsest* and *Provenance*

This paper was born, as many are, over a cup of coffee at *The Menagerie*, an amazing coffee shop close to a Brisbane (Australia) university campus where both authors work and have worked. The scene is a recurrent trope in the academic/practitioner world. In front of one cup of steaming coffee someone talks about a dead end, in front of the other: A 'critical friend' who asks questions that may, in time, unravel something. Eventually, more coffee is ordered, and the discussion turns into a series of dot points, and some theories are scribbled. Soon after, two halves of a paper-intention are duly allocated. The conversation utilises the construct of provenance to enable the practitioner to illuminate the critical incidents that have informed her development, and with these additional insights, to undertake her practice more effectively and more self-consciously.

Both authors of the present article are academics; one works at Birmingham City University in the UK, the other is a sessional academic in the field of creative writing and professional communications at Queensland University of Technology, in Australia, and a writer herself. They adopt a practice-led perspective (Gray, 1996) in their conversation to shed light on the unexpected ways provenance (Hill & Lloyd, 2018) infuses into creative practice, and the ways in which the practice-led researcher identifies and harnesses those 'interventions' to improve their practice. As each practice has a history or provenance, so does each practitioner of that practice. This peeling back layers of experience to undercover one's writing reminds the writer about the construct of palimpsest.

The palimpsest has a well-documented provenance. It is defined as a manuscript or piece of writing material on which later writing has been superimposed (Oxford, 2018). Most notably associated with writings by Archimedes, the idea of a palimpsest conveys the sense that one's provenance has been written and is continually written over. This idea is based on an artefact of a wax tablet with prayers. Under investigation it was found that the lower levels of the wax tablet had evidence of Archimedes principles, and thus the artefact was claimed as the earliest recording of Archimedes work (Netz & Noel, 2011). Although not the first writer to use the concept figuratively, it was Thomas De Quincey who, in writing the essay entitled "The Palimpsests" (1845), inaugurated "the substantive concept of the palimpsest" (Dillon, 2005, p. 243). The concept has been employed broadly in the fields of literature (creative, critical and theoretical), philosophy and cultural studies, informing, and being informed by many contemporary critical discourses (Dillon, 2005)

In the area of literature, Gérard Genette (1982, p. 5) refers to the notion of palimpsests to indicate hypertextuality: "any relationship uniting a text B to an earlier text A, upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary". Thus here, palimpsest in its figurative sense signifies an amalgam, a superimposition of books over previous books that have, in time, overlayed others. Indeed, the work of a writer conveys the writer's literary background, as it reads in the opening quote, in Borges' (1981) words, "I am all the writers that I have read*".*

With his theories of textuality, developed in *On Rancine* (1964), *S/Z* (1975), *Image*, *Music-Text* (1977) and *The Rustle of Language* (1986), Barthes (1986) argues that a text contains layers of meaning. He contributes the analogy of the onion:

> An onion, a superimposed construction of skins (of layers, of levels, of systems) whose volume contains, finally, no heart, no core, no secret, no irreducible principle, nothing but the very infinity of its envelopes—which envelop nothing other than the totality of its surfaces. (p.).

This analogy suggests understanding the text as a result of multiple forces. Furthermore, Barthes goes beyond the verbal form, arguing that the text could be seen as "a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centers of culture" (Barthes, 1977, p. 146). Therefore, the provenance of the text can be traced far beyond the literary realm.

If creative writing is considered (the practice, the practitioner and the text itself as a result), many are the experiences that can be found superimposed as a palimpsest (or layers of an onion), which conform their respective provenances. In the case of the migrant writer, the substitution of first language by the language of the adopted country, is one such layer. Wenche Ommundsen (2012) argues that "writing does not stop at national or linguistic borders, but spills across nations, cultures and languages in today's ever more globalised cultural economy" (p. 2); hence many systems are traversed when transnational or transcultural literatures are born, carrying their traces as something like a generative, mysterious, and entangled debris.

The role of a second language for a writer can be understood drawing on Toni Morrison's (1992) concept of becoming. Referring to social constructs of "Whiteness" and "Blackness" and their representation in literature, Morrison defines it as "entering what one is estranged from" (p. 2). This paper applies becoming to a second language writer. Thus, when a second language English speaker writes, their work is informed throughout all its layers by a language that is, in Evelyn Ch'ien's words, "weird" (2004). Indeed, in that act of becoming a second language writer, the practitioner carries their own provenance across linguistic and cultural divides. That provenance is infused by a whole array of unfamiliar experiences lived by the migrant, and eventually sifted through the sieve of language.

Furthermore, the local readership has its own agenda. Referring to Asian Australian literature, Omundsen (2012) argues that:

> distant reading—reading texts from cultural traditions very different from one's own— calls on a certain openness, a willingness to suspend disbelief, to postpone judgement, and to acknowledge the limits to one's own cultural literacy. Playing in the space between the familiar and the unfamiliar has its own rewards, and it is this space that many transnational writers have made their playground. (p. 4)

The impact of Provenance for a creative writer is evident in Aleksandra Lun's (2015) first work of fiction, the novella *The Palimpsests*. *The Palimpsests* satirically explores the story of a second language writer confined into a mental health asylum for having renounced his mother tongue, to write in Antarctic, an act considered illegal. The protagonist, alongside other patients, undergoes therapy known as Bartlebian Therapy:

> El objetivo de la terapia bartlebiana es la reinserción lingüística […] La terapia se divide en dos partes y consiste en analizar los acontecimientos que llevaron al paciente a un manicomio y en hacerle olvidar la lengua extranjera en la que escribió sus libros. Para esos fines al escritor inmigrante se le somete a sesiones psicoanalíticas y a un aislamiento lingüístico en el que solo tiene contacto con su lengua materna o un idioma diferente del que está aquejado.

> [The objective of Bartlebian therapy is linguistic reintegration […]. The therapy is divided into two parts and consists of, firstly, analysing the events that drove the patient into an asylum and, secondly, making him forget the foreign language he adopted to write his books. To this end, the immigrant writer is subjected to psychoanalysis and

linguistic isolation, during which he maintains sole contact with his mother tongue or a language other than the one that afflicts him.] (Translated in Asymptote Journal)

Herself a Polish writer who resides in Belgium and writes in Spanish, Lun mocks, in a form of self-parody, the second language writer syndrome (Solano, 2016), and explores themes on migration, creativity and identity.

The second language writer: Interrogating onions

Literature captures long established patterns or formulas and transforms them into something other (Barthes, 1989). Now, the transformation of the long-established, into the something-new, through the funnel of any writer's mind, to become the writer's own craft, is inescapably affected by their provenance. In the case of the foreign writer, their craft goes through many translations on its way to the page, traversing the foreign writer's provenance, making their craft the outcome of, stealing from Salman Rushdie (1991, p. 17), a "translated man".

In his own onion metaphor, Barthes (1989, p. 99) refers to the written text as a layered discourse: "a superimposed construction of skins (of layers, of levels, of systems)" that leads to "no core, no secret and no irreducible principle", but to the examination of layers, one by one. Therefore, we set off on a journey of inquiry into Ana's provenance, which takes us back to our initial meeting. It was then when the concept of provenance (as a palimpsest or as Barthes's onion) fell in between our two coffee cups, bringing its association with a practitioner interrogating their practice, and later an in-depth exploration of practice and its associated research. This is what it means for an inquiry to flow from or arise within a practitioner's practice, often referred to as practice-led inquiry (Gray, 1996).

Cultural identity, argues Ommundsen (2012, p. 3), "is not something which exists independently of the imagination, not something that can be found or retrieved through a search for cultural roots, but a site of instability and metamorphosis, something which has to be constantly invented, written into being". At the time of our coffee meeting, Ana's cultural identity was being subdued, tamed underneath the most Australian use of English she could muster and the most unrelated to herself practice/research topic she could afford. However, one has to deeply agree with Ommundsen in that cultural identity is embedded into our creative being and that cannot but be allowed to reveal.

Ana's 'halt' and 'borrowed language': An unplanned case study

In the conversation, Geof explains that one of the foundations of practice-led inquiry is that the researcher/inquirer begins with their own practice, and frequently begins with some 'irregularities' in the normal flow of that practice. This is not an easy starting point, albeit an unavoidable trigger. Donald Schön speaks of a practitioner's 'reflection in action', a process initiated with "some puzzling, or troubling, or interesting phenomenon". In dealing with it, "the practitioner reflects on the understandings which have been implicit in his action, understandings which he surfaces, criticizes, restructures, and embodies in further action" (Schön, 1983, p. 63). According to Schön, our knowledge is usually implicit in the ways we recurrently act and read our everyday issues, therefore the way we perform our writing is a given until something troubles it, and we need to deconstruct it. In light of the Barthes' onion metaphor, we 'peel away' the layers to uncover, reflect upon and interrogate one's tacit knowledge.

Geof comments that in Ana's profile, she looks to her native Spanish, and her growing up in Argentina, which provides a distinctive historical and cultural background, including the literature to which she was exposed and which inescapably, emerges in her own practice. Additionally, the migrant experience and the act of writing in a second language, all add up to create a unique niche for her practice provenance. The trouble, as Schön puts it, only arises when her writing is disrupted, or, as it certainly did in the course of her studies, it arrives to a

halt in which she feels there is a form of miscommunication. Miscommunication between writer and reader, between entry points to language: English-English and 'weird English', between a local and a translated life, that, inescapably, leads to alienation. There is a time of forced reflection in which the practitioner reaches for a sense of authenticity. Even more so, it goes back to reclaiming an authenticity for their practice that seems waning under the weight of miscommunication.

In the conversation in the café, both the writer and her critical friend recognise two disruptions. The first was clearly the one that led to the meeting and the cup of coffee, and could initially be labelled as the 'halt in Ana's studies'. Ana had asked her 'critical friend' to meet for coffee because she felt she was having writer's block: That she could not find herself in her writing anymore, that her new-found 'writing persona' was alien to her as much as it was alien to her Australian audience, and she felt that something was amiss, misunderstood or plainly wrong with her language borrowing. She felt her creative writing was not being understood or valued by those who were assessing her work. As we talked about the identified disruption, what became evident was the earlier disruption that led her to reclaiming her cultural provenance and attempting to infuse that into her creative writing. The act of naming and framing that cultural provenance can itself help to identify the ways in which the signature sentences of her writing change to embrace her identified presence as a writer. However, as one episode of troubling is discussed, so it reveals an even deeper understanding of the practice and the troubling of the practice—working with what Ana calls 'a borrowed language'.

Therefore, she undertook a deep practice-led inquiry into her writing. These two elements were influencing her writing in a way not quite anticipated. Indeed, in addition to Ana's cultural heritage (the readings and authors she grew up with and were impactful in the development of her practice), and the socio-political climate of Argentina that provided 'composting' material for the development of some stories of displacement and alienation, she was about to encounter other forces at play.

The backstory

Recognising the importance of Provenance, Ana illuminated recent critical incidents that led to her current sense of writer's block. In February 2017, Ana started her Masters in Creative Writing with two big ideas in mind, and a proposal. She wanted to express her concerns on technological progress and its social impact, and she wanted to do so by means of her creative practice. The introduction of *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business* (1985) by Neil Postman captured her apprehensions. By comparing two acclaimed dystopian novels, *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, and *1984* by George Orwell, Postman concludes:

> "Orwell feared those who would deprive us of information. Huxley feared those who would give us so much that we would be reduced to passivity and egoism. Orwell feared that the truth would be concealed from us. Huxley feared the truth would be drowned in a sea of irrelevance" (Postman, 1985, p. xx)

Noticeably, Postman's claims on the prevalence of Huxley over Orwell and how his predictions were current in the eighties, served as inspiration to Ana, and she decided to follow his thread. Additionally, and after having read those and other contemporary dystopian novels, she assumed that speculative fiction, and within it, the dystopian novel, was the most apt to discuss some perils of the technological bliss we live in. Those ideas underpinned Ana's thesis proposal, and motivated what she took at the time as a brilliant idea for a dystopian novella, which would pose a critique on the dark side of the digital technologies era, looking at the social impact of hyper-connectedness, transparency, surveillance, and a generalised apathy towards it all.

By the time of her initial meeting with her advisory team, Ana had written over six thousand words of what she had thought as to be the skeleton/ first draft of her planned dystopian novella, and had read over a dozen dystopian novels. The first scribbles of the novella happened on her

mobile phone while traveling in an Argentinean sleeping bus south and out of Buenos Aires, in the middle of the night, surrendering to jet-lag insomnia. Over an eight-hour journey, Ana drafted the first, 'brilliant idea' that was to make the foundation for the novella. The fact that she was writing in English did not represent a major obstacle as, sixteen years of living, studying, and working in Australia had naturally and expectedly prompted the shifting of languages. She had just been accepted into the Master's degree, and she had two weeks ahead of her to map out her personal creative practitioner journey. If such a journey had to be a translation of herself, if her Spanish had to go in the back seat for a while, she was up for the challenge.

The first hurdle did not take time to arrive. Her 'brilliant idea' had been thought of, written, published, and made into a movie by Dave Eggers four years before. She therefore bought *The Circle*, read the book, watched the movie as soon as it was out, and included it into her collection of reference texts. Indeed, and while the originality of Ana's practice-led research was compromised in terms of the chosen topic, she could still work on the approach given to it and the style used to achieve a piece with her own signature. She could still not thrive; it seemed that Dave Eggers' shadow was permanently cast on her. This first hurdle was at the time attributed to Ana not being entirely seasoned on the latest dystopian novels, nor was she fully aware of the more current genre tropes and conventions that were being established around the fast-pace growing digital scene (an issue Ana's main supervisor timely pointed out). However, she was committed to her dystopian fiction and was prepared to draw further from the available dystopian novels and academic literature to pursue her project, which was now gradually stepping away from the novella genre and into a short story collection form. One year into the masters and Ana's project came to a halt. She felt lost and more than anything, inauthentic as a practitioner, while her work became stagnant. Schön's troubling was starting to exercise its disruptive power. Indeed, while her first stories delved into 'being exposed', online consumerism, and some other ways of being engulfed and shaped by technology, as her writing progressed, Ana's short stories started to take a different course. The alienation shared by most of the characters, and initially attributed to hyperconnectedness in the digital era, grew into one closely related to her personal migrant experience. Moreover, not only Argentinean history started to partake of backstories with more and more frequency, but her native Spanish started to emerge alongside mixing Spanish words among the English, surfacing without warning into perfectly monolingual dialogues. Her stories started to divert from the dystopian, the intrusiveness of technologies towards other forms of connected disconnections, other intrusions and exclusions. Her practice started to reveal an irrefutable tension. Unable to move beyond that tension, the whole practice came into question.

Then the coffee was ordered, and the process of deconstructing the tension began.

Provenance and the creative practitioner

Explaining the nature of Provenance, Geof added that when a practitioner can see and read their own story, it is easier to recognise the ways in which critical incidents have played out to shape their identity as well as their practice. As Ana recounted both her distant past and her immediate past, the reflection by hearing herself speak and (later) reading her story, gave rise to a greater understanding of her identity. This recounting is both the act of provenance and the outcome. Telling and retelling the incidents that shaped one's practice help a practitioner understand the different layers of their identity that play out in their everyday practice. For a creative writer, they become aware of the factors that influence their writing and enable them to make more conscious choices about the placement of those factors in their writing.

The notion of provenance, defined as "the practitioner identifying and articulating the story of their development of their current professional practice as a start to investigating their practice" (Hill & Lloyd, 2018), provided Ana's project with a scaffold to inquire into her own writing, its 'troubling' and its new, unexpected, directions. The acts of identifying and raising her consciousness about the events in her past, which she now believed were impacting on her present, was similar to the scraping away of the wax in a palimpsest to reveal the evidence of the earlier work. Surfacing the layers of experience and critical incidents to show their connections to her current creative writing. Just like the Archimedes palimpsest, her current

writing was not even aligned with her earlier experiences. The page needed to be figuratively turned around to see clearly how the earlier work was both present and having an impact on her contemporary writing.

Reflecting on her practice, Ana firstly identified that the new trends in the dystopian genre had taken off far beyond her, admittedly, partial repertoire of works by George Orwell, Yevgeny Zamyatin, Aldous Huxley, E.M. Forster, Jack London, and others. She had the sense that she was forcing herself into compromising authenticity as a practitioner, in lieu of fitting her practice into a genre that had been evolving at a speed analogous to the one of technological development, thus generating a new body of literature. At this stage, this was completely unrelated to her migrant condition or any linguistic divide, and rather due to the unrelenting pace of dystopian literature expansion, even more so, on the theme of technology. However clearly this revealed itself, there was something deeper than a need to refocus and redefine her theme and genre. What is revealed by this repetitive reflective practice are values that lie at the heart or the underlay of practice. These values can be seen to support the thinking and logic of the ways in which a practitioner makes sense of their environment. A concept such as authenticity thus becomes the foundation value or the threshold of thinking, by which every act of writing is influenced.

Reclaiming an authenticity that seemed to be waning, Ana undertook an even deeper practice-led inquiry into her writing. She soon became aware that not only was she writing in a genre that had developed in a way that had eluded her, but she was also doing so in a language that was playing tag-a-war with her. These two elements were influencing her writing in a way Ana had not anticipated. That authenticity becomes a threshold element of an exegesis argument, representing faithfulness to the practitioner, and translating or bridging the gap between first language readers and second language voices.

In this conversation about Provenance, Geof discussed how the idea of Provenance is not new. The term provenance comes from the French verb provenir, "to come from" (Oxford, 2018). It is defined as a noun referring to "the place of origin or earliest known history of something" (Oxford Languages, 2023) and is commonly used in art and antiques discourse where Darraby (1995, p. 23) described it as the "chronological history of a work of art traced to the creator by tracking the chain of transfer of ownership and possession, location, publication, reproduction, and display'". When professionals undertake a similar exploration of their practice this is the process of practice-led inquiry—which is research into your own professional practice initiated by illuminating your practice. The professional becomes their own initial data and the focus of their interrogation. As soon as a professional can hear or see their story about how their practice has developed, it raises other additional questions. This layering of questions leading to greater insights is the same as peeling the layers of an onion, and the end result is the same as the palimpsest, with the underplay of events evident in the fabric of the current events and practices.

The inner knowledge and knowledge about the fabrication of their identity becomes a threshold body of knowledge for both producing and understanding new elements of practice. In the case of the creative writer, it gives them new insights to recognise their identity in the nuances of their writing and also to embed these nuances in new forms of writing. This authenticity is what creates their niche as a creative writer that is evident in the content they write and the ways in which they use their knowledge of language to express these ideas.

The critical friend?

A conversation of Provenance to illuminate a practice does not always produce results solely for the practitioner. The critical friend can also gain realisations about their practice. Mindful of Ana's claims that her writing might be read from the bias of 'the home ground' and that she had 'experienced miscommunication between writer and reader', Geof considered both the way in which he commented on already written text and the ways in which he wrote to complement the essay. The reading of Ana's writing and Geof's commentary are thus a continuation of the conversation initiated in the coffee shop. Geof has his own Provenance of a private Australian

boy's school and an (in hindsight) informed English curriculum that in his teens exposed him to Hardy, Austen and Bronte along with the gender expected Golding and Catholicism expected Kenneally. Those texts exposed him not only to ideas of social action, but to forms of expression and ways of describing that warranted them models of good literature.

As 'critical friend', Geof's role is to raise questions to help Ana recognise events in her past that might be influencing her present. Geof's Provenance of Psychologist makes him ever mindful that an innocent question about the past can open a Pandora's Box of grief. However gently he treads, there is awareness of taking one down a path from which there is no retreat. In the efforts to expose the impacts of one's history there are the risks of making explicit more than can be dealt with at that given time. As he read what Ana had written and what he wrote in a collaborative recounting of a conversation, he recognised his own bias, his 'home ground'. Whether this is in a thought—a decision to leave 'tag-a-war' rather than replace it with 'tug-of-war'—or in the juxtaposition of ideas to create what he saw as a chronology, and what at times looked to him like a collage of memories, each impacting on the other. As co-author, writing with respect so as not to destroy what may be perceived by another reader as 'the Spanish language influence' but as equal academics having a need for the ideas to be coherent to any reader. Reading his thoughts suggesting to him that he did not want to destroy another's authenticity at the expense of his own ways of outlaying an argument, he had to overcome his own bias of what constitutes 'good' academic writing. He could hear himself making comments to his own doctoral students about consistency in referencing and he saw and read variations between himself and Ana in their referencing styles. He opted to leave these differences untouched in an effort to maintain the sense of individual style within collaborative writing.

But, Geof was not the only 'critical friend'. Ana also drew on literature as a critical friend. Ideas expressed in texts she has read drew her awareness to her own "weird" (Ch'ein, 2004) English. Without asking specific questions, these commentators raised a critical agenda, helping her to explore not only her own writing, but that of others and through this to raise her self-consciousness raising questions.

The outcome of Provenance: Awareness of one's style and niche

Together, we reach a point of shared communication, similar to that sense of sharing which we both felt at the end of our coffee meeting. There is a written article that both models and advances the idea that when a practitioner exposes herself (through the support of a critical friend) to the impact of earlier memories and experiences, this can help her to strengthen her sense of who she is as a writer. It can help her to recognise the choices she makes as a practitioner—whether to write something in English or Spanish; whether to write in the present or the past; whether to refer to herself as 'she' or as 'Ana'. The practitioner has illuminated her own practice, and hopefully encouraged by this short experience will continue to consciously reflect as she hones the craft.

The 'critical friend' has also refined his practice by the collaboration. He has found new ways of helping a practitioner explore their practice, and these conversations have also taken him into a new professional discipline of creative writing, which while he recognises is one with which he has little experience, he can see the impact of his own provenance in understanding the dilemmas of what acts as seeds for creative writing and from where we draw our models of 'good' creative writing or literature. He is also harkened by the act of collaboration in writing and finding ways in which multiple authors can retain their individual identities and still create a seamless text that is both monologue and dialogue.

The coffee dialogue is ended (for now) and the iteration of a paper written, still awaiting future meetings over coffee and future refinements until we reach a point of saying—that is it. Now for publication!

References

Austen, J. (2010). *Pride and Prejudice*. Saddleback Publishing.

Ch'ien, E. (2004). *Weird English*. Harvard University Press.

Barthes, R. (1964) *On Rancine*. Hill and Wang.

Barthes, R., & Balzac, H. (1974). *S/Z*. (1st American ed.). Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Barthes, R., & Heath, S. (1977). *Image, music, text*. Fontana Press.

Barthes, R. (1986). *The Rustle of language*. University of California Press.

Fermosel, J.L.A. (1981, September 25). Jorge Luis Borge: "No estoy seguro de que yo exista en realidad". *El País.* https://elpais.com/diario/1981/09/26/ultima/370303206_850215.html

Brontë, C. (2014). *Jane Eyre*. Open Road Media Romance.

Coghlan, D., & Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopaedia of action research*. SAGE.

Darraby, J.L. (1999). *Art, artifact and architecture law*. Clark Boardman Callaghan

De Quincey, T. (1998). The palimpsests. in G. Lindop (ed.), *Confessions of an English opium eater and other writings*, ed. Grevel Lindop (pp. 104-114). Oxford University Press.

Dillon, S. (2005). Reinscribing De Quincey's palimpsest: The significance of the palimpsest in contemporary literary and cultural studies. *Textual Practice*, *19*(3), 243– 263. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502360500196227

Eggers, D. (2014). *The circle :a novel*. London: Penguin books.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A.P. (Eds.). (1996). *Composing ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing*. Alta Mira Press.

Galvin, K.T., & Prendergast, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Poetic inquiry II: Seeing, caring, understanding: Using poetry as and for inquiry*. Sense Publishers.

Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree*. University of Nebraska Press.

Golding, W. (1960). *Lord of the flies*. Penguin Books in association with Faber.

Gray, C. (1996*). Inquiry through practice: Developing appropriate research strategies. No Guru, No Method?* Discussions on Art and Design Research, UIAH.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Education Communication and Technology Journal*, *30*(4), 233-252.

Hardy, T., & Kramer, D. (2004). *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (New ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hill, G., & Lloyd, C. (2018). Articulating practice through provenance. *Action Research.* http://arj.sagepub.com/

Huxley, A. (2006). *Brave new world*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Keneally, T. (2004). *The chant of Jimmie Blacksmith* . Perennial.

Lun, A. (2015*). Los palimpestos*. Editorial Minúscula.

Morrison, T. (1992). *Playing in the dark : Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Harvard University Press.

Netz, R., & Noel, W. (2007). *The Archimedes codex: Revealing the secrets of the world's greatest palimpsest.* Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Penguin.

Ommundsen, W. (2012). Transnational imaginaries: Reading Asian Australian writing. *Journal of the Association for the Study of Australian Literature*, *12*(2), 1-8.

Oxford English Dictionary. (2018). Palimpsest, n and adj. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/136319?rskey=0bfnkd&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

Oxford English Dictionary. (2016). Provenance, n. https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/153408?redirectedFrom=provenance#eid

Postman, N. (1986). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. Heinemann

Reason, P., & Marshall, J. (1987). Research as personal process. In D. Boud & V. Griffin (eds.), *Appreciating adult learning* (pp. 112.126). London.

Rushdie, S. (1991). *Imaginary homelands: Essays and criticisms 1981-1991*. Penguin.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Solano, F. (2016, January 11). El síndrome del extranjero. *El País.* https://elpais.com/cultura/2016/01/07/babelia/1452185660_776061.html

Stenhouse, L. (1981). What counts as research? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 29* (2), 13-114.