12-9-2017

In the Light of Shared Words: Collaborative Writing in a Research Study on Student Voice in Spanish Schools

Teresa Susinos Rada
susinost@unican.es

Noelia Ceballos López
noelia.ceballos@unican.es

Ángela Saiz Linares
University of Cantabria, saizla@unican.es

Follow this and additional works at: http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr

 Part of the Education Commons, and the Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons

In the Light of Shared Words: Collaborative Writing in a Research Study on Student Voice in Spanish Schools

Abstract

This article describes the process of collaborative writing between teachers and researchers which constitutes the final phase (results dissemination) of a qualitative-collaborative research project. This study was developed in Cantabria (Spain) with the purpose of promoting and analysing student voice experiences in various schools. The final process of collaborative writing was organised in two parts: one oral, based on an epistemic interview and a second moment of written production based on a shared writing of the report. This process of collegial writing facilitated a new reading and reappropriation of the described student voice experiences by the participants. It also constitutes a way of disseminating the research which challenges traditional social research methodology. The process of collaborative writing presented here has resulted in a book of teacher narrative reports which compiles some of these student voice experiences and is fundamentally aimed at other education professionals, such as teachers or school counsellors.

Keywords

Collaborative Research, Student Voice, School Improvement, Shared Narrations, Teacher Narrative Report

In the Light of Shared Words: Collaborative Writing in a Research Study on Student Voice in Spanish Schools

Teresa Susinos-Rada, Noelia Ceballos-López, and Ángela Saiz-Linares
University of Cantabria, Santander, Cantabria, Spain

This article describes the process of collaborative writing between teachers and researchers which constitutes the final phase (results dissemination) of a qualitative-collaborative research project. This study was developed in Cantabria (Spain) with the purpose of promoting and analysing student voice experiences in various schools. The final process of collaborative writing was organised in two parts: one oral, based on an epistemic interview and a second moment of written production based on a shared writing of the report. This process of collegial writing facilitated a new reading and reappropriation of the described student voice experiences by the participants. It also constitutes a way of disseminating the research which challenges traditional social research methodology. The process of collaborative writing presented here has resulted in a book of teacher narrative reports which compiles some of these student voice experiences and is fundamentally aimed at other education professionals, such as teachers or school counsellors. Keywords: Collaborative Research, Student Voice, School Improvement, Shared Narrations, Teacher Narrative Report

Introduction

This article is part of a research study funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation[1], recently concluded. The aim of this larger study was to expand opportunities for students to participate and take decisions on the design, management and evaluation of any aspect of school life (curriculum, organization, school climate, co-existence and so on).

Theoretical arguments underlying this research, described in previous works (Susinos & Haya, 2014; Susinos, Haya, & Ceballos, 2015; Susinos & Rodríguez-Hoyos, 2011), are firmly supported by what has come to be known as the student voice movement (Bragg, 2007; Fielding, 2011; Rudduck & Flutter, 2007). The ultimate goal is the development of schools that are more inclusive (Bolívar, 2004; Stoll & Fink, 1999) and democratic (Apple & Beane, 2000; Dewey, 2004; Fielding, 2007), placing students as agents, that is, as "authorised voices" for school improvement. The experiences developed in our project should be regarded as examples of "distributed agency" (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999; Gaitán, 2010; Hart, 1992; Rudduck & Flutter, 2007; Susinos, 2009) and urge us to think about which Bernstein (2000) terms "'acoustics of the school': Whose voice is heard? Who is speaking? Who is hailed by this voice? For whom is it familiar?" (Bernstein, 2000, p. 21).

More specifically, the objective of this article is to describe the final phase of this research project, which corresponds to the elaboration of a book of teacher narrative reports, titled "When everyone counts. Student participation experiences in schools" (Susinos-Rada, Ceballos-López, Saiz-Linares, in press) that compiles some of the student voice experiences. This book is the result of a collaborative writing process between researchers and teachers participating in the experience and it is mainly directed to other educational agents, such as teachers and school counselors. In this article we highlight how collaborative research opens

diverse spaces for meeting and negotiation between researchers and educational practitioners along different phases of the process. This collaborative process reaches maximum intensity in the last step of production and dissemination of the research results in a collaborative written narration where none of the voices reverberated more than others.

This is one of the most original contributions of this project, because while research based on a collaborative perspective is more present in the design and development phases in Spain, there are very few opportunities for participants to make decisions during the evaluation and dissemination stages. Similarly, research reports are traditionally regarded as individual writing spaces authored by academics. From a logical positivist perspective, academic writing should be "value free" and belong to a single, impersonal author. However, according to Elizabeth St. Pierre (2014), the notion of a single, independent author outside the text has been brought into question by authors such as Foucault, Barthes and Derrida. On the contrary, writing should be regarded as an "assemblage" of writing, ideas, readings and previous experiences which are brought together in a unique and original text whose authorship is unattributable or multiple. In this regard, we agree with St. Pierre when she says that collaboration not only takes place between real authors who are present in the writing process but also with numerous absent authors, given the interweaving that exists between reading and writing. Therefore, we consider that our book is the result of collaborative writing (not only between the signatory authors, but also between many other absent authors) constituting some sort of assemblage and whose construction process is impossible to trace or map.

More precisely, we recognize the value of generating shared narrations on three essential elements. First of all, narration is a unique and powerful tool for shared reflection between researchers and practitioners. In this vein, Feldman (1999) suggests that narration is always a dialectical process between different people that involves an act of speaking, listening, response and interpretation. The need of the Other is therefore ultimate and collaboration becomes essential to create a shared understanding.

In addition to its collaborative value, authors such as Hollingsworth (1994) and Booth (2007) argue that narrative research formats allow participants to review and rethink educational practices. This idea is particularly relevant in a context such as schools, where the immediate demands of everyday work impede the teacher from stopping and thinking about the practices that take place daily.

Finally, the ideological position we maintained throughout the research dissuaded us from drawing up a traditional research report in which writing is considered as an expression of individual creativity, of knowing as an interior act of intellection, only carried out by researchers (Taylor, 2014). As Connelly and Clandinin (1995) propose, "practitioners have seen themselves without a voice in the research process, and have often found it difficult to feel encouraged and empowered to tell their stories. It has made them feel unequal, inferior" (p. 20). For this reason, we embrace a new way of understanding research and scientific knowledge where the dissemination of research findings has been made as of this document: elaborated collaboratively with the expressed intention of representing the voices of all participants. A position that, as Taylor (2014) points out, challenges the orthodox understandings of writing research reports given that it regards textual production as an embodied, fluid and sometimes contradictory process. Likewise, we assume the Kiegelman's approach (1996) advocating the need to submit the research process, and especially the use and ownership of data, to ethical standards and social commitment. In this sense, we hold that "educational research alone is directly relevant for the issues of practice if the right people hear" (Ainscow & West, 2008, p. 29).

Collaborative Qualitative Inquiry

The research carried out constitutes a collaborative-qualitative inquiry (Cochran-Smith, 2009). This qualitative methodological approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2012; Flick, 2014; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2005) responds to a clear inclination to gain a deeper insight into the meanings constructed by our participants and also to understand the reflections they developed after participating in the different student voice experiences in each school (Rapley, 2014).

Specifically, the collaborative writing, which is analysed in this article, constitutes the final and needed phase of a research process of a collaborative nature. Ultimately, such research is committed towards a less alienating relationship between the researcher and the researched, and redefines the hierarchical relationship traditionally established (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Fenstermacher, 1986; Gibbons et al., 1994; Grundy, 2007). In this research knowledge resulting from collaborative research seeks to reflect "a wider range of voices, ideas and perspectives" (Christianakis, 2010, p. 111). Considering the researchers as "micro-politically illiterates" (Eilerstsen, Gustafson, & Salo, 2008), the collaborative reflection process allows them a better comprehension of the school culture (Groundwater-Smith, Mitchell, Mockler, Ronnerman, & Ponte, 2013).

Context

This research has been conducted over the last four years in the Autonomous Community of Cantabria (Spain). As said, the main aim of this research was to promote and encourage improvements and changes in schools through the opening of spaces of student participation under the principles of the student voice movement. This movement has an extended tradition in some Anglo-Saxon countries, but it is not well known in Spain. We are part of a research group from the University of Cantabria (IN-PARES) with a long tradition in social and educative qualitative research and with several projects on inclusive education and school improvement. This inclusive vocation of our research is expressed both in the social phenomena studied (in this case, student voice) and in the methodological choice of collaborative research and the use of participatory social methodologies.

Participants

The research involved a total of fifteen student voice experiences at different educational levels, although not all of them formed part of the collaborative writing described in this paper. The criteria used for in the selection of the experiences and the teachers who participated in the process of collaborative writing are intended to demonstrate the diversity that exists in the project.

Firstly, we wanted to include the different schools and educational levels that have participated in the research project: one narration from Infant Education, six from Primary Education and lastly, a narration from a Secondary School, more specifically, a "Second Chance Programme."[2]

Furthermore, these narrations reflect on student participation experiences that concern different aspects of school life: co-existence, the improvement of teaching-learning processes, access to school and material aspects (repairing toilets or changing facilities and sports

---

[2] The Initial Professional Qualification Programmes were designed to offer a second opportunity to pupils who had failed in compulsory secondary education and are termed as "second chance programs" in the Spanish context. 30% of all schools in Spain

tracks…) and the curriculum (one project was bonded to the area of social sciences about the improvement of the neighbourhood from a community perspective).

A final criterion was the selection of participants with different work trajectories or previous participation in student voice experiences. Specifically, nine education professionals (teachers and school counsellors) took part in this writing in pairs with a researcher.

Data Collection Procedures

The techniques used for the process of collaborative writing between teachers and researchers were: epistemic interviews (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Kvale, 2011), the reflective meetings between each pair (or in some exceptional cases in a trio) of teacher-researcher, and the cycle of co-writing (mutual reviewing of the narrations produced).

This process of collaborative writing and diffusion was presided over by communicative ethics (Kiegelman, 1996; Wyatt & Gale, 2014). Firstly, all participants should be considered as authorized interlocutors, who participate with their own voices. Secondly, the influence of the researcher in the exegesis of the say of participants throughout the whole process should also carefully be taken into account and controlled.

On the other hand, informed consent must be also guaranteed, in order to ensure that everybody participates voluntarily in the research after having understood the aims and implications of the study. To this end, before starting our research we contacted each school headteacher and explained to him/her in detail the purpose and requirements for participating in the project. Once this first contact was made, another informational session was held with all the teaching staff with the aim of making an open invitation to the different school professionals to participate and also to ensure confidentiality during the research process.

In addition, the confidentiality and protection of privacy or anonymity (Grinyer, 2002) of the people participating in the experience (students, teachers, schools, local entities) were guaranteed through different procedures. Thus, any information that could identify the participants and the schools has been removed from the text.

Finally, advocating the presence of the participants in this final phase of dissemination requires explicitly recognising their authorship in the texts which were produced. In this regard, each chapter of the book is signed by the teachers and researchers responsible for narrating each experience in a position of equality.

Background to Collaborative Writing

The process of collaborative writing which is described here is rooted in the larger research project in which the guidelines of a co-research relationship began to be established (see Table 1). Thus, the final phase was preceded by two earlier ones which explain to a certain extent how the mechanisms of collegiality were slowly forging.

Opening: "Creation of a Mixed Team"

At the start of each experience, we created a mixed team consisting of school professionals (teachers, headteachers and school counsellors) and researchers. The configuration of this team involves negotiating and establishing the roles and tasks of each members to finally generate a horizontal relationship (Gitlin, 1992; Mercer, 2002). This is a complex point, but also vital for the development of the experience under a collaborative framework. In this context, researcher and teachers have to maintain a dialogue and make shared decisions based upon the unique expertise provided by their different professional backgrounds. It is at this early stage of the relationship where some uncertainty reigns. This

arises from the breakdown of traditional roles in research and the acceptance of the fact that knowledge is no longer the exclusive terrain of the researchers. This tension is attenuated as dialogue proceeds under the prism of the shared objective: to increase opportunities for student voice.

Table 1. *Moments of collaborative research*

Steps, moments (What?)	Opening	Development	Closing
Aim, objective (Why?)	Sharing meanings of student voice through horizontal research relationships	Co-reflecting and conjoint decision making during the process	Summarizing the experience through a collaborative and reflective writing. Inspiring other professionals
Tools (How?)	Mixed research group	Seminars along the large research process	Oral review: epistemic interview. Shared writing
Products or results (What for?)	Critical review of actual student voice and opening new possibilities	Implementation of student voice experience towards more democratic school culture	8 narrations of student voice experiences aimed to practitioners

Development: "Student Voice Project"

A second milestone of collaboration is that related to moments of reflection and decision-making that take place in the mixed work teams during the student voice project developed within each school. Each project follows some common phases: Teachers and researchers begin a process of analysis and reflection on the school's participatory culture.

The epistemic interview and the seminars between researchers and participants become, from this instance, the main instruments for collaboration throughout the experience. In this analysis, attention is focused on barriers and supports, which impede or facilitate student participation.

The next phase is the selection of the topic which the improvement project will be based on. To this end, the development of a process of consultation and deliberation with students is fundamental. The collaboration between teachers and researchers takes place during the process of designing different strategies for student consultation that allow all voices to be heard.

Once the topic was selected, a process of inquiry led by students began. In this case, the collaboration between teachers and researchers is based on the design of inquiry strategies and also on the resources and educational supports which are required to enable student participation.

Closing: "Collaborative Writing-Up of the Experience"

We find the final milestone in the last phase of the research, corresponding to drawing conclusions and writing the research report, which is the main subject of this article. This moment is when teachers and researchers reflect together on the student voice experience they have developed. This final research stage results in the production of a written narration aimed to summarize the experience through a collaborative and reflective process. We have specifically constructed eight narrations, compiled in a multi-vocal and reflexive text in which

tools and strategies used to promote participation are particularly emphasized. This dialogic production resulted in the publication of a book of teacher narrative reports conceived as a guide of good practices. Its objective is, therefore, to collect and make publicly available the process and the more relevant learnings developed throughout every experience and to inspire other education professionals to implement and develop student voice initiatives (Escudero, 2009). In short, we wanted to create a means of disseminating information not only produced by teachers but also one which was directed at teachers. It was for this reason that students did not participate in this stage of writing, despite the potential of creating a narration which includes their perspectives.

The Process of Collaborative Writing-Up of the Experience

As a coherent ending of a research based on the collaboration between the teachers and the university researchers, the last phase of the research process corresponds to the conjoint creation of a report in which the student voice experiences developed in each school are recounted. The process of collaborative writing has proven to be a valuable tool to evoke the shared reflection on the experience of the professionals involved.

Collaborative writing as a research strategy has its origins in "writing as a method of inquiry (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) and "collaborative writing practices and communities" (Davies & Gannon, 2006; Speedy, 2013; Wyatt & Gale, 2014) where diverse writing strategies have always been presented (Cowie et al., 2010) within a collaborative logic model. In this study, the narrative process involved oral techniques (epistemic interviews) first, followed by written ones (shared writing processes).

Oral Techniques: Epistemic Interview

The first stage of this process of collaborative writing is identified with the development of a qualitative interview of epistemic value in which the researcher and teacher meet to discuss the experience based upon a previously drawn-up script. The purpose of this interview was not to obtain new information, but more so to re-build together the experience and generate a consensual narrative of it. Unlike traditionally interviews used in qualitative research, where the goal is to collect the voices of respondents with minimal influence of the researcher, the epistemic interview we used considers the researcher as one more participant. In this regard, this tool is proposed as being an opportunity for conjoint inquiry and shared meaning construction (Brinkmann, 2011). We recognize, as Habermas (2003) and, more recently, Raelin (2012) stated, the dialogue and shared reflection are a source of change in itself.

Moreover, the use of this oral technique was chosen because this type of narration is more accessible and presents an excellent prelude to the written text that would be drawn up later. It also appears to be a valuable option when we want to stimulate the teachers' memory regarding how they remember the experience. But we must also acknowledge some minor difficulties arising from its implementation. For example, we found cases where the episodes we wanted to access were incomplete or did not have a real chronological order. In the meantime, other anecdotal incidents, instead of complex processes of student participation, were remembered.

In any case, it was in the course of the dialogue between teachers and researchers when a more complete and complex narration was built, by combining the memory and the knowledge of each of the participants.

To facilitate this process of memory and reinterpretation, we drew up a script with broad topics as well as some questions that were used as a guide. This was felt to be more effective than a proposal closed from the very outset. In this way, the script became an instrument for

linking the topics with the responses obtained and to access new information related to their theoretical space. Thus, the interview became a meaningful tool to make the participants' thoughts explicit (Díaz de Rada, 2007; Kvale, 2011). The following table (Table 2) collects the structure and topics of the script used.

Table 2. *Structure of the epistemological interview*

Topics	Purpose	Sample questions
School culture of participation prior to this student voice experience	To identify the basic characteristics of school culture of participation prior to the initiative. To recognize the key issues of the school culture in order to increase opportunities for student participation.	*How would you describe your students and their role in educational processes?* *What needs or aspects would you want to improve?*
The process and stages of the experience itself	To identify key moments of the experiences, paying attention to the various strategies of participation developed. To reflect on the value of the strategies as a means of listening to the voice of all students. To identify the difficulties encountered in the consultation process. To listen to the reflective processes that allowed to rise these difficulties during the experience.	*What strategies of dialogue / deliberation took place? How were shared students ideas after the consultation phase?* *What was your role? And the students' role?* *What ideas / thoughts were helpful to you at this time?* *What aspect did you find the most difficult? And the easiest aspect?*
Improvements experienced in the culture of the school / classroom	To identify and reflect about the changes that were developed related to the key aspects of the school culture of participation.	*What have you learned after this experience?* *What has changed in your classroom / school / education level?* *What kind of changes did you experienced as a teacher?* *What can you say about the changes experienced by your students?*

This oral process of reconstructing the experience allowed us to become aware of the divergence of interpretations that researchers and teachers made of the same experience, for example, concerning the development of the students assembly. The prevailing view of some teachers was linked to a process which was controlled excessively by adults and which usually ended with a voting process, while researchers emphasized the need to limit these procedures and enable an assembly process directed by the students themselves, within a more deliberative context. Developing a shared narrative allowed a new understanding that integrated the particular subjectivity of the researcher and the participant.

Once oral narrations about student voice experiences were available to us (transcript of the epistemic interview), we launched the second strategy of elaboration of the report: the process of collaborative writing.

Written Techniques: Shared Writing Processes

While the development of the interviews has been similar in all cases, this second stage diverged, following a single process and a set of unique relations. As demonstrated by Barad (2007) in her idea of "spacetimemattering," each text has its own life in so far as people, objects, times and spaces function as "agentic participants" in the collaborative writing process. This has been evidenced in the degree of involvement of teachers in written texts and the support received by researchers. In short, while all the texts produced are regarded as collaborative, the writing process has been diverse. In this way, we find narrations where the responsibility of writing up the text fell mainly on the researcher, who acquired the commitment to respect the teachers' speech produced in the interviews. In other cases, it was the teachers who led the writing process, and the role of the researchers was to provide support and guidance. The decision regarding these forms of written production was agreed with the teachers, according to two main reasons. Firstly, the degree of involvement of the participants: the more knowledge developed about the experiences, the more autonomy they had to write by themselves. This is explained, among other reasons, by the fact that some teachers were in their first year on the project while others had developed a much more extensive experience. Secondly, this was so because, for some teachers, the writing process on their teaching practice was an entirely new activity, and it proved to be more accessible for those who did have previous experience in these kinds of activities. As they expressed, some already made use of writing as a means of educational documentation (Bowne, Cutler, Debates, Gilkerson, & Stremmet, 2010), or they used to have a class diary to reflect on their daily teaching activity.

Regardless of the chosen mode of collaborative writing, the final text was intended to be a collaborative process of reflection in which both feel identified, in an attempt to include the dialogue between the different voices produced. According to Jane Speedy (2013), this dialogue remains, for the most part, hidden from readers. Dissent, the way in which disagreements are negotiated, is an essential part of producing the final text. Sometimes, these differences arise with regard to structural aspects of the text; at other times they are related to the contents, for example, what information should be included from the school, the classroom and the students without transgressing our commitment to the anonymity of all those involved.

Finally, all the chapters resulting of this written process were prepared following a common scheme which meets the following headings:

1. Introduction

2. Description of the school. In this section one can know roughly what school or classroom the experience is carried out.

3. Needs for school improvement. This section presents what were the main needs for change seen in the school or classroom, as well as its major strengths. The elements described here are the synthesis of the previous work of dialogue and revision carried out jointly by the teachers, counsellor and the university researchers. Therefore, these lines of change condense the information coming from interviews, observations in the classroom, the experiential knowledge of tutor and counsellor and the perspectives added by the research team.

4. Calendar. Every experience is developed following certain phases, activities and times during the academic year which are reflected in this section.

5. Description of the process. This section is where we describe in more detail how the experience was carried out in each school, how students were consulted to find out what needs for improvement in the school seemed to be of priority and how they organized themselves to undertake the changes in those elements selected.

It should be noted here that in this process of deployment of activity, the project has taken great care to be attentive as to how the student consultation process develops, how the joint deliberation processes among students are run (how they debate in order to choose what the proposed change to be undertaken from all those proposed by their peers) and how the development of the improvement activity is itself a space for democratic and inclusive participation (attentive to everyone involved, so that everyone can make relevant contributions, so that there it is not the same voices that always impose over others, that the students decide as many things as possible, that the results be shared and communicated also to external agents ....).

6. Material and human resources that we use to carry out the experience in its different phases

*7. Issues for discussion***:** Conjoint conclusions, improvement, concerns and debates and future projects related to the experience carried out.

8. Bibliography

Table 4. Moments and techniques of collaborative writing

Steps, moments (What?)	Oral process	Written process
Tools (How?)	Epistemic interview	Cycle of co-writing (mutual reviewing of successive versions of the text) following a shared scheme
Aim, objective (Why?)	To stimulate memory To favour a reflective dialogue on the experience	To construct a shared and reflective account of the experience
Products or results (What for?)	Reflective dialogue between teachers and researchers which is transcribed as the basis of the final text	Book of teacher narrative reports

Discussion

In this paper we have described the direction, strategies and the main results of the collaborative writing process undertaken in the last phase of our research about student voice.

This process of collaborative writing, rare in traditional educational research, has allowed us to observe the qualitative-collaborative principles until the end of the research process, giving coherence to a research project in which the participation and the involvement

of teachers in all phases has been a fundamental premise. In this regard, collaborative writing is the result of an earlier collaborative research process which facilitates the establishment of equitable relationships and shared work for this final stage.

On the other hand, the collaborative writing process has resulted in book of teacher narrative reports whose first recipients are teachers and other educational professionals. These narrations have a practical or applied vocation, as it has allowed us to expand the audience that the conclusions of our work is aimed to contributing, in that way, to democratize the knowledge gained.

The value of this storytelling in the last phase of the research is to thus provoke and allow a new reading of the experience. This is firstly so, with the intention that the teachers and other participating educators can recognize the changes and new actions that student voice experience has promoted. Secondly, with the idea that they give meaning and reinterpret some situations, thereby creating new ways of understanding bygone actions and also reorganizing responses for the future (Bruner & Weisser, 1995; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Subsequently, this collaborative writing process has enabled some educators to recognize and identify a change in their practice, replacing strategies like voting on taking decisions with others closer to the principles of the student voice: the establishment of a dialogue, reasoning and discussion of the proposals.

Access to one's own experience through teachers' memories is a process that requires specific memory evocation techniques. It is important to note that, usually, many details fade or are inaccessible in a first narration process. In our case, we implemented elicitation mechanisms like the interview questions on specific issues or mobilising their memory through the description, provided by us, of some episodes. Thus, we recommend the creative use of other means of evocation such as images, videos, photographs, texts, etc.

In addition, technological tools would present a broader channel to publicly disseminate the knowledge generated from experiences, so that would be accessible to a greater number of teachers than using a traditional format as the book is. Finally, it would promote the meeting and exchange between teachers involved and those who have an interest in developing student voice initiatives.

In short, regardless of the format we use for collaborative writing, reflecting together with some distance from the experience allows us to reinterpret the pedagogical practices, to deepen the knowledge generated and, finally, to re-orient some practices currently used (Suárez, 2005). Thus, through collaborative writing, teachers and researchers reappropriate the lived experience and give a new meaning to it, observe themselves and others from a different perspective and construct new interpretations of experience (Griffin, Parker, & Kitchen, 2010).

However, in this process of writing collaboratively we encountered some difficulties which deserve to be mentioned. One fundamental problem is linked to the ongoing negotiation of the role of the researchers and practitioners (Gitlin, 1992; Mercer, 2002). During the process we observed a certain tendency by teachers to entrust the final writing to the researchers. On the other hand, we ourselves discovered that we were more predisposed than desirable to assume responsibility for the final product. In this regard, being constantly aware of the inertias of traditional roles in research becomes essential.

Similarly, we feel that some conflicts were derived from the different languages and discursive models that typically characterize our different conceptual and referential universe (school and university). Thus, it becomes necessary to assume that this co-writing project requires an effort by both professional groups in order to reconcile academic and school perspectives.

Finally, we would like to emphasize the role of collaborative writing as a valuable model for scientific production and dissemination which challenges traditional research

methods and recognizes the heterogeneity of perspectives held by different participants (Wyatt & Gale, 2014).

References

Apple, M., & Beane, J. (2000). *Escuelas democráticas* [Democratic schools]. Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Ainscow, M., & West, M. (2008). *Mejorando las escuelas urbanas. Liderazgo y colaboración* [Improve urban schools: Leadership and collaboration]. Madrid, Spain: Narcea.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity.* Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bolívar, A. (2004). El centro como unidad básica de acción educativa y mejora [The center as a context of innovation]. In J. M. Moreno Olmedilla (Ed.), *Organización y gestión de centros educativos* [Organization and management of educational centers] (pp. 93-120). Madrid, Spain: UNED.

Booth, S. (2007). Repositioning research as writing to improve student learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*(4).

Bowne, M., Cutler, K., DeBates, D., Gilkerson, D., & Stremmel, A. (2010). Pedagogical documentation and collaborative dialogue as tools of inquiry for pre-service teachers in early childhood education: An exploratory narrative. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *10*(2), 48-59.

Bragg, S. (2007). "Student voice" and governmentality: The production of enterprising subjects? *Discourse*, *28*(3), 343-358.

Brinkmann, S. (2011). Interviewing and the production of the conversational self. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry and global crises* (pp. 56-75). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Bruner, J., & Weisser, S. (1995). La invención del yo: La autobiografía y sus formas [The invention of the self: Autobiography and its forms]. In D. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds), *Cultura escrita y oralidad* [Oral and written culture] (pp. 177-202). Barcelona, Spain: Gedisa.

Christianakis, M. (2010). Collaborative research and teacher education. *Issues in Teacher Education*, *19*(2), 109-125.

Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: The Jossey-Bass Education Series.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education*, *115*, 347-377.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1995). Relatos de experiencia e investigación narrativa [Stories of experience and narrative investigation]. In J. Larrosa (Ed.), *Déjame que te cuente. Ensayos sobre narrativa y educación* [Let me tell you. Essays on narrative investigation] (pp. 11-59). Barcelona, Spain: Laertes.

Cowie, B., Otrel-Cass, K., Moreland, J., Jones, A., Cooper, B., & Taylor, M. (2010). Teacher researcher relationships and collaborations in research. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *15*(2), 69-80.

Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1999). *Más allá de la calidad en educación infantil* [Beyond quality in early childhood education]. Barcelona, Spain: Graó.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Doing collective biography.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2012). *Manual de investigación cualitativa* [Qualitative

investigation manual]. Barcelona, Spain: Gedisa.

Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and education.* North Chelmsforth, MA: Courier Corporation.

Díaz de Rada, Á. (2007). *Etnografía y técnicas de investigación antropológica* [Ethnography and investigative anthropological techniques]. Madrid, Spain: UNED.

Eilerstsen, T., Gustafson, N., & Salo, P. (2008). Action research and the micropolitics in schools. *Educational Action Research*, *16*(3), 295-308.

Escudero, J. M. (2009). Buenas prácticas y programas extraordinarios de atención al alumnado en riesgo de exclusión educativa [Good practices and extraordinary programs of attention to pupils at risk of educational exclusion]. *Revista del Currículum y Formación del Profesorado* [Journal of Curriculum and Teacher Training], *13*(3), 107-143.

Feldman, A. (1999). *Conversation as methodology in collaborative action research.* Retrieved from http://people.umass.edu/~afeldman/ActionResearchPapers/Feldman1999.PDF

Fenstermacher, G. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 37-49). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Fielding, M. (2007). On the necessity of radical state education: Democracy and the common school. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *41*(4), 539-557.

Fielding, M. (2011). La voz del alumnado y la inclusión educativa: una aproximación democrática radical para el aprendizaje intergeneracional [The voice of students and educational inclusion: A radical democratic approximation of intergenerational learning]. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado* [Journal of Curriculum and Teacher Training], *70*(25), 31-61.

Flick, U. (2014). *La gestión de la calidad en investigación cualitativa* [Quality management in qualitative research]. Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (2005). The interview, from neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 695-727). London, UK: Sage.

Gaitán, L. (2010). Ser niño en el siglo XXI [Being a child in the 21st century]. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía* [Pedagogical Notebooks], *407*, 12-16.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Shchwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science in research in contemporary societies*. London, UK: Sage.

Gitlin, A. (1992). *Teachers' voices for school change: An introduction to educative research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, S., Parker, D. C., & Kitchen, J. (2010). Carrying stories from the outside in: A collaborative narrative into a teacher education community. *Education*, *16*(2), 15-29.

Grinyer, A. (2002). The anonymity of research participants: Assumptions, ethics and practicalities. *Social Research Update*, *38*. Retrieved from: http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU36.pdf

Groundwater-Smith, S., Mitchell, J., Mockler, N., Ponte, P., & Ronnerman, K. (2013). *Facilitating practitioner research: Developing transformational partnerships.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Grundy, S. (2007). Killing me softly: The audit culture and the death of participation. In Maureen Todhunter (Ed.), *Action research and education in contexts of poverty: A tribute to the life and work of professor Orlando Fals Bord*. Bogota, Colombia: UNISALLE.

Habermas, J. (2003). Toward a cosmopolitan Europe. *Journal of Democracy*, *14*(4), 86-100.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2005). *Etnografía: Métodos de investigación* [Ethnography: Research methods]. Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.

Hart, R. (1992). *Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship.* Italy: UNICEF.

Hollingsworth, S. (1994). *Teacher research and urban literacy education: Lessons and conversations in a feminist key.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kiegelmann, M. (1996). The subject writes back: Reflections on ethics in qualitative research. *American Educational Research Association. Proceedings of the international conference in New York.*

Kvale, S. (2011). *Las entrevistas en investigación cualitativa* [Qualitative research interviews]. Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Mercer, G. (2002). Emancipatory disability research. In C. Barnes, M. Oliver, & L. Barton (Eds.), *Disability studies today* (pp. 228-249). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Raelin, J. (2012). Dialogue and deliberation as expressions of democratic leadership in participatory organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *25*, 7-23.

Rapley, T. (2014). *Los análisis de la conversación, del discurso y de documentos en investigación cualitativa.* Madrid: Ediciones Morata.

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959-978). London, UK: Sage.

Rudduck, J., & Flutter, J. (2007). *Cómo mejorar tu centro escolar dando la voz al alumnado* [How to improve your school by giving the voice to the students]. Madrid, Spain: Morata.

Speedy, J. (2013). Collaborative writing and ethical know-how. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *5*(4), 349-356.

Stoll, L., & Fink, D. (1999). *Para cambiar nuestras escuelas: Reunir la eficacia y la mejora de las escuelas* [To change our schools: Bring together the effectiveness and improvement of schools]. Barcelona, Spain: Octaedro.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2014). An always already absent collaboration. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, *14*(4), 374-379.

Suárez, D. (2005). Documentación narrativa, experiencias pedagógicas y formación docente. Reconstrucción del proceso de capacitación y de producción de relatos de formación por parte de profesores de Institutos de Formación Docente del Noroeste argentino. Informe del Proyecto UBACyT (F099), El saber de la experiencia. Experiencias pedagógicas, narración y subjetividad en la trayectoria profesional de los docentes, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Buenos Aires. Narrative documentation, pedagogical experiences and teacher training. Reconstruction of the process of training and production of training stories by professors of Teacher Training Institutes of the Argentine Northwest. Report of the UBACyT Project (F099), Knowledge of experience. Pedagogical experiences, narration and subjectivity in the professional trajectory of teachers, Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, Buenos Aires].

Susinos, T. (2009). Escuchar para compartir. Reconociendo la autoridad del alumnado en el proyecto de una escuela inclusiva [Listen to share. Recognizing the authority of students in the project of an inclusive school]. *Revista de Educación*, *349*, 119-136.

Susinos, T., & Haya, I. (2014). Developing student voice and participatory pedagogy: A case study in a Spanish primary school. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *44*(3), 385-399.

Susinos, T., Haya, I., & Ceballos, N. (2015). The power of student participation for promoting inclusive school ethos. A Spanish experience. In C. Gemma & V. Grion (Eds.), *Student voice* (pp.131-144). Barletta, Italy: Cafagna.

Susinos, T., & Rodríguez-Hoyos, C. (2011). La educación inclusiva hoy. Reconocer al otro y crear comunidad a través del diálogo y la participación. *Revista interuniversitaria de formación del profesorado* [Interuniversity Teacher Training Magazine], *70*(25), 15-30.

Susinos, T., Ceballos-López, N., & Saiz-Linares, A. (in press). *Cuando todos cuentan. Experiencias de participación de estudiantes en las escuelas.* Madrid: La Muralla.
Taylor, C. (2014). Telling transitions space, materiality, and ethical practices in a collaborative writing workshop. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, *14*(4), 396-406.
Wyatt, J., & Gale, K. (2014). Introduction to the special issue on collaborative writing as method of inquiry. *Critical Studies Cultural Methodologies*, *14*(4), 295-297.

Author Note

Teresa Susinos Rada is with the Department of Education University of Cantabria, Santander, Cantabria, Spain. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: susinost@unican.es.
Noelia Ceballos López is with the Department of Education University of Cantabria, Santander, Cantabria, Spain. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: noelia.ceballos@unican.es.
Ángela Saiz Linares is with the Department of Education University of Cantabria, Santander, Cantabria, Spain. Correspondence regarding this article can also be addressed directly to: saizla@unican.es.

Article Citation

Susinos-Rada, T., Ceballos-López, N., & Saiz-Linares, Á. (2017). In the light of shared words: Collaborative writing in a research study on student voice in Spanish schools. *The Qualitative Report,* *22*(12), 3172-3185. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss12/6