Data’s Entanglements: Artmaking As Corresponding Companion During Diffractive Analysis
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Abstract

This essay invites readers into two creative correspondences that emerged during the author’s involvement in a participatory arts-based research project called Life Lines. The Life Lines project aimed at engaging a small group of young adults alongside researchers in their use of multimodal arts practices to inquire into what makes young adult identity work the way that it does. In Life Lines the phenomenon of identity and the approaches to inquiry used to explore it were conceptualized through a material feminist framework that proposes the co-constituting nature of meaning and matter (i.e., bodies, atmospheres, and objects of all kinds). Diffractive analysis practices were adopted, creating the conditions for theorizing to become infused with artistic practice, resulting in a series of correspondences that took the form of back-and-forth dialogues between artful images and creative prose. The two correspondences shared illustrate the author’s attempts at staying with what Life Lines data were doing as they became mobile, transitive, and unpredictable in their patterns of entangling meaning and matter during diffractive analysis.
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I want to watch watching arrive. I want to watch arrivances.

—Hélène Cixous, 1997, Rootprints

Work as a scholar-artist feels most fruitful and respectful for me when it involves creatively joining with the liveliness of things’ and thoughts’ arrivals (Cixous & Calle-Gruber, 1997), attending through artmaking to a range of sensorial influences before they settle into or onto something I think I know (my identity, your story, that mountain). Dwelling through art as inquiry with and in an animate middle space of knowings’ travels, textures, and intonations feels a practice of patience and heightened awareness. It requires a type of decentering of self-consciousness in favor of a stance of humility and porosity to the range of life’s enigmatic forces and forms as they gather, assemble, and reassemble along lines of instigation. As Deleuze and Guattari (1987) forewarn however, “It’s not so easy,” this thinking and conversing with “things from the middle, rather than looking down on them from above or up at them from below” (p. 23). It involves facing some very old and powerful habits, including habits of research that crave the reduction of complexity pulsating through life’s arrivals, determining their unity, and claim staking their pattern’s resemblance to models of thought that inscribe, predict, and discursively contain living’s secrets and excesses outside of common recognition. If my modes of arts-engaged inquiry are to join with the wisdom of phenomena in their becoming knowable rather than eschewing that wisdom in favor of thinking that insists on border-building and joining things up, then I must consign to foraging for answers to hard questions like those raised by philosopher Luke Higgin’s (2011), who also endeavors to shift knowing’s modes from a type of command and control, to modes of joining with the irreducible “middles” of life’s multiplicities. Higgins (2011) asks: “What would it mean to begin always from the middle? To renounce the lure of mastery with which definitive beginnings and endings seduce thought?” (p. 142).

One response to Higgin’s question involves situating my inquiry as acts of what social anthropologist, Tim Ingold (2021) refers to as correspondence. Ingold proposes correspondence as a way of coming into sensitive and caring relation with knowing-in-being with the world, conversing with (not just about) the relational qualities between beings (human and more-than-human), thoughts, and things—including places, atmospheres, actions, and objects of all kinds. Correspondences can take many forms and can carry-on between many types of “participants,” whether an improvisational dance between a blossom and the nectar-seeking bumble bee or a handwritten series of devotional letters transmitted between lovers separated by occupation and geography. Whatever brings this type of attuning and responding about, and no matter its forms, Ingold insists the activity shares three distinguishing properties: it is processual (it carries on); open-ended (aiming for no fixed destination or conclusion); and dialogical—it engages with knowing that emerges from the ‘goings on’ between and among participants (Ingold, 2021, p. 11). In this essay, I illustrate two creative correspondences that emerged during my involvement in a participatory arts-based research project called Life Lines. These correspondences take the form of a back-and-forth dialogue between two types of ‘participants’, creative prose and drawn images, each coming into dynamic relation and co-producing ideas and actions that came to matter. Before turning to these correspondences as the heart of this essay’s offering, I first share some of the specific methodological and conceptual details of the Life Lines project to orient readers as they enter the image-word correspondences that follow.
**Life Lines: Co-Creative Speculation Over Identity Work’s Workings**

In January 2019 at a northeastern United States university, myself and two colleagues, Kelly Mancini Becker and Erika White, launched an arts-engaged participatory research project we called *Life Lines*. Over a 4.5 month period, we came together weekly to work alongside eight young adult co-inquiring participants, engaging in multimodal artmaking practices, which we referred to as maker sessions. Leaning into my training as a qualitative researcher and expressive arts facilitator, *Life Lines* maker sessions were designed as a way to integrate conventional practices of qualitative fieldwork (including interviews and observations) with visual artmaking, journaling, movement, somatic awareness, and mindfulness practices. All of the studio-inquiry practices we engaged supported an open-ended and iterative exploration of each other’s thoughts, feelings, actions, and curiosities about what makes young adult identity work *work* the way that it does. Put differently, the *Life Lines* project engaged multimodal arts practices as a primary mode for speculating over and creatively experimenting with questions about *how it is* for young adults to travel the felt-thought terrain between common notions of identity premised upon western developmental psychology that emphasize internalized agency and self-construction compared to other, nondominant material feminist theories of subjectivity that foreground non-unitary, nomadic processes of co-creativity between social, psychic, and ecological life forces (Braidotti, 2013; Truman, 2022). At the beginning and throughout *Life Lines*, we (the researchers) were open about our ambivalence regarding traditional psychological models of identity. We spoke with participants about our intentions to condition our inquiry, with their help, as an arts-rich time and space for iteratively experimenting with models of thinking and action that emphasized the co-constitutive entanglements between the social, personal, and material (i.e., bodily, object-oriented, atmospheric, etc.) dimensions of subjective life. We did not ask the young adult participants to read either conventional or material feminist theories of subjectivity as part of their involvement. Instead, ideas from these theories were braided into multimodal expressive arts activities and prompts for guiding the maker sessions, individual interviews, and more independent visual journaling between our weekly gatherings. Overall, *Life Lines* was a project premised upon beliefs in the pressing need for models of subjectivity and its study that are more adequate to the task of understanding the complex processes by which social and material worlds—including bodies, objects, structures, and living systems of all kinds—come together to co-create young adults’ sense of *becoming with* and *in* the environs of which they are a part.

Our interest in the influence of conceptualizations of young adult subjective life stretched beyond issuing correctives or trying to fill gaps in theoretical models. Wanting, always, to meet the embedded, embodied, and ethical complexities of our empirical work, *Life Lines* was conceived as a radically relational project. That is, as mothers, scholars, and teachers of young adults, we understood and took seriously that youth today are maturing during complicated times. In our personal and professional lives, we witnessed daily the ways in which the lines of transition from teen-hood to adulthood were unfolding in a historical moment heavily marked by foreboding discourses of, for example, geopolitical strife, environmental degradation, high incidences of national and international violence and human suffering, precarious financial markets, eroding public trust in political, health, and public safety systems, polarizing governmental leadership, and more. Running parallel with these unrelenting and amplified reports of rapidly changing social and deteriorating environmental circumstances, we witnessed firsthand the disquieting statistical picture of sharply increased rates of depression and anxiety among young adult collegians (Hibbs & Rostain, 2019). The conceptual-empirical work of *Life Lines* grew, in part, from our desire and commitment to do research that explores *and* responds directly to young adults navigating what we registered as a remarkably intense (though not surprising) contemporary moment, along with its very real psychological and physical effects. Given our
inquiry focus on thinking and making *between* conventional notions of identity work and those that center subjective formations as entanglements of social, psychic, and material life, we committed to engaging fieldwork and analysis practices that decentered researcher exceptionalism (i.e., thinking *for* the data) in favor of an approach to analysis premised on joining *with* data’s liveliness. Readings in material feminism and especially writings by Karen Barad (2007) became a useful way to gain a conceptual and methodological foothold in efforts to condition studio-inquiry fieldwork and later analysis practices as the type of middle-dwelling I invoked at the beginning of this essay. This meant producing and working with data that were both conventional (i.e., interview transcripts, observation notes, video recordings of maker sessions, and myriad visual journaling pages) and unconventional, including affective, dream, movement, and emotional response data. These less common or “transgressive” data (St. Pierre, 1997a) moved and produced more data, and also made data behave differently than many qualitative research approaches account for. Data as a *doing* belies their typical status as something participants ‘have’ or ‘give’ and instead become understood as *intra*-acting agents (Barad, 2007) or analytic forces that can *co*-produce meanings with, for example, movements between painterly gestures, textural preferences, and discursive compositions. Conceptualizing data through an agential realist framework that proposes the *co*-constituting nature of matter and meaning meant creating the conditions during *Life Lines* fieldwork for theorizing to become *infused* with artistic practice, causing thinking-making to proliferate, become mobile, aesthetically transitive, and unpredictable in its patterns and impacts.

Yet, how to stay with the proliferating and activating forces of data conceptualized in this way, especially when faced with the post-fieldwork task of detailed analysis? Here again, Barad (2007) and other scholars working from material feminist perspectives helped us understand *diffractive methodologies* and accompanying practices of *diffractive analysis* as approaches to inquiry that place emphasis on insights emerging *within* the dynamic and often unpredictable *intra-active* (Barad, 2007) folds of thoughts’, actions’, and sensations’ *arrivances* (Cixous & Calle-Gruber, 1997). While beyond the scope of this writing to provide a thorough overview, a basic tenet in diffractive practices of analysis is that ideas and questions get *produced* (compared to found) from reading different types of texts (i.e., data, research reports, popular media, policies, theory, etc.) through one another, and through the multifarious *material* entities (i.e., affects, movements, memories, dreams, technologies, atmospheres, and objects of all kinds) with which they are entangled. As the researcher on our small team who took primary responsibility for engaging diffractive analysis practices with *Life Lines* data, I swiftly became aware of the extent to which analytic attention in this approach would need to center the *co*-constitutive process of analysis itself; all the *goings-on* between the multiple bodies of thought and thoughtful bodily-object-atmospheric correspondences. Leaning into what diffractive analysis practices were requiring of me at the time (and still) produced a series of intense *interferences* in my thinking-making, which simultaneously and paradoxically provoked a multitude of unanticipated openings, rearrangements, and exposures of new lines of thought and patterns of inquiry’s lively unfolding. It is to two such instances of aesthetic activations and their correspondence that I now turn. The first correspondence emerged while still engaged in *Life Lines*
fieldwork and early analysis. The second correspondence surfaced while immersed in efforts to tangle with diffractive analyses’ generative and demanding proliferations and their entanglements with my bodymind during later analysis post-fieldwork. Note, the first image that appears (Figure 1.) was created by a Life Lines project participant, Rory (pseudonym), and is used with permission. The remaining images were produced by me.

Correspondence I. Rising Tides

Rory is carefully tearing from a magazine the words “THE OPTION,” pasting them to the top of one of her drawings (Figure 1.). Working, unintentionally perhaps, in ways akin to what Barbara Bickel (2020) describes as “trance-based inquiry,” Rory sinks into the Life Lines’ community ritual studio space, where “art is an aesthetic sensorial practice of coming to know and not know” (Bickel, 2020, p. 50). I register with/in my hand her hand’s rhythmic relation with the smooth black ink pen she uses. My head and hips swerve to the curvy moment moving and making what seems to be their co-emerging “vibratory signature” (Turner, 2017), their “energetic stamp... behind every act of creation” (p. 100). This “stamp,” with its rhythmic orienting and atmospheric dynamic, is something and something I feel Rory bringing to make our small circle matter, differently, week after week. In my encounter with watching their choreographed arrivances (Cixous & Calle-Gruber, 1997), I register how it is to become with the lines’ aesthetic activation, making me breathless in the ways they know how to breathe. Entanglements between researcher and researched, art mediums and movements, moods and meanings and more, each immanent and infused lines of correspondence, feels a pulling-together cutting-apart, “one move,” as Barad (2014) would put it, of something of identity work’s workings on Rory and now me.

Being in-relation with Rory’s image is producing meaning-full interferences in my capacities to register the multitude of surrounding energies, each rippling through the inquiry scene at an unfamiliar and hard to fathom scale. Joining with the ambulating and activating forces, my thinking body and bodies of thought are on the move and now making too. How is it to know with such modes of movement and disequilibrium? What can staying-with the
floating and fleeting currents of Rory’s image enable me to make in response to concerns and curiosities about young adult identity work’s workings? There is so much to register with/in these lines’ unfoldings and enfoldings that are making, and making their way through Rory’s memories in response to our research team’s invitation to consider subjectivity’s passages. Lines keep materializing thoughts about change and growth becoming more on-the-move, and less something she has to hold onto and compose on her own. In this provisional moment, Rory’s lines of flight are intra-acting to produce something of my own knowing through not knowing how it is to negotiate identity works’ workings on me. Folding my emerging lines through what is becoming sense-able from Rory’s, holds open, makes spacious, and moves me to take-up less slick, more sticky art mediums than the smooth, dark, and permanent ink companions that seem to keep choosing Rory. For me, more gritty mediums are arriving in unexpected heaps from some deep reservoir of fragmented feelings that somehow connect to felt intimacies of my becoming unwittingly recognizable by my vocational high school shop’s material-cultural milieu. Media from the Commercial Art Trades wing intermingles with my memories of the snarky-smart rhythms of my ‘voc-tech’ peer kin. Even though we didn’t know it in the right moment, or in the right key, we were on the train tracked to some lower-status vocational destination before our modes of knowing ever left the early education station.

How to read the diffractive pattern’s emotionally-imaginative know-how pulsing through Rory’s visual narrative, winding its ways in excess of what it means for me to be doing this inquiry with/in this university milieu? I re-turn—over and over again—to what each inquiry moment and making involves and makes anew. This shifts the early analytic currents coming over the threshold, sending my thinking adrift from data expected to evolve ‘as if’ what was before is now divisible; a static relic of a personal past, cut-off from its intra-active potencies that, in embodied reality, never stopped becoming agentic, even as, or more because, they came through so much else than “me” in the singular now-academic-arrival and at another temporal scale. This image (Figure 2.) is becoming made and meaningful through Rory’s (Figure 1.) intra-actions working to materialize and make sense-able only now as a resistance to imposed benevolence by high school guidance counselors, who balk at the irrational move by any of us “lower socioeconomic” young adults to try and bushwhack our ways to academe. Re-turn, over and over, to follow diffraction’s gritty arrivances; the torn and tossed-off emotional ephemera conversing with a sticky-stale ballpoint pen and its companion run-of-the-mill no.2 lead pencil. All is coming into frictional contact with cheap paper that got stored improperly, for years, in my damp basement. It/I grew lumpy and coarse in the corners without notice. But that surface knows something I don’t about how it is to “negotiate( ) the relations between the various bodies that enable art to come into being” (Bolt, 2013, p. 7). Relations move and make between my body, Rory’s body, the mediums that have come to matter, differently, and the bodies of theoretical contestations between what identity is, how it should behave, when it should progress, where it is likely to lead one body as it is compared to another and another and an-other. All this is becoming-art-i-facts—real and agentic modes that make diffractive agencies send, sort, sift, and scrape the surface in ways immanent to this emotional inquiry event and the weighty wants of data’s entanglements.

Working to stay with the trouble of diffractive practices involving me physically, psychically, and socially, I inquire through and with this intra-active tumble of bodies-thinking-through-bodies-of-thought, registering the affective-aesthetic imprints of pulpy paper in dynamic relation with gritty lines of getting lost, feeling loved, or leaving behind the land-locked high that rises, over there in Rory’s lower left corner (Figure 1.). With Rory’s modes for artfully experimenting in-between how her bodymind knows through identity models that say how it is all supposed to go, and the experiment’s invention of THE OPTION for how it might be otherwise, I feel differently responsible and response-able for bringing curiosity and co-creativity to the
diffractive inquiry event and for what it is now making possible. The material-theoretical currents churn and pull into proximity a way of shrinking a little less under the weight of the industrial research complex that keeps Rory—and us all—striving to be counted. Working in a reciprocal fashion with what is given, I follow Rory’s image-provocation through to her luscious red figuration (Figure 1.), whose lively lines push through the current(s) boundaries, fearing less about leakages and tilting our whole feminist boat into an entire universe of previously unconsidered sea of analytic possibilities.

**Figure 2.** Untitled. 8” X 10”, mixed media on paper. Clark/Keefe, 2019.

**Correspondence II: Diffractive Analysis, or Becoming a Leaky Boat in Stormy Seas without a Compass**

It is the semester after the data collection phase for the *Life Lines* project. I have only just started working with what feels a thick, generative thicket of analytic energy. Hundreds of pages of text from transcribed interviews, hours of video recordings of the maker sessions and file folders of visual journal pages are piling high. Simultaneously, news of an ominous virus is starting to spread across the globe, entangling us in ways we could not prepare for. Digital maps on the Internet are glowing with color-coded maps of where COVID-19 was believed to have “originated,” which (human) groups are (unsurprisingly) being hit the hardest, whether and how much masking and social distancing will protect us from the potentially fatal contagion, and so much more. In this sea of precarity our small research team wonders about re-constituting the relational inquiry activities of *Life Lines*. As mother-scholars of our own and others’ adolescent and young adult kin, we are wit(h)nessing (Bickel, 2020, p. 10) the already-dangerous and escalating levels of stress and anxiety accompanying the evacuation of on-campus living quarters, mandatory “shelter-in-place” orders, and needing to “pivot” to fully online learning. Gaining swift approval from our institution’s ethics board for
amendments to our research protocol, Life Lines re-activates virtually during the final weeks of the Spring 2020 semester and another round of data activation begins (Becker, Clark/Keefe & White, 2022). Meanwhile, the first wave of Life Lines data waits for us to take the diffractive analytic bait, some patient, others not so much. Our team’s mounting professional demands meet painful personal experiences with loss, grief, and confusion about how to stay the course with analysis while so much else becomes so slippery. We each do what we can, when we can, to honor all the data waves rolling in. The tide is rising, creating sensations of a state of animated suspension that keeps holding for a type of attention that is hard to come by (Clark/Keefe, 2020). But how to turn and re-turn all that Life Lines is producing without capsizing?

I am all in the affective upswells and intellectual disequilibrium that the times intra-acting with what diffractive analyses require of me—now alone—as my research companions attend to unavoidable and unrelenting demands on their personal and professional lives. I read lines in Rory’s transcript (Figure 3.), through dreams of drowning, through statistics on young adult mental health, through worry with my co-researchers, through lines in my morning journal (Figure 4.), through drawing the slippery circumstances of working in the diffractive undertow (Figure 5.).

Figure 3. Transcript. 8.5 “ x 11”, print on paper.

Interviewer: You describe experiencing identity work in terms of a tangle...

Rory: ...Yeah. I feel kind of tangled. So, feeling pulled — like kind of undulating maybe, but — feeling pulled in many directions and kind of like not knowing how to straighten out and not knowing how to resolve the tangled mess and rolling up, and different things. And then also I remember feeling like I was spinning. It’s like if you’re in a wave and you get caught in the bottom? Like, uh?

Interviewer: The undertow?

Rory: Yeah. And, or, you’re in the washing machine and it’s like, “How do I get out of this? I don’t know where air is.”

Figure 4. Dream Data: Diffractive Drowning. 5.5 x 8.25, print on paper. Clark/Keefe, 2020

Diffractive Drowning

In the nightscape’s apparatus of knowing, I cannot settle my bodymind. My data-legs are working like an unrelenting metal coil, groping for the optimum soft spot across the vast sheet surface. Unable to find firm-enough footing, gulps for air fill my analytic bottleneck with liquid memories of near drowning as a young child—twice. Fully awakened in the seafoam of sweat to the data-wave’s entanglements, lines of drift soak my morning drawing habit that knows far better how it is to be in and with the diffractive undertow. Ink, paper, movement, memories help me stay just barely above the trouble of trying to take a diagonal line of drift into the moon’s timing between models of identity that have the capacity to break waves of young adult imagination. Float on artmaking’s forces, draw in diffractive thinking’s wild currents, and correspond with something of another inexplicable plane that moves whatever I keep trying to think-make as analysis. It’s hard to be buoyant in the lashing currents of dominance’s discursive uprush and backwash of unpotable water and dangerous quick-fix sands. A cabal of crows are calling me in to lie a spell amidst their murder on the lawn. They ketch over who gets to be the one to tell me of death’s escape through catching my breath. Worn from the sea’s tumult, I listen and sink into the brittle grass of the marsh scratching my back as the moon’s dry light diffracts across the puddle of sweat still streaking my brow.
As I come up for air, I sense *Life Lines* data and the diffractive practices are not done with me attempting to forage for modes of new knowing. I work to stay with diffraction's diffractions, even as it all proves an unruly travel companion. Rogue and impetuous, it is teaching me much about letting go of mirages of modes of meaning situated in Cartesian beliefs that separate what data are, where they are located, and how I can categorically control where they will need to go to show what I know. As diffraction and I tangle with the wild winds that threaten protocols of procedural fidelity, our correspondence weaves desires to know in tones and textures that make more material the workings of subjective formations. Reading data through theory through memories of young adult epistemic oppression, through movements with ink and charcoal, I feel reverence for the more than metaphorical truth that connects my no.2 pencil to my embodied modes of knowing in ancient relation to the waves of affective and intellectual drift and dreaming during diffractive practices. While still fearful of drowning, I sense I need to lower the data ship's sails and stretch their canvas containment, working diffracting data's entangling “bewilderment for all it’s worth” (St. Pierre, 1997b, p. 281). Arrivances affect/ing agents most certainly know something that I don't about what unexpected materials and modes may be required for becoming more epistemically open and collectively
adaptive. One foot on the boat’s ballast for balance, it is time to enter into relationship with my long-practiced modes for knowing in the world’s ways of diffracting me in multiple directions at once. Like the discursive-material seas that threatened to drown me, multiplicity is indeed a force to be in respectful relationship with; a relation of generative tension and tumult in-between swells well in excess of any one moment’s notice or theory’s capacity for making any of this definitively meaningful. Diffractive patterns of analysis come into contact with matte medium, both priming for whatever this cabal is stirring. … breathe … Things in-between are suspiciously quiet at-first as movement’s making a curious rabbit-like figure, who just yesterday showed up softly at the near-center of a large head’s dizzying dealings with heaps of storied, dream, and emotional Life Lines data. It is not long before others enter the relational-analytic mix, gently yet with purpose, some preening their fragile feathers and causing me to think, and think again, about what models of identity development enable us to know and where those lines of delineation grow thick in their uneven inclusions and exclusions. My boat’s sail is getting more and more crowded as felt-thought-movements enter into relationship with diffractive layer after diffractive layer of medium, making meaning sometimes grow gills to the slippery rhythms produced while reading Rory’s and other participants’ data through theoretical insights from Julietta Singh (2018), who conceptualizes “vital ambivalence” as “a practice of representation that emphasizes, politicizes, and embraces the subject’s contradictions and slippages” (p. 158). These thought-felt emergences during diffractive analysis subsist and insist on modes of knowing through reciprocal generativity. They help me discern what I want, no need, to bring as more-than-human companions to foreground how it is to know in intimate relation with practices, politics, and particularities of thought and feeling. Tilting toward diffractive analyses’ tumult, it is poetics, pigment, bristles, line, and shadow who join thinking-in-being attentive to the art of subjective aliveness. Here lines, forces, and figurations speak nothing yet know most everything according to diffractive affective analyses’ rhythm—its moving, making, and mattering as Data’s Entanglements (Figure 6.).

Aesthetic Arrivances: Meeting and Making More Room for Arts-Engaged Companions

Like many qualitative researchers, I have been taught to want the safety and easy(ier) recognition that comes from traveling with common procedures for capturing, coding, and representing patterns in others’ stories. Yet, in my ongoing process of unlearning certain inquiry approaches that overemphasize the “discoverability” of human experience, I have come to sense the need for modes of knowing in radical relation with what registers, always provisionally and partially, as animating my sense of aliveness (Clark/Keefe, 2010; 2014b). In opportunities to engage qualitative research, I gravitate towards paths that refuse stale routes and potentially harmful routines of detachment and proceduralism (Springgay & Truman, 2018). Middle dwelling while in the grips of diffractive analyses’ currents, even with, or better, because of its demands, is one such path. Owing in-part to the ways my labor-intensive working-class upbringing reinforced my epistemic habits of embodied knowing and communication (Clark/Keefe, 2009), drawing, painting, and prose poetic writing (even while having no ‘formal’ training in any of these) have long afforded an especially important companion for traveling open-hearted through the proliferation of movements and affective frictions, vibrations, relays, and ricochets that I experience as indeterminately of interest and non-exhaustively at play in all qualitative data analysis practices. In my continued efforts to learn to meet and make room for arts-engaged companions, I re-turn, over and over, to Higgins’s (2011) dis/orienting question: “What would it mean to begin always from the middle? To renounce the lure of mastery with which definitive beginnings and endings seduce thought?” (p. 142). In the gift of writing-making this essay, beginning “always from the middle” (Higgins, p. 142) has meant dwelling sensitively with life’s arrivances (Cixous & Calle-Gruber, 1997), joining
with their secrets of becoming and carrying-on in open-ended creative correspondence with knowing that emerges from the “goings on” between all of inquiry’s participants (Ingold, 2021), human and otherwise.

Figure 6. Data's Entanglements. 26” x 30”, acrylic on canvas. Clark/Keefe, 2021
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**Endnote**

1 Since the publication of Karen Barad's (2007) groundbreaking text, Meeting the Universe Halfway, in which she first proposes diffractive methodology as a potentially fruitful alternative to traditional social science practice, several excellent resources for understanding diffraction's theoretical underpinnings and examples of what social science scholars' diffractive practices have produced have been emerging. I return often to two sources: Hillevi Lenz Taguchi and Anna Palmer's (2013) article, A More 'Livable' School? A Diffractive Analysis of the Performative Enactments of Girls' Ill-/Well-Being With(In) School Environments and Lisa Mazzei's (2014) article, Beyond and Easy Sense: A Diffractive Analysis. Both offer highly accessible entry points for thinking with Barad's proposition of diffractive analysis practices during empirical work.