LOST AND FOUND IN TRANSLATION: PARTICIPATORY ANALYSIS AND WORKING WITH COLLECTIONS OF DRAWINGS

Katie MacEntee and Claudia Mitchell

> The task of interpretation is virtually one of translation.
> Susan Sontag, 1966

INTRODUCTION

As researchers in the social sciences, we glibly use the term 'data collection' in our research studies, but how do we really think of 'collections' in the data collection process? We ask this question because work with drawings (and indeed other forms of visual representation such as photos or collage) typically yields what might be regarded as an art collection. How does the term 'collection' itself imply something of an archive? How might the idea of working with an art collection or a collection of visual arts-based artefacts such as drawings contribute to the interpretation/translation process? And finally, what are some of the opportunities (and challenges) we face when we re-frame our thinking about collections of drawings, particularly in relation to the voice of the producers and audiences? This chapter focuses on the notion of participatory analysis and the ways in which the producers themselves might be engaged in analysis, but the ways in which third-party analysis can deepen an understanding of the issues are also covered.

Our interest in thinking about collections and archives stems from the association between data collecting involving drawings and the various collections of children's drawings in the public domain. If you google "children's drawings", you will find references to a fascinating array of different collections and information on institutions dedicated to displaying them—from the Jewish Museum of Prague's collection of drawings produced by children in the Terezin Concentration camp to the World Awareness Children's Museum's mission to "foster awareness, understanding, and appreciation worldwide of cultural diversity for children and adults" (World Awareness Children's Museum, 2009). As Sarah Henry (2002) pointed out, these collections highlight the ways in which children move from being the observed to the observers:

> Children are among history's most elusive witnesses. Museum and libraries are full of objects and documents that appear to tell the stories of childhood but are actually the creations of adults. The books, toys, clothes, and child-rearing manuals that inform what we think we know about childhood tell us

> much more about what society wanted children to be than children actually saw, heard, believed, or felt. Thus children are more often than not the observed, rather than the observers of history. This gap in the historical record troubles historians of childhood and leaves the rest of us with a seriously impoverished understanding of our own history. For when we do have the opportunity to listen to children, their testimony is powerful. And art is one of the most compelling ways children have of expressing what they have experienced. (p. 18)

One can access virtual collections, such as the drawings produced by children during the Spanish Civil War (Avery Architectural & Fine Arts Library, 2004). The references generally include the size of the collections: 2000 pieces of art created from over 100 countries at Paintbrush Diplomacy, 1300 words in the Stone Soup Museum of Children's Art, 4500 children's drawings from Terezin, and so on. And if you visit the virtual collections, you will discover some of the coding and categorising; it is often possible to know the age, sex, and location of the child producer, along with, in some cases, even the name. The circumstances in which the drawings were collected are also part of the information provided. In the case of the Terezin drawings, it is noted that Mrs. Friedl Dicker Brandeis taught art classes to children at the camp before she was sent to Auschwitz and that she was able to hide two suitcases full of the children's drawings. Some of this coding and categorising complements what has been done in published book collections such as Volovková's (1993) *I Never Saw Another Butterfly: Children's Drawings and Poems From Terezin Concentration Camp, 1942–1944* or Geist and Carroll's (2002) *They Still Draw Pictures: Children's Art in Wartime. From the Spanish Civil War to Kosovo.*

This work on collections of children's drawings is interesting for a number of reasons. First, it highlights the ways that children's drawings serve as evidence of some of the most horrific moments in history. As Colin Rhodes (2000) pointed out, the whole movement of children's drawings dates back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century, after which, in the late 19th century, the notion of a raw primitivism speaks to natural expression that is "outside the complex social structures that govern the lives of most adults" (pp. 26–27). A second reason for highlighting these collections of children's drawings is a methodological one. These collections can be read as a validation of children's drawings as method, in and of itself. Notwithstanding the many debates and discussions about the truth value of images, and of course the challenges of interpretation, the sheer volume of drawings produced by children and, furthermore, the fact that they are produced in relation to so many different social justice issues, suggests that we need to take seriously—though not uncritically—the genre itself. If so many images exist, so do these questions: How, under what circumstances, and in whose interests were they collected? We need to ask questions that point back to the responsibility of adults to resist trivialising the time, the hopes, the dreams, and the safety of children. The focus of this last question is particularly critical because so many children's drawings have been collected during times of war. What is the impact of these drawings, if any, on the adults who collected them in the first place? What about

the impact on child audiences? The existence of so many public collections also raises the question of why we do not make better use of these collections. If, for example, we are interested in studying the effects of conflict on children, do we not have a responsibility to seek out other collections that are in the public domain (on websites, in museums, in published collections) so that we are building on and adding to what is already there rather than simply collecting more data? Finally, as noted above, we are interested in the idea of fully mining collections of drawings, particularly those that we elicit in our fieldwork with participants. For us, there is a crucial question: How can the voices of the producers themselves become central to research being carried out on their images?

THE BACKSTORY OF THREE ARCHIVES

In this section, we offer three brief cases of working with collections of drawings. Although we refer to these as three 'archives', their genesis is far from sophisticated: Not unlike the two suitcases that originally contained the Terezin drawings, these archives started out as cardboard boxes, folders, and a drawer in a file cabinet.

Draw a Teacher (Canada)

One of the 'archives' of children's drawings is a collection made up of more than 500 drawings produced by Quebec primary school children in response to the prompt: "*Draw your teacher.*" As described in Chapter 1, Sandra Weber and Claudia Mitchell came upon the drawings somewhat by accident when they saw a reference to the collection in the local newspaper. The artist who had organised the project turned over the collection to the research team (Weber & Mitchell, 1995, 1996) when they contacted her. The sheer size of the initial collection moved the team into an interpretive paradigm related to the question of what to do with 500 drawings. Their first response was not to start coding and categorising (something they eventually did) but rather to lay out the drawings on the floor, on desks and tables, and simply engage in a 'walk about' around the images. The visual lay-out, they realised, served as an invitation to others to engage in the interpretive process. A group of beginning teachers, for example, looked at this visual lay-out and began to talk about particular images in relation to their own teachers ("This one looks like …"). In their comments, they often spoke about their own hopes and dreams: "This is the kind of teacher I want to be" and "Here is an example of what I DON'T want to be". They engaged in something that Weber and Mitchell eventually termed 'future oriented remembering' (hooks, 1994). Thus, although these two researchers ultimately came to code drawings according to age, sex, and subject area depicted on the blackboard, and according to such emerging categories as romance, the individual responses of beginning teachers highlighted the significance of memory and the past in such coding. Interestingly, beginning teachers ended up doing their own drawings in due course (Weber & Mitchell, 1996) and, therefore, expanding the collection.

Let Every Child Learn (South Africa)

On a larger scale, we encountered examples of this kind of 'future-oriented remembering' (hooks, 1994) in the dialogue of a group of beginning teachers in South Africa as they looked through drawings of teachers and schools produced by South African school children. The drawings were produced by over 12,000 school children in response to two art competitions, one sponsored by the South African Post Office ("Let Every Child Learn") and the other by the Checkers supermarket chain ("Back to school: Draw your teacher"). Both collections were created in 1994–1995. As a visiting professor at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) in Johannesburg (and as a relative outsider to South African education), Claudia Mitchell worked with a group of beginning teachers at Wits to study the drawings. What started as a project of analysing these drawings, however, ended up, for these teachers, becoming a memory project in which the drawings served as visual memory prompts. The tape recordings of their group discussions were filled with questions and comments like "Do you remember …?", "Oh no—this is just like what our classroom was like", or "I remember this …" as they proceeded to talk about struggling with the legacy of schools as sites of oppression—places in which teachers are often seen to be overly punitive, unprofessional, lazy, and authoritarian. Many of the teachers in this group focused on a particular image to recall school, and the memories offered were often very poignant. The teachers also made many references to issues of power and the disciplinary role of teachers—again prefacing many of their comments by "I remember …". The archive, then, is a memory one, and the types of comments made by the teachers highlighted the possibility of reflection and looking back but also the need for comparative data. What would the images look like 10 years later? Would the teachers have a more future-oriented analysis?

Draw Gender-Based Violence (Rwanda)

The two preceding cases highlight the significance of personal memory in the interpretive process. We were aware of other dimensions of translation in such a process when we were working with a collection of drawings on gender-based violence produced by children and young people in Rwanda. As part of a project in Rwanda related to children's participation in addressing gender violence in and around schools, Claudia Mitchell worked with children and young people in every region of the country to get their perspectives on the issues. One of the data collecting tools was the production of drawings on gender-based violence (see Table 7.1).

Table 7.1.

In one primary school in Rwanda, children were asked to visually express 'feeling unsafe', which included drawing places where they might feel frightened. Comments by the children are listed beneath each caption.

Drawing 1 Caption: "Fear behind the Toilets"
 – *I fear behind the toilet because I can easily be raped from there or else they kill me.*
 – *Inside the toilettes I fear there because a boy can rape me from there.*
 – *Behind the school I fear there because every one can easily harm you from there.*
 – *I fear in the corridor because some one can rape you from there when it is dark.*

Drawing 2 Caption: "Because the Headmistress Punishes Us"
 – *On the administration block I fear there because the headmistress punishes us seriously.*
 – *Near the toilets are bushes so we fear there because like a girl can easily be raped from there.*
 – *On the road we fear there because car can knock you to death.*

Drawing 3 Caption: "Boys or Men Can Easily Catch Me"
 – *Behind the classes we fear there because of the bush and someone can rape you.*
 – *We fear the barracks because they can beat us from there and we meet bombs.*
 – *On the toilet I fear there and boys or men can easily catch me and rape me.*
 – *On the road I fear there because the car can knock me down.*

Drawing 4 Caption: "The Soldiers Can Beat You"
 – *Behind the classes I fear there because there are snakes that can bite me.*
 – *On the road I fear there because some one can rape me from there.*
 – *On the barracks I fear there because the soldiers can beat you or you are bombed.*

Many of the images produced included captions written in Kinyarwanda, so translation relied on the help of a young Rwandese medical student named Jean-Paul. In total, he worked with approximately 1000 drawings. He would work with them for a few days and then return them to the research team with translations of the captions but also a page or two of general comments. In fact, he was not just involved in translating the captions from Kinyarwanda to English but also in translating the images themselves: "This is what I think the drawing means." Unlike the responses of the beginning teachers to the children's drawings in the South African case mentioned previously, Jean-Paul's responses were less explicitly about his own memories and more about his perspective on the social reality of contemporary Rwanda. The backstories that he provided were critical to how we worked with the drawings.

We gained an even greater appreciation for an insider perspective when we had occasion to explore the images in an outsider context. A research assistant at McGill University became interested in working with the same collection of drawings that Jean-Paul had worked with. We were uncertain about what she might do with the drawings: Would she simply organise them according to sex, location, and age? Or would she try to look at the actual themes? The task proved to be a

difficult and frustrating one because she felt so far outside the context of the actual collecting of the drawings, or the context of contemporary Rwanda:

> My ability to read scenes of men and girls with cars and cells phones as prostitution was inhibited by lack of familiarity with this type of exchange in my urban North American childhood where cell phones and cars are a "natural" part of middle-class life. So too was my ability to interpret scenes of children in forests as a commonplace threat to a Rwandan child's safety impeded by my cultural estrangement from having to cross wide-open, un-policed spaces daily without the provision of a trusted adult. (field notes, 2009)

What the three cases in this section highlight are some of the opportunities for using archival data to evoke new stories. Working with beginning teachers' interpretations of children's drawings of teachers led to some critical findings on the role of memory in becoming a teacher (Mitchell, 2004; Mitchell & Weber, 1999). At the same time, these examples, especially those dealing with issues of social justice, draw attention to the following questions: How might the producers (in this case, the children who produced the drawings), or at least members of their community, interpret the collection of images? And how might the processes of using-reusing, coding-recoding, and playing-replaying contribute to deepening an understanding of the phenomenon under study?

PARTICIPATORY ANALYSIS PART 1:
THE PRODUCERS AND THE IDEA OF THE DIGITAL ARCHIVE

In this section, we consider the idea of engaging the children themselves in the process of working with the images. As explored elsewhere (see Mitchell, 2009; Mitchell, Walsh, & Moletsane, 2006; Moletsane, Mitchell, Smith, & Chisholm, 2008), the significance of the visual (drawings, video making, and photography) in breaking the silence related to such issues as gender-based violence in and around schools is critical. In the case of the drawings of gender-based violence from Rwanda, where policy-making was key, how might the voices of the producers— the girls who drew images of such violence—be further invoked within grassroots policy-making? Such a question is located within what Patricia Maguire (1987, 2001) and others refer to as feminist participatory research, an approach to research that acknowledges participants as more than 'subjects' and in so doing recognises the critical perspectives of girls and women in identifying both gender issues as well as possible solutions at the community level.

Participatory Archiving

The participatory archive, as Huvilo (2008) and Shilton and Srinivasan (2008) noted, is a relatively new concept that refers to the ways in which users (including producers) can also be engaged in designing the archive as well as in coding and re-coding the data. A digital archive (regardless of whether it is a public site or a

restricted research site created by a research team) is simply a collection of records in a digital form that makes it possible to both store data and to retrieve it via software applications (Pearce-Moses, 2005). Digital images are described using a metadata protocol and saved in a database for retrieval, access, and preservation. As outlined elsewhere (Park, Mitchell, & De Lange, 2007) in the actual digitisation, the activity of connecting original materials and their apparent objective and subjective descriptions with newly created digital surrogates form the database (Hughes, 2004). As Shilton and Srinivasan (2008) observed, the reason for creating a new participatory method in working with archives is to prevent, as much as possible, the distortion of cultural histories of marginalised populations. Implementing a system that allows marginalised groups to become engaged in the entire archiving process allows a community to ensure the authenticity of the individual pieces, with the archive depicting a more accurate history of the community. In his essay "Reading the Archive", Allan Sekula (2003) observed that archives are far from neutral. He cites numerous examples of the ways in which both the content and management of archives shape what knowledge (and ultimately whose knowledge) is stored in the first place and how it is coded and categorised, how it can be retrieved, and who has access to the archive. The examples in the previous section of this chapter of how beginning teachers interpreted the drawings of children according to their own histories and memories, or the example of the research assistant who found it difficult to associate forests with danger, speak to the presence of multiple meanings but perhaps also to the absence of the meanings intended by the producers. Although much of the work related to participatory archives links to the use of public archives in such settings as libraries and universities, the nature of interactivity offers promising developments that could be incorporated into the participatory work of community-based archives or restricted sites. Work on digital archives of local photo data on a restricted site in a rural South African context highlights the possibility for community members to be more directly engaged in contributing to analysis, management, and dissemination of the data/knowledge production (see also De Lange, Mitchell, & Park, 2008; De Lange, Mnisi, Mitchell, & Park, 2010; Dyson & Leggett, 2006; Mnisi, DeLange, & Mitchell, in press; Park, Mitchell, & De Lange, 2007, 2008).

An archive, then, can become a democratic space, one that invites the producers themselves (for example, adolescent girls in Rwanda) to participate along with 'users' in the case of stakeholders and researchers. We draw on the successes of work with photo archives to consider how these successes can transfer to work with drawings. Our interest is in the development and application of interactive digital formats (within an archive) so that producers can play with, remix, and rework the visual data (their own and others) and in so doing, fully exploit the dynamic nature of the archive and the data. Producers (and users) can add their voices to the data in a variety of ways, ranging from the use of social tagging to creating stories (as a type of analysis) using the images and digital technology.

PARTICIPATORY ANALYSIS PART 2:
INSIDER AND OUTSIDER PERSPECTIVES ON ART-MAKING

Participatory analysis can go beyond work with the participants, even if such work is clearly the starting point. Much has been written on using arts-based techniques, reflexivity, and the potential for arts-based methods to open the door to alternative forms of data representation and knowledge production (Eisner, 1997; Knowles & Cole, 2008; Knowles, Luciani, Cole, & Neilson, 2007; Leavy, 2009; Mitchell & Weber, 2004; Moletsane et al., 2007). However, there is a paucity of research concerning the role of participant-produced art in participatory arts-based research and little consideration of the role of audiences (those not directly involved with the initial research process) who view the art. In this section, we explore the potential of integrating third-party perspective analysis into arts-based research. We do this by focusing on participant-produced images created during arts-based research committed to a change-centred approach (Schratz & Walker, 1995). Responding to critiques of participatory research, raising questions about participant-produced art and the participatory nature of the research, and interrogating the role of aesthetics in facilitating change, we argue the potential of participatory analysis that contains an explicit critique of artistic forms and what it means to do research for social change. We conclude by discussing the value of incorporating the audience voice into participatory arts-based research analysis.

As discussed above in 'Participatory Analysis Part I', the inclusion of the participants' voice and understanding, through coding and analysis of the drawings, can contribute to a more democratic approach to the research process. It helps ensure that the art is accurately represented and explained. But the inclusion of participants in research analysis also carries challenges. It requires training, it can be difficult for participants to review data that presents them (or their situation) in a negative light or that is painful for them, and the process can be tedious (Cahill, 2007). Of particular note is the risk of romanticising the participant's voice. Kincheloe (2009) wrote of Participatory Action Research (PAR) techniques:

> Too many contemporary advocates of PAR have failed to ask hard questions about the nature of participation. Without such complex and intense questions, PAR too often migrates to one of two positions: a research method/design that (1) romanticizes and essentializes the perspectives of the oppressed and fails to question the diversity of viewpoints among subjugated groups; (2) embraces facile notions of participation that serve as new and more hegemonically sophisticated modes of exclusion. (pp. 119–120)

Although the inclusion of participant interpretation and analysis is important, without a critical exploration of the limitations of any particular participant or group of participants' perspectives, we risk constructing a positivist universalism. We argue that participatory arts-based research can also be trapped into glorifying the perspective of the participant and therefore risks essentialising participant voices, glossing over difference, and/or creating further marginalisation within an already struggling group. Without taking away from the importance of participant analysis, Kincheloe's critique leads us to consider how participant-centred research

may benefit by finding ways to incorporate a wider range of perspectives or voices into its analysis process.

A participatory arts-based approach—with participants creating art for the sake of research and typically without any formal training in the arts—has been important in marginalised communities (Lykes, 2001a, 2001b; Mitchell & Kanyangara, 2006; Umurungi, Mitchell, Gervais, Ubalijoro, & Kabarenzi, 2008; Wang, 1999) because it helps 'give a voice' to otherwise overlooked groups and experiences. Although not always participatory, arts-based research is politically motivated, with a significant proportion of participatory research dedicated to ensuring that participant needs and goals are realised, at least in part, through the research process and findings. This type of collaborative and interdisciplinary work has ties to PAR and its "key question of how we go about generating knowledge that is both valid and vital to the well being of individuals, communities, and for the promotion of larger-scale democrative social change" (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood, & Maguire, 2003, p. 11). An emancipatory approach commits this work to challenging an oppressive status quo (for example, gender-based violence in Rwanda) and including a critical analysis of the everyday lives and insights of traditionally oppressed individuals and communities. As we see with the drawing work by girls in Rwanda, the participants become the centre of the research and are inextricably involved in the act of knowledge production. It is their knowledge of risk and unsafe spaces (represented in part by their drawings of toilets and forests) that inform policy change. Therefore, displaying the girls' drawings for community members and for ministry officials was integral to the research process. The power of exhibiting the participant-produced art is one of the valuable aspects of this type of research and can play a key role in ensuring that participant objectives are met.

Exhibiting participant work helps ensure that participants receive recognition for both their work and their role in the research. Other 'showings' of the art may be through the inclusion of individual images in academic books and journal articles or as projected conference slides (100 times magnified) in PowerPoint presentations. Still other work might be 'adopted' by the community: hung in offices, archived in museums, incorporated into a coffee table book, or re-presented digitally online. This art can be presented in a variety of forms, sometimes without the accompanying information recorded from the participant. In the case of photographs on the topic of HIV and AIDS taken by teachers and community health workers in a rural area of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, the collection still hangs in the community health clinic 7 years after the completion of the research project. Hundreds of people pass by these photos every week. What do these images mean to the people who work at this clinic? How are the images understood by the clients who visit the clinic?

When we are showing art to a wider audience, there is potential for a third-party perspective that might shed new light on the research process and lead to new understandings of the actions required to bring about social change. In this sense, it can seem as though the knowledge production process of participatory research is never ending. What might be gained by incorporating these perspectives into the analysis? Guided feedback, question and answer periods, comments in a visitors'

book, and focus groups are all examples of how a third-party perspective analysis of the issues under research might be captured. The audience can describe its relationship to the issues, its understandings, its ability to effect change, and its potential to take action. Given Kincheloe and Cahill's critiques, how might the formal incorporation of this type of analysis into the research process contribute to avoiding the essentialisation of the participant voice? Indeed, what responsibility do we have as researchers to capture alternative understandings of participant-produced art? How might an outsider lend a constructive analysis to the art?

Third-party analysis, of course, also has its challenges, especially in relation to aesthetics. On the role of aesthetics in arts-based research, Leavy (2009) wrote:

> The issue of aesthetics is central to the production of arts-based texts as well as our evaluation of them. Although in the best cases art provokes, inspires, captivates, and reveals, certainly not all art can meet these standards. Throw novices into the mix who create art for their scholarly research and even less of what is produced is likely to meet the aesthetic ideals developed in the fine arts. (pp. 16–17)

On the one hand, participants may feel uncomfortable being judged on their work, and it can seem unfair for outsiders to judge pieces created by amateur research participants. In turn, outsiders may not be experienced at responding to art. As Eisner (1985) explained, "the reward and insights provided by aesthetically shaped forms are available only to those who can read them" (p. 25). Those unaccustomed to viewing art may lack the language to review it or may have no interest in doing so. The aesthetics of a drawing produced by a participant can fall anywhere along a subjective scale from aesthetically 'good' to 'bad'. And these judgments can be made by the participant, the researcher, the research group, the community, or a larger population—some or all of whom may differ in opinion. On the other hand, aesthetics is more than simply evaluating 'prettiness'. As Springgay, Irwin, and Kind (2008) discussed, Bourriaud's (2002) concept of relational aesthetics has to do with the viewer and the art both being active, meaning-making subjects within an exhibition space. In this sense, once the artist-participant completes the piece, the art takes on a life of its own and is separate and independent from the artist-participant. Following relational aesthetics, the display of participant-produced art (with or without the presence of the artist or the re-representation of the artist's voice) takes on a central role in the construction of meaning by allowing for multiple interpretations to be evoked and understood from any one piece of art.

However, regardless of these challenges, the aesthetic—the ability of the art to 'do something'—can have lasting consequences and can have an impact on the research. Under most circumstances, a researcher is likely to include an aesthetically pleasing or dramatic image to exemplify various research findings and observations in publications and conference presentations. In Chapter 1, for example, Claudia Mitchell discusses the haunting drawing from Rwanda of the perfectly formed baby in the toilet, an image that she has used in a variety of presentations. Although researchers ask permission to show images again in their publications, how is this understood by participants? Does the girl living in rural

Rwanda who drew the image of the baby at the bottom of the toilet have any real understanding of what it means to have this image projected onto a screen as part of a PowerPoint presentation? What is the researcher's responsibility regarding the incorporation of a discussion of aesthetic consequences into participatory work? On the one hand, participants who produce a drawing that is aesthetically pleasing to members of their community may enjoy praise and admiration from within their community context. This may motivate a participant, who knows that her or his end product will be exhibited to a larger audience, to make compromises in terms of content for the sake of aesthetics. Does this take away the validity of the research? On the other hand, both the participant and the researcher may benefit from an aesthetically pleasing drawing if it is more likely to sway policy makers towards political action that will benefit those involved in the research. Given that aesthetics can have an impact on the research process and outcomes, it cannot be ignored and needs to be more deeply explored. At the least, there should be explicit discussions within research groups of the potential consequences of aesthetics in arts-based research.

Finally, we consider the significance of an emerging conceptual framework to examine the various audiences in participatory analysis approaches, especially in the context of collections (or data sets). By this, we mean the responses of all those who view the art produced during the research process, including community members, policy makers, and, of course, the participants themselves who, in a participatory group, are also audience to co-participants' work as well as to their own work. Here, we consider a number of key questions: How does a consideration of aesthetics inform the 'reach' of the work? Should we be considering what would be entailed in the development of a 'participant aesthetic'? What is the potential of the audience to give a (guided) analysis of art produced during arts-based research? How might documenting the analysis of the audience help inform our understanding of the role of participatory methods on making positive change in participants' lives or in taking action? Will including audience perspectives encourage viewers to engage more in the work and provoke action on their part? These questions, we suggest, might form a foundation for interpreting and translating participant art in ways that more fully mine collections, and as noted at the beginning of this chapter, 'honour' the art work of children, many of whom face difficult circumstances.

CONCLUSION

We began this chapter with Susan Sontag's words on the interpretation process as a process of "translation". Critical to this process is ensuring that participants and politically invested third-party individuals and groups are given space to participate in the translation process. A consideration of the various perspectives in this process suggests the beginnings of a framework within which one might incorporate the idea of participatory analysis into participatory arts-based research. We have highlighted terms such as 'audience' and 'aesthetics' and have considered the possibilities for deeper engagement with the drawings by those who produce

the art in the first place, as well as the various audiences. Indeed, there remains the potential to incorporate a more dynamic and nuanced understanding of how aesthetics and drawings can inform the knowledge production process. Collections should not be static, and perhaps the most critical aspect of this work is to consider how adult researchers can keep the types of archives described here (and the collections and issues they house) alive.

REFERENCES

Avery Architectural & Fine Arts Library. (2004). *Children's drawings of the Spanish Civil War* [Online exhibition]. Retrieved from http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/eresources/exhibitions/children

Brydon-Miller, M., Greenwood, D., & Maguire, P. (2003). Why action research? *Action Research, 1*(1), 9–28. doi:10.1177/14767503030011002.

Cahill, C. (2007). Participatory data analysis. In S. Kindon, R. Pain, & M. Kesby, (Eds.), *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place* (pp. 181–187). London, England: Routledge.

De Lange, N., Mitchell, C., & Park, E. (2008, April). *Working with digital archives: Giving life (to data) to save lives in the age of AIDS.* Oral presentation at the American Education Research Association, New York, NY.

De Lange, N., Mnisi, T., Mitchell, C., & Park, E. G. (2010). Giving life to data: University–community partnerships in addressing HIV and AIDS through building digital archives. *E-Learning and Digital Media, 7*(2), 160–171. doi:10.2304/elea.2010.7.2.160.

Dyson, L. E., & Legget, M. (2006, December). *Towards a metadesign approach for building indigenous multimedia cultural archives.* Proceedings of the 12th ANZSYS conference: Sustaining Our Social and Natural Capital, Katoomba, New South Wales, Australia. Retrieved from http://www-staff.it.uts.edu.au/~laurel/Publications/TowardsAMetadesignApproach.pdf.

Eisner, E. (1985). Aesthetic modes of knowing. In E. Eisner (Ed.), *Learning and teaching: The ways of knowing* (pp. 23–26). Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Eisner, E. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher, 26*(6), 4–10. doi:10.3102/0013189X026006004.

Geist, A. L., & Carroll, P. N. (2002). *They still draw pictures: Children's art in wartime from the Spanish Civil War to Kosovo.* Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Henry, S. (2002). Children as witnesses to history. In R. F. Goodman & A. H. Fahnestock (Eds.), *The day our world changed: Children's art of 9/11* (pp. 18–22). New York, NY: New York University Child Study Centre & Museum of the City of New York.

hooks, b. (1994). In our glory: Photography and black life. In D. Willis (Ed.), *Picturing us: African American identity in photography* (pp. 43–53). New York, NY: The New Press.

Hughes, L. M. (2004). *Digitizing collections: Strategic issues for the information manager.* London, England: Facet.

Huvilo, I. (2008). Participatory archive: Towards decentralised curation, radical user orientation, and broader contextualisation of records management. *Archival Science, 8*(1), 15–36. doi:10.1007/s10502-008-9071-0.

Kincheloe, J. (2009). Critical complexity and Participatory Action Research: Decolonizing "democratic" knowledge production. In D. Kapoor & S. Jordan (Eds.), *Education, Participatory Action Research, and social change: International perspectives* (pp. 107–121). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Knowles, J. G., Luciani, T. C., Cole, A. L., & Neilson, L. (Eds.). (2007). *The art of visual inquiry.* Halifax, NS: Backalong Books.

Leavy, P. (2009). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Lykes, M. B. (2001a). Activist participatory research and the arts with rural Maya women. Interculturality and situated meaning making. In D. L. Tolman & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *From subject to subjectivities: A handbook of interpretive and participatory methods* (pp. 183–199). New York: New York University Press.

Lykes, M. B. (2001b). Creative arts and photography in participatory action research in Guatemala. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 363–371). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maguire, P. (1987). *Doing participatory research: A feminist perspective*. Amherst: Center for International Education, School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

Maguire, P. (2001). Uneven ground: Feminisms and action research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook for action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 59–69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mitchell, C. (2004). Just who do we think we are? Memory work and self-study with beginning teachers. In R. Balfour, T. Buthelezi, & C. Mitchell (Eds.), *Teacher development at the centre of change* (pp. 45–54). Durban, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Mitchell, C. (2009). Geographies of danger: School toilets in sub-Saharan Africa. In O. Gershenson & B. Penner (Eds.), *Ladies and gents: Public toilets and gender* (pp. 62–74). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Mitchell, C., & Kanyangara, P. (2006). *Violence against children and young people in and around schools in Rwanda: Through the eyes of children and young people*. Kigali, Rwanda: National Youth Council and UNICEF.

Mitchell, C., Walsh, S., & Moletsane, R. (2006). Speaking for ourselves: A case for visual arts-based and other participatory methodologies in working with young people to address sexual violence. In F. E. Leach & C. Mitchell (Eds.), *Combating gender violence in and around schools* (pp. 103–112). London, England: Trentham Books.

Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (1999). *Reinventing ourselves as teachers: Beyond nostalgia*. London, England: Falmer Press. doi:10.4324/9780203454497.

Mitchell, C., & Weber, S. (2004). Visual arts-based approaches to self-study. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. L. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices, Volume 1* (pp. 979–1038). Toronto, ON: Kluwer.

Mnisi, T., De Lange, N., & Mitchell, C. (in press). Learning to use visual data to 'save lives' in the age of AIDS. *Communitas*.

Moletsane, R., De Lange, N., Mitchell, C., Stuart, J., Buthelezi, T., & Taylor, M. (2007). Photo-voice as a tool for analysis and activism in response to HIV and AIDS stigmatisation in a rural KwaZulu-Natal school. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Mental Health, 19*(1): 19–28. doi:10.2989/17280580709486632.

Moletsane, R., Mitchell, C., Smith, A., & Chisholm, L. (2008). *Methodologies for mapping a southern African girlhood in the age of Aids*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Park, E. G., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2007). Working with digital archives: Photovoice and meta-analysis in the context of HIV & AIDS. In N. de Lange, C. Mitchell, & J. Stuart (Eds.), *Putting people in the picture: Visual methodologies for social change* (pp. 163–172). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Park, E. G., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2008). Social uses of digitization within the context of HIV/AIDS: Metadata as engagement. *Online Information Review, 32*(6), 716–725. doi:10.1108/14684520810923890.

Pearce-Moses, R. (2005). *A glossary of archival and records terminology*. Chicago, IL: Society of American Archivists.

Rhodes, C. (2000). *Outsider art: Spontaneous alternatives*. London, England: Thames & Hudson.

Schratz, M., & Walker, R. (1995). *Research as social change: New opportunities for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sekula, A. (2003). Reading an archive: Photography between labour and capital. In L. Wells (Ed.), *The photography reader* (pp. 443–452). New York, NY: Routledge.

Shilton K., & Srinivasan, R. (2008). Participatory appraisal and arrangement for multicultural archival collections. *Archivaria, 63*, 87–101. Retrieved from http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria.

Sontag, S. (1966). *Against interpretation and other essays*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Springgay, S., Irwin, R. L., & Kind, S. (2008) A/r/tographers and living inquiry. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Umurungi, J.P., Mitchell, C., Gervais, M., Ubalijoro, E., & Kabarenzi, V. (2008). Photo voice as a methodological tool to address HIV and AIDS and gender violence amongst girls on the street in Rwanda. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 18*(3), 413–420.

Volovková, H. (1993). *I never saw another butterfly: Children's drawings and poems from Terezin Concentration Camp, 1942–1944* (2nd exp. ed.). New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Wang, C. C. (1999). Photovoice: A participatory action research strategy applied to women's health. *Journal of Women's Health, 8*(2), 185–192. doi:10.1089/jwh.1999.8.185.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (1995). '*That's funny, you don't look like a teacher': Interrogating images and identity in popular culture*. London, England: Falmer Press. doi:10.4324/9780203453568.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (1996). Drawing ourselves into teaching: Studying the images that shape and distort teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(3), 303–313. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(95)00040-Q.

World Awareness Children's Museum. (2009). *About the World Awareness Children's Museum*. Retrieved from http://www.worldchildrensmuseum.org/Pages/about.html.