

This article was downloaded by: [Ariana Mangual Figueroa]

On: 28 November 2014, At: 11:34

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tqse20>

Citizenship, beneficence, and informed consent: the ethics of working in mixed-status families

Ariana Mangual Figueroa^a

^a Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Published online: 21 Nov 2014.

To cite this article: Ariana Mangual Figueroa (2014): Citizenship, beneficence, and informed consent: the ethics of working in mixed-status families, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, DOI: [10.1080/09518398.2014.974722](https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.974722)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2014.974722>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Citizenship, beneficence, and informed consent: the ethics of working in mixed-status families

Ariana Mangual Figueroa*

Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

(Received 19 December 2013; accepted 3 September 2014)

This article draws from a 23-month ethnographic study conducted in mixed-status Mexican homes to detail the particular methodological concerns that arise when conducting research within these legally complex and vulnerable families. Specifically, the analysis illustrates when and why undocumented parents in one focal family asked the ethnographer to consider legally adopting their two young sons in an effort to obtain equal rights for both children and to mitigate the risk of family separation during deportation. The ethical issues of beneficence, informed consent, and reciprocity raised by this particular situation open onto larger methodological and ethical questions relevant to qualitative and ethnographic researchers working within immigrant communities.

Keywords: citizenship; beneficence; informed consent; reciprocity; ethnography

Introduction

This article addresses two under-examined aspects of qualitative research in education: first, it focuses on a growing population of mixed-status families living in the United States (US) often invisible in educational scholarship; and second, it takes up the ethical issues raised by conducting research in vulnerable communities. Mixed-status families include some members who are undocumented, some that are US-born citizens, and others who may be in various stages of applying for legal resident status or US citizenship (Fix & Zimmerman, 2001). Family members in mixed-status households face a constant tension between guarding against the detention and deportation of undocumented members, and working to integrate family members into the communities where they live (Gonzales & Chavez, 2012; Zavella, 2011). While there is a growing body of research that explores the educational and social (Gonzales, 2011; Mangual Figueroa, 2011, 2012) as well as health and developmental (O'Leary & Sanchez, 2011; Suárez-Orozco, Yoshikawa, Teranishi, & Suárez-Orozco, 2011; Yoshikawa, 2011) implications of living in a mixed-status family, there is little, if any, scholarship that details the particular methodological concerns that arise when conducting research within these legally complex and vulnerable families. This article hopes to fill that void by analyzing a conversation with parents in one mixed-status family that raises questions about the relationship between citizenship, informed consent, and reciprocity in qualitative research.

*Email: amf@gse.rutgers.edu

The data presented in this article draw from a 23-month ethnographic study of language socialization that I conducted in an emerging Latino community in southwestern Pennsylvania from 2008 to 2010. This study sought to explore the ways in which members of four mixed-status families – in this case, undocumented Mexican-born parents and eldest siblings with younger US-born siblings – were socialized to take on particular roles within domestic and public settings based upon their citizenship status. As a language socialization researcher, I drew upon linguistic anthropological methods to track the ways that identity, group membership, and social status related to ethnicity and nationality were encoded in language and communicated across the lifespan (Schieffelin & Ochs, 2008). In order to document parents' and children's learning about identity, I conducted participant observation in formal and informal educational settings. A central concern in language socialization research is to understand the ways in which macro- and micro-relations of power are expressed in everyday talk (Garrett & Baquedano-López, 2002) by collecting systematic and longitudinal ethnographic recordings of exchanges between individuals (Garrett, 2007). Elsewhere I have analyzed the ways that adults and children make sense of macro-categories like citizenship in everyday micro-interactions (Mangual Figueroa, 2011, 2012); here, I explore the ways that these categories shaped the relationship between the study participants and myself.

Throughout the course of this study, I learned about the ways in which different kinds of documents – immigration papers, school report cards, and money – circulated in the lives of mixed-status families and prompted conversations about citizenship. For example, I learned that the Spanish word for paper – *papel* – signifies much more than the material surface on which one writes. Figuratively speaking, *papeles* refer to state-issued documents ranging from a visa to green card to passport that declare a person is residing in the US legally or is a US citizen. Having or not having *papeles* served as a metonym for having or not having US citizenship status in the homes of the mixed-status families that I met. *Papeles* are a material and symbolic form of social capital that facilitates or inhibits an individual's access to educational, economic, and political participation in the US. The lived experience of having or not having papers does not simply affect individuals but instead shapes the everyday experiences of the entire mixed-status family. The movement of these papers – and the kinds of movement they regulate – make visible important thresholds in the lives of mixed-status families: public and private; school and home; and research participants and researcher. In light of these concerns about documentation, I began to reconsider the significance of one of the key documents produced by researchers and presented to participants at the outset of any qualitative study: the informed consent form.

The relationship between *papeles* and informed consent became especially clear during a conversation that I had with the parents in the Utuado-Alvarez family on my last field visit to their home in the spring of 2010.¹ This focal family included two undocumented parents from Mexico, an undocumented eight-year-old son who had crossed the border from Mexico into the US with his mother, and a four-year-old US-born citizen. I am a US-born citizen of Puerto Rican descent raised in a bilingual household in the northeast US. All four family members were present during this conversation when the parents – Marta and Carlos – asked me to consider adopting their two sons as a way of helping them to prepare for the constant threat of their own deportation. Marta and Carlos hoped that I would agree to initiate an international and domestic adoption process in which I would assume legal custody

of their two children. This arrangement would ensure two key things: that both children would be afforded the rights of US citizens and that they would remain in my care if Marta and Carlos were detained and deported. A key part of the adoption agreement was that Marta and Carlos would raise their two sons but that I would travel with the children to Mexico to be reunited with their parents in the event that they were deported. As I will show, this request was the parents' attempt to obtain a direct and lasting benefit from their participation in my research project. During the early stages of my fieldwork, I could not have anticipated that any study participants would want me to become an adoptive parent; similarly, the Utuado-Alvarez parents only posed this request at the very conclusion of the study, after we had established a sustained and profound relationship throughout the course of this ethnography.

I present my conversation with the Utuado-Alvarez parents during my last field visit to their home, because it provides an opportunity to examine something that we are typically asked to articulate at the outset of our studies – the potential risks and benefits posed to participants – but that we rarely reconsider in conversation with participants throughout the course of our research. Although I had worked closely with Millvalley's mixed-status community for nearly two years, and despite having had to articulate the possible benefits of the study in order to obtain informed participant consent prior to beginning data collection, the Utuado-Alvarez parents taught me that researchers may not always know at the outset how participants believe that a study will directly benefit them. Participants may articulate or expand upon the researcher's understanding of the study's potential benefits at different points throughout the research process, including at the very conclusion of formal fieldwork. Elsewhere I have shown that our methodological focus on gaining access to and entering the field makes us less attuned to the significance of exiting the field and to the important lessons that researchers can learn about reciprocity as they prepare to leave the study site (Katz, 2014; Mangual Figueroa, 2014). Here I explore a related paradox – the need to posit the study's benefits prior to beginning the research project, before establishing the unique relationships with participants that might allow them to articulate how they believe that participation can most benefit them.

This article seeks to contribute to an ongoing conversation in this journal about the power relations that are encoded in researcher–researched relationships and the strategies that both groups use to make themselves less vulnerable during the research process (Huckaby, 2011). By exploring the risks and benefits of engaging in qualitative educational research, I hope that this article will contribute to the project of “humanizing research” by considering whether the impact of our research is commensurate with the generous participation of the individuals who make our studies possible (Paris, 2011). In the next section of this article, I review the extant literature on risks and benefits within educational and anthropological research. I then describe the study in more depth and present an audio-recorded exchange that took place during my last visit to the Utuado-Alvarez home. The article closes with a discussion of the data and its implications for reforming methodological training by reconsidering how and when we articulate the benefits and risks of our research.

Literature review: risks and benefits in qualitative research

In order to conduct qualitative research, US federal law mandates that researchers obtain Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. As part of this approval process,

researchers must articulate the risks and benefits that their studies pose to potential participants. When evaluating applications to conduct research with human subjects, IRB committees tend to focus on whether the study provides direct or indirect benefits to participants and whether these benefits outweigh any potential risks (Pritchard, 2002). These concerns are encapsulated in the concept of *beneficence*, defined as “an obligation on the part of researchers to do no harm, maximize possible benefits, and minimize possible harms” (Hemmings, 2006, p. 13). Once IRB approval is obtained, the researcher must share information about risks and benefits with potential participants; this is an essential part of the informed consent process in which participants are given the opportunity to evaluate what is at stake in joining a study. Recent ethical violations in biomedical research along with changes in federal educational policy have led IRBs to focus their reviews more on the possible risks than on the potential benefits posed by qualitative research (Lincoln & Tierney, 2004). This trend, and scholars’ concerns about the negative impact of the current IRB review process on qualitative research, are a dominant theme in the educational and anthropological literature on ethics.

Qualitative researchers face increasing challenges from educational policy-makers who seek to impose rigid standards for what counts as scientific and valid research. These new standards define scientific educational research as “experiments, meta-analyses, and randomized trials” that contribute new knowledge to the field by making generalizable claims about teaching and learning (Eisenhart & Towne, 2003, p. 31; Lincoln & Tierney, 2004). This definition, encoded in educational policy like the No Child Left Behind Act, ignores the significance of qualitative action research, social justice, and practitioner-based modes of investigation that challenge objectivist and positivist methodologies (Eisenhart & Towne, 2003; Lincoln, 2005, 2010). The focus on using educational research to make broad claims about teaching and learning privileges large-scale and quantitative research on testing and evaluation, and discounts the scholarly contribution of qualitative examinations of the experiences of teachers and students in schools. As a result of these changing standards, IRBs have taken on an “overregulatory function” in using a limited set of criteria for determining what kinds of research should be approved (Lincoln & Tierney, 2004, p. 228). Lincoln and Tierney (2004) argue that qualitative research has the potential to offer direct and indirect benefits to participants, and that IRBs should evaluate qualitative research based upon “which research procedures offer ‘direct benefit’ to research subjects (or their communities) and which offer only to answer the research questions” (Lincoln & Tierney, 2004, p. 229). Different criteria may be needed to evaluate the rigor and ethics of qualitative research that directly benefits participants by improving the conditions of teaching and learning while also providing indirect benefits by generating new knowledge about the focal population.

A series of articles published in *Educational Researcher* between 1993 and 2007 highlight the emergent and dynamic quality of qualitative research and the challenges that researchers face when submitting applications to IRB committees unfamiliar with this methodology. IRB committees are often composed of members familiar with clinical medical research that is hypothesis-driven and dictated by a set of predetermined procedures, whereas qualitative researchers focus on social phenomena contingent upon the local contexts of research. As a result, qualitative researchers may not be able to predict the kinds of challenges and possibilities that emerge in the course of a study (Hemmings, 2006; Howe & Dougherty, 1993). Pritchard (2002) notes that this dilemma is acutely felt by practitioner researchers

who are members of the educational communities that they hope to study, and who “often do not know at the outset what data need to be collected, or what the potential benefits or risks are of the particular line(s) of inquiry they will eventually pursue” (p. 6). In an era of heightened concern about risk, qualitative educational researchers have found that IRB committees apply a one-size-fits-all approach to evaluating their applications instead of assessing the unique and varied approaches to research design and ethics that qualitative research presents (Hemmings, 2006; Pritchard, 2002).

Anthropologists employing ethnographic methods have also dedicated attention to addressing the “practical issues facing anthropologists, not the least of which is the challenge of seeking human subjects approval from our university institutional review boards” (Grinker, 2003, p. 203). In a 2003 special issue of *Anthropological Quarterly*, scholars detailed concerns that IRBs view participant observation as a liability rather than a valid methodological approach. Ethnographic research often poses no more than “minimal risk” to participants, because it does not require them to deviate from the everyday practices that they would normally partake in (Gordon, 2003). However, IRB committees often exaggerate the risks posed by sustained observation and ignore the significance of the methodological premise of establishing relationships with participants by becoming a consistent presence in their lives (Plattner, 2003). It is these close relationships that facilitate the ethnographers’ ability to minimize any discomforts associated with being observed and address risks that emerge during the research process. The IRB’s rigid focus on risk may not only make it difficult to obtain approval to conduct ethnographic research, but it can also impose a formal legal process that inhibits the researcher’s ability to maintain her trusted insider status (Gordon, 2003; Marshall, 2003).

The uniform approach to risk assessment may also obscure IRBs’ ability to be flexible when evaluating qualitative research procedures. Educational researchers and cultural anthropologists share concerns about the standardization of the definition of risk and of the procedures for obtaining informed consent (Plattner, 2003). In order to efficiently assess applications and regulate the ethical conduct required of researchers, IRB committees increasingly require all researchers to pursue the same methods regardless of site (for example, requiring researchers to obtain written signatures on consent forms despite the fact that participants in some research sites may not be literate or feel comfortable signing legal documents) (Metro, 2014). As Marshall (2003) notes, “the legalistic rendering of consent models used by most IRBs fail to recognize the social construction of informed consent as an act of communication ...” (p. 274). The interactional nature of the consent process necessarily means that researchers should attend to the unique social norms of the populations that they are studying and adapt the consent process according to what is most appropriate within that research site. Educational researchers working with young children suggest that a key aspect of ethical research requires a “do-it-yourself and not simply a ready-made, off-the-peg approach” (Alderson & Morrow, 2011, p. 4). The current IRB process can undermine the very objectives that it was created to facilitate – namely, prompting researchers to anticipate and address how their research might benefit participants while minimizing those risks particular to their study population.

Growing concerns about IRB committees’ reviews of qualitative and ethnographic research have led scholars to write extensively on risk, even as they critique IRBs for over-focusing on that aspect of the research process. The scholars reviewed

here provide rich insights into the significance of beneficence and informed consent; yet the examples that they furnish primarily illustrate the challenges of anticipating and addressing risk in qualitative research and the punitive IRB review process that they and others have faced as a result. This article draws our attention to an important counterpart to the researcher's speculation about risk – what participants see as potential benefits to participation – and how attempting to provide those benefits may also pose ethical dilemmas for the researcher. My role as a participant observer in the Utuado-Alvarez parents' lives is precisely what facilitated their ability to articulate how I might directly and materially benefit their family. By the time I learned about the family's hopes that I would help the family by adopting their two sons, the IRB process had concluded and I had no formal body concerned with ethics with whom I could share my dilemma.

Phases of the study: embarking on and engaging in ethnographic fieldwork

Embarking on fieldwork: researcher involvement and participant recruitment

This study took place in an emerging Latino community in Millvalley, Pennsylvania, a post-industrial city in the southwestern part of the state. In order to launch a study including mixed-status families, I knew that I would need to work towards two things at the outset of the research process: gaining a deeper understanding of the local context of reception in which the families lived and establishing trust with families and community members. I began attending services at a local Catholic church that many Latino families attended, and I soon learned that church members – activist nuns, heads of grassroots interfaith organizations, and parishioners – were organizing a campaign for migratory reform in Millvalley. During the time of this study, the federal government developed an initiative known to organizers as the 287(g) program that offered funding to local law enforcement agencies who identified and detained undocumented migrants living in the area. In Millvalley, the vast majority of migrants who were stopped and detained were individuals who had committed routine traffic violations like running a stop sign or driving without a license. The effects of this surveillance and detention on families, and the impact of family separations when parents were deported, were felt locally in Millvalley (see Dreby, 2012; Freed Wessler, 2011 for evidence of the national impact of family separation). Within this context, I began to volunteer as an interpreter during meetings between Latino families and local law enforcement officers, and in grassroots mobilizations to petition for migrants' rights. After six months of engaging in this solidarity work – a form of reciprocity that I hoped would benefit the Latino community from which I would recruit the study's participants and that indicated my inability to assume a position of detached, objective expertise – I had met many mixed-status families and become known as *la traductora* (the translator).²

At this stage, I began to recruit four focal families to participate in my study. I talked with families and church leaders about my interest in documenting the way that citizenship status shaped families' everyday lives. Since my relationships with these community members were formed through solidarity work around immigration reform and rights for undocumented migrants, they were very forthcoming in talking about their own families' mixed status or recommending other families. The mixed-status families in Millvalley, like many in other emerging Latino communities, included parents and eldest children who had migrated to the US as well as younger siblings born in the US (Passel & Cohn, 2009). I recruited families via the snowball

method of talking with one family, and getting recommendations for another, and so on (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003). I met with the four families in their homes to explain the study and review the IRB consent forms. On my first or second visit with each of the families, they signed the forms; all four families spoke openly about their migratory status on my first visit. For example, one mother described the process of accessing health care for her eight-year-old undocumented son at free clinics available to uninsured patients in Millvalley; another family recounted a story about a family friend that was deported for driving without a license and shared their fears that the same fate could befall their adolescent son.

The four focal families included two families in which the eldest undocumented child was enrolled in middle or high school and two families in which the eldest undocumented child was enrolled in elementary school. The Utuado-Alvarez family that is the focus of this article was one of the latter; the parents had two young sons named José and Igor. José, who was born in Mexico and migrated to the US with his mother as a toddler, was an undocumented second grader at the time of the study; his younger, four-year-old brother Igor was born in the US and enrolled in Head Start. Marta, their mother, and José had been in the US for five years at the time of the study; their father, Carlos, had arrived in Millvalley before them. The family lived with another mixed-status family at the time of the study, and they shared the rent and expenses of a two-bedroom apartment in one of two Millvalley neighborhoods with the highest concentration of Latino residents. The Utuado-Alvarez sons were present for all of the afternoon and evening visits that I made to the family and were often active participants in the exchanges that took place about citizenship and family life in Millvalley (Mangual Figueroa, 2011).

Engaging in data collection and analysis

My visits to the focal families were conducted primarily in their homes, but also included participant observation in the public spaces that they frequented. As a participant observer, I documented families' interactions and talk about citizenship via field notes and video recordings, and I also participated in the everyday activities that took place in and around their homes. I saw each of the four families on a weekly basis from January 2010 through June 2010, and I continued to participate as an active member in community-wide grassroots events. In some cases, the focal family members were also involved in those events and we would attend together. I visited each family's home once a week, recording over 45 hours of video recordings of everyday interactions in all four homes. The home visits began around 2:30 pm when I met the children either at school or at home, promptly after they had been dismissed from school. I spent an average of four hours with the families during each visit, often staying up until or through dinnertime at around 6 or 7 pm. At times, parents would ask me to accompany them to parent-teacher conferences or social service offices and the children would ask if I would go with them to the park; I would, with the parents' permission, engage in all of these activities with family members of all ages.

The parents often asked if I would translate for them. I decided that since I had met many of the families as a community interpreter, and since my interest was in family members' talk about citizenship, I would reciprocate their participation in the study by interpreting or translating whenever they asked me to. This granted me access to many interactions that I would not have otherwise seen, including, for example, a mother reinstating her child's participation in a food assistance program,

a family buying a used car and filing their taxes, and a mother conversing with her son's teacher. In addition, I continued serving as an interpreter in grassroots efforts to institute migratory reform in and around Millvalley whenever local activists and organizers invited me to do so. Participants' requests for me to serve as a language broker were key moments throughout the course of the study in which they initiated exchanges that could provide them with direct and immediate benefits.

I quickly learned that these different types of brokering activities – interpreting conversations and translating forms at social service offices or local businesses versus interpreting prepared oral testimonies delivered at public grassroots events – carried very different types of risks. In the case of the former, I had to be extremely cautious about not revealing the parents' and siblings' migratory status because of the grave risk of deportation. I learned how to omit mentions of parental status when furnishing the children's social security numbers at the Health and Human Services office, and how to quickly end the exchange between parents and a used car salesman when he asked to see their driver's license (something undocumented migrants cannot obtain in Pennsylvania). In the public actions organized by local groups for immigration reform, speakers declared their migratory status and counted on being protected as one of many undocumented migrants participating in the unusual act of collective public visibility. This nuanced understanding of the kinds of risks that mixed-status family members took to advocate for their families – and the ways in which I was implicated as a participant observer – was not something that I could have anticipated when I submitted my IRB application prior to the study.

During data analysis I coded field notes, tape logs, and transcripts for patterns in the ways that participants talked about the themes of citizenship, nationality, education, and socialization. The transcript presented in the following section exemplifies the approach I took in data analysis: coding data for emergent themes related to citizenship, working in both Spanish and English, and focusing on the details of interaction by analyzing participants' turns in the conversation. I have presented the bilingual translations side by side for readability and numbered each turn for reference during the analysis. While I often employ conversation analysis transcription methods when presenting data to draw attention to those paralinguistic cues that shape communication, I have chosen not to do so in this article in order to focus on the referential content of the words uttered within a speaker's individual turn. I do, however, preserve the imperfections and grammatical errors that issue forth in naturally occurring speech, especially during a conversation fraught with anxiety and awkwardness like the one presented here. I have rendered the speech the same way in the English translation, preserving errors as they appeared in Spanish because they are significant to understanding the affective dimension of the exchange.

As themes began to emerge during the coding process – specifically regarding when and how the subject of citizenship was discussed – I continued to note what was generalizable or particular to each family. The data presented here did not fit neatly into any pattern. No other family asked me to adopt their children. However, the issues raised here (of family cohesion, deportation, my role within the families, and the possibility of providing direct benefits) were an integral part of my conversations with other focal families. While the Utuado-Alvarez family was the only one to ask me to legally change my role in their family, other families talked with me about the possibility of becoming a godparent or traveling with children to visit family in Mexico. The kinds of direct benefits sought by undocumented parents – ranging from everyday interpretation and translation to life-altering adoption procedures – indicate

the agentic roles that they assumed within the study while creatively enlisting my participation in their daily lives. This particular situation therefore opens onto larger methodological and ethical questions relevant to qualitative and ethnographic researchers working within immigrant communities.

Findings: the ask, or, would I adopt the Utuado-Alvarez sons?

In the data presented below, Marta and Carlos described the daily risks they faced as heads of a mixed-status family and indicated the ways that I could directly benefit them and their sons by becoming an adoptive parent. Prior to this exchange, we had been talking about the presence of Latinos in Millvalley and the changes that they had noticed in the city as a result of the demographic changes taking place. Marta shifted from talking about Latinos in general to asking questions about my family in particular and Carlos asked about whether I intended to have any children of my own (at the time I did not have any). After a few turns of talk, including questions that I posed about the children's school experiences and comments that I made to José and Igor, Carlos explained why he had asked about my intentions to have children. In doing so he began, hesitatingly, to introduce the bid for adoption:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Carlos: <i>Sabes se lo pregunto, que se dice, porque</i> ((long pause)) | Carlos: You know I'm asking you, how do you say, because ((long pause)) |
| Ariana: <i>No, dime.</i> | Ariana: No, tell me. |
| Marta: <i>Está escuchándole "interesante" mira, te digo que está lista.</i> | Marta: She's listening "interesting" look, I'm telling you she's ready. |
| Carlos: <i>tú y tu esposo pudo ir al, al</i> | Carlos: you and your husband could go to, to |

As Carlos struggled to find the specific language to introduce the adoption question, cutting himself off before explicitly stating his request, Marta encouraged him to speak by assuring him that I was attentively listening. She said aloud what she imagined I was thinking in the moment – that the proposal was “interesting” – and she directed Carlos to “look” at me and interpret my expression as a signal that I was ready to hear his request. This attention to my “readiness” is significant given that we had revisited many of the afternoon's themes – citizenship, family, and childrearing – countless times in the two years that we had known each other. Yet on this particular day, Marta assured Carlos that I was ready to be approached about the possibility of adopting their sons.

Marta picked up where Carlos left off, discussing the logistics and explaining that they would pay for everything and that the children would continue living with them. Nine turns later Marta explicitly mentioned the word *adopción* (adoption). Carlos jumped in immediately to explain that only a person with whom they had a great amount of trust could be asked. He said:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <i>En realidad, eso sólo lo puede hacer la persona de confianza, una pareja con confianza, que llegaba, una sea responsable de la ilegalidad de él.</i> | Really, only a trusted person could do that, the trusted couple, that came, one might be responsible for his illegality. |
|---|--|

The mention of trust and illegality in the same sentence underscored the significance of the request, and indicated Marta and Carlos' perception of me as a privileged insider in their home. Yet Carlos' halting speech (a trusted person or couple “that

came” or “might be” willing to take on this responsibility) indicated how difficult it was for him to broach the complicated subject of legal adoption when the details remained so uncertain. I asked if they knew of any US citizens who had agreed to adopt the children of undocumented migrants and they explained that they knew of one Millvalley schoolteacher who had adopted her godchildren, the children of Mexican migrants living in the city. Marta and Carlos took a few minutes to explain the details of that arrangement, and it became clear to me that the example of a teacher was particularly relevant since they knew I had been a teacher and often positioned me as a teacher in relation to their sons. They hoped that I would be able to imagine myself taking on the same adoptive role as the schoolteacher in their example. In Example one, the Utuado-Alvarez parents articulated the first direct benefit that could come from adoption and provided a rationale for asking me to do so.

Example one

Direct benefit: obtaining rights

- | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|--|
| 1 Marta: | <i>Yo quiero que mi hijo sea un ciudadano americano, tenga igual que mi hijo José, Igor</i> | 1 Marta: | I want my son to be an American citizen, to have the same as my son José, Igor |
| 2 Ariana: | Mmhmm | 2 Ariana: | Mmhmm |
| 3 Marta: | <i>tener los derechos, o sea, los mismos obligaciones.</i> | 3 Marta: | to have the same rights, that is, the same responsibilities. |
| 4 Ariana: | <i>Sí</i> | 4 Ariana: | Yes |
| 5 Marta: | <i>Todo igual</i> | 5 Marta: | Everything the same |
| 6 Ariana: | Ahh | 6 Ariana: | Ahh |
| 7 Carlos: | <i>O sea</i> | 7 Carlos: | That is |
| 8 Marta: | <i>Sí</i> | 8 Marta: | Yes |
| 9 Carlos: | <i>O sea</i> | 9 Carlos: | That is |
| 10 Marta: | <i>Quiero que se llama José, lógico.</i> | 10 Marta: | I want him to be named José, obviously. |
| 11 Ariana: | Mmm | 11 Ariana: | Mmm |
| 12 Carlos: | <i>La primer, la primera persona, o una persona casada que sabe nuestros deseos eres tú.</i> | 12 Carlos: | The first, the first person, or a married person who knows what we want is you. |
| 13 Marta: | Mm hmm | 13 Marta: | Mm hmm |
| 14 Carlos: | <i>Si lo platican tú y tu esposo y que dijera que “fíjate que es bueno” y si no lamentarias o “quisieron encontrar una pareja que le adopte. Si no pues “nada más me platican entre ellos” y</i> | 14 Carlos: | If you and your husband talk about it and you might say “look this is good” and if you wouldn’t regret it or “they wanted to find a couple that might adopt him.” If not, well, “they just talk with me about it between them” and |
| 15 Ariana: | <i>Claro</i> | 15 Ariana: | Of course |
| 16 Marta: | <i>Sí porque tienen que ser casados.</i> | 16 Marta: | Yes because they have to be married. |
| 17 Carlos: | <i>Sí, no si no es casados, no lo hacemos.</i> | 17 Carlos: | Yes, no if it’s not married, we won’t do it. |
| 18 Marta: | <i>No lo aceptan.</i> | 18 Marta: | They won’t accept it. |
| 19 Carlos: | <i>Es lógico.</i> | 19 Carlos: | It’s obvious. |

In this portion of the exchange, Marta and Carlos expressed two hopes for José that could be facilitated through adoption: first, that he become an American citizen and

obtain equal rights to those of his younger, US-born brother (turn 1). Second, that José retain his identity despite changing his nationality, as evinced by their desire for him to keep his Spanish name (turn 10). These goals remained present throughout the remainder of the exchange and provide insight into the parents' understanding of American citizenship – that rights and responsibilities were both integral parts of citizenship and civic opportunity (turn 3) and that immigrant children could retain their culture while obtaining US nationality (something which the parents instilled in both children by speaking Spanish and retaining cultural traditions despite living in the US).

In addition to explicitly expressing these goals, the Utuado-Alvarez parents also indicated why they were sharing these desires with me. As they did so, they provided additional clues about why they thought I would be an ideal person to help facilitate these goals. In turn 12, Carlos explained that I was the first person who knew about their intentions and underscored that part of my qualification was that I was married. This, I knew from previous discussions, was important to them as a Catholic family; here, Marta also evoked immigration officials who served as gatekeepers not only at the border but also during this process by potentially accepting or rejecting the adoptive couple's application (turn 18). The trust that they mentioned earlier, my role as a professional which they indexed when mentioning the teacher as a comparable role model, and the fact that I was married were all clues about why they had chosen to ask me – the ethnographer – to adopt their sons. Over the course of the study, I had become a feasible and approachable candidate; Marta and Carlos would not have known these details nor felt this trust at the outset of our relationship.

Example two

Direct benefit: uniting family

The conversation continued as the Utuado-Alvarez parents talked more about the logistics of the adoption process as they understood it: needing to travel to Mexico with José to begin the adoption process internationally, paying 14,000 dollars for the adoption fees, and amassing all of the necessary “*documentación*” (documentation, which here could mean adoption papers and/or citizenship papers). Marta's phone rang but she did not pick it up even though she often did during our visits, underscoring the particular attention and seriousness that she thought this conversation warranted. I used the momentary silence while Marta turned off her phone to express compassion and understanding about wanting José to be equal to his brother (indicated where the transcript resumes in turn 23). Marta then began to describe the second direct benefit that would come from an adoption:

- | | | | |
|------------|--|------------|--|
| 23 Ariana: | <i>Pero yo entiendo ese deseo, uh, lo de, que ustedes tienen de que él sea igual</i> | 23 Ariana: | But I understand that desire, uh, that of, that you have for him to be the same |
| 24 Marta: | <i>Sí</i> | 24 Marta: | Yes |
| 25 Ariana: | <i>a</i> | 25 Ariana: | to |
| 26 Marta: | <i>Y sea que con esa confianza algún día que nosotros nos salgamos, me los llevo Ariana. No los voy a dejar aquí</i> | 26 Marta: | And so it would be with that trust that one day if we were to leave, I'd take them Ariana. I'm not going to leave them here. |
| 27 Carlos: | <i>Sí porque él que</i> | 27 Carlos: | Yes because he who |
| 28 Ariana: | <i>Yo me acuerdo que ustedes</i> | 28 Ariana: | I remember that you |

- 29 Marta: *Aunque él sea adoptado por un Americano o de algún amigo como, o sea, la final es ahorrar dinero y decir "este dinero va a ser por cualquier cosa pasa." Porque su padre y yo en realidad no tenemos estatus inmigratorio. Nos llevamos acá. "Tienes ese dinero para que me lleves mi hijo a un lugar donde yo podría indicar"*
- 29 Marta: Even if he were to be adopted by an American or some friend like, that is, the goal is to save money and say "this money will be for whatever might happen." Because his father and I really don't have migratory status. We make do here. "You have that money so you can take my son to a place that I could specify"
- 30 Carlos: *Ariana pero además*
- 30 Carlos: Ariana, but also
- 31 Ariana: *Sí*
- 31 Ariana: Yes
- 32 Carlos: *ya si lograron a ser esa pareja que nos hace este favor, Ariana, pudiera ir a visitar a su abuelita.*
- 32 Carlos: now if you were to become that couple that would do us this favor, Ariana, he could go visit his grandmother.
- 33 Ariana: *Es cierto.*
- 33 Ariana: That's true.
- 34 Carlos: *Los dos.*
- 34 Carlos: Both of them.
- 35 Marta: *Los dos.*
- 35 Marta: Both of them.
- 36 Ariana: *Yah*
- 36 Ariana: Yah
- 37 Marta: *A acompañarse*
- 37 Marta: To go together
- 38 Carlos: *No lo podían irse porque Igor tiene papel a ir por avión, y el otro se va*
- 38 Carlos: They couldn't to go because Igor has papers to go by plane, and the other one goes
- 39 Marta: *Y el otro se va a caminar y cuando regrese porque por avión se pueden ir los dos*
- 39 Marta: And the other one will walk and when he returns because they could both go by plane

Marta and Carlos explained that the second direct benefit of adoption would be to allow the family to stay united. However, staying united would first entail facilitating their separation by taking José back to Mexico and beginning the international adoption process. In turns 26 through 29, the Utuado-Alvarez parents detailed how having an adoptive parent would allow them to reunite with their sons in the event of deportation. Marta first declared that she did not intend to leave her children in the US if she was deported (turn 26). However, in order to secure her ability to reconnect with her children in that circumstance, she needed to change the composition of her family by legally giving custody of her children to an adoptive parent. Although I had mostly listened throughout the exchange, in turn 28, I tried to make connections between this conversation and previous exchanges I had had with Marta and Carlos. As an ethnographer, I wanted to bring an analytic perspective to this exchange by connecting this conversation to others that we had had earlier in the study regarding the parents' plans for their children's care in the event of deportation. Marta quickly interrupted me and continued to explain the exigency of finding this adoptive parent. She explained that the goal of the adoption was that the new guardians would be responsible for using money that she and Carlos saved to travel with José and Igor to Mexico so that they could be reunited. Marta did not want her children to be placed in the foster care system if she was deported; at the time of the study, this was a topic of concern for parents of mixed-status families living in Millvalley (Mangual Figueroa, 2014).

Even when the family was not in a state of crisis prompted by detention and deportation (although they were constantly living with the fear and uncertainty that attended these possibilities), Marta and Carlos hoped that adoption by an American

citizen adult would allow José and Igor to reunite with their family in Mexico. Carlos introduced this additional benefit in turns 30 and 32, noting that the boys would be able to visit their grandmother if my husband and I were to adopt the boys. Both Marta and Carlos reiterated that this would be true for *both* boys (turns 34 and 35), underscoring the importance of equality that they discussed earlier. Carlos began to describe how differences in José and Igor's status impacted their ability to travel (turn 38), and Marta explained that José would have to return to Mexico first without legal permission and then as a US citizen. She exemplified this distinction by using travel as a metaphor for lacking or having papers – first José would return to Mexico walking (the way that she brought him to the US when they crossed the border without legal permission) but after the adoption he would be able to travel via plane with a US passport like Igor.

The Utuado-Alvarez parents believed that adoption could help to alleviate the daily risk of family separation due to deportation, equalize opportunities for both brothers, and facilitate travel across borders. Throughout the exchange, they used rhetorical strategies to position me as an ideal candidate for adopting their sons and to frame the adoption as feasible and probable. For example, they addressed me using formal and informal speech – vacillating between the formal *usted* and informal *tú* second-person singular pronouns – underscoring the dual nature of our relationship in which I could be a supposedly objective, distant researcher at one moment and a family confidant in the next. While they could have used the conditional verb tense *would* and the unspecified subject *one* to convey the hypothetical nature of the adoption, Marta and Carlos instead addressed me in the first person and inserted my name when describing the future steps they would take in the process (“I will leave you the money, Ariana,” in turn 29). They also modeled the language that they hoped I would use to underscore the positive and privileged nature of the request when speaking to my husband (“Look, this is good”; “they just told me about it” in turn 14). In this way, Marta and Carlos created a space in the present conversation where they imagined a future adoptive arrangement between their family and mine.

I report on the remainder of the exchange elsewhere, detailing the communicative resources that the Utuado-Alvarez parents employed when articulating why adoption would have been an ideal and obtainable arrangement for us (Mangual Figueroa, 2014). I will note here that while I did not ultimately agree to adopt the children, and while the parents never mentioned it again during my visits to their home after the study ended, I have continued to reflect upon this exchange as I have written about them, their family, and the findings of this research. Throughout this ethnographic study, Marta and Carlos were extremely concerned with mitigating any risk associated with being undocumented; however, they did not explicitly ask me to help them to find a legal solution to the problems associated with their mixed status until the very end of my fieldwork. I was unprepared to address this request in part because our methodological considerations of issues of beneficence – as a result of legal processes such as IRB reviews and the requirements for obtaining informed consent – generally take place prior to conducting fieldwork. There is no doubt that it is important to consider the risks and benefits that our research poses to participants and to obtain informed consent from potential participants before beginning our research. However, I have found that by frontloading our conversations about ethics, we rarely acknowledge or incorporate insights that we gain about reciprocity throughout our studies into the research process itself.

Discussion: humanity and vulnerability in qualitative research

This article attempts to contribute to a broader conversation about the methodological challenges of anticipating and addressing issues of beneficence in qualitative research by focusing on the ethical significance of participants' requests that researchers provide them with direct and lasting benefits. While qualitative researchers have good reason to be concerned about risk – including our moral responsibility to not bring harm to participants and the challenges we face when our work is reviewed by IRB committees that exaggerate the risks posed in qualitative studies – this focus actually places researchers in a temporal, procedural, and ethical bind that makes it more difficult to plan for ethical fieldwork. Temporally, the need to articulate risks and benefits prior to beginning the study and getting to know participants means that this exercise is largely speculative and not particular to the needs of the study population. Procedurally, while IRB applications are meant to facilitate thoughtful discussion and consideration of research ethics, researchers often feel compelled to generate language that they know the IRB wants to hear in order to avoid lengthy revisions that can delay the start of the research. Ethically, a focus on articulating and mitigating risks might make researchers less attentive to the challenges of providing useful benefits to their participants. By focusing our attention on benefits, I hope to illustrate how ethical challenges related to providing benefits must be considered as thoughtfully as those related to risk management. Since one of the great possibilities of educational research is that it can provide direct benefits to participants, it is important that we take participants' requests seriously, even if they cannot be fulfilled.

As this article has shown, participants may be in the best position to articulate and propose direct benefits to the researcher once the study is well under way and relationships of trust have been established. Yet existing protocols like the IRB review process are not designed to take into account or prepare researchers for the emergence of issues of risk and reciprocity across the ethnographic study. In this case, the Utuado-Alvarez parents' bid for adoption – a legal arrangement that would have had long-term and material benefits for the entire family – was presented on the last day of my formal fieldwork. In some ways, the Utuado-Alvarez parents were providing me with information to be able to make an informed decision about adoption, emulating a similar interactional experience to the IRB consent process that I had initiated at the start of the study. Just as I had done, they outlined the stakes of this arrangement in lay language and asked me to consider participating in this important milestone. And in much the same way as the IRB consent process establishes a particular set of roles (the researcher asks for consent and the participants provide it by signing the forms), this conversation attempted to reestablish our roles and the terms of our relationship (from ethnographer to adoptive parent and from participant to empowered parent).

While the focal conversation presented in this article represents the case of one set of parents who attempted to enlist me in providing a binding set of direct benefits by requesting that I transition from my role as researcher to adoptive parent, I have also described instances in which participants made bids for beneficence in more mundane and casual ways. This continuum of requests ranged from routine interpretation and translation activities that took place in the home (such as reading notices and letters received in English and answering telephone calls from English speakers) to brokering events that required more planning and preparation (such as

arranging to interpret an exchange at a car dealership, public school, or social service office). These moments provide two important insights into the study participants: first, that they most desired help gaining access to goods and services in the domains of education, health, and transportation; and second, that they found creative ways to redefine the terms of our relationship so that they were not only research subjects but also active agents enlisting me in advocating for their everyday needs. The families' ability to access basic necessities – having sufficient and nutritious food to eat, traveling to and from paid work, and progressing through the educational system – depended upon exchanges that took place in public institutions, and parents saw me and my research as an opportunity to obtain these minimal requirements for a decent quality of life.

The analysis of this exchange gives us insight into the complexity of the research process as well as the Utuado-Alvarez family's understanding of the focal unit of analysis in the study, in this case *citizenship*. As a result, it allows us to make the research process a finding in and of itself, a necessary step in humanizing the experiences of the researcher and of those researched (Paris, 2011). Through sustained participant observation and everyday translation, I built the "relationships of dignity and care" (Paris, 2011, p. 140) that made the Utuado-Alvarez parents' adoption request possible, but I then confronted the limits of how I could reciprocate the family's generous participation in the study. Like Paris, "I continually question whether it was worth it for them, whether those months of humanization between us influenced their lives in important enough ways" (2011, p. 147). As he suggests, raising the question of whether the direct benefits we offer participants are commensurate with what the participants have given us is an opportunity for critical reflection that can inform future research and relationship-building with historically marginalized and vulnerable research populations. This reflection should be an important part of how we write about our study – pointing not only to the challenges, oppressions, and forms of strength evidenced by our participants, but also exposing our own challenges in fulfilling the possibilities of ethnographic research. As we chronicle the messy realities of our participants' everyday lives, it is also important that we air the less polished moments of our own methodological trajectory, thereby expanding the criteria of what is permissible in academic reports of our research (Guishard, 2009).

By writing about the research process in reflective ways, we objectify ourselves and our experiences in much the same way that we do our participants. Huckaby (2011) reminds us that, "attention to concurrent relations of vulnerability and power is an important theoretical move with numerous practical considerations" (p. 177). There are consequences for both the participants and researcher when entering into a research relationship and I have shown how the participants tried to mitigate their risks by harnessing my social capital as an ethnographer. In this case, the Utuado-Alvarez parents' request for adoption was both an acknowledgment of the structural challenges that they faced as a mixed-status family as well as an example of the creative and resourceful ways in which they worked to advocate for themselves and their children. I highlight this duality in an attempt to shift away from deficit views of migrant families and toward a perspective that demonstrates their resilience and strength. At the same time, by outlining the challenges that I faced as an ethnographer in this context, I draw our attention to the subjective process of conducting research, replete with imperfections and challenges, in order to contest the idealized notion of the objective, flawless expert researcher.

The process of writing about those moments in the research process that posed particular challenges has helped me to identify the aspects of our ethical training and practice that warrant redress, recommendations that I will specify in the following section. In this sense, I heed Behar's cautionary note by making my vulnerability worthwhile for the academic and her community by using it as a means to further more ethical ends. As she warns:

Vulnerability doesn't mean that anything personal goes. The exposure of the self who is also a spectator has to take us somewhere we couldn't otherwise get to. It has to be essential to the argument, not a decorative flourish, not exposure for its own sake. (Behar, 1996, p. 14)

The process of sharing vulnerability brings with it the responsibility of making change. As Marta explained, being a citizen entails a set of responsibilities as well (turn 3). So how can ethnographers be engaged and critical members of their research sites and academic communities? What can be done to ensure that future ethnographers continue to grapple with these issues in productive ways that honor their responsibilities to their participants, while being honest about the limitations of the direct benefits that they can provide?

Conclusion: next steps

I advocate a three-pronged approach to changing the conversation about beneficence and informed consent in qualitative research. This approach includes the concurrent activities of: reflecting upon critical junctures in the research process, institutionalizing change in the ethics review process, and participating in disciplinary conversations about ethics. Each of these activities aligns with the temporal, procedural, and ethical bind that I described in the previous section and I will briefly review each area in turn.

It is important that we acknowledge the ways in which a frontloaded bureaucratic IRB review process runs the risk of forcing qualitative researchers to focus on avoiding liability over preparing for contingency. Existing IRB procedures put pressure on us to anticipate and resolve issues of risk, often overlooking key questions regarding beneficence, before we have established trusting relationships with those who consent to participate in our study. Yet it is not until our studies are underway that we face critical ethical decisions unique to qualitative researchers and that we learn about the ways in which we can provide direct benefits to study participants. As Metro (2014) puts it, "what makes my behavior ethical is not the extent to which I follow a predetermined code of action but instead how I respond in the moment to the unpredictable words and actions of others" (178). Scholars in education and anthropology have called for researchers to serve on university IRB committees and to educate existing IRB members on the specific characteristics of qualitative methodology in order to promote more favorable reviews of those studies (Gordon, 2003; Hemmings, 2006; Lincoln & Tierney, 2004; Marshall, 2003). In addition to working within the existing IRB process, I advocate addressing beneficence through something other than an initial set of protocols. In order to refocus our attention on beneficence (in addition to risk), we should develop a review process that treats beneficence as an emergent set of practices and possibilities that demand reconsideration throughout the course of our study.

In addition to obtaining official IRB approval to conduct research, qualitative researchers should consider developing a set of ethical procedures that are specific to their research site and that shift away from a framework of protecting participants from research toward a model of engaging participants in the research process. One way of making this shift would be to explicitly ask participants why they are participating in the study and what they hope to gain from participation. This requires a belief in the agency of participants to articulate their own goals and needs, and would likely require follow-up conversations throughout the course of the study. In order to ensure that conversations about ethics take place over time, researchers can consider constituting their own review committees – not in lieu of existing IRB requirements, but in addition to and independent of them – composed of mentors, peers, and participants. The researcher could share data with this committee at key points throughout the study, not just at the beginning. In a way, this could constitute a multifaceted member check that would bring a particular ethical lens to reviewing the researcher's work. This could be especially useful for graduate students who cannot serve on their local IRBs, but it could also become integral to the work of researchers who often have to create an advisory board when applying for research funding. This process could incite positive and productive dialogue among diverse stakeholders. In this way, we could change ethics review committees from simply serving a gatekeeping function to serving as a sounding board for genuine concerns that emerge throughout the course of our research.

Finally, we should continue to participate in the conversations taking place in our fields as professional organizations revise their existing codes of ethics and make public proclamations about scientific rigor and individual rights within social science research. The American Educational Research Association recently approved a revised code of ethics in 2011 that mentions two ways in which *benefit* is important in our research. First, it states that the researcher should disclose any potential conflicts of interest when using research to make institutional changes that she may benefit from; and second, that benefits should be mentioned during the informed consent process at the outset of the study. The notion of beneficence that I have explored here is largely absent from the code, except in a brief mention of the importance of applying our research findings for the public good. More recently, the National Research Council (2014) proposed a set of revisions to the Common Rule – the set of federal guidelines established in 1991 for the protection of human subjects. On the one hand, the report might alleviate researchers' concerns about rigid protocols for obtaining informed consent by proposing that they develop procedures appropriate for the local practices of the communities they intend to study. On the other hand, the document may generate new concerns about proposed research categories that would be excused from IRB review altogether by declaring certain kinds of data public domain and exempt from informed consent procedures. We should engage in conversations about what constitutes the public good and what types of data should be considered public domain, what it means to work in vulnerable communities, and what role existing research methods may have in perpetuating or transforming existing social inequalities.

Qualitative researchers have a critical role to play in shaping policy and practice in the social sciences. Sharing ideas with colleagues serving on committees developing codes of ethics and weighing in during periods of public comment can be opportunities for us to register our concerns and to advocate for our methodologies and our communities. Instead of bracketing the ethical and procedural challenges that we

face during the research process, we should foreground them in the exchanges that take place in our classrooms and in our publications. Such conversations should inform our broader research questions, methodological frameworks, and study protocols. In this case, the examination of the adoption request helped me to gain deeper insight into the significance of citizenship for mixed-status families and the potential for ethnographers to work in solidarity with such families. It is my hope that this reflective methodological approach will also deepen the rigor and relevance of our qualitative research.

Acknowledgements

As ever, I am humbled by the generosity of the families who participated in this study and I am indebted to them for the lessons that I learned during our everyday encounters. Django Paris and Maisha Winn first provided me with the opportunity to explore these methodological concerns in a chapter published in their 2014 edited volume *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities*. Members of the 2011–2012 Institute for Research on Women Seminar at Rutgers University provided invaluable feedback on earlier drafts of this article. I am grateful to Jen Hofer, founding member of Antena, for her close reading and valuable commentary regarding the transcripts presented here. The insightful suggestions made by the reviewers and editors of this journal have strengthened this manuscript; I thank them for their careful attention.

Notes

1. All proper nouns used to describe the study location and participants are pseudonyms.
2. While the families referred to me colloquially as *translator*, many language justice activists note an important distinction between acts of interpretation and translation. An interpreter facilitates communication through spoken language, while a translator does so through written language. The distinction is significant because of the different skill sets, audiences, and purposes involved in each activity (Antena, 2014). Throughout this article, I use the families' term – translation – when noting their requests for my help. I differentiate between my role as an interpreter or translator when I describe those interactions in which I served as one or both. I use the term translation to explain my analysis of the audio data transcribed into Spanish and English.

Notes on contributor

Ariana Mangual Figueroa is an assistant professor in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University. Her recent ethnographic study examines how learning and language use are shaped by immigration and educational policies. Her work has been published in *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* and the *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education*.

References

- Alderson, P., & Morrow, V. (2011). *The ethics of research with children and young people: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- American Educational Research Association. (2011). Code of ethics. *Educational Researcher*, 40, 145–156.
- Antena (Hofer, J., & J. Pluecker). 2014. *How to build language justice*. Antena Books/Libros Antena. Retrieved from <http://antenaantena.org/homemade-books/>
- Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Dreby, J. (2012). *How today's immigration enforcement policies impact children, families, and communities: A view from the ground*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Eisenhart, M., & Towne, L. (2003). Contestation and change in national policy on “scientifically based” educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(7), 31–38.
- Fix, M., & Zimmerman, W. (2001). All under one roof: Mixed-status families in an era of reform. *International Migration Review*, 35, 397–419.
- Freed Wessler, S. (2011). *Shattered families: The perilous intersection of immigration enforcement and the child welfare system*. New York, NY: Applied Research Center.
- Garrett, P. (2007). Researching language socialization. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.), *Language socialization* (Vol. 10, pp. 189–202). New York, NY: Springer/Kluwer Academic.
- Garrett, P., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 339–361.
- Gonzales, R. (2011). Learning to be illegal: Undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 76, 602–619.
- Gonzales, R. G., & Chavez, L. R. (2012). “Awakening to a nightmare”: Abjectivity and illegality in the lives of undocumented 1.5 generation Latino immigrants in the United States. *Current Anthropology*, 53, 255–280.
- Gordon, E. J. (2003). Trials and tribulations of navigating IRBs: Anthropological and biomedical perspectives of “risk” in conducting human subjects research. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, 299–320.
- Grinker, R. R. (2003). From the editor. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, 203–204.
- Guishard, M. (2009). The false paths, the endless labors, the turns now this way and now that: Participatory action research, mutual vulnerability, and the politics of inquiry. *Urban Review*, 41, 85–105.
- Hemmings, A. (2006). Great ethical divides: Bridging the gap between institutional review boards and researchers. *Educational Researcher*, 35(4), 12–18.
- Howe, K. R., & Dougherty, K. C. (1993). Ethics, institutional review boards, and the changing face of educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(9), 16–21.
- Huckaby, M. F. (2011). Researcher/researched: Relations of vulnerability/relations of power. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24, 165–183.
- Katz, V. (2014). *Kids in the middle: How children of immigrants negotiate community interactions for their families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Institutional review boards and methodological conservatism: The challenge to and from methodological paradigms. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 165–181). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (2010). “What a long, strange trip it’s been...”: Twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 3–9.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Tierney, W. G. (2004). Qualitative research and institutional review boards. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10, 219–234.
- Mangual Figueroa, A. (2011). Citizenship and education in the homework completion routine. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 4, 263–280.
- Mangual Figueroa, A. (2012). “I have papers so I can go anywhere!”: Everyday talk about citizenship in a mixed-status Mexican family. *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education*, 11, 291–311.
- Mangual Figueroa, A. (2014). La carta de reponsabilidad: The problem of departure. In D. Paris & M. T. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 129–146). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, P. (2003). Human subjects protection, institutional review boards, and cultural anthropological research. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, 269–285.
- Metro, R. (2014). From the form to the face to face: IRBs, ethnographic researchers, and human subjects translate consent. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 45, 167–184.
- National Research Council. (2014). *Proposed revisions to the common rule for the protection of human subjects in the behavioral and social sciences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

- O'Leary, A. O., & Sanchez, A. (2011). Anti-immigrant Arizona: Ripple effects and mixed immigration status households under "policies of attrition" considered. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 26, 115–133.
- Paris, D. (2011). "A friend who understand fully": Notes on humanizing research in a multi-ethnic youth community. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24, 137–149.
- Passel, J. S., & Cohn, D. (2009). *A portrait of unauthorized immigrants in the United States*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Plattner, S. (2003). Human subjects protection and cultural anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, 287–297.
- Pritchard, I. A. (2002). Travelers and trolls: Practitioner research and institutional review boards. *Educational Researcher*, 31(3), 2–13.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77–108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In P. Duff & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 8, pp. 1–13). New York, NY: Springer.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., Yoshikawa, H., Teranishi, R. T., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2011). Growing up in the shadows: The developmental implications of unauthorized status. *Harvard Educational Review*, 81, 438–472.
- Yoshikawa, H. (2011). *Immigrants raising citizens: Undocumented parents and their children*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Zavella, P. (2011). *I'm neither here nor there: Mexicans' quotidian struggles with migration and poverty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.