

Critical Performativity in the Field: Methodological principles for Activist Ethnographers

Abstract

It has been proposed that engagement with activism might make critical organizational scholarship more relevant to practitioners. However, there is a lack of systematic inquiry into how such engagement might be undertaken, which this paper redresses. We propose activist ethnography as a suitable methodological framework for critical organizational scholarship, drawing on organizational ethnography, militant ethnography, and participatory action research, to construct a theoretical framework which we use to analyse four ethnographic vignettes of our own experiences of research with activists. Our contribution is to 1) assess the methodological challenges and opportunities of engagement with activism, 2) give an account of our own experiences as activist ethnographers for others to learn from, 3) propose strategies whereby the challenges of academic activism might be negotiated, and the opportunities maximized.

Introduction

The concept of critical performativity, has been proposed to critical organization scholars as a way of forging positive, affirmative, engagement *with* practice (Spicer, Alvesson, & Kärreman, 2009). It has been suggested that critical academics should work outside of the corporate world with groups that include “activists” (Willmott, 2008), trade unions and women’s groups (Fournier & Grey, 2000), or variously defined “marginalised” groups (Adler, 2002; Adler, Forbes, & Willmott, 2007), including sweatshop workers (Boje, 1998), and students (Grey, 2007). Fleming and Banerjee have similarly called for critical scholars to work more closely with “social and environmental activists, the unemployed and precarious workforce” (Fleming & Banerjee, 2016, p. 270) and the network of alter-globalization movements. Through such engagements, critical scholars are encouraged not only to understand practice, but importantly, to work towards changing it. This can be through the transformative redefinition of dominant discourses (Alvesson & Spicer, 2012), raising the consciousness of practitioners (Wickert & Schaefer, 2015) or offering practical guidelines for organizations (King & Learmonth, 2015).

Through such calls, critical performativity promotes organizational scholarship as a form of academic activism, seeing engaged research as a route to transformative change (Kieser & Leiner, 2012). Yet, despite these aspirations, there are few examples of systematic inquiries into how such engagement might be carried out (see King, 2015). Questions therefore remain concerning the theoretical and practical issues that might be faced by those wishing to take critical organizational scholarship into the field. Our primary contribution, therefore, is to provide methodological principles for the nascent critically performative researcher. We do this in two ways: firstly, we evaluate other methodological traditions that have sought to bring about positive change through the research process, namely organizational ethnography (OE), militant ethnography (ME), and participatory action research (PAR). We synthesise these approaches into a new theoretical framework for an activist ethnographic methodology. Our proposal is that a fruitful activist ethnographic methodology may be constructed from a synthesis of the procedural virtues of OE, the activism of militant ethnography and the democratic learning of PAR. Whilst the term activist ethnography is not new (see Bisailon, 2012; Craven & Davis, 2013; Emihovich, 2005 for examples, as well as our discussion below), we offer a more systematic set of principles for undertaking such a methodology.

Secondly, we contribute to a distinctive “activist ethnography” by reflecting on our own engagement with activist organizations, presenting our experiences for the guidance of others. Using four vignettes to illustrate different methodological issues, we explore the personal, ethical, and practical dilemmas that arise from attempts to combine the roles of critical organizational researcher *and* activist and suggest practical strategies for working through these issues, which we summarise in table 2 and its accompanying discussion. We conclude that procedural virtues, derived from organizational ethnography, provide the critical organizational researcher with a way of negotiating the very real difficulties and contradictions of activist ethnography in the field. Furthermore, we argue that activist ethnography promises to realisation of the “radical reciprocity” called for by Ellis (2007, p. 7) between researcher and researched but rarely achieved in other approaches.

The paper proceeds as follows: we begin by evaluating the aspirations for engagement of critical performativity, placing it in the wider context of academic activism, including activist ethnography. We derive several “procedural virtues” from organizational ethnography, which we contrast and combine with elements of what we term “militant ethnography” and participatory action research. We go on to analyse our own experiences of engagement as activist ethnographers, reflecting upon the possibilities afforded by the different approaches reviewed. We then combine theory and reflection to provide suggestions for others wishing to extend critical performativity from theory to practice. Finally, we evaluate the potential of our methodology for future work.

Critical Performativity and Academic Activism

The argument for moving from negative critique, removed from practice, to a positive, affirmative, engagement, to bring about change (Spicer et al., 2009), rests on a perception that critical scholarship is disengaged from the world. Critical scholars, it is said, “fiddled with footnotes” whilst the “global economy crumbled” (Spicer, Alvesson, & Kärreman, 2016, p. 243). Critical performativity proposes an interventionist approach, where critical theory is used to transform organizational practice. The natural partners for such an enterprise are argued to be those movements and groups who themselves aim to bring about positive social change (Fleming & Banerjee, 2016). Despite the novel coinage of “critical performativity”, this is not a new idea and these aspirations are shared with a broader tradition of academic activism, usefully defined by Flood, Martin, and Dreher (2013, p.17) as encompassing four elements: “[1]a means to produce knowledge to inform progressive social change...; [2] a

means of conducting research which itself involves social change...; [3] a site for progressive strategies of teaching and learning” and [4] seeking to change the institution of the academy itself. Khasnabish and Haiven (2015) define academic activism similarly, arguing that academics should use their privileged position and occupational autonomy for the benefit of activist groups. In common with critical performativity, there is much invocation of the academic activist as public intellectual using their social capital to influence change at the level of public discourse (Cooper & Coulson, 2014; Hawthorne-Steele, Moreland, & Rooney, 2015). Others suggest advocacy and help with the authorities for socially disadvantaged or marginalised participants (Checker, Davis, & Schuller, 2014) or using one’s role as educator to bring about changes in consciousness within one’s students (Coté, Day, & de Peuter, 2007; Eschle & Manguashca, 2006). What all these various conceptions of academic activism have in common is the desire that scholarship might be more than an abstracted intellectual exercise.

Academic activism looks mostly to either ethnography (Coleman, 2015; Hussey, 2012) or participatory action research (Chatterton, Hodkinson, & Pickerill, 2010) as providing an appropriate methodological framework for close engagement with participants (see also Barros, 2010; and King, 2015, for examples specific to organizational research). For example, Emihovich (2005) used ethnography in her consciousness-raising work with activist groups. Hussey (2012) sees activist ethnography as producing useful knowledge for activists whilst contributing to academic knowledge. Coleman proposes activist ethnography as a “third space” between academia and activism that enables “solidarity work” with activists (2015, p. 265). A highly interventionist form of ethnographic activism that privileges the activist role over the researcher role has been termed “militant ethnography” by Juris (2007). It is paralleled by Scheper-Hughes’ (1995) “militant anthropology” and Lyon-Callo and Hyatt’s (2003) “ethnography from below”. Militant ethnography requires that “researchers have to become active participants” in social movements and help with “actions and workshops, facilitating meetings, weighing-in during strategic and tactical debates, staking out political positions, and putting one’s body on the line during mass direct actions” (Juris, 2007, p. 165).

Critical performativity shares the aim of academic activism to transform practice (Wickert & Schaefer, 2015), particularly through the role of “public intellectual” (Bourdieu, 1998), placing academic expertise at the disposal of social movements (Spicer et al., 2009). However, there is little guidance concerning appropriate methods for the putative critical

organizational scholar. For instance, in their “illustrative case”, Alvesson and Spicer (2012) apply critical performativity to a fictional example that provides little practical guidance on the issues likely to face researchers dealing with the real world. In table 1 below, by contrast, we identify a wide range of methodological issues and principles from our reading of the wider literature on academic activism and organizational ethnography. We highlight as significant research aims, researcher identity, research-participant relations, representation, power relations and ethics, and methodological tactics. In our next section, we consider the contribution of organizational ethnography to these methodological principles, identifying procedural virtues that we argue are essential to realise the aspirations of critical performativity.

Organizational Ethnography and Procedural Virtue

Organizational ethnography is characterised by ethically-oriented methodological principles derived from its anthropological antecedents that, we argue, are indispensable for the activist ethnographer. We term these principles “procedural virtues” (PVs). We believe that the term is of our own making but we are aware of Fine’s (1993) sceptical use of the ethnographer’s “classic virtues”. We use procedural virtue to denote ethico-political principles that we argue are widely found within organizational ethnography but that tend to be restricted to how ethnographic texts are produced. These principles have emerged in response to various critiques of anthropology from post-colonial, feminist and other radical perspectives. These critiques begin with the posthumous publication of Malinowski’s diaries challenging the status of the author as a dispassionate observer (1967) and other positivistic assumptions (Okely, 1992), including a realist understanding of text (Foley, 2002), and the assumed neutrality of ethnographic research (Bourgois, 2003). These have framed debates ever since (Denzin, 1997; Fortune & Mair, 2011). Clifford and Marcus’ influential “Writing Culture” (1986) outlined the key features of these critiques including the potentially regulative function of ethnography, and the elitism of ethnographers. In response, organizational ethnography has taken a critically reflexive turn that is the foundational procedural virtue (see Collinson, 2003; Cunliffe & Alcadipani, 2016; Wray-Bliss, 2002, 2004). Critical reflexivity might be summarised as an acute sensitivity to, and continual reflection on, the methodological issues we identify in table 1 and their effects on texts, the researcher, and participants.

Reflexivity combines with an emancipatory intent in much ethnographic work, often expressed as a desire to give a voice to the marginalised (Rodriguez, 2003) and a commitment to the representation of everyday life (Kondo, 1990). Van Maanen (1988), for example, lauds the Chicago School's accounts of life on the social margins (Whyte, 1993) and of manual work (Terkel, 1970). Hassard, McCann, and Morris (2007) propose that organizational ethnography presents the "human side" of working life in ways that challenge dominant managerial orthodoxy. Madison further argues that organizational ethnography should be characterised by a "compassion for the suffering of living beings" (2012, p. 5). A questioning of the dynamics of the practitioner/researchers' relationship (Dehli, 2003) becomes itself a form of intervention and engagement (Huizer, 1979; Huizer & Mannheim, 1979). Simply being there is not enough, argues Okely (1975), rather one must join with "people immersed in those situations and circumstances [who] are trying to make sense of their reality" (Chell, 1998, p. 70) and help them to a "better" understanding of their own situation. As with PAR, this may involve "a more radical democratization of knowledge" (Rose, 1990, p. 11) that finds its expression in multi-authored texts (Fischer 1986), and co-operative story-telling (Tyler, 1986).

Engaging and accessible writing is another means by which giving voice to those on the margins might be realised within ethnography and is again exemplified by the Chicago School (Burawoy, 2000; Gergen, 2003; Van Maanen, 2010). Van Maanen, in particular, has argued that ethnography should be an engaged literary art (1988, 2010). Humphreys, Brown, and Hatch (2003) advocate organizational ethnography as "improvisational jazz", emancipating the researcher from positivistic norms. Gilmore and Kenny (2015) celebrate the "messiness" of ethnography and its ability to incorporate multi-vocality, and a cooperative partnership between researcher and researched (Cunliffe, 2002; Ybema, Yanow, Vels, & Kamsteeg, 2009). The techniques of the novelist may be used to communicate the emotional dimension of, and promote empathy for, the other (Nugent & Abolafia, 2007), linking artful representation with a commitment to emancipation (Chorashi & Wels, 2009). Denzin argues for an ethnography that aims "to change the world by writing from the heart" (2006, p. 6).

Writing from the heart suggests another of our proposed procedural virtues, that of relationality and emotionality in organizational research. Burkitt (2012) has argued that theories of reflexivity tend to be too individualistic and rationalistic which leads to the exclusion of the emotions. However, for the activist ethnographer, understanding the emotional dimension of engagement with others is essential. It is difficult to envisage a form

of critical performativity not linked to compassion for the other (Hansen & Quinn Trank, 2016). Hibbert, Sillince, Diefenbach, and Cunliffe (2014) suggest that a relational reflexivity will lead to the generation of richer insights. Gray (2009) argues that affectivity is an essential aspect of how we apprehend the world and so emotional reflexivity is a crucial aspect of the ethnographic method. Gilmore and Kenny (2015) suggest a team approach to ethnography as a way of enabling this desirable emotional reflexivity.

To summarise this section, we have highlighted a number of principles that have been developed within ethnography to meet various challenges to it. We have termed these principles “procedural virtues” and identified them as reflexivity, emancipatory purpose including giving voice, engaged and accessible writing of use to, and sometimes co-produced by, participants and, relationality-emotionality. These virtues, we propose, are an essential element of a critically performative activist ethnography and align well with the related emancipatory intent of academic activism. However, we now justify our position that the procedural virtues are not sufficient in themselves as a method for actualising critical performativity, drawing on both participatory action research and militant ethnography for complementary methodological principles.

Militant Ethnography, PAR and Activist Ethnography

Critiques of organizational ethnography suggest that the procedural virtues often remain unrealised and are overly focussed on the concerns of academics rather than participants (Wray-Bliss, 2003), rarely reaching “beyond the self-referential sphere of scholarship” (2009, p. 17). Fine argues that ethnographers, despite a “kindly” surface, may operate “against the interests of the observed group” (1993, p. 272). Maxey (1999) suggests that activists are mostly indifferent to academic writing, however well-written. In addition, the procedural virtues do not incorporate the aim of working alongside activists. In the following paragraphs, therefore, we supplement the procedural virtues with methodological principles from militant ethnography and participatory action research.

We characterise militant ethnography as an active involvement *with* activists beyond generating knowledge *about* them (see also Davis, 2003; M. Fine & Weis, 1996; Lyon-Callo & Hyatt, 2003). It supplements the procedural virtues of reflexivity, giving voice, and relationality-emotionality, with the aim of building “long-term relationships of mutual commitment and trust”. By becoming “entangled with complex relations of power”, one lives “the emotions associated with direct action organizing and activist networking” (Juris, 2007,

p.165). “Better interpretations and analyses” result because such involvement “generates practical, embodied understanding” (Juris, 2007, p.166). Militant ethnography, therefore, aims to satisfy the more interventionist aims of academic activism. However, we propose that such active involvement still requires the reflexivity and ethics of the procedural virtues if the risks associated with militant ethnography are to be mitigated.

One striking illustration of such risks is provided by the militant ethnography of urban anthropologist, Vincent Lyon-Callo (2004) who for five years worked as an associate director of a homeless shelter in Northampton, Massachusetts. He conducted a “politically engaged ethnography [with] an explicitly activist methodology” (2004, p. 21). Lyon-Callo attempted to persuade his participants to change their thinking and practice according to his own political convictions. Despite participants often finding Lyon-Callo’s Foucauldian terminology alienating, he claimed that he succeeded in conducting an insightful ethnography and in persuading participants to challenge aspects of how the shelter was organized. However, there were also serious negative consequences. The actions he encouraged led to funders, business leaders and politicians withdrawing support, leading to Lyon-Callo’s resignation and three workers losing their jobs (Lyon-Callo, 2004). The case illustrates the risks of fomenting resistance to established practices and taking on powerful interests which can have very real material consequences for both researcher and participants. This is not to suggest that such action is necessarily wrong, rather that the ethics and consequences of activist research are complex and unpredictable. Had Lyon-Callo paid sufficient attention to the procedural virtues of empathy, relationality, sensitivity to power relations and the ethics of his intervention, the outcomes might have been very different.

If militant ethnography stresses the need for academics to contribute *to* activism, participatory action research by contrast stresses the necessity of learning *from* activism and forms the third pillar of our own ethnographic activism. i.e. a combination of procedural virtues with the *working alongside* of militant ethnography and the *learning from* of PAR. As Fenwick (2003) and Gorli, Nicolini, and Scaratti (2015) point out, PAR has had a rather limited uptake within organization studies, although Ripamonti, Galuppo, Gorli, Giuseppe, and Cunliffe (2016) propose a reflexive version of action research with managers. PAR with activist organizations has though been widely used in urban geography (PyGyRG, 2016). We draw on these examples of PAR because they took place within similar groups to our own ethnographic study and so provide insights of direct relevance to our work (see Chatterton et al., 2010; Doná, 2007; Hodkinson & Chatterton, 2006, for examples).

PAR aims at creating relevant and accessible knowledge for both academics and practitioners (Chatterton, Fuller, & Routledge, 2007, p. 219). It is arguably less combative and more collaborative than ME, but PAR scholars acknowledge similar messy realities and tensions (Chatterton et al., 2010). However, it is more alert to the role of the procedural virtues in aiding the ethically concerned researcher (Fuller, 1999), sharing with organizational ethnography a stress on power-relations, the emotional dimensions of close relationships with participants and the potential consequences of seeking social change as part of research (Chatterton et al., 2007). PAR contributes to our understanding of reflexivity as including developing our academic practice by learning from our participants. One example is applying the consensual decision-making methods learned from alter-globalization groups to academic conference organization (see Bell & King, 2016; Land & King, 2014 for examples).

PAR may thus be characterised as sharing a commitment to the procedural virtues of organizational ethnography but extending them through collaboration and participation with those researched. The aim is to bring about positive change and facilitating the organisational and critical analytical skills of all participants (McTaggart 1997 in Reason & Bradbury, 2006, p. 1). This requires commensurate changes in academic practice; transforming “an alienating ‘Fordist’ mode of academic production into a more flexible and socially owned process” (Kindon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007, p. 1). Unlike much militant ethnography, PAR seeks to address problems that are meaningful to participants who jointly determine with researchers the ethics and risks of intervention (Kindon et al., 2007). This partnership may extend to writing the research collectively (see Chatterton et al., 2010). Like organizational ethnography, PAR struggles to realise these aspirations. Cooke and Kothari (2001) argue that PAR researchers tend to be the dominant partners in the research process and as Pain and Francis observe “despite our best efforts we found, like others, that the ideal of participation is seldom achieved, and that fulfilling the key premise of participatory research – effecting change with participants – is fraught with difficulties” (2003, p. 51). One of the persistent difficulties in both cases is the rejection by the assumed “beneficiaries” of academic activism (see our own experiences of this below).

We do not therefore believe that PAR provides a panacea to the problems of combining activism and research, but it does suggest a third strand to our combination of the activist contribution of militant ethnography and the procedural virtues of OE that stresses the democratisation of useful knowledge for both academics and practitioners. PAR principles

are useful in that they suggest ways of sharing relevant and accessible knowledge with groups in ways that do not increase dependency or hierarchy; offering both radical critiques and inspiring alternatives (Chatterton et al., 2007).

Insert Table 1 around here

In table 1 we summarise and contrast our ideas concerning the procedural virtues in OE, the more interventionist approach of militant ethnography and the collaborative democratic ethos of PAR and suggest how a combination of the strengths of all three might be used to construct a distinctive activist ethnographic methodology. In the next section, we present our own journey towards the development of methods to negotiate the practical issues peculiar to activist ethnography. This is clearly germane to the chief aims of this paper, in that it provides a practical example to guide those who might wish to follow our approach. Of significance are the messy realities of attempting to implement the procedural virtues within activist ethnography. Issues faced included how to balance academic and activist concerns, relationships with participants and how best to represent the complexities of the multiple viewpoints of ourselves and our participants. In the following section, we therefore outline our initial methodology and how this developed as well as the context of our research.

Experiences of activist ethnography

Methods and Context

In this section, we explain how we sought to construct and apply the methodology proposed in the final column of table 1, through our own engagement with a constellation of alternative organisations and social movement projects in a medium sized city in the Midlands region of the United Kingdom, which we call Midtown. It should be borne in mind that, as is often the case, we did not enter the field with a fully-worked out prescriptive “toolbox” of methods. Rather we sought to employ the procedural virtues of reflexivity and relationality as a way of learning with and from our participants as the project unfolded. We wished to give a voice to those engaged in alternative forms of organizing rarely heard in organization studies. We adopted a critically reflexive stance that did not assume that our expertise as academics (the “public intellectual” identity central to critical performativity) made us superior to our participants. However, we also wished to pursue the ideals of militant ethnography in terms of working for positive emancipatory social change alongside the groups we were engaged with. Consequently, what these changes should be and how the groups organized to achieve

them, were matters for mutual learning and negotiation, as congruent with PAR's insistence on the democratisation of useful and accessible knowledge production. Where we departed slightly from ideals of co-creation of knowledge was in the writing of our primary published account of our engagement. This was due essentially to disinterest on the part of our participants concerning academic texts (about which more below). However, we did produce a range of other documents from webpages, reports of meetings, etc that were of direct use and relevance to the groups studied.

We became involved in what was self-described by members as the "Midtown Alternative Consensus" (MAC), a loose network of activist and alternative lifestyle groups, as they attempted to coordinate joint projects. Over a six-month period, we jointly attended all the MAC formal planning meetings, ten in total that comprised a group of 25 participants. This period culminated in a festival in October 2009 which included 63 events of which we attended twelve. Over 275 participants were present at the festival. However, our intention to develop an activist ethnography congruent with the procedural virtues required both a longer and deeper period of engagement with the MAC. This was achieved through the more fully immersed author 2 having been a part of the MAC for approximately ten years and having attended hundreds of meetings and helping to organise tens of events. This long-term immersion considerably enhanced the more intensive six-month engagement, particularly because of pre-existing relationships of trust.

We utilised familiar ethnographic data collection methods including observing, conversing (including informal conversations, questions at meetings), and interviewing. Additionally, we analysed various documents produced by the MAC including the MAC website (16 pages) and their online magazine (eight representative editions). We also read and summarised in excess of 100 emails and 200 hundred messages posted on the numerous social media platforms used by the MAC. Fieldnotes were made during events or as soon as possible afterwards, comprising in total 48 pages. We observed the locations and spaces important to participants and how they chose to present themselves in terms of dress, lifestyle and speech. Finally, we conducted a small number of in-depth life history interviews (six in total) with key participants. A key feature of our activist ethnography was a team approach (Fortune & Mair, 2011) which provided us with a range of options to enact the procedural virtues of reflexivity and sensitivity to issues of power and representation through dialogue between us. It also enabled us to explore the emotionality of our different forms of

engagement and to strengthen the reciprocity of our relations with each other and with our participants as envisaged by Gilmore and Kenny (2015).

From our review of the literature, we were aware of the pitfall of losing sufficient critical distance from our own insider assumptions (Alvesson, 2003) in fully immersed research. We therefore adopted different roles. Author 1 acted as more of an observer and undertook the more overt data gathering including conducting interviews. Author 2, on the other hand, was a long-standing member of the MAC and so had a unique insider access and understanding. The team approach enabled the challenging of assumptions through a constant process of discussing our responses to our participation with each other. Tacit assumptions, emotions, tensions and knowledge could thus be surfaced, explored and incorporated into our research. Our team approach also enabled us to balance activism with research (as proposed in table 1) by undertaking different but complementary roles that would have been hard to combine in a single individual.

We decided that the most effective way to present our learning was to use autobiographical vignettes, a well-established way of communicating the experience and “feel” of the ethnographic process (Barter & Renold, 2003), particularly when incorporating self-ethnographic data (Humphreys, 2005). Vignettes enable the writing of rich ethnographic description within the confines of a journal paper (Van Maanen, 2010). In addition, Ripamonti et al. (2016) suggest that vignettes are an effective way of representing the emotionality of the activist ethnographic encounter. Each of our four vignettes focusses on a different methodological issue related to the procedural virtues as delineated in Table 1. As the use of vignettes emerged as a central element of our activist ethnography, an account of how we developed them in our research may prove a useful example for others wishing to pursue similar methods.

The first stage of writing the auto-ethnographic vignettes was developed by a lengthy and recursive reading and rereading of the fieldnotes and reflexive diaries both as individuals and together, discussing them and reflecting on which experiences were most salient (Hay, 2014). The differences, sometimes disagreements, concerning our perceptions and emotions that surfaced during this stage enabled us to reflect on the various academic and activist identities at play and challenged our preconceived notions regarding the setting. We became aware of how applying the procedural virtues was frequently problematic in practice. Based on these discussions, we moved onto the second stage of crafting ethnographic stories using

Elbow's (1981) freewriting technique of focusing on the emotional content to examine which experiences felt important, or on moments where we felt uncomfortable or questioned our beliefs or practices (Humphreys, 2005). The third phase, was to move these accounts beyond introspection by reflecting on the broader social-context captured in the experience (Reed-Danahay, 1997). This involved reflecting on our assumptions and subjecting them to analytical insight in the context of the broader environment provided by both re-reading of our data and existing research into similar groups. Our team approach greatly helped: we swapped individually drafted vignettes, each reading the other's narratives, asking clarifying details and refining the stories. We then jointly analyzed them in terms of how they exemplified those features of the procedural virtues, PAR and militant ethnography that we were attempting to combine in our activist ethnography. We then tested the utility of our vignettes by "performing" them (Ellis & Bochner, 1992) at conferences, exploring what aspects resonated with others and subjecting them to critical scrutiny and feedback before rereading the fieldnotes and analysing them against our key themes. This entire process was recursive, we frequently returned to earlier stages to refine our vignettes.

By engaging in this rigorous reflexive process, we were able to adjust and develop our ethnographic practice. It made us more aware of the power-relations, competing identities, ethical dilemmas, and tensions between institutional and activist goals that we discuss below and that other activist ethnographic researchers will also need to negotiate. Such an awareness enables these issues to be incorporated into richer, more nuanced ethnographic accounts as well as enhancing our understanding of how one might contribute to activism. In our next section, we present our vignettes and discuss in detail how our attempt to develop a distinctive activist ethnography was experienced in the field.

Vignette 1: You are not one of us (the outsider's perspective)

In this vignette, we address the methodological issues identified in table 1 concerning researcher identity and researcher participant relations and identify methodological tactics to address them.

It was the second meeting of the MAC. I had had a friendly reception at the first meeting when [Author 2] and I explained how we would like to base some research on the social centre project over the next few weeks. I was confident of a positive response when I asked whether I could record the meeting, rather than making frantic notes. As soon as I asked the question, the atmosphere changed. I suddenly became very aware of

being an outsider. Suspicion about our research was evident; some being very hostile to it. Others, whilst being happy about the research, still had some reservations about recording. Some thought that our academic viewpoint would help them organize more effectively. Some were distrustful of my motives, fearing a journalistic exposé or feeling that it was exploitative to use their project for research. “*We don’t know you*”, they told me “*how do we know that you won’t just leave when you have the information that you want?*”

Author 1 from notes taken after the 2nd MAC meeting

Author 1’s role as largely observer-participant is highlighted in the vignette. It is not unusual in ethnography for there to be issues of acceptance and researcher anxieties over this (Cunliffe & Alcadipani, 2016). However, such issues are particularly salient within activist ethnography where one wishes to work alongside the group rather than simply study it. We had expected that this would be a low-key request, given author 2’s long-standing involvement with the group and author 1’s experience with similar groups. We were both taken aback by the reaction. It illustrates the danger of assuming, as critical performativity tends to, that academics will be regarded positively (see for instance Willmott, 2008) and welcomed by activists because of shared causes or intellectual expertise (Spicer et al., 2009). Instead, some MAC activists were suspicious of our involvement. When we discussed this reaction, we reflected that this was partly due to being business school academics, an off-putting identity for alternative organizations like the MAC (Fournier & Grey, 2000; Parker, 2002). Such reactions have also been noted in PAR research. Chatterton *et al* found they were sometimes seen as “exploitative, unaccountable, managerialist, and compromised by our academic status” (2010, p. 251). We concur that the (perceived) expertise and social capital of the academic was seen as inimical to a pursuit of inclusive, democratic “do-it-yourself” learning.

For us, this experience, suggested that the procedural virtues of empathy and giving voice as well as critical reflexivity cannot be restricted to the writing of ethnographic accounts as tends to be assumed in organizational ethnography. Rather, these virtues must be pursued from the outset of involvement in the field. Our response to the suspicion of the MAC was informed by our reading of PAR and its emphasis on learning from and being alongside. Firstly, we undertook a range of mundane but helpful tasks including taking minutes and notes for the group, creating webpages or simply moving the furniture for

meetings (see for instance Chatterton et al., 2010). This reciprocity demonstrated our desire to engage as ordinary members of the group and not to assume a superiority based on academic status. Such activities also enabled us to understand from the inside the everyday lives of MAC members and so enriched our research. Our second strategy was a relational one, to actively build relationships over time with members of the MAC. Our team approach considerably aided us in coping with these sometimes emotionally difficult episodes. We provided each other with mutual support and helped each other develop a reflexive understanding of the processes that were occurring and what underlay them, enriching our eventual accounts of organizing in the MAC. For scholars without the advantage of author 2's long-standing connection with participants, it might prove much more difficult to obtain acceptance, again demonstrating the importance within AE of team approaches and complementary researcher roles. The vignette underscores that aspirations, such as co-production of knowledge and academic activist involvement, are always likely to be problematic and require long-term, and effortful work. However, the vignette also suggests a possible strategy to such co-construction. Within our activist ethnography, the procedural virtue of giving voice to the marginalised had to be worked on through active involvement in the consensual democratic decision-making process used by the MAC. This helped develop the related virtue of sensitivity to power-relations. By taking seriously the reactions of the activists when we asked to do the recording, we jointly arrived at an appreciation of each other's position and needs and so determined together a way forward to respect and meet them. It was only by abandoning a researcher role based on academic social capital that this was made possible.

Vignette 2: Who am I? Academic or activist? (the insider's perspective)

In this vignette, we address the methodological issues of conflicting researcher identities and the ensuing ethical dilemmas.

It's a couple of weeks into the project and things seem to be progressing. I am quite excited about this, yet I am also becoming increasingly uncomfortable. The problem is that I feel a little on the edge of the group and not able to fully join in. Whereas others seem to speak authentically as members of the community, I feel conscious of my other academic identity. I wonder, as I speak, if others, knowing what I do for a living, look at me differently. Do they expect me, as an organizational "expert" to be able to offer solutions?

Yet I also don't feel I can really be an academic here either. I have a notepad with me, and take notes but I feel self-conscious about them. [Author 1] seems quite able to write down what people say, but I feel sheepish about it. Every time I do it I notice that I am shielding my notepad as though I am trying to pretend that I am not really writing things down. As the meeting goes on this discomfort grows, I put my notepad down, I sit and listen. I'll try and remember what has been said.

Author 2 from notes taken after the 4th MAC meeting

The anxieties and conflicts of insider activist ethnography rarely surface in official accounts despite the fact that “their location in between various social groups and psychological states often leaves researchers at the margins, or shuttling between periphery and centre” (Gilmore & Kenny, 2015, p. 67). This discomfort may account for the tendency within organizational ethnography to mitigate it through the researcher identity remaining dominant. In activist ethnography, where the embodied presence and activities of the researcher cannot be easily distinguished from those of the activist, identity conflicts are particularly problematic (see Wacquant, 2011 for a discussion). The tensions experienced by Author 2 resulted from simultaneously negotiating two identities on a public stage rather than through the private reflection assumed in much writing on the procedural virtue of critical reflexivity.

The issues raised for activist ethnography by this are both practical and emotional. Practically, it is difficult to combine data gathering methods, such as note-taking, that require standing back from the immediate flow of events when one is also simultaneously trying to fully engage in the moment. Our way of addressing this was through negotiating complementary researcher roles, to turn this issue into a positive advantage. Author 1 was able to undertake data gathering and observation, freeing author 2 to participate less self-consciously. This enabled Author 2 to retain his focus on experiencing activism, thus supporting the procedural virtue of constructing empathetic accounts based on an insider viewpoint. Discussion between the authors then surfaced the different perspectives of each researcher role. Again, the vignette suggests that the procedural virtues should not be restricted to the writing-up stage but should be incorporated into a flexible and dynamic process of active reflexivity in the field. Being attentive to the procedural virtues during activist-ethnographic fieldwork can also offer new vantage points for analysis. Straddling both worlds means that it is possible to use one mode of being, the researcher, to reflect on

the conditions of possibility for the other, the activist, and vice versa. Pursuing this dialogic form of reflexivity also encouraged us to be open with each other about our anxieties and tensions which in turn taught us a great deal about the emotional dimension of organizing in the MAC for its members.

Vignette 3: Participants or friends?

In this vignette, we address the methodological issues of power-relations, researcher identity and ethics when researching participants who are also (or who become) friends.

We finish our coffee and start looking at the paper that [author 1] has drafted. We are both pleased to see it taking shape. Mostly, the paper reflects our joint discussions; however, author 1 has added new material from his recent interviews. They include accounts of serious depression, isolation, sexual abuse and suicide attempts, all freely volunteered by interviewees. Author 1 is pleased with these accounts believing that they offer rich insights into the lives of activists. However, as author 2 reads this material for the first time he feels very different.

“Do you really think we should include this stuff about depression and suicide attempts?” author 2 asks.

“Why not, they all consented to this stuff being used? We’ll be careful how we present it. I think it’s important to the research” replies author 1.

“But I just don’t feel comfortable with revealing the lives of my friends like this” continues author 2. “Should I really be reading all of this about the pain and difficulties that they have been through? What will it be like when I see them again knowing these things from their past that they haven’t told me? I don’t like the idea that we are broadcasting these stories to the world. It’s just too close to home.”

Meeting between author 1 and 2 taken from author 1’s notes

Our different reactions as authors to the life histories of participants brought into sharp relief tensions between the academic and activist self. For author 1, the stories were engaging, revealing and personal. They required handling with great care and sensitivity but they did not violate his relationship with the participants. For him, the use of these stories accorded with a representational ethics based upon an empathetic understanding of the other (Reedy, 2009) and so was congruent with the procedural virtues. However, author 2 had

longstanding friendships with the storytellers that he expected to continue and he struggled with these stories being made public. It felt voyeuristic to him and he wished to protect his friends from academic analysis and the judgement of outsiders. The vignette illustrates that the procedural virtues might mean very different things to researchers depending on their precise relation to the field, even though both authors shared a sense of the possibilities that these quotes might offer.

Again, whilst this issue is not unique to activist ethnography, it is particularly acute because of the close, long-term engagement, and ambitions to work with the activists involved. Issues of power relations and ethics when friends provide “data” may have a powerful personal impact. As Brewis (2014) has identified from her own experiences, there is a dilemma of wishing to avoid betraying friends and the desire to pursue the procedural virtue of making other voices heard. It illustrates that the procedural virtues are not always compatible or a basis for consensus between researchers. Such tensions are not easily, if ever, resolvable, and our response to them was to confront them together as researchers. In this way, we reinforced the procedural virtue of reflexivity concerning power relations. The procedural virtue of the democratisation of knowledge pursued through the co-production of knowledge within PAR may mitigate these issues. For example, draft accounts can be sent to research participants during the writing process to discuss how they feel about their data being used in this way or their view of the analysis offered. Not only can this be a way of validating the research but also, particularly for those involved in activist groups, a way of giving back to the communities involved in the research (see Varkarolis & King, 2017 for a discussion).

Why then use friends in one’s research at all? Within activist ethnography, engagement implies “subjective connection to the participants” and being “genuinely ‘part of the experience’ rather than being detached from it” (Beech, Hibbert, MacIntosh, & McInnes, 2009, p. 197). Friendships tend to precede or follow such engagement and Tillman-Healy has argued that “friendship-as-method can bring us to a level of understanding and depth of experience we may be unable to reach using only traditional methods” (2003, p. 737). We suggest that friendship as method requires the relational stance that Ellis has termed “radical reciprocity” (Ellis, 2007, p. 7) . The democratising of the research process in PAR offers one route to this whereby participants become fully involved in authoring their own stories (Gorli et al., 2015), although the disinterest of most MAC members in academic texts made this problematic for us. The exploration of emotional conflicts between author 1 and author 2,

however, did again help us considerably in working through these issues and determining a shared ethical position in how accounts were presented. Such constant dialogue enabled us to keep the issues of instrumentality constantly in mind as the research progressed.

Vignette 4: “Who am I working for?” (Institutional opportunities and constraints)

In this vignette, we address the issues that typically arise within academic activism from tensions between activist and institutional obligations.

I am at home writing material for the MAC website. I promised them that I would get this done by the end of the week. I am enjoying it, playing with different layouts and writing content. It’s nice to be doing something that I feel will make a difference. Then I hear an email ping into my inbox and, although it’s some pointless university-wide corporate message, it reminds me that I’m officially “at work” and I start to feel guilty. “Really”, I tell myself “what I am doing is far more important than this corporate nonsense. Nobody at my university knows I am doing this”, I muse to myself, “I could be doing loads of things from writing a paper to gardening and nobody would know. At least this feels useful.”

I like the freedom that I have as an academic to be able to do this type of activity. It should feel a wonderful luxury, yet, as I continue working on the website, my pleasure at it evaporates. “Shouldn’t I be doing this in my own time? I’m not exactly paid to do this am I? But this is research”, I tell myself. “Surely, it’s essential to engage like this?”

From fieldnotes taken by Author 2 three months into the project

Vignette 4 illustrates the many tensions and contradictions that arise when the identity of researcher and activist combine and the difficulties of balancing the various aims of academic activism. Some have argued that it is impossible to satisfy both institutional expectations and academic activist aims. The vignette suggests that when the procedural virtues, particularly those related to critical reflexivity, are extended beyond the construction of texts (as we argue above is a requirement for effective and ethical academic activism), then identity tensions will likely become acute and so need strategies for managing. One solution is to simply accept that there will be a trade-off between activist and academic career ambitions. As Grint and Jackson argue “instead of singularly devoting ourselves to the pursuit of getting published in top-tier journals, we may have to be prepared to walk away from the publishing production line for prolonged periods to lend a hand in our respective

communities and get directly involved in real life” (2010, p. 352). Unwillingness to pay this price may partly explain why most proponents of critical performativity remain at a distance from the engagement they espouse (King, 2015). Our vignette illustrates that trying to balance one’s professional obligations and one’s activist commitments leads to considerable stress and anxiety.

If one *can* live with these anxieties and negotiate the institutional pressures, however, we found that academic jobs enable the combination of scholarship with activism to a surprising extent. Being researchers confers considerable freedom in how one uses time (Johnson & Mullen, 2007). This provides opportunities to use some of our time for activist commitments albeit at the cost of heightened professional performance anxiety. Thus, rather than shame-faced hand-wringing about our academic privileges, activist ethnography enables using these for the benefit of those we research (Khasnabish & Haiven, 2015). In turn, the greater degree of involvement with the field supports the extension of the procedural virtues to all aspects of the research process and enhances the ability to produce rich portraits of unfamiliar settings and to represent voices that often go unheard within organizational research.

Discussion: What did we learn about activist ethnography and how it should be done?

Insert table 2 around here

We began by asking whether and how it might be possible to combine research with activism to fulfil the aspirations of critical performativity. In table 2 we show how we have combined elements of organizational ethnography, militant ethnography and participatory action research in our own form of activist ethnography, which we developed through our engagement with the MAC. We also show how we extend the use of the procedural virtues from being restricted to the writing of texts to a set of principles that inform all stages of the research process. Finally, we suggest practical methodological strategies, (which for ease of reading we have numbered in table 2 and referred to below) for the putative activist academic researcher. A caveat concerning these strategies is suggested by our own experience of the messiness, tensions and contradictions of activist ethnography which other academic activists are likely to face (see also Chatterton et al., 2010). These strategies should not be read as a straightforward set of tools, rather they are offered as starting-points for reflection through which researchers can become more conscious of, and therefore better able to make decisions

about, the challenges they face. Indeed, our fifth proposed strategy in table 2 is for a flexible, negotiated, and processual approach to the deployment of methodological tactics (5).

Our first proposed group of strategies is for activist ethnographers to identify settings in which they can feasibly embody both researcher and activist identities (1), rather than privileging one over the other. This requires either a long period becoming a fully accepted member of activist groups or the use of existing commitments and affiliations (2). A team approach greatly increases the potential opportunities of one or more researchers possessing such prior memberships (3). Associated with this strategy is the need to “work alongside” rather than simply “being with” participants (4). We found that it was not our academic expertise that was in demand but rather our contribution of another pair of hands to help with the everyday mundanities of practical organizing (Chatterton et al., 2010; Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). Indeed, our relative autonomy and financial security as academics enabled us to do these things more easily than many of the MAC activists (Authors 2016).

Additionally, the “DIY” culture of groups such as the MAC does not welcome the professionalized expertise that academia is seen to represent. Rather, the main strength of activist ethnography for us is not the knowledge produced from the research encounter or the transfer of such knowledge from one domain (academia) to another (practice). Rather engagement offers a way of learning from the tensions generated between the roles of researcher and activist. We thus recommend the abandonment, at least in the context of close engagement with activist and social movement groups, of pretensions to public intellectualism (12). Engaging in these groups on their own terms is more likely to open up new and interesting spaces to explore this tension and consider new ways of being academics. As vignette 1 exemplifies, working alongside our participants also built trust, acceptance and understanding. By combining the *working alongside* of PAR with the procedural virtues, particularly a dialogic relational reflexivity arising from our team approach, we felt we enriched our own insights and wrote better research.

Extending critical reflexivity from the text to the field is also a key feature of our activist ethnography and this enlarged procedural virtue was facilitated by employing team ethnography in two ways (6). The first was to ease the practical difficulties of embodying both activist and researcher identities by each participant occupying different roles in the field. The second way was to confront together the tensions and emotions generated by combining activist and academic identities (7 & 8). We identified and worked through these

together, using our combined but complementary knowledge of organizational ethnography, militant ethnography, and PAR to develop a way of responding to them. The resultant discussions proved invaluable for our research, although not by finding simple resolutions. Rather our team approach enabled us to better understand the methodological issues involved and to use them fruitfully. It follows that a further proposed strategy is to develop a comprehensive familiarity with these three areas of methodological literature (13) and for ethnographic teams to incorporate expertise across them (14). Our bibliography provides a useful starting point for the realisation of this strategy for the nascent activist ethnographer.

We also propose the use of vignettes as an appropriate form of textual representation of activist ethnographic research (9). We suggest that the dialogic, recursive, and negotiated approach we detail in our methods section above provides a framework for practicing many of the procedural virtues relating to reflexivity in the writing of activist ethnographic texts (10). In addition, vignettes are accessible to activist as well as academic readerships, providing a way to engage activists in the writing of the research. We found that MAC members were largely disinterested in conventional academic writing even though they thought deeply about their own practices and theoretical frameworks. For our future forays into academic activism we would like to experiment with the co-construction of vignettes with our participants as a way of achieving the aim of texts more useful and relevant to activists. Rather than waiting until a full paper is written up for a journal (which can be many years after the study is completed), vignettes may be used as a form of quick and timely feedback more likely to aid the activist group (Varkarolis & King, 2017).

Finally, we recommend considering the strategy of “friendship as method” (11). This has much to offer the activist ethnographer, although as vignette three illustrates, it is not without its own challenges. In particular it requires the addition of “radical reciprocity” (Ellis, 2007) to the procedural virtues in order that participants are no longer seen as the ‘other’. Friendship as method promises to fulfil the procedural virtues related to breaking down the distinction between researcher and participant. It enables activist ethnographers to build richer understandings of the relational glue of mutual aid which sustains activist communities (see Authors 2016). By sharing the emotions, struggles, pleasures, and everyday interactions as fully part of such groups, many of the procedural virtues take on an active role that goes well beyond how texts are produced.

Concluding Thoughts

We began this paper by noting that the aspirations of critical performativity to engage with activism were rarely actualised and that there were, consequently, many questions to be answered concerning the theoretical and practical issues that might be faced by those wishing to take critical organizational scholarship into the field. Our primary contribution, in this paper has been to answer some of these questions through exploring both methodological issues and possible responses to them. We have considered the wider field of academic activism and contrasted and combined three methodological traditions that have all sought to bring about positive change through the research process, namely organizational ethnography, militant ethnography, and participatory action research. Our combining of these three traditions provides an enriched theoretical framework on which those wishing to embark on activist ethnography may draw. We synthesised aspects of these approaches into our own methodological proposal for a form of activist ethnography (see tables 1 and 2 above). We have thus offered a systematic framework for undertaking activist ethnography in order to achieve the aims of critical performativity.

Secondly, we have presented learning from our own experiences of developing our method in the field through four vignettes to illustrate different methodological issues. We evaluate these experiences in terms of the personal, ethical, and practical dilemmas that arose during our own attempt to combine the roles of critical organizational researcher *and* activist in order that others interested in academic activist methods might be better prepared to confront similar issues themselves. To this end, we suggest strategies for working through these issues, which we summarise in table 2 and its accompanying discussion, relating these to an enlarged conception of the procedural virtues. We conclude that procedural virtues, derived from OE, provide the critical organizational researcher with a way of negotiating the very real difficulties and contradictions of activist ethnography.

Despite the discomforts and doubts expressed above, we characterise our activist ethnographic engagement with the MAC as positive and would encourage others who wish to bring about change through their research to pursue similar methods. For one thing, we were able to publish a polyvocal ethnographic account of the MAC in a high quality journal, that we hope has challenged many assumptions of how and for what purpose organizing takes place (see authors, 2016). The insights in this research would not have been possible without an activist intent combined with organizational ethnography informed by the procedural

virtues via a team approach. Overall, we consider our attempt to immerse ourselves in the everyday practices and life-worlds of the alternative organizational practitioners of the MAC as successful. Our access to these life-worlds and the trust required for our involvement were, however, only possible because of the long-term engagement with the MAC on the part of author 2. Successfully turning this access into an empathetic ethnographic account of the MAC was only possible because of the less immersed author 1 feeling more able to represent the MAC in writing. These factors may be difficult for others to replicate but our team approach and the strong relationship that emerged out of our shared experiences provided one solution to the difficulty of combining activism and scholarship within a single individual. We were guided throughout by the procedural virtues of organizational ethnography particularly with regards to having a truly “insider” perspective (Brunwick & Coghlan, 2007; Karra & Phillips, 2008), a diminishment of the distance between researcher and researched, and an engagement that occurred over a longer period of time than is typical for other forms of qualitative research (Cunliffe, 2010). Indeed, we were able to extend the practice of these virtues from the production of texts to every stage of the research process.

Our final comment is to suggest that humility regarding the expectations of critical performativity of a positive reception for critical scholarship from activist communities might be a necessary additional procedural virtue. Following PAR’s example of learning from the groups it engages with, we suggest the main value of moving from organizational ethnography to activist ethnography is to participate in new and interesting ways of organizing. In other words, we as academics may have more to learn from activist practice than activists have to learn from our academic practice.

References

- Adler, P. S. (2002). Critique in the Name of Whom and What? *Organization*, 9(3), 387-395.
- Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2007). Critical Management Studies. In J. P. Walsh & A. Brief, P. (Eds.), *Academy of Management Annals* (Vol. 1, pp. 119-179). London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Alvesson, M. (2003). Methodology for Close-Up Studies - struggling with closeness and closure. *Higher Education*, 46, 167-193.
- Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2012). Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations*, 65(3), 367-390.
- Barros, M. (2010). Emancipatory Management: The Contradiction Between Practice and Discourse. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(2), 166-184.
- Barter, C., & Renold, E. (2003). Dilemmas of Contortl: Methodological implications and reflections of foregrounding children's perspectives on violence. In R. M. Lee & E. A. Stanko (Eds.), *Researching Violence: Essays on methodology and measurment* (pp. 88-106). London: Routledge.
- Beech, N., Hibbert, P., MacIntosh, R., & McInnes, P. (2009). But I thought we were friends Life cycles and research relationships. In S. Ybema, D. Yanow, H. Wels & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life* (pp. 196-214). London: Sage.
- Bell, E., & King, D. (2016). *Unmarking the unconference: Alternative methods of meeting organization as an organizational learning encounter*. Paper presented at the OLKC, St Andrews.
- Bisaillon, L. (2012). An Analytic Glossary to Social Inquiry Using Institutional and Political Activist Ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(5), 607-627.
- Boje, D. (1998). Nike, Greek goddess of victory or cruelty? Women's stories of Asian factory life. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 11(6), 461-480.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of Resistance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourgois, P. (2003). *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewis, J. (2014). The ethics of researching friends: on convenience sampling in qualitative management and organization studies. *British Journal Of Management*, 25(4), 849-862.
- Brunwick, T., & Coghlan, D. (2007). In Defence of Being 'Native': The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1), 59-74.
- Burawoy, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Global Ethnography: forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world'*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burkitt, I. (2012). Emotional Reflexivity: Feeling, Emotion and Imagination in Reflexive Dialogues. *Sociology*, 46(3), 458-472.
- Chatterton, P., Fuller, D., & Routledge, P. (2007). Relating action to activism: theoretical and methodological reflections. In S. Kindon, R. Pain & M. Kesby (Eds.), *Participatory*

- Action Research Approaches and Methods; Connecting people, participation and place* (pp. 216-222). London: Routledge.
- Chatterton, P., Hodkinson, S., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Beyond Scholarly Activism: Making Strategic Interventions Inside and Outside the Neoliberal University. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 10(2), 245-275.
- Chatterton, P., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Everyday activism and transitions towards post-capitalist worlds. *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers*, 35(4), 475-490.
- Checker, M., Davis, D.-A., & Schuller, M. (2014). The conflicts of crisis: critical reflections on feminist ethnography and anthropological activism. *American Anthropologist*, 116(2), 408-420.
- Chell, E. (1998). Critical Incident Technique. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in Organizational Research, A Practical Guide* (pp. 51-72). London: Sage Publications.
- Chorashi, H., & Wels, H. (2009). Beyond Complicity: a plea for engaged ethnography. In Y. Sierk, D. Yanow, H. Wels & F. Kamsteeg (Eds.), *Organizational Ethnography: studying the complexities of everyday life* (pp. 231-252). London: Sage.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. London: University of California Press.
- Coleman, L. M. (2015). Ethnography, Commitment, and Critique: Departing from activist scholarship. *International Political Sociology*, 9(3), 263-280.
- Collinson, D. L. (2003). Identities and Insecurities: Selves at Work. *Organization*, 10(3), 527-547.
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Cooper, C., & Coulson, A. B. (2014). Accounting activism and Bourdieu's 'collective intellectual' – Reflections on the ICL Case. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25(3), 237-254.
- Coté, M., Day, R., & de Peuter, G. (2007). Utopian Pedagogy: creating radical alternatives in the neoliberal age. *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 29(4), 317-336.
- Craven, C., & Davis, D.-A. (Eds.). (2013). *Feminist activist ethnography: counterpoints to neoliberalism in North America*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2002). Social Poetics as management inquiry: a dialogical approach. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 11(2), 128-146.

- Cunliffe, A. L. (2010). Retelling Tales of the Field: In search of organizational ethnography 20 years on. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(2), 224-239.
- Cunliffe, A. L., & Alcadipani, R. (2016). The Politics of Access in Fieldwork Immersion, Backstage Dramas, and Deception. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(4), 535-561.
- Davis, D.-A. (2003). What Did You Do Today?: Notes From A Politically Engaged Anthropologist. *Urban Anthropology*, 32(2), 147-173.
- Dehli, K. (2003). 'Making' the Parent and the Researcher: Genealogy Meets Ethnography in Research on Contemporary School Reform. In M. Tamboukou & S. Ball (Eds.), *Dangerous Encounters; Genealogy & Ethnography* (Vol. 17, pp. 133-152). New York: Peter Lang.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. London: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (2006). Analytic Autoethnography or Déjà Vu All Over Again. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 419-428.
- Doná, G. (2007). The microphysics of participation in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 210-229.
- Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with Power: Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(1), 3-29.
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (1992). Telling and performing personal stories: The constraints of choice in abortion. In C. Ellis & M. Flaherty (Eds.), *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience* (pp. 79-101). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Emihovich, C. (2005). Fire and Ice: Activist Ethnography in the Culture of Power. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(4), 305-314.
- Eschle, C., & Maiguashca, B. (2006). Bridging the Academic/Activist Divide: Feminist Activism and the Teaching of Global Politics. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 35(1), 119-137.
- Fenwick, T. (2003). Emancipatory potential of action learning: a critical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(6), 619-632.
- Fine, G. A. (1993). Ten lies of ethnography moral dilemmas of field research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 22(3), 267-294.

- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1996). Writing the "Wrongs" of Fieldwork: Confronting Our Research/Writing Dilemmas in Urban Ethnographies. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2(3), 251-274.
- Fleming, P., & Banerjee, S. B. (2016). When performativity fails: Implications for Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 69(2), 257-276.
- Flood, M., Martin, B., & Dreher, T. (2013). Combining academia and activism: Common obstacles and useful tools. *The Australian Universities' Review*, 55(1), 17-26.
- Foley, D. E. (2002). Critical ethnography: the reflexive turn. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(5), 469-490.
- Fortune, D., & Mair, H. (2011). Notes from the sports club: Confessional tales of two researchers. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40(4), 457-484.
- Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1), 7-32.
- Fuller, D. (1999). Part of the action, or 'going native'? Learning to cope with 'politics of integration'. *Area*, 31, 221-227.
- Gergen, K. J. (2003). Beyond knowing in organizational inquiry. *Organization*, 10(3), 453-455.
- Gilmore, S., & Kenny, K. (2015). Work-worlds colliding: Self-reflexivity, power and emotion in organizational ethnography. *Human Relations*, 68(1), 55-78.
- Gorli, M., Nicolini, D., & Scaratti, G. (2015). Reflexivity in practice: Tools and conditions for developing organizational authorship. *Human Relations*, 68(8), 1347-1375.
- Gray, B. (2009). Putting emotion and reflexivity to work in researching migration. *Sociology*, 42(5), 935-952.
- Grey, C. (2007). Possibilities for critical management education and studies. *Scandinavian journal of management*, 23, 463-471.
- Grint, K., & Jackson, B. (2010). Toward 'socially constructive' social constructions of leadership. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 348-355.
- Hansen, H., & Quinn Trank, C. (2016). This is going to hurt: compassionate research methods. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(3), 352-375.
- Hassard, J., McCann, L., & Morris, J. (2007). At the sharp end of new organizational ideologies: ethnography and the study of multinationals. *Ethnography*, 8(3), 324-345.
- Hawthorne-Steele, I., Moreland, R., & Rooney, E. (2015). Transforming Communities through Academic Activism: An Emancipatory, Praxis-led Approach. *Studies in Social Justice*, 9(2), 197-214.

- Hay, A. (2014). 'I don't know what I am doing!': Surfacing struggles of managerial identity work. *Management Learning*, 45(5), 509-524.
- Hibbert, P., Sillince, J., Diefenbach, T., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2014). Relationally Reflexive Practice: A Generative Approach to Theory Development in Qualitative Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(3), 278-298.
- Hodkinson, S., & Chatterton, P. (2006). Autonomy in the city? Reflections on the social centres movement in the UK. *City*, 10(3), 305-315.
- Huizer, G. (1979). Research-Through-Action: Some Practical Experiences with Peasant Organisation. In G. Huizer & B. Mannheim (Eds.), *The Politics of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Huizer, G., & Mannheim, B. (Eds.). (1979). *The Politics of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Humphreys, M. (2005). Getting Personal: Reflexivity and Autoethnographic Vignettes. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(6), 840-860.
- Humphreys, M., Brown, A. D., & Hatch, M. J. (2003). Is Ethnography Jazz? *Organization*, 10(1), 5 - 31.
- Hussey, I. (2012). "Political Activist as Ethnographer" Revisited. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 37(1), 1-23.
- Johnson, W. B., & Mullen, C. A. (2007). *Write to the Top!; How to become a prolific academic*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Juris, J. S. (2007). Practicing Militant Ethnography with the Movement for Global Resistance in Barcelona. In S. Shukaitis, D. Graeber & E. Biddle (Eds.), *Constituent Imagination: Millitant Investigations/Collective Theorization* (pp. 164-176). Oakland: AK Press.
- Karra, N., & Phillips, N. (2008). Researching "Back Home": International management research as auto-ethnography. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3), 541-561.
- Khasnabish, A., & Haiven, M. (2015). Outside but Along-Side: Stumbling with Social Movements as Academic Activists. *Studies in Social Justice*, 9(1), 18-33.
- Kieser, A., & Leiner, L. (2012). Collaborate with practitioners: But beware of collaborative research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 21(1), 14-28.
- Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place*. London: Routledge.
- King, D. (2015). The Possibilities and Perils of Critical Performativity: learning from four case studies. *Scandinavian journal of management*, 31(2), 255-265.

- King, D., & Learmonth, M. (2015). Can critical management studies ever be 'practical'? A case study in engaged scholarship. *Human Relations*, 68(3), 353-375.
- Kondo, D. K. (1990). *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Land, C., & King, D. (2014). Organizing otherwise: Translating anarchism in a voluntary sector organization. *ephemera*, 14(4), 923-950.
- Lyon-Callo, V. (2004). *Inequality, Poverty, and Neoliberal Governance; Activist Ethnography in the Homeless Sheltering Industry*. New York: Broadviewpress.
- Lyon-Callo, V., & Hyatt, S. B. (2003). The Neoliberal State And The Depoliticization Of Poverty: Activist Anthropology And "Ethnography From Below". *Urban Anthropology*, 32(2), 175-204.
- Madison, D. S. (2012). *Critical Ethnography: Methods, Ethics, and Performance*. London: Sage.
- Malinowski, B. (1967). *A diary in the strict sense of the term* (N. Guterman, Trans.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Maxey, I. (1999). Beyond boundaries? Activism, academia, reflexivity and research. *Area*, 31(3), 199-208.
- Nugent, P. D., & Abolafia, M. Y. (2007). Imagining the 'iron cage': the rhetoric of hidden emotions in critical ethnography'. *Ethnography*, 8(2), 205-226.
- Okely, J. (1975). The Self and Scientism. *Journal of the Anthropology Society of Oxford*, 6(3), 171-188.
- Okely, J. (1992). Anthropology and autobiography: participatory experience and embodied knowledge. In J. Okely & H. Callaway (Eds.), *Anthropology & Autobiography*. London: Routledge.
- Pain, R., & Francis, P. (2003). Reflections on participatory research. *Area*, 35(1), 46-54.
- Parker, M. (2002). *Against Management; Organization in the age of managerialism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- PyGyRG. (2016). About Us. Retrieved 11/05/2016, from <http://www.pygyrg.co.uk/about-us/>
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.
- Reed-Danahay, D. (1997). *Auto/Ethnography*. New York: Berg.
- Reedy, P. (2009). *The Manager's Tale: Stories of managerial identity*. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Ripamonti, S., Galuppo, L., Gorli, M., Giuseppe, S., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2016). Pushing Action Research Toward Reflexive Practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 25(1), 55-68.
- Rodriguez, C. (2003). Invoking Fannie Lou Hamer: Research, Ethnography And Activism In Low-Income Communities. *Urban Anthropology*, 32(2), 231-251.
- Rose, D. (1990). *Living the ethnographic life*. London: Sage Publications.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (1995). The primacy of the ethical: propositions for a militant anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 36(3), 409-440.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2009). Critical Performativity: The Unfinished Business of Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 62(4), 537-560.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2016). Extending Critical Performativity. *Human Relations*, 69(2), 225-249.
- Terkel, S. (1970). *Working*. New York: The New Press.
- Tillmann-Healy, L. M. (2003). Friendship as method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(5), 729-749.
- Tyler, S. (1986). Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document. In J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing Culture; The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (pp. 122-140). London: University of California Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: on writing ethnography*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (2010). A Song for My Supper More Tales of the Field. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(2), 240-255.
- Varkarolis, O., & King, D. (2017). Voicing researched activists with Responsive Action Research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 12(4), 315-334.
- Wacquant, L. (2011). Habitus as topic and tool: Reflections on becoming a prizefighter. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 8(1), 81-92.
- Whyte, W. F. (1993). *Street Corner Society: the social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wickert, C., & Schaefer, S. M. (2015). Towards a progressive understanding of performativity in critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 68(1), 107-130.
- Willmott, H. (2008). Critical Management and Global Justice. *Organization*, 15(6), 927-931.
- Wray-Bliss, E. (2002). Abstract Ethics, Embodied Ethics: The Strange Marriage of Foucault and Positivism in Labour Process Theory. *Organization*, 9(1), 5-39.
- Wray-Bliss, E. (2003). Research Subjects/Research Subjections: Exploring the Ethics and Politics of Critical Research. *Organization*, 10(2), 307-325.

- Wray-Bliss, E. (2004). A Right to Respond? Monopolisation of 'Voice' in CMS. *Ephemera: Critical dialogues on organization*, 4(2), 101-120.
- Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Vels, H., & Kamsteeg, F. H. (2009). Organizational Ethnography: Studying the complexities of everyday life.

Table 1: Different Methodological Models of Critical Academic Engagement

| Methodological Issue | Critical Performativity | Organizational Ethnography Procedural Virtues | Militant Ethnography | Participatory Action Research | Activist Ethnography |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Primary Aim | Taking theoretical critique and making it relevant to organizational practice, looking for critical possibilities in the present (Wickert and Schaefer, 2015) transforming practice through critique (Spicer et al., 2009) | Authentic rich description of organizational cultural settings. Often aimed at revealing unseen or marginal communities. | Political change based on the convictions of the researcher. Ethnography as political praxis (Juris, 2007) | To co-construct with research participants' positive changes in the research setting. To work with congruent organizations that already have shared aims. To engage in mutual learning with participants. | Combine procedural virtues with the co-operative values of PAR in the pursuit of dialogical co-constructed political aims. |
| Identity (researcher role) | The 'romance of lonely dissent' (Parker) Public Intellectual forging symbolic | The radical writer as autonomous artist. | Political radical and dissenting outsider. | Co-participant with facilitation and authorial expertise. | Constant reflexivity based on recognition of tensions within the self and between different team roles. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | weapons of resistance (Bourdieu) | | | | |
| Researcher-Participant Relations | Ambitions to extend engagement beyond mainstream organizations to social movements and other alternative organizations (Fleming and Banerjee, 2016; Willmott, 2008), primarily through the contribution of academic expertise (Spicer et al., 2009; Spicer et al., 2016) | Giving ‘voice’ to participants. Empathetic accounts from the perspective of the participants | Seeks to persuade participants of researchers’ perspective and to encourage political action based on this. | Aspires to equality through processes such as co-writing and a democratic negotiated approach to all aspects of the research | Explicitly acknowledge and negotiate issues of researcher/activist identity struggle Equal weight given to activism and research. Rejection of notion of superior intellectual contribution |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Representation | <p>Usually assumed that academic/authorial expertise resides solely in the researcher (Wickert and Schaefer, 2015; Spicer et al., 2016).</p> <p>The researcher presents the represented to other researchers through conventional academic dissemination. (King and Learmonth, 2015)</p> | <p>Ideals of representing marginal or unheard voices through authorial interpretation and skilled writing (ethnographer as artist) (Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Van Maanen, 1988).</p> | <p>Primary focus is on political change and so issues of individual representation are less significant than accounts of political action.</p> <p>The academic as expert is retained. Either as a facilitator of political action or as a mentor in radical political theory.</p> <p>Often incorporates an ideal of the democratisation of knowledge.</p> | <p>Equal partnership with participants including joint control of representation (co-writing).</p> <p>Continuing modification of representations as engagement proceeds through mutual learning.</p> | <p>Interrogation of own identity and practice as activist.</p> <p>Integration of activist and researcher self within the same individual. Thus, representation from the inside, including self-representation.</p> <p>Adoption of PAR principles enhanced by the academic-activist self.</p> |
| Power Relations and Ethics | <p>Researcher as guru and ‘public intellectual’, stating what the practitioner <i>could, should, or would</i> do in a</p> | <p>Critical reflexivity - sensitivity to power relations but remedy located less in the field and more in</p> | <p>Assumes the researcher empowers participants in new ways by persuading them to</p> | <p>Becoming conscious of, and seeking to overcome inequalities in power relations</p> | <p>Acceptance of conflicts and tensions and constant working through these as of value in the research-activist process.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| | particular situation (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012; King, 2015). | how participants are represented in written text. | reinterpret their situation and to challenge the status quo. | with participants is central to PAR methods at all stages of research. | Heightened sensitivity to power relations through identity conflicts with the academic activist self. |
| Methodological Tactics | <p>Primarily theoretical critique (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012; Spicer et al., 2009; Cabantous et al., 2016; Gond et al., 2015; Hartmann, 2014) with aspirations for more practical engagement (Fleming and Banerjee, 2016).</p> <p>Few examples of direct engagement with practice, but some that draws on PAR (i.e. Barros, 2010; King and</p> | <p>Observation</p> <p>Participation</p> <p>Interview</p> <p>Critical reflexive thick description (Cunliffe, 2003)</p> <p>Empathetic representation as a primary aim</p> <p>Use of self-reflexivity, i.e. through pair interviewing (Gilmore and Kenny, 2015) as a means of achieving a critical</p> | <p>Argumentation and challenging of assumptions of participants.</p> <p>Encouragement to undertake political action.</p> <p>Authoring as political action</p> | <p>Intervention in practice and the use of ethnographic methods to collect and present data.</p> <p>Facilitation of mutual learning through a collaborative process of interpretation.</p> <p>Co-authorship of accounts of participation and participants.</p> | <p>A synthesis of other four approaches with the added dimension of the collapse of the distinction between academic and activist.</p> <p>No assumption of a privileged role in the field as researcher.</p> <p>Use of team ethnography to deal with the challenges of closeness and distance inherent in the research experience and to productively utilise identity tensions.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | Learmonth, 2015) for methods. | reflexivity on own assumptions | | | |
| Critiques | <p>Calls for engagement tend to remain just that. There is very little detail as to how CP might be implemented.</p> <p>Assumption of superiority of academic theoretical expertise over activist praxis.</p> | <p>Radicalism restricted to how texts are produced.</p> <p>Retains unequal power relations based on authorial discretion.</p> <p>Primarily for an academic audience.</p> | <p>Serious ethical questions posed by the risks created for the researcher and researched.</p> <p>Assumption of political leadership retains implicit unequal power relations between researcher and researched.</p> | <p>Despite aspirations to democratisation of knowledge, academics reframed as possessing expertise in facilitation.</p> <p>In practice learning from participants limited (Chatterton et al., 2010).</p> | <p>Few critiques as a novel approach. Issues include the difficulty of balancing academic-activist identities, particularly if there are expectations of career success based on this approach.</p> |

Table 2: Methodological Strategies for Activist Ethnographers

| Activist Ethnographic Principle (from the final column of Table 1) | Related Procedural Virtues | Proposed Strategy | Issue Addressed | Potential Benefits |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Combine the aims of critical performativity, organizational ethnography, militant ethnography, and PAR.</p> | <p>Authentic rich description of organizational cultural settings.</p> <p>Giving ‘voice’ to participants. Empathetic accounts from the perspective of the participants.</p> <p>Representing marginal or unheard voices.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider and identify settings in which one may fully merge participant and researcher identities (prior engagements, existing affinities, and connections). 2. Aim for long-term engagements with groups studied to establish mutual aims and to live the experiences and emotions of participants. 3. Seek opportunities for team ethnography and the involvement of participants in the writing of research. | <p>The aim of pursuing research that makes a positive difference both to academic and participant knowledge and practice.</p> <p>The tendency to avoid identity conflict and tensions by clinging to the special status of “public intellectual”.</p> <p>The weaknesses identified with each methodological approach when pursued in isolation.</p> | <p>Enriched research based on closer identification with participants and an intimate embodied understanding of the field.</p> <p>Practical assistance as activists to the groups studied, as negotiated between researchers and participants.</p> <p>Offers the potential to learn with and from activism rather than simply observing and describing it.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>4. Identify and pursue “mundane” forms of participation and assistance (“working alongside” rather than simply “being with”).</p> <p>5. Pursue a non-prescriptive, processual and flexible set of methods negotiated between researchers and participants.</p> | | <p>Closer relationships with participants based on the principle of reciprocity leading to better access and a richer understanding of the setting (“entangled with complex relations of power”, Juris, 2007, p.165).</p> <p>The avoidance of the most common pitfalls identified with a single methodological approach.</p> |
| <p>A reflexivity based upon combining and confronting researcher and participant identities</p> | <p>Extension of critical/self reflexivity from the text to the field and to the wider lives of researchers.</p> <p>Emotionality/relationality experienced fully within the person of the researcher-activist rather than being externalised.</p> | <p>6. Use of team ethnography with complementary roles linked to a dialogic form of reflexivity throughout the research project.</p> | <p>The limitation within organizational ethnography of reflexivity to the writing of texts rather than all stages of the research.</p> <p>The avoidance of problems caused by a lack of reflexivity, including the imposition of the</p> | <p>Richer more nuanced research which gets to the heart of the research setting and where the emotional and relational dimensions are directly experienced and reflected upon by the researchers through dialogue with each other and with participants.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | Sensitivity to an extended range of power relations both within texts but also experienced through embodied participation. | | researcher's own political assumptions or the unwarranted assumption of the public intellectual role within the CP and ME approaches. | |
| Conscious negotiation of the researcher-activist identity tension - balancing the activist and academic role. | Self-reflexivity Authentic rich description based on "insider" accounts. | 7. Reframing conflicts between researcher and activist identities from problem to resource by making confronting such conflicts a central part of the research process. 8. Surfacing conflicts through the application of team-based dialogic reflexivity. | Potentially disabling identity tensions between the researcher and activist role are accepted and explored as a source of learning in themselves. | By identifying, accepting and exploring such tensions they become available as a source of learning and so enrich rather than disable the activist academic. |
| Devising appropriate forms of representation for AE and incorporating self-ethnography and co-authorship. | Empathetic, relational, and engaged writing. The representation of marginalised voices. | 9. The development of vignettes as a way of representing the experience of the other and the self in engaging and convincing ways. | The richness of ethnographic data is difficult to capture and convey within the research paper format. | Vignettes have the potential to vividly communicate to a wide readership (academics and activists) the feel and richness of activist ethnographic data in an |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>10. The use of a dialogic approach to writing through constant discussion and refinement within the ethnographic team.</p> | <p>Normal academic writing conventions produce texts that are often seen as irrelevant to activist readers.</p> <p>The plurality of methods is difficult to integrate within other forms of data presentation.</p> | <p>accessible and empathetic way.</p> <p>Vignettes are capable of integrating insights from life histories, events, self-ethnography and participant observation.</p> |
| <p>Negotiating power relations and ethics</p> | <p>Going giving voice to breaking down the barriers between researcher and participant.</p> <p>Critical awareness of researcher privilege.</p> | <p>11. The conscious and reflexive use of “friendship as method” based on the principle of radical reciprocity.</p> <p>12. Avoiding assumptions of the value to the research or activism of the public intellectual role.</p> | <p>The various ethical dilemmas and complex power issues demonstrated in the vignettes.</p> | <p>An enhanced awareness of the ethical and power dimensions of research with activists as well as an expanded set of strategies based on team ethnography, for making positive use of these to enrich research.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | Developing a sensitive and emancipatory ethics of representation. | | | |
| Methodological Tactics | Use of a plurality of methods to achieve critically reflexive rich descriptions. | <p>13. Develop a comprehensive familiarity of the methodological traditions of OE, ME and PAR in order to provide a wider and more flexible range of methodological tactics and responses congruent with academic activism.</p> <p>14. Work in methodologically diverse research teams.</p> | The weaknesses and pitfalls identified when restricted to a single methodological approach. | <p>A greatly expanded repertoire of methodological tactics to employ as involvement in academic activism emerges in the field.</p> <p>The avoidance of common pitfalls associated with single approaches.</p> |