



Sedgwick, C. and Tsitsou, L. (2022) Doing online collaborative auto-ethnography during the pandemic to research academic precarity. In: SAGE Research Methods: Doing Research Online. SAGE. ISBN 9781529604221 (doi: [10.4135/9781529604221](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529604221))

This is the author version of the work. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it:  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529604221>

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/264507>

Deposited on 10 February 2022

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Case Study Title	<i>Doing Online Collaborative Auto-ethnography during the pandemic to research academic precarity.</i>	
Authors:		
1	Name	<i>Dr Lito Tsitsou</i>
	Author email	<i>Lito.Tsitsou@glasgow.ac.uk</i>
	Affiliation, country	<i>University of Glasgow, UK</i>
	SAGE Author ID	<i>[office use only]</i>
Author bio. <i>Please include a separate biography for each author. Maximum of 200 words per author.</i>		<b>Lito Tsitsou</b> is a cultural sociologist interested in artistic production and consumption, access to art, ballet, contemporary dance and film, the moving body, Bourdieu's social theory and research methods. She is currently a Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Glasgow.
2	Name	<i>Dr Claire Sedgwick</i>
	Author email	<i>c.sedgwick@derby.ac.uk</i>
	Affiliation, country	<i>University of Derby, UK</i>
	SAGE Author ID	<i>[office use only]</i>
Author bio. <i>Please include a separate biography for each author. Maximum of 200 words per author.</i>		<b>Claire Sedgwick</b> is a researcher and impact officer at the University of Derby. Her current project focuses on the experiences of comedians in the East Midlands and is funded by a British Academy Leverhulme Small Research Grant. Her first monography <i>Feminist Media: From the Second Wave to the Digital Age</i> was published by Rowman and Littlefield International in 2020.
Research Project Discipline <i>Alert your editorial contact if the relevant field is not included prior to writing your entry.</i>		<i>Sociology [D1]</i>
Academic Level of intended readership		<b>Postgraduate</b>
Published articles		Tsitsou, L., Sedgwick, C., (2021). Between and Betwixt: Experiences of Academic Precarity and Resistance During COVID-19 Pandemic, in <i>Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference of the Journal Scuola Democratica "Reinventing Education", VOL. 2, Learning with New Technologies, Equality and Inclusion</i> , 897-906.
<i>For office use only:</i>		
Title/Spin ID		
Access/Product Code		
ISBN		
DOI		
URI		
URL		
Copyright year		2022
Copyright statement		© SAGE Publications Ltd 2022

## Abstract

In this entry we provide a self- reflexive account of our experience of doing online collaborative autoethnography during the COVID-19 pandemic. We came together to share our respective experiences of precarity as academics and as researchers who study precarity within the creative industries. We arrived at this collaborative autoethnographic approach through a feminist lens, as we considered that a cooperative piece of work would allow us to better understand our experiences and situate them within the wider context of UK Higher Education. Moreover, we held that collaborative production of knowledge reflects

our feminist epistemological stance. Specifically, as a research method, collaborative autoethnography allows for epistemic and academic reflexivity. In other words, allowed us to make sense of our roles as researchers and how our positionality is linked to the creative industries we were researching. Although the pandemic has been a time of isolation and trauma, it has also meant that fostering remote relationships has never been easier. Our epistemologies, ethics and research interests paved the way for an online collaborative autoethnographic approach, very much imposed by the conditions of the pandemic, which, however, contributed to a reflexive exercise that mirrors the situation of precarious academics researching precarious creative professions. In this entry we outline the benefits of using online methods and discuss some of the practicalities of carrying out collaborative auto-ethnography online. We discuss ethical implications to doing this work online and the impact that collaborating online has had on our work.

### **Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this guide, students should be able to:

- Evaluate whether a collaborative autoethnography would be an appropriate method for your research.
- Consider ethical implications to collaborative autoethnographic research done online.
- Apply a collaborative autoethnographic approach to their own research.

### **Case Study**

#### **Project Overview and Context**

The present case study draws on a small online collaborative autoethnographic project on academic precarity. The purpose of the study was to explore and reflect on our precarious trajectories as female early career academics studying aspects of precarity in the cultural industries during the COVID-19 pandemic.

At the onset of the pandemic, we did not know each other at all. We were introduced to each other through a common friend- also an academic. We came together informally, with the intention to explore the possibility of working together as academics who work on creative industries. We explored the idea of writing something together that would mirror our overlapping research interests in specific cultural fields, comedy, and dance, respectively. We are particularly interested in the phenomenon of precarity in these creative forms of work. Driven by an ethics of care and solidarity, we came together with the intention to mutually support each other, and support our research fields, especially since cultural sociology and cultural studies are marginalized. We very quickly realized that beyond our specialist convergence, we had much more in common, our own precarity as early career researchers. Our experiences of marginality and struggles

came to the forefront of our discussion. As we were exploring informally our respective situation, we became interested in how we experience and think about precarity during the pandemic. We felt it was important to consider how our experience as precarious academics working within UK higher education can be understood within the wider context of systemic precarity in the UK.

This resulted into a form of online autoethnographic exploration, which we agreed we would pursue formally. By using a collaborative auto-ethnographic approach we were able to reflect on our perspectives and understand our own experiences as a valuable source of data. Furthermore, we hoped that a collaborative approach would help us move away from an individualistic understanding of the issue. We embarked on this collaborative autoethnographic journey using digital technologies and online spaces, and particularly Zoom, email and an online cloud storage with editing features. As Roy and Uekusa (2021: 384) citing Cornwall (2020) argued, the COVID-19 pandemic provided a unique window into exploring and documenting people's experiences of the 'social, economic, health, political, emotional, and religious aspects of the current crisis'. In this spirit we also felt the need to reflect and document our experiences and trajectories of precarious work culminating in the global pandemic using Online Collaborative Autoethnography. Online (CAE) as an approach to our work sprang from the condition of the pandemic but quickly became an ideal way of ensuring continuity and consistency in our approach.

#### Section summary

- Online collaborative autoethnography was a useful tool for helping us discuss our experiences during the COVID- 19 pandemic and enabled us to carry out the research despite restrictions.
- A collaborative approach moved us away from an individualistic approach to the issue of precarity. This was important in helping us understand precarity as systemic.

#### Research Design

We employed a kind of ethnography called collaborative auto-ethnography. 'Collaborative autoethnography (CAE) is a qualitative research method that is simultaneously collaborative, autobiographical, and ethnographic' (Chang, Heewon, et al, 2012:17). In other words, it is a method of inquiring the self in specific contexts and in relation to one another. As we implied earlier, the use of personal experience as a means of understanding a systemic- social phenomenon is particularly important, because it offers a privileged point of view into a cohesive set of interpretations and thoughts which "are not readily opened to others" (Chang, Heewon, et al.2012 :21). Methodologically CAE, as a form of autoethnography, can be considered to move along a continuum of processes that emphasize the self (autobiographical), the context (ethno) and the inquiry (graphy) (Ellis and Bochner ,2000: 740) but in a cooperative manner. CAE is centred around investigating the

personal, but it does so through a collective and collaborative process among a group of researchers (Chang, Heewon, et al, 2012:21). There are a variety of CAE approaches, but we utilised what Lund & Nabavi, 2008a; Norris, Sawyer, & Lund, 2012; and Sawyer & Norris, 2009, 2015) have labelled duoethnography or what Coia & Taylor (2006:159) call co/autoethnographic approach . As the latter argue, the purpose of this type of autoethnography is the “co-construction of meaning” about personal experience and the self in the social conditions and contexts in which they are situated (Coia and Taylor (2006: 159). As autoethnography, our approach focused on the marginalised aspects of our experience, exploring instances of disadvantage and injustice, and highlighting the personal as an indication of the social consequences of precarity and prompting for change (see Trotter et al., 2006). Roy and Uekusa (2021: 386) encourage social science researchers to employ this self-reflective strategy which enables privileged insight into personal life stories and how these are linked with others and the wider social context.

In this light, we decided to follow Norris, Sawyer, & Lund (2012) and approach this as a conversation; this was both a form of documentation and exploration of our own experiences, so it served both as a data collection and a form of analysis in the traditional methodological sense. We considered that this strategy was the most appropriate, as it incorporated a form of interviewing/focus group technique (asking each other questions or commenting on a pre-agreed issue) which would produce an output (transcript) to which we could perform further analysis. We then agreed that a “digital conversation” on Zoom would be the most appropriate approach during the pandemic. Indeed, to conduct research during the pandemic meant to resort to creative and innovative “distance methods’ (Taster, 2020, p. 8).

Doing digital research posed challenges and it was something we had just started doing in our respective research, namely doing online technology mediated interviews. It is important to consider the digital nature of this project, since the genesis of the project, the data collection and analysis for it have all taken place virtually. The COVID- 19 pandemic normalised the use of video- conferencing, making it a necessity during the lockdown. In our case, we were introduced to each other on Zoom and used this platform for our subsequent conversations. This meant that our geographical locations were less of an impediment than they might have been in the past. Moreover, it created a sense of further proximity and connection which is something we did not expect. The Zoom session created a dedicated space and time for the conversation – a safe space where we could reflect on our precarious condition. Furthermore, as Fielding et al (2008) note, online interviews are cheaper to carry out. Notwithstanding issues of the digital divide, carrying out research online provided flexibility and meant that we did not have to travel long distances to carry out our discussions. This can be particularly useful if you have international participants, as well as any participant who may otherwise find it difficult to find time to be interviewed in person. For much of the research project we lived over 400 miles away from each other. Even without taking COVID- 19 travel restrictions into consideration, this would have made continued in-depth conversations impossible.

Our decision to take an online collaborative auto-ethnographic approach has worked well for several reasons. Firstly, the nature of our research lent itself to a collaborative approach.

Furthermore, a qualitative approach was a better approach than a quantitative one, since our discussion was based on our own subjective experience. One disadvantage of this is that whilst we can situate our experiences within the wider context of precarity in academia, we also need to be aware that our experience is not definitive.

### *Epistemological Considerations in Online CAE*

More generally, CAE rests upon the idea of intersubjective experiences as constructed through dialogue, cooperation, and solidarity, with emphasis on emergence of emotions and ideas prompted by this joint self-reflexive inquiry. More importantly, CAE seeks to explore the self within the historical and social context it operates (Lapadat, 2017:598). Denzin (2014:20) argues that these interlinked personal narratives constitute an alternative call to action that undermines dominant ideas and discourses and the contexts that generate them. In our case this links to a critique to the structures of the academy. Online CAE is compatible with our feminist epistemological position which holds that knowledge is not value free and should highlight experiences of oppression to incite change. Moreover, it is a method and a strategy that embraces vulnerability (Holman Jones et al, 2013). In our view, online CAE represents a way of researching and knowing which is cooperative, reflexive, and non-hierarchical. More specifically, it emphasizes that knowledge is collective (Thomas et al, 2018) and that there is value in this explicitly collaborative approach. It is, however, important to note that online CAE can be used with a wide range of epistemological positions, and that online CAE aligns with a wide range of social justice, anthropological and phenomenological research.

In this sense, online CAE encourages epistemic and academic reflexivity, as it embodies a reflexive awareness of how knowledge is produced, by whom and for whom, and brings this into the fore of academic outputs, debates, and theories. Taking this into consideration, it is important to stress that our use of online CAE is a set of approaches and methods that explicitly acknowledge our epistemological and political standpoint, as well as our intention to highlight experiences of oppression and incite change. Specifically, our experiences of precarity, our belief in knowledge production as a collective endeavour, as well as our shared understanding of the importance of solidarity and support, reflects our feminist standpoint (Harding, 2004). Moreover, it demonstrates our intention to reinforce a feminist paradigm. Lapadat (2017: 591) refers to the work of Denzin (2003) to describe autoethnography as a:

political performance of resistance by one person, and another person- where, by telling their individual stories and theorizing them, (researchers) democratize research, critique racist and hetero-gender- normative dominant discourse.

Autoethnography recognizes the importance of individual experience since ‘every person’s experience must be acknowledged’ (Lapadat, 2017:591. Chang, Heewon et al (2012) note that there is a large body of research by academics exploring their experience as researchers. Our research follows in that tradition. It was, therefore, important to provide a safe and non-judgmental space, especially as precarity is an

emotive issue. As we will discuss in the ethics section, it was important that we considered our wellbeing as participants, even though we were also the researchers.

### **Section summary:**

- Online Collaborative Autoethnography is a method where the researchers carry out the research whilst also being participants of the research.

Collaborative Autoethnography is underpinned by concepts of solidarity and the valuing of individual experience. CAE is a reflexive method in terms of knowledge production and is suitable for emotive

### **Research Practicalities**

This case study was seen a collaborative project in all its dimensions, and we have agreed in advance that this will be the case. We ensured equal power in our collaboration at all stages of the research, such as decision on themes, decision on methods and practicalities, on analysis etc. We also decided that all outputs from the project would be written collaboratively to further reflect the cooperative nature of the project.

Data collection for the project primarily involved two online semi-structured conversations between us. Ethical approval was sought and granted from the University of Glasgow prior to this. Our conversations took place on zoom which we accessed using our institutional credentials and were recorded and automatically transcribed by zoom. We both went over the transcripts to revise any mistakes in transcription and once the transcripts were available, we organized the interview data into themes, and met online again to discuss these themes in more detail. This added an extra layer to our original “digital discussion,” since we could review what we had originally said and amend it. It was important that the data from our conversations was stored securely, but also somewhere that we could both access. We placed all our data in a password protected secure cloud location provided by one of the institutions where we work.

We began each conversation with a broad set of questions/ themes to allow for our discussion to organically develop (Longhurst, 2003). In our first conversation, we explored our experience of work in academia, and more specifically our experiences of precarity. Although we share some experiences of precarity in common, we were also able to reflect on our differences. For example, Claire is a UK citizen, and so has different experiences of UK academia than Lito, who is a migrant. Claire’s experience of precarity has been spread across different institutions, whereas Lito has had precarious contracts primarily at the same institution. Through looking at these differences we were able to understand precarity as both a systemic and specific problem. The use of online collaborative autoethnography as a method helped us foster these connections and shared understandings of the problem, by sharing knowledge and expertise. It also helped us increase our analytical capacity as we were able to share experiences and perspectives, and this in turn meant we could reflect on the wider problem of academic precarity while recognizing our precarity as part of a systemic problem within academia.

### Section summary:

- We applied for ethical approval at one of the institutions we worked at made sure that data was securely stored and accessible to both of us. We also agreed on a collaborative approach to outputs.
- We embarked on online a semi-structured conversations and this was followed by going through the data and organizing it into themes. We were able to look at our shared and divergent experiences and link these to wider discussions about precarity within UK Higher Education.

### Method in Action

One of the benefits of our digital collaborative approach is that we were able to reflect on our conversations and have further conversations about them. As we were both subjects of the research and the researchers, we were able to follow up on points we had made in a way that would not be possible, if we were interviewing participants. This continual collection of data required that we built a good rapport with each other. Chang, Heewon, et al, (2012: 38) note that in duo- autoethnographic approaches 'professional, sometimes personal, rapport becomes a fuel for enriching stories.' Alongside using video- conferencing to carry out our conversation we also regularly discussed the research via email and instant messages. The use of electronic communication allowed for continual dialogue with each other and certainly helped developed rapport. However, despite the strong rapport we developed, we would question the extent to which any of our discussions were ever truly organic or natural since we were also aware that we were collecting data. This demonstrates the blurring between personal and research conversation in the research and is something that we consider further in the discussion on ethics.

One of the most significant challenges is that our own personal experience changed throughout the research. At the very beginning of the research, Lito and Claire were both facing the end of their fixed term contracts, with no guarantee of new contracts. However, in the time since the project has started, Lito has secured a 36- month post, and Claire has secured a permanent contract. Whilst this does not invalidate anything that we previously spoke or wrote about as part of our research, going forwards we will need to account for how our own changing circumstances impact on our perspectives. Linked to this is the fact that much of the research was carried out away from our job roles. It is, therefore, important to consider how you will plan to carry out the research, especially if you are doing it around other responsibilities. Although the collaborative autoethnographic approach leads to rich data, it can also be time- consuming. We planned our research conversations in advanced and gave ourselves interim deadlines for transcription and analysis. This meant that we could keep on track. Working collaboratively was also beneficial here as we were able to allocate the work between us.

### *Ethics*



Collaborative autoethnographic work should be considered like any other piece of research. This entails that ethical approval must be obtained ideally before embarking upon such work. This may be seen as a grey area, given that the researcher and the participant roles overlap but there are a host of ethical issues that are associated with both roles that need to be considered in advance and they are usually documented in the ethics review process. This process is designed to support researchers to conduct research with integrity and according to ethical and legal standards. In the case of Autoethnography (AE) or CAE this may require preparing some documentation to hand out in the same manner as you would to the participants of your research. This may seem a bit unusual, but researchers are encouraged to reflect and think about the rigor and integrity of their work.

However, ethics expand beyond the review process, which is integral to academic research, and often frame the rationale of inquiry. In our case CAE was motivated by what Visse and Niemeijer (2016:302) refer to as “relational ethics of care,” which in this case is the practice of solidarity and support during precarious times reflected on our research practice and content. CAE provides relational insight into our experiences with a view to a more just and caring academia. Moreover, this relational approach is linked to the digital as well as the face-to-face aspects of CAE. One needs to consider the minimum digital conditions for participation and how these may reflect hierarchies and power relations in the digital sphere. In other words, the type of technology used, its ease of use, issues around the digital divide need to be considered (see Luka et.al, 2017). What is more, these potential challenges need to be undone for equity and balance to be achieved. In our case, these issues were answered by our interlinked academic positionings both precarious, at similar stages of our career and with variable privilege and lack of at the stage of the research. Moreover, we both observed how knowledge is produced in this process (Sprague, 2005: 5) which is an issue of responsibility towards each other as well as toward the wider research community. Sometimes the transfer of traditional methods onto an online format appears straightforward, especially in a digitally saturated everyday life exacerbated during the pandemic. However, it requires reflection as to how digital technology may be impacting on participants and researchers, (e.g., feeling Zoomed out) and require equal and multilateral negotiations. In other words, the digital labour required to participate and conduct the research should be considered (Asperg, Thiele, and van der Tuin, 2015).

As with all research working with individuals, some conditions for ethical research need to be met. One key point is anonymity. CAE is an approach that could potentially threaten anonymity of those who are not participants of the research. This is an issue which should not be lightly considered. In this case we made a conscious decision that our identities as participants and researchers would be visible and would feature in any future output. This decision was in line with our feminist epistemological stance, that saw our visibility as a key aspect of the experience we wanted to explore and communicate, and as a vehicle of change. However, before making such decision one needs to consider the challenges and limitations this may pose. On the one hand being eponymous highlights and validates the experience under exploration but potentially exposes personal and sensitive information as well as placing a strain on institutional or other affiliations. Before embarking on our conversation, we both made an agreement that our work would focus more on our experience of precarity, our thoughts and emotions which, we, however, would monitor. This means that we have made judgements about how much to disclose and we reviewed

our transcripts to identify areas we may want to reconsider including or which we may want to recall. Moreover, we decided to focus on what is subjective and personal rather than on the specific contexts, institutions or individuals that may have been linked to those experiences. This came after consideration of the power dynamics in which we are entangled, as precarious workers in powerful institutions but also as academics who have an interest in protecting academic work and integrity. When a researcher who has a public profile speaks about their own life and discloses their own experience, there is an immediate danger of exposing those who frame that experience and with whom the researcher interacts (Ellis, 2007). It is this aspect of relational ethics that becomes particularly central in relation to anonymity. Focusing on the subjective/ personal was a way to protect the identity of 'non- consenting others' (Mannay, 2016: 229).

Linked to this, the issue of confidentiality is also an important challenge. Even though there is control over how much is disclosed and to what extent conversations unravel, naturally occurring discussions can very often slide into unexpected territories. This can present two problems: the issue of confidentiality between/across participants and the issue of researcher responsibility. As these roles are intimately entangled in CAE some decision making was made in advance of embarking on our online conversation. Our online meeting was constructed as a safe space in which sharing and reflecting on potentially upsetting matters was possible, we were aware that we would have the opportunity to edit our transcripts and make decisions, if we felt unsure about what we had shared. Further to this, confidentiality is respected beyond the context of the research, as what we shared about ourselves will not be relayed outside the context of the research and without each other's consent and/or without the opportunity to frame this in an appropriate manner.

This is very much associated with the issue of consent which again can be complex in the context of online CAE (Lapadat, 2017). We consented freely into this joint exploration motivated by solidarity, scientific interest, and the condition of precarity. We consented into the online nature of this endeavour using types of technology that meet the standards of data protection. We also set processes to negotiate consent throughout the project both in relation to sharing experiences but also in terms of outputs and any associated activity linked to this piece of work. In this sense, online CAE constitutes a prime example of the need to negotiate consent on an ongoing basis as this is a requirement for ethical collaboration.

Although our research approach was well founded in the values of support and solidarity and constructed a safe space for discussion, we acknowledged the possibility of distress because of our conversation. As colleagues who have been working closely, we have a certain degree of closeness, which can alleviate any mild distress, however, we committed to providing some further support information in the event of a triggering discussion or a distressful memory.

### *Data protection*

In recent years, data protection, something that researchers were highly aware of and responsible for from an ethical and safety point of view, has now become a legal

requirement; keeping data safely stored and protecting participants' confidentiality is now a legal issue. Most academic institutions have set up processes and technologies that can support researchers in conducting research safely online, data storage and data transferring. In this light, it is best to select video conferencing technologies provided and approved by the affiliated institutions, using the dedicated accounts which usually provide an extra layer of online safety and protection. Similarly, institutional storage and transfer technologies can provide better security on this. This entails that privacy notices should be prepared and abided by. But this does not come without administrative and other ethical challenges. On the one hand the autonomy of the participant as to how the data is processed is bounded by institutional requirements, while precarious workers may have to argue their case in relation to data retention beyond their employment and the conditions for doing so.

A final point linking to confidentiality and data protection has to do with what in online or offline ethnographic work we consider to be data or meta data. Collaboration rests upon constant reflexive practice, such as discussions and negotiations about the research, about the analysis and presentation of research. These become, often, part of the data or features in some form and shape in the analysis. As these may emerge spontaneously e.g., impromptu conversations or meetings or emails, it is best that they all take place on the same safer institutional media.

#### Section summary

- When carrying out online CAE, it is important to consider the resources that you will need, including the time it will take to carry out the research and plan accordingly.
- Even though you are the research subject in a collaborative autoethnography, it is still important to consider ethics and apply for necessary ethical approval.
- It is also important to ensure you are following Data Protection guidance.

#### **Practical Lessons Learned**

Although you may be the subject of your research, you still need to consider ethics. For example, we needed to apply for ethical approval as researchers, even though we were researching ourselves. As our approach was rather experimental and sprang from an organic conversation about academic precarity, it took us some time to consider this as concrete piece of research. As a result, we were less organised at the beginning which delayed our application for ethical approval. It would have been helpful to consider how we would use the time before ethical approval to research and prepare for the data collection. Therefore, it is important to plan and organize ahead. As part of this, it is important to also consider secure data storage, ensuring access and ease of use for all your collaborators

One of the benefits of working collaboratively is that the work includes perspectives of more than one person. However, one potential disadvantage is that it can be unclear who is doing

what and when. When working collaboratively, it is helpful to have a schedule in place for when you will carry out your interviews/ conversations, when they will be transcribed and when you will write them up. It is also helpful to come up with a clear division of labour especially, if the group of collaborators is large. During this research project we utilised video chats, messenger apps and emails to ensure that we stayed connected and kept each other on track with the following steps of work. However, it was sometimes difficult to find time to keep lines of communication open and having a clearer timeline of when we would meet and what we would discuss and work on would have helped. Due to our established rapport and familiarity with each other we managed to work this out informally, but it can be a potential issue of tension with larger groups or with people you have not worked with before. Although the approach we have taken, keeps in line with ethnography in the wider sense- dealing with the unexpected and unknown in the field, we do think having a strategy for working collaboratively in the digital sphere can produce rich and robust results. Therefore this is something we will implement in the future. Furthermore, although we did often have time to reflect on our conversations afterwards, this was incidental rather than planned which will alter in our future work. When doing online CAE, especially if you are discussing potentially sensitive topics, it is helpful to give yourself time to reflect and make time for this to take place.

Similarly, it is useful to establish a concrete plan about what to do if any of the collaborators become upset or there are any disagreements with regards to the direction of work; whilst we agreed that we would make each other aware if we became upset and offer each other routes for support in hindsight it would have been helpful to agree to some guidelines for discussion before the conversations, especially around what to do if any of us became uncomfortable with the discussion, or if we had any strong disagreements about the direction of the research. Even though this never became an issue in our research, putting these in place would have allowed for greater transparency and would have resolved any potential disagreements quickly.

Overall, despite our lack of experience in creating protocols of practice, the key lesson we learnt throughout this research is to utilise the online tools available to maximise communication throughout the project. Using an online approach allowed us to have regular meetings and to keep in touch as we were analysing and writing up the research. However, this only worked because we had a good rapport and agreed on the focus of the research and its findings. It is, therefore, important to consider who you will be doing the research and how as much as what the research will be about.

#### Section summary

- It is important to plan your research in advance to make sure that you have time and space to analyse your data and organise further discussions. This is especially important when doing research online since often conversations can happen over multiple platforms and in different media.
- You should not forget the importance of ethics and making sure you look after the data you collect.

## **Conclusion**

Online Collaborative Autoethnography is a research approach that allows for a privileged insight into the interconnection of the self with others; it does so through a reflexive investigation of personal experience using digital means. It is associated with an epistemological position that views knowledge production as a collective endeavour and recognizes the value of collective research. It can be linked to feminist epistemologies and the ethics of care and solidarity, as it is a means to highlight experiences of oppression and enable change, though of course can be associated with other epistemological positions too. Online CAE entails the use of digital tools that construct suitable spaces for reflection and exploration of the interconnected self. Digital collaborative autoethnography, in the form of conversation, seeks to create a naturalistic setting in which ideas and experience will flow naturally and will be collectively negotiated. It can also create a safe space for emotive and sensitive topics.

When carrying out online collaborative autoethnography, it is important to consider how you will navigate eponymy alongside the need to keep information confidential and have a plan in place for how you will use the data you have collected. Although you are the subject of the research, you still need to consider ethics and formal ethical approval processes, as well as data protection. Although continual conversation can be generative, it is also important to have a plan in place for your conversations to make sure you are giving yourself enough time for analysis and further discussion. A digital conversation may be a naturalistic method, however, you need to consider that it is still a co-constructed narrative and that the digital sphere shapes according to its own logic. In that sense, you will need to consider the digital nature of the approach both in terms of how it is linked to the content and objectives of your research as well as the ethical and epistemological implications of the approach.

---

## **Discussion Questions**

1. What are the benefits of collaborative autoethnography?
2. What are the drawbacks of collaborative autoethnography?
3. What are the ethical considerations?
4. How can online tools help you carry out collaborative autoethnography?

---

## **Multiple Choice Quiz Questions**

1. What is Online Collaborative Autoethnography?

- A. A form of autoethnography where you work with others as both researchers and research subjects using digital means (CORRECT)
  - B. A form of autoethnography where you are the sole researcher
  - C. A quantitative research method
2. Do you need to consider ethics when doing online collaborative ethnography?
- A. No, you do not need to consider ethics at all.
  - B. Yes, you should consider ethics and complete an ethical approval if necessary. (CORRECT)
  - C. Yes, but you will never need to complete an ethical approval.
3. *What are the benefits of online CAE?*
- A. Collaborative Autoethnography provides quantitative data
  - B. Collaborative Autoethnography allows you to share perspectives and knowledge (CORRECT)
  - C. Doing Collaborative Autoethnography means you do not have to submit ethical approval.
4. *What are the Drawbacks of online CAE?*
- A. Collaborative Autoethnography can be time consuming (CORRECT)
  - B. Collaborative Autoethnography only provides quantitative data
  - C. Collaborative Autoethnography can only be done by large groups
5. *What are the ethical considerations associated with online CAE?*
- A. There are no ethical considerations
  - B. You need to consider issues of confidentiality and data protection (CORRECT)
  - C. You will be sending out lots of surveys so need to consider who your participants are.

### **Further Reading**

- Chang, H, Ngunjiri, W.F, Hernandez, C. K-A. (2012). *Collaborative Autoethnography: Developing Qualitative Inquiry*. Routledge.
- Denzin, N. (2014), *Interpretive Autoethnography*, Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA.

- Visse, M., & Niemeijer, A. (2016). Autoethnography as a praxis of care—The promises and pitfalls of autoethnography as a commitment to care. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 16, 301-312. doi:10.1108/QRJ-04-2016-0021

## Web Resources

[Insert links to up to six relevant web resources here]

- Taster, M. (2020), Editorial: Social Science in a Time of Social Distancing, *London School of Economy Impact Blog*, 23 March 20, available at:  
<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/03/23/editorial-social-science-in-a-time-of-social-distancing/> (accessed 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020).

## Reference List

- Asperg, C., Thiele, K., & van der Tuin (2015). Speculative before the turn: reintroducing feminist materialist performativity. *Cultural Studies Review*. 22(1), 145-172.  
<https://doi.org/10.5130/csr.v21i2.4324>
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, W.F, Hernandez, C. K-A. (2012). *Collaborative Autoethnography: developing qualitative inquiry*. Routledge.
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F., & Hernandez, K. A. C. (2016). *Collaborative autoethnography* (Vol. 8). Routledge.
- Coia, L., & Taylor, M. (2006, July). Moving closer: Approaching educational research through a co/autoethnographic lens. In *The Sixth International Conference on Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*.
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). Performing [auto] ethnography politically. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 25(3), 257-278.
- Denzin, N. (2014), *Interpretive Autoethnography*, Sage Publications, Los Angeles, CA.
- Ellis, C & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In Denzin, M. & Lincoln, Y. (pp. 733-768) *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.
- Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13, 3-29. doi:10.1177/1077800406294947
- Fielding, N. G., Lee, R. M., & Blank, G. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of online research methods*. Sage.
- Harding, S. G. (Ed.). (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. Psychology Press.
- Holman Jones, S., Adams, T., & Ellis, C. (2013). Introduction: Coming to know autoethnography as more than a method. In S. Holman Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 17-47). Left Coast Press.

- Lapadat, J. C. (2017). Ethics in autoethnography and collaborative autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(8), 589-603.
  - Longhurst, R. (2003). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. *Key Methods in Geography*, 3(2), 143-156.
  - Luka, M.E, Milete M., & Wallace J (2017). A feminist perspective on Ethical Digital Methods in Zimmer M & Kinder-Kurlanda K. (Ed.), *Internet Research Ethics for the Social Age: New Challenges, Cases, and Contexts*. Peter Lang
  - Lund, D. E., & Nabavi, M. (2008). A Duo-Ethnographic conversation on social justice activism: Exploring issues of identity, racism, and activism with young People. *Multicultural Education*, 15(4), 27-32.
  - Mannay, D. (2016). The politics of visibility, voice and anonymity: Ethically disseminating visual research findings without the pictures. In Warr, D, Guillemin, M, Cox, S & Waycott, J. *Ethics and Visual Research Methods* (pp. 225-235). Palgrave Macmillan.
  - Norris, J., Sawyer, R. D., & Lund, D. (2012). *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (Vol. 7). Left Coast Press.
- Roy, R. and Uekusa, S. (2020), "Collaborative autoethnography: "self-reflection" as a timely alternative research approach during the global pandemic", *Qualitative Research Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 383-392. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-06-2020-0054>
- Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2009). Duoethnography: Articulations/(re) creation of meaning in the making. In Gershon, W.S (Ed.) *The Collaborative Turn* (pp. 127-140). Brill Sense. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087909604\\_008](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087909604_008)
  - Sawyer, R., & Norris, J. (2015). Hidden and null curricula of sexual orientation: A duoethnography of the absent presence and the present absence. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 5-26.
- Taster, M. (2020), Editorial: Social Science in a Time of Social Distancing, *London School of Economy Impact Blog*, 23 March 20, available at: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/03/23/editorial-social-science-in-a-time-of-social-distancing/> (accessed 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020).
- Thomas, E, Stornaiuolo, A & Campano, G. Collective knowledge production and action." *Research in the Teaching of English* 53, no. 2 (2018): 97-101.
  - Trotter, J., Brogatzki, L., Duggan, L., Foster, E., & Levie, J. (2006). Revealing disagreement and discomfort through auto- ethnography and personal narrative: Sexuality in social work education and practice. *Qualitative Social Work*, 5, 369-388. doi:10.1177/1473325006067366
  - Visse, M., & Niemeijer, A. (2016). Autoethnography as a praxis of care—The promises and pitfalls of autoethnography as a commitment to care. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 16, 301-312. doi:10.1108/QRJ-04-2016-0021
  - Zheng, R. (2018). Precarity is a feminist issue: Gender and contingent labor in the academy. *Hypatia*, 33(2), 235-255.