A couple of years ago we went to a conference on participation and power in participatory and action research. As collaborative researchers, we apply creative methodologies such as roleplay, photo elicitation and peer observation to illuminate and deconstruct practitioners’ normative understandings of what it means to be, for instance, interdisciplinary or empathic. As such, our ambition is to illuminate and investigate potential gaps between rhetoric and practice – i.e. what the practitioners think they are doing and what they are in fact doing – in order to qualify their situated meetings with patients and relatives in a complex and unpredictable practice. At the conference, we presented a paper in which we took a reflexive look at ourselves as collaborative researchers and questioned: Do we walk the talk and live up to the democratic ideals of collaborative research in our facilitation of workshops with practitioners? Is there a difference between what we think we are doing – and what we are in fact doing? The purpose of the presentation was to challenge taken for granted assumptions about the way in which difference and diversity contributes to the creation of new knowledge in collaborative learning processes. In the paper, we take a closer look at an incident where the voice of a particular participant was silenced in a collaborative workshop, which were a part of a research and development project with health care professionals. As a point of departure for our critical reflexive moment-by-moment analyses, we showed a 4 minutes video-sequence of the incident in which a participant appeared to be silenced. The audience seemed to be moved by the video and there seemed to be unrest in the room. Still, we continued our presentation as planned. Birgitte explicated our critical reflexive approach to the analyses of the emergent power/knowledge relations in the incident. In conclusion, we suggested ethics to be a critical stance and invited the research community to discuss the implications and dilemmas this perspective may have for the ways in which you can navigate and practice collaborative research. We had hardly finished our presentation before several members of the audience requested to speak and posed questions like:
Why did you not intervene from the very beginning of the session?

How could you not see the humiliation of the participant in the specific situation?

Why did you not go back and talk to the participants about your analyses?

Which ethical codex do you apply here?

Introduction

Much research in management learning contexts focus on positive and rewarding incidents when they address the importance of working with reflexivity in participatory learning processes (Corlett, 2012, p. 117; Cunliffe, 2002). However, within critical reflexive approaches in the action research community, recent discussions address how democratic ideals of participatory research can be critically explored (Arieli & Friedman, 2009; Gunnarsson, 2003; Heen, 2005; Kristiansen & Bloch-Poulsen, 2004; Phillips & Kristiansen, 2013). This paper contributes to this line of research and, moreover, discusses the ethical complexity, which arises in the co-production of knowledge between researchers and participants. The implication of a critical reflexive perspective is that researchers should dare to focus on the gaps between rhetoric and practice and deconstruct our understandings of the nature of ethically proper research relationships in co-production processes in collaborative research. Instead of leaving sensitive phenomena out of the research process, it becomes an ethical imperative to investigate these phenomena in order to gain insight into what is at stake in dialogical reflexive processes. An awareness of how power relations are at play in all processes of knowledge production may strengthen the practical validity of “co-produced” knowledge in action research.

In the narrative we presented above, the audience does obviously not think we live up to the ideals for collaborative and democratic knowledge production. Moreover, in the narrative the silencing and othering appear to occur not only in the paper we present – but also between the audience and us – as researchers. Something is obviously at stake. The question is what? According to Blackman and Sadler-Smith,

being silent or silenced in organizational settings is not only a power-invested process, but also has ramifications for knowing, learning and organizing (Blackman & Sadler-Smith, 2009, p. 570).
The purpose of this paper is to investigate how the workings of power dynamics lead to the silencing and othering of particular participants. We revisit our discomfort at the conference - and in our reflexive analysis you can - inspired by Davies et al. - say that we are moving into a slippery, complex and demanding ground.

Not only must we engage in such an apparently fraught practice as reflexivity but also, in our engagement with research invent our own methods of meaning making as we go and we are in the process of deconstructing and moving beyond (Bronwyn Davies et al., 2004, p. 362)

According to Davies, it can be extremely ambivalent and unpleasant to look deeper into how we contribute to meaning making processes when we deconstruct them. However, it is mandatory if we wish to qualify our research and position as researchers.

In the next section, we expand on our critical reflexive approach to ethics, othering and collaborative knowledge production before we introduce more contextual information about the production and content of the conference paper and the response we got at the conference. In the concluding discussion, we raise two generic and ethical dilemmas in collaborative knowledge production we wish to discuss with you at the CMS conference.

**Critical approaches to reflexivity and ethics**

In our critical approaches to reflexivity and ethics, Foucault inspires us. According to him, ethics is a critical stance (Foucault, 1994); a stance that encourages continuous reflection and critique of the process and product of knowledge production. The conception of ethics changes the research focus from possession to production and from subjects to processes of subjectification. An applied approach to research ethics draws attention to how a researcher and/or facilitator (co-) produces (possibilities for) subject positions in the field of study/work – including which positions she nourishes in processes of collaborative knowledge production. In other words, research inspired by post-structuralism builds on an ethics of reflecting and exposing how any involvement in the world is a powerful and performative act. A post structuralist perspective reminds us that all participants are interwoven in situated power/knowledge-relations in which all actions are understood as processes of subjectification that are inherently and reflexively negotiated and connected to local discourses at play. This approach does not distinguish between the power embedded in individual actions and power embedded in discourses at play: They are two sides of the same coin and are
both active in subjectification processes in collaborative knowledge production. We suggest that a post-structuralist perspective provides a strong platform for reflexivity on how any process of change and knowledge production—including those who claim to propagate democracy, justice, empowerment etc.—are non-innocent movements within a non-innocent space (Neidel & Wulf-Andersen, 2013, p. 157)

According to Foucault, power relations can be subjected to empirical, situated studies precisely because they are dynamic and contextual. In this article, we investigate how dynamics of knowledge and power unfold in the narrative. Similar to Phillips and Napan we argue that

...reflexivity about the production of the power/knowledge in the discourse of dialogue can form a platform for a destabilisation of discourse that can open up for practice change in a particular normatively prescribed direction (Phillips & Napan, 2016, p. 7).

In this regard, we argue, that the unravelling of mechanisms of in- and exclusion in tensional situations with problematic outcomes has potential to prevent othering and, therefore, further inclusion of marginalised voices. In the next section we expand more on the dynamics of power, identity, and othering before we take a closer look at the way in which this dynamic unfolds in the narrative.

Power, identity and othering

From a Foucauldian perspective, power is “an active productive force which mobilises subjectivity and creates subject positions” (Usher & Edwards, 2005, p. 399). As such, subjectivity is produced in the way we position ourselves or are positioned by others. The subjectification process and concept of positioning draws attention to the dynamic aspects of interaction (Bronwyn Davies & Harré, 1990; Søndergaard, 1996) in which the power of dominant discourses is not absolute. This implies that subjects are not recruited passively into a certain position. Frequently, there are multiple discourses at play and we have choices regarding which discourses we choose to take up or not as we position ourselves in every utterance we make (Bronwyn Davies & Harré, 1990). In other words, the process of subjectification can be seen both as a process “that originates outside the individual and is determined by forces external to the individual, and as the person’s inner work” (Christensen, 2016). Moreover, both processes “suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to”
(Foucault, 1994, p. 334). As such, they can be seen as a product of complex interplays between the individual and his or her immediate social surroundings and contextual norms.

A basic premise of post-structuralist theory is that the primary instrument in the co-construction of identity through positioning in social interaction is the invocation of difference through relations to “the Other”. Jaworski & Coupland describe how

it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what one is not, to precisely what one lacks, to what has been called the constitutive outside, that the ‘positive’ meaning of any term – and thus one’s ‘identity’ – can be constructed (Jaworski & Coupland, 2005, p. 672).

Invoking difference does not have to be a problem. However, it becomes a problem when othering rests on a normative evaluation of others in which individual characteristics and/or actions are classified as right or wrong, good or bad. This way of invoking difference “…often generates strong emotional reactions. Who would voluntarily accept being positioned by others as ‘the different other’?” (Olesen & Pedersen, 2013). As such, it entails dynamics of exclusion as well as inclusion, circumscribing the voices which can contribute to the production of new knowledge and to making somebody who does not fit in the ‘different other’. Thus the post-structuralist perspective is preoccupied with the “non-innocence” of any participation and involvement, and with the ways in which power infuses all knowledge production processes (Christensen, 2016; Neidel & Wulf-Andersen, 2013).

**A paper presentation on othering in collaborative knowledge production at a conference on collaborative research**

The paper we presented at the conference was written on a collaborative development and research project in two psychiatric wards. In the project, we worked alongside the practitioners to improve their psychoeducation and dialogues with patients (Olesen & Nordentoft, 2013). In this process, we negotiated a detailed framework for the workshops with the participants in order to create a space for mutual and democratic investigation of participants’ dilemmas and challenges in their practice. Particularly, we introduced peer-observation (Lauvås & Handal, 2006; Nordentoft & Wistoft, 2012)) and held regular workshops where the peer observation pairs shared and reflected on their experiences together with the rest of the group. The workshops received extremely positive
evaluations from the participants and the project at the psychiatric ward was awarded a prize in 2010 by The Nordic Network for Adult Learning for innovation in the field of competence development for healthcare professionals. In the project, we followed principles of procedural ethics – informed consent, confidence and consequences - both before and during the research process (Kvale, 1996; Nordentoft & Kappel, 2011). However, we, as mentioned, discovered several incidents in which certain participants appeared to be silenced when we went through the video-footages after the workshop.

The incident in question comes from the third workshop where a nurse has observed a healthcare assistant (HA) in his conversation with a psychiatric patient who had a massive consumption of coffee and cigarettes. In his psychoeducation the HA anticipated to make the patient reduce her coffee intake. However, the nurse is critical of HA’s actions in her peer feedback and talks on his behalf. As such the HA is at risk of loosing his face and becomes almost what Goffman calls a “nonperson” which is characterized by the fact that others talk on their behalf (Aronson, 1998). Significantly, we – the researchers – did not interfere and thereby appeared to approve of the nurses feedback. We called the paper “Walking the talk” because we realized that we had not been able to “walk the talk” and honor the normative democratic ideals for collaborative knowledge production. Our ambition was to initiate democratic collaboration and knowledge production – at the same time – we acted out a methodology based on fixed positions and power relations, which inherently led to othering and the marginalization of certain participants (Olesen & Nordentoft, 2013).

In our talk at the conference, we drew attention to the difficult and emergent balances researchers have to navigate in and demonstrate how we fail to honor the normative democratic ideals for collaborative knowledge production. For instance, we illuminated the way in which we as researchers (explicitly or implicitly) nourishes our own positions and power in the situated context and fail to register the othering processes taking place in the workshop. We summarized these emergent balances in collaborative knowledge production in three paradoxes.

*Firstly, our ambition is to engage in democratic collaboration and knowledge production; at the same time, we act out a methodology based on fixed positions and power relations.*
Going through, the video-footages of the workshop, we noticed the impact of multimodal aspects for the way in which positions and power relations appeared to be negotiated between the participants and us. Aspects, which clearly contravened our intention of creating a space for a democratic dialogue. For instance, we sat at head of the table. This seating appeared to encourage a teacher-student type of interaction in which we posed the questions and the participants were inclined to respond and looking for an accept to their response from us. Moreover, the boundaries between normative and situated knowledge forms accentuated in participants’ talk seemed to be blurred and intertwined. In other words, we were caught in our own web and not able to transform our normative understanding of the difference between normative and situated knowledge in the situated dialogues in the workshop. Instead, the continuous mixing of different knowledge forms was closely linked to, and shaped, the ways in which positions and power relations were negotiated and distributed among the participants. This interactional dynamic eventually led to othering of a particular participant.

*Secondly, we advocate that practitioners listen to the patients in order to meet their needs; at the same time, we do not listen to what practitioners state that they need from us.*

As mentioned in the narrative, our ambition is to deconstruct practitioners’ normative understandings of what it, for instance, implies to listen. However, the emergence of a teacher-student type of interaction seemed to enforce an interactional dynamic in which we imposed our normative understanding of what it means to listen onto the practitioner in which we, paradoxically, were inviting them to produce more context-sensitive answers. This dynamic infused the asymmetrical relationship between the practitioners and us and the othering process. In this regard, Arieli (2009, p. 280) points out: “*Asking questions is a sign of power over and domination, in which the stronger party asks questions and the weaker party, is expected to give answers*”.

*Thirdly, we want to let go of control; at the same time, we want to stay in control.*

In the video footages of the workshops, we alternate between relinquishing and staying in control. In the two first paradoxes, we argue that we stay in control and act out the opposite of our democratic intentions. On the other hand, there are also several instances in the video-footages, where we do not intervene or speak. In other words, moments in which we let go of control. Recent publications in the action research community suggests that “*it seems as if knowledge is produced*...
when the researchers give up being in control and begin listening to what emerges, within themselves and in relation to their various partners” (Phillips & Kristiansen, 2012, p. 267). However, the incident in the narrative is such a moment and – as we have described – the nurse positions herself in a superior position and others her peer. As such, this situation provides knowledge on how letting go does not necessarily mean more democratic dialogues.

After the presentation of these three paradoxes, we invited the audience at the conference to discuss tensions in collaborative knowledge production rather than the taken for granted assumptions about the fruitful and successful nature of such processes. Specifically, we questioned how we can work with our own position as researcher/facilitator and design a collaborative space to ensure creating space for all voices? To tell the truth, we were a bit nervous – but also curious and excited about the feedback we would get.

**Othering processes at the conference on collaborative research**

Nobody seemed to be interested in the paradoxes, we had introduced. Instead, after a few moments of silence, we were overwhelmed by what we heard as aggressive, accusing questions from parts of the audience.

It appeared as if our research colleagues was emotionally affected and also ethically disturbed by our presentation. Rather than accepting our invitation to be critical reflexive, they appeared to to condemn our praxis as collaborative researchers. We know that many of the researchers at the conference work with post-structuralist approaches to collaborative research, and therefore, we assumed that there would be a consensus regarding the notion that researchers cannot objectively see, act or interpret situations, they take part in, better than their co-researchers from the field of praxis. Never the less the reaction from the audience indicated the opposite.

At the time, we felt as if time stood still. We experienced an intense discomfort and we had a distinct feeling of making big academic fools out of ourselves; Why did we invite all this critique? We strived to maintain our face (Goffman, 1972) and in hindsight, our response to the intimidating questions we were asked to respond to must have appeared defensive and also somewhat aggressive. Our answers went like “We thought that we were supportive in making the participant formulating his
experiences with his own words” and “We suggest that you will also experience that you will shut down some voices when you facilitate collaborative processes. Most of the time you do not discover it – because you do not record it on video”.

In the situation, we were not able to “disidentify” (Heen, 2005, p. 270) with our feelings and be reflexive about their nature of origin. Later on, we were able to use them as information. According to Heen feelings can “convey quite accurate information about the outer world” (Heen, 2005, p. 270) and, therefore, be used as point of departure for investigating hypotheses about what is at stake in emotional moments.

So after a while, our feelings were still there, however, we were able to distance ourselves from them and observe them, almost as if they belonged to somebody else. In this regard, Cunliffe asserts that if we engage in and reflexively investigate moments in which we become emotionally “struck” then we can make sense of our experience. Moreover, this investigation can lead to the creation of a practical, embodied and situated knowledge, which emerges from the experience itself. A knowledge that illuminates the tacit and taken for granted aspects of practices. As such, a reflexive exploration and perhaps understanding of emotional situations has potential to affect and change our entire “being, talking and acting” (Cunliffe, 2002, p 36).

In her chapter, “My Discomfort” Lilleaas (Lilleaas, 2013) makes a critical reflexive analysis of her experience as a researcher in her field of study. Similarly to our experience, she describes how it was an immense challenge for her to address all of the ethical questions which surfaced in her writing process (Lilleaas, 2013, p. 112). Drawing on Bourdieu she addresses the challenge of being critical to your own profession – a profession which is hard-wired in your own deep structure. She, moreover, suggests that there is an “academic doxa” in which disciplines and researchers contribute to a “static” - i.e. a certain way of viewing research practices (Lilleaas, 2013, p. 117). Moreover,

The researchers practice can be a result of embodied habits and a part of a game regarding legitimacy in the research field (Lilleaas, 2013, p. 117)

Lilleaas appears to refer to traditional academic norms in qualitative research when she refers to and criticizes academic doxa. However, from our experience at the conference we think this doxa also applies to action research and collaborative research practices. In action research, there is a
prevailing ideal of democratic knowledge production in a transformative process. Together, researchers and practitioners are able to “identify important emerging issues that would otherwise remain invisible” (Bammer, Brown, Batilawa, & Kunreuther, 2003, p. 86) and produce new knowledge in a mutual development of practice. In this collaboration, the relationships and the local formation of “networks of power dynamics” (Reason & Bradbury, 2001) are seen as essential to the knowledge production and possible outcomes of the research and change process. “Participation” is a defining characteristic of collaborative approaches and it is based on a central premise that research is enacted “with” people rather than “on” or “for” them (Bradbury & Reason, 2001). The ideal is a democratic relationship in which both sides exercise power and shared control over the research process. Within this framework, researchers are supposed to act as committed facilitators, participants, and learners rather than distanced, neutral observers, analysts, or manipulators (Arieli & Friedman, 2009, p. 265).

Contrary to these ideals, we expose how we contribute to the exclusion of voices at the conference. Therefore, we interpret the reactions of the audience as a feeling of discomfort for two reasons: Not only do we expose an unethical incident – we also show how we have contributed to the occurrence of it. Drawing on Cunliffe (Cunliffe, 2002), we assert, that the audience was “struck” emotionally by watching how the voice of a participant was excluded in a way, which almost made him a non-person. So just like we were struck emotionally by the response from the audience – the audience was struck probably because we – as collaborative researchers - disturbed the doxa and taken for granted ways of doing collaborative research. Surprisingly, many of the participants at the workshop become normative in their questioning about the ethical standards we must live up to in spite of the fact that they, themselves, also work with poststructuralist approaches to collaborative research. Their reaction appeared to be centered around questions which invited to criticism of our competencies as facilitators and collaborative researchers rather than the discussion of generic challenges in collaborative knowledge production we invited them to take part in.

Our discomfort and “struckness” made us aware of the contrast between acceptable and unacceptable emotions in the action research community – i.e. emotions, which are recognized or dismissed and downplayed. At the conference, mutually rewarding relations clearly seemed to be nourished and privileged over “critical-reflexive” approaches to the production of new knowledge.
Somehow, this discovery was no surprise. However, we suggest that both our discomfort, and also the discomfort of the audience can be linked to the way in which unspoken feeling rules in the action research community were violated. According to Hochshild (Hochschild, 1983) feeling rules can be seen as norms - i.e. unspoken expectations - for the way in which it is appropriate to feel and act out your feelings (Hochschild, 1979). Our paper appeared to oppose a prominent discourse in the action research community – i.e. that action researchers and their co-researchers create mutually rewarding and flourishing relations and communities together (Reason & Bradbury, 2001). As such, our presentation can be seen as a threat to this “flourishing” discourse, and therefore, we were positioned as “the different other” (Olesen & Pedersen, 2013). In other words, we disturbed the audience and their normative perceptions of what it implies to be a proper collaborative researcher and facilitator. At the same time we were inscribed, and did actively inscribe ourselves in a sociocultural context, where we didn’t fit in.

In light of our experiences at the conference, we assert that if collaborative researchers are to tackle the tensions between ‘what ought to be´ and `what is´ and – so to speak - `walk the talk´ of co-production in action research they must deconstruct their understandings of the nature of ‘proper’ research relationships and ‘proper’ knowledge forms. Importantly, this investigation include a reflexive analysis of their own emotional reactions – i.e. discomfort and failures as well as their successes (Heen, 2005; Levy, 2016; Lilleaas, 2013).

**Concluding discussion**

In the unravelling of the narrative we have presented in the beginning of this paper, we have been moving on a “slippery” and emotionally loaded ground. A post-structuralist perspective is preoccupied with the “non-innocence” of any participation and involvement, and with the ways in which power infuses all knowledge production processes (Christensen, 2016; Neidel & Wulf-Andersen, 2013). According to this understanding, differences and tensions cannot be resolved or dissolved per se. Rather, as Phillips (2011a, p. 68) suggests, they can be subjected to reflexive consideration in detailed empirical analysis of the productive role of power in emergent dynamics of in- and exclusion, whereby certain voices are privileged and others are marginalised or silenced (Gershon, 2009; Phillips, Kristiansen, Vehviläinen, & Gunnarsson, 2013). However, this manoeuvre is complex. When you are emotionally struck, it seems easy to dichotomise – establish an “us” versus
“them” in the analyses and lose sight of the dynamic features of collaborative processes. We struggle with this in both our analysis of the incident at the psychiatric ward and at the conference. Both situations are more complex than we are capable of communicating. In an attempt to stay true to the complex process of collaborative research, we will close this article by introducing two emerging generic and ethical dilemmas in the narrative – dilemmas, to which there are no straightforward answers.

Whose responsibility?

| When power is seen in a Foucauldian way it is not possible for researchers to be responsible for (collaborative knowledge production) processes. | From a normative position, we - as humans and researchers - have an ethical responsibility in our relationship to others. |

As we have described in the paper, the audience at the conference seems disturbed by our presentation and the unethical nature of the way in which we have conducted the workshops in which certain participants were silenced. Thereby we exposed not only ourselves but also – importantly - the practitioners. However, we suggest that even apparently ‘innocent situations’ are loaded with power. Christensen says:

Whereas the traditional (Marxist) power is rather explicit, Foucault points at all the subtle mechanisms of influence that operates in our linguistic, behavioral and institutional practice (Christensen, 2016, p. 2).

Thus, the premise, that power exists and is being exercised even when no one seems to be dominating or dominated is not accepted at the conference (Foucault, 1994). Moreover, when power is seen as productive, we cannot be responsible for the ways participants involve themselves or each other in collaborative knowledge production processes (Neidel & Wulf-Andersen, 2013).

Because knowledge and power relations are dynamic, there is no insurance for what happens in collaborative research processes. This poststructuralist approach can be deeply disturbing because it contrasts with traditional scientific ideals, which emphasize the ability of science to predict future events and unfortunate incidents from happening. Furthermore, it suggests that normative ethical guidelines can be seen as instrumental and over-simplistic representations of the mostly ‘messy’, situated and interactional realities surrounding collaborative research processes.
However, from a normative position, we - as humans and researchers - have an ethical responsibility in our relationship to others. Even though we consider ourselves as equally involved and committed to the research process, it does not take away our responsibility – neither in the incident with the practitioners nor at the conference together with our fellow researchers. We cannot, as Shotter says, “relate ourselves to others and otherness as we ourselves please”. When we operate situated as researchers, “our actions take on an ethical or moral quality” (Shotter, 2016, p. 11).

Thus, the dilemma represents a meeting between two ethical poles, which do not comply with one another. In mainstream qualitative research and ethics, researchers are asked to consider their ethical obligation and position, because they are seen as superior to and can exercise power over their informants. According to Foucault, ethics is a critical stance (Christensen, 2016). A stance, which pays attention to what emerges in the research process. From this perspective, researchers and facilitators must be aware of their own contribution to the reflexive nature of positioning and subjectification processes (Christensen, 2016, p. 13). We suggest that we can only act as responsible researchers if we constantly have an open and critical-reflexive discussion on our research- and facilitating practices with our colleagues.

The challenge of representation

| How can we expose dynamics of othering - | and not expose individuals? |

The dilemma of representation is embedded in the epistemology of research. We suggest that some of the emotional reactions after our paper presentation at the conference can be interpreted in light of the Kantian distinction between relating to others as an end or as means to something else. According to Kant, a fundamental principle of morality, which underlie all of our moral duties is that humans being should be treated as an end themselves – and not as means to something else. In other words, we were exposing the poor practitioner for our own benefit and making him a means to an end in our research. De Raeve (Raeve, 1994) takes her point of departure in this Kantian notion when she discusses the ethical nature of research in sensitive settings. She refers to how researchers historically has tended to view it legitimate to perform research on vulnerable and disadvantaged people. She, moreover, argues that that as long as researchers are focused on the completion of the
research not the care of the individual’ subjects, then they are still treating other people as ‘means to an end’.

From a post-structuralist perspective, nobody is vulnerable per se. Instead, all participants (including researchers) are interwoven in situated power/knowledge relations where all actions are understood as processes of subjectification. In this dynamic process, all identities are discursively and reflexively negotiated in the situated context. In our research, we anticipate to mediate and reconcile these two apparently contradictory epistemological positions. Firstly, from a normative ethical position, we acknowledge that we have an ethical obligation as authors of the paper. Secondly, we agree that we cannot write about our relationships with other people without invoking distance. Thirdly, we are ambitious in how we present our research objects or partners, however, we did not imagine the force of the ethical and emotional feeling rules we were violating. Finally, we did not only describe the participants in our talk, we also them participants on video! So – you may ask: Do our noble intentions make it acceptable to show the humiliating process where a person is made a non-person?

Maybe if we had read Strumińska-Kutra article and her argument for not revealing sensitive data - we would have known better – she says that

Even if communication of detailed descriptive research on relations of power would not pose an ethical risk (...) it is still prone to underestimate power inequalities (Strumińska-Kutra, 2016, p. 3).

Ellis questions which stories researchers are allowed to share and to construct (Ellis, 2007). Interestingly, she raises the same question as one of the members of the audience at the conference: Is it ethically legitimate to present a paper, which has not been seen or approved by the involved participants? Still, you can reverse this question and ask if it would be ethically legitimate to show the video to the participants. In Lilleaas experience “giving knowledge back to participants gives them the opportunity to produce new understandings of themselves and of society” (Lilleaas, 2013, p. 118). However, we see that there could be a risk of exposing the same practitioner once again and thereby repeating and perhaps increasing the othering-process. We chose not to return and show the video to the participants and share our analyses with them. We did not want to take that chance – and we did not - and we still do not have compelling ideas of how to prevent this. Perhaps you do?
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