

Organisational autoethnography: possibilities, politics and pitfalls

Welcome to this special issue of the *Journal of Organisational Ethnography* “Organisational Autoethnography: possibilities, politics and pitfalls”. This special issue acknowledges the growing interest in organisational autoethnography (OAE). To date, there has been no special issue in the *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* on OAE. However, OAE has always been important to this journal, first introduced as a research method in the inaugural issue (Doloriert and Sambrook, 2012). The interest in OAE as an approach/method of research continues to increase, as demonstrated by the number of citations this paper received. Furthermore, another 14 OAE related articles have been published across various issues in the *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, with several others mentioning AE.

Interest in OAE goes far beyond the *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*. There is an increasing number of articles on OAE in a broad range of journals, across a broad spectrum of disciplines and subdisciplines (see for example, Boylorn, 2014; Butcher, 2013; Foster, 2017; Grenier, 2015; Herrmann, 2012b; Pelias, 2003). Closer to home, scholars are writing an increasing number of articles on OAE in leading business and management journals (e.g. Learmonth and Humphreys, 2012 in *Organisation*; Boyle and Parry, 2007 in *Culture and Organization*), as well as increasing number of book chapters (e.g. Sambrook, 2015, 2016) and texts (Herrmann, 2017).

The explosion of OAE is impressive. Autoethnographers have been tackling important organisational topics such as accounting (Davie, 2008; Haynes, 2013), human resources (Grenier and Collins, 2016; Sambrook, 2015, 2017; Sambrook *et al.*, 2014), leadership (Kempster and Iszatt-White, 2013; Murphy, 2008; Parry, 2008), marketing (Hackley and Hackley, 2016; Holbrook, 2005; Patterson and Baron, 2010), organisational spirituality (Anderson, 2018), public relations (de Andrade, 2014; James, 2012), workplace discrimination and bullying (Sobre-Denton, 2012; Vickers, 2007) and work-life balance issues (Aubrey *et al.*, 2008; Cohen *et al.*, 2009).

Furthermore, there are OAEs exploring diverse types of organisations, including family businesses (Lindemann, 2017; Tull, 2017), health care organisations (Brommel, 2017; Ellis, 1999; Tullis, 2012; Foster, 2014; Foster *et al.*, 2006), information technology (Cain and Trauth, 2017; Kidd *et al.*, 2013), the military (Higate and Cameron, 2006; Hunnicut, 2017), non-profit organisations (Herrmann, 2011; Kramer, 2017), religious organisations (Nash, 2017; Hokkanen, 2017), public administration (Frandsen, 2015), retail establishments (Denker, 2017; Sidoti, 2015), sports organisations (Krizek, 2017; Trujillo, 2013; Trujillo and Krizek, 1994), the tourism industry (Mackenzie and Kerr, 2013; Neumann, 1999; Scarles, 2010) and of course academia (Bochner, 1997, 2008, 2016; Doloriert and Sambrook, 2009, 2011; Ellis *et al.*, 2017; Herrmann, 2012a, b; Tullis and Holman Jones, 2014; Vicary and Jones, 2017).

Related to autoethnography are the notions of “at home” ethnography that have been introduced in the journal (Alvesson and Einola, 2018). Like OAE, at-home ethnography involves studying one’s own organisation. However, the focus is different. Alvesson and Einola, 2018 (p. 213) explain that “‘At home’ and ‘auto’ may overlap, but the former is interested mainly in learning about what goes on in the various interactions or events one observes and in which one has a limited personal stake. For instance, an at-home ethnographer may observe how others deal with hierarchical relations, and not focus so much on one’s own personal experiences of hierarchies”. In this special issue on OAE, however, we focus very much on the personal experiences of, with and within organisations.



All of this reflects on the growing awareness and attraction of novel research methods to examine and better understand complex cultural organisational issues. So, it is our immense pleasure to introduce this special issue focussing on the possibilities, politics and pitfalls of OAE. First, we briefly define and discuss the nature of OAE. In doing so, we identify some of the formative work in OAE, setting the scene for this edition. We then introduce the papers in this special issue. We end revealing some of the possibilities, politics and pitfalls, not least some of the ethical issues, that we have faced on this interesting editorial journey.

Defining organisational autoethnography

Boyle and Parry (2007) contend that the prime focus of an OAE is to illuminate the relationship between the individual and the organisation. As Herrmann (2017) suggests, the individual's relationship with the organisation is ubiquitous: "An organization was involved bringing you into the world, and an organization will be involved in burying you" (p. 6). When we define organisation, as academics, we normally first think about our universities or Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Alvesson and Einola (2018) note "it is surprisingly uncommon that academics study the "lived realities" of their own organizations or other phenomena they have good "natural" access to" (p. 212). However, sociological and anthropological studies of academic organizations go back at least to 1970s (Bloland, 1979; Griffiths, 1979; Ramsey, 1975). For a variety of reasons, we organisational scholars were, unfortunately, a little late to recognise the importance of this form of research on our own institutions (see Herrmann, 2017).

Some of this is due to our vastly different disciplinary backgrounds. For Sally, until recently, employed in a traditional British (Welsh) University, she was located in a business school. Within this type of organisation, there are departments of accounting, business, economics, finance, management, marketing, organisational behaviour (OB), strategy, etc., each of which could provide rich AEs (e.g. Haynes, 2006). Drilling down further, for example, Sally has focussed on AEs of human resource development (HRD) along with other HRD colleagues in the UK and USA (Grenier, 2015; Grenier and Collins, 2016; Lee, 2016; Sambrook, 2015, etc.). So Sally tends to think of organisations in terms of OB and organisational studies. Yet other social science studies of organisations are different from this, and take a non-business approach. For example, Andrew's edited collection is derived from the communication studies discipline (Herrmann, 2017). Here, authors narrate their life experiences in various organisations, tackling issues, such as sex, gender, stigma, illness, economics, masculinity, socialisation, quitting, disappointment and mistreatment. The organisations written about include a local bar, family businesses, the military, a news organisation, dialysis clinics and information technology, illustrating the wide range of contexts for OAEs.

Organisational autoethnographers not only investigate their own organisations (Learmonth and Humphreys, 2012) but collaborate with practitioners and students from other organisations, crafting "co-produced" AE (e.g. Kempster *et al.*, 2008) and/or "collaborative autoethnography" (e.g. Chang *et al.*, 2012, Jones and Sambrook, 2016), or co-authored (Herrmann *et al.*, 2013). Such co-authored pieces can also address some relational ethical concerns (Ellis, 2007). The range of organisations on which to focus is expansive – from public sector, including health and social care (Jones, 2012; Jones and Sambrook, 2016; Roberts, 2007; Wainwright, 2010) and the military (Hunnicut, 2017) to private organisations, including SMEs (Lindemann, 2017) companies (Kempster and Stewart, 2010) and third sector/social enterprises (Land and King, 2014).

To address these differences, this SI incorporates diverse conceptualisations of organisation. Perhaps unsurprisingly to us, the majority focus on public sector Higher Education organisations across the globe, ranging from the UK (Brewis *et al.*, Campbell and Beattie, who also includes Russia), to the USA (D'Souza and Pal), New Zealand

(Fitzpatrick and Farquhar) and South Africa (Mayer and May). Still in the public sector, Lee reflects back on her (British) high school organisation and Jonrad's research is situated in a health care organisation. We have just two examples in the private sector: Nycyk focusses on a (large) Australian construction organisation, and Herrmann's is set in a (small) North American comic book shop. These fit reasonably well with Doloriert and Sambrook (2012)'s categorisation below.

AE in, of and for organisations

The AE method allows for insightful and emotionally-rich readings of organisational life. As highlighted in the inaugural issue (Doloriert and Sambrook, 2012), we suggest organisational AE can occur within at least three contexts.

Autoethnography within Higher Education organisations

This is increasingly popular, due not least to the convenience of researching one's own organisation (see Doloriert and Sambrook, 2009, 2011; Sambrook *et al.*, 2008). Contributions here explore the autoethnographer as a researcher/teacher/administrator etc. doing scholarly work, and/or as an employee working in an organisation (that happens to be HE). Many HE autoethnographies fit into both categories as the autoethnographer reveals their complex and multifaceted story (Doloriert and Sambrook, 2009, 2011; Duarte and Hodge, 2007; Ellis, 2007; Etherington, 2007; Haynes, 2006; Humphreys, 2005; Jago, 2002; Krizek, 1998; Medford, 2006; Pelias, 2003; Poulos, 2010; Rambo, 2007; Riad, 2007; Sambrook, 2010; Sambrook *et al.*, 2008; Scott, 2009; Sparkes, 2007). Several of the papers in this special issue feature university organisational settings – such as Beattie, Brewis *et al.*, Campbell, D'Souza and Pal, Fitzpatrick and Farquhar and Mayer and May.

Autoethnography within “previous/other life” organisations

Autoethnographers sometimes write about their experiences elsewhere, particularly their work experiences prior to entering HE, although this could include work experiences simultaneously with HE. Examples of these types of organisational AE include Blenkinsopp (2007), Vickers (2007) and Zavattaro (2011). A good example of this in this special issue is Lee, who reflects back on her experiences as a (gay) school teacher, harassed by a neighbour and unsupported by her head teacher and writes about it in her new context as an academic doctoral researcher. Another is Nycyk, reflecting on his research/project management experiences in a construction organisation.

Autoethnography as complete member research in other organisations

AE as complete member research is perhaps more difficult given the tensions and impracticalities of becoming a complete member researcher in an organisation other than the researcher's own. Doloriert and Sambrook (2011) have observed that recently there are several examples of works that show organisational AE (Goodall, 1994; Van Maanen, 1998), but only a handful that outwardly call themselves organisational AE (e.g. Kempster *et al.*, 2008; Kempster and Stewart, 2010; Yarborough and Lowe, 2007). Opportunities arise through what Kempster *et al.* (2008) refer to as co-produced AE where at least one author is researcher and at least one other a practitioner working in an “other” organisation (Boyle and Parry, 2007; Kempster *et al.*, 2008; Kempster and Stewart, 2010; Yarborough and Lowe, 2007). In this special issue, we have potentially two papers in this category. The first is where Eve Jonrad reflects on being a psychiatric nurse in a healthcare organisation where a smoking ban is resisted by other nurses. Yet, could we add Andrew Herrmann's paper as a (mere) participant – and not complete member – in a comic book store?

As Herrmann (2017, p. 1, emphasis in the original), notes, “If autoethnography begins with “a *person*, an individual *researcher*, who interrogates their self and their positionality” it is not necessary to be a fully enmeshed “complete member” organisational participant to write organisational autoethnography. So, this can helpfully expand Doloriet and Sambrook’s (2012) at least three contexts and provide more possibilities for organisational autoethnography (Herrmann, this issue).

With these different forms of organisational AE in mind, the aims of this special issue are to:

- introduce early career researchers to the benefits and challenges (possibilities, politics and pitfalls) of doing AE in various organisational contexts;
- encourage and promote the dissemination of organisational autoethnographic research; and
- demonstrate, despite its lack of generalisability and focus on the individual/self, how AE can illuminate and inform organisational practice, and potentially effect change.

SI themes

This special issue has three themes that each explores the possibilities, politics and pitfalls of AE as a growing and diverse method of organisational inquiry. The papers in the “doing” theme mainly exemplify some of the possibilities and insights of OAE, but also touch upon (potential) politics and pitfalls. Those in the “ethics” theme focus especially on the considerable associated with pitfalls but also offer glimpses of possibilities and cannot avoid issues of politics. Those in the “critical” theme address issues of power, privilege and possible persecution, again highlighting some possibilities and ethical concerns along the way.

Doing organisational AE

This first theme shares some examples of doing OAE. What types of organisations can we research and write about? What organisational topics can autoethnographers focus on? How can they craft their stories? We have four papers that offer insightful examples.

Elaine Campbell bravely broaches the stigmatised subject of (her own) depression and anxiety in academia. This is a beautifully crafted evocative autoethnography, drawing on diary entries collected during her three-month sickness absence. Elaine poignantly articulates how she worked through the decline in her mental health, experiencing loss of identity and how she managed to reconstruct it during and after recovery. Elaine offers a personal “happy ending” but alerts us to the political and ethical pitfalls associated with deeply reflexive research.

On another potentially taboo topic, Jo Brewis *et al.* share their experiences of researching the intimate subject of menopause. Through a “moderate” autoethnography (Wall, 2016) harnessing “emotional recall” (Ellis, 1999) from elements of memory work, Jo, Vanessa and Andrea use vignettes to reveal the impact this had on their various academic work situations, illustrating how researchers can influence, and be influenced by, their research topics. To challenge the stigma of the menopause, they found themselves constantly negotiating the alleged public–private divide in their own employment contexts. Their research attempts to both empower women experiencing menopausal transition in other economic activities and researchers engaging with other taboo subjects, thus also offering a critical perspective.

On another thorny “everyday” issue, Eve Jonrad draws on experiences as a psychiatric nurse on an inpatient ward to provide first an autoethnographic “story”, then a commentary of an agency nurse resisting the “policing” of a smoke free policy. It is through writing out

the story that Eve is able to reflect on the social meanings of this memory and theorise that the agency nurse was practising a form of passive “resistance”. In addition, from a critical perspective, Eve offers various implications for public policy that we are invited to consider.

Andrew Herrmann uses narrative vignettes to examine rituals and communicative practices in a local comic book shop from the first person perspective of a collector, a cultural participant and geek insider. The autoethnography, in a “novel” organisational context, connects communicative and ritual practices to organisational culture, hegemonic masculinity, geek culture and personal identity. Andrew also argues that we do not need to be an embedded organisational insider to perform organisational autoethnography.

These papers offer a glimpse of the broad range of possibilities available to autoethnographers in terms of organisational type, choice of topic and ways of capturing and narrating the story. As well as telling, they show (and sometimes perform) some of the delicate issues autoethnographers confront.

The ethics of organisational AE

Our next theme builds on the precarious and perilous nature of OAE relating to its ethical issues. This encompasses relational ethics (e.g. Ellis, 2004, 2007), the ethics of “I” (the researcher), as well as the researched (Doloriert and Sambrook, 2009; Wainwright and Sambrook, 2010). How do autoethnographers grapple with issues of consent, confidentiality when they are revealing so much of themselves and, by inference, their colleagues, family and friends? To what extent can Humphreys and Watson’s (2009) fictionalisation strategy address these intricate issues? What experiments have been conducted with alternative autoethnographic ways of doing research to attempt to protect researchers and the researched and what has been learned through the process? Andrew (2017) goes some way to addressing these issues in his search for an autoethnographic ethic, but not necessarily in the organisational context.

Responding to these, we have two articles that focus on ethical issues. Catherine Lee carefully considers culture, consent and confidentiality when sharing a deeply disturbing personal experience with a neighbour, implications for her former job as a school teacher and her headmaster’s response. In doing so, she explores the incompatibility of her private and professional identities, and reflects on the impact of homophobic and heteronormative discursive practices in the workplace, on health, well-being and identity. Catherine reveals much about her self in the paper, but takes great care not to reveal others. In the review process, there were concerns about giving the neighbour a pseudonym but Catherine justifies calling him (ironically) Mr Freeman!

Employing vignettes, Michael Nycyk exposes some of the ethical dilemmas he encountered in a construction organisation during a design management ethnography project. This raises fascinating tensions between design “science” and ethnographic “craft”. Michael faced communication issues, political conflicts, discipline differences between social science and engineering research practice and the need to maintain positive relationships with field informants during data collection. These papers expose some of the challenges autoethnographers face and offer strategies for addressing them.

Critical organisational AE

Our final theme embraces critical autoethnography in an organisational context, which turns “personal stories into critical investigations and interventions, *about* power, *of* difference, and *for* organizational change” (Herrmann, 2017, p. 7, emphasis in the original). Here, we are interested in how scholars and practitioners grapple with telling and showing AE from a critical perspective (King, 2015; King and Learmonth, 2015). What are the possibilities afforded by AE as a means of enquiry into the political, ethical and practical issues that arise through engaged forms of work. Some forms of AE, particularly evocative

AE, have been accused of being insular and lacking in self-reflexivity (see Allen's (1997) critique of Ellis (1986, 1995), or offer naïve realism (Coghlan, 2007) that do not create wider sociological understandings (Sparkes, 2002). Some suggest that, by combining evocative with analytical AE (Learmonth and Humphreys, 2012), AE can provide (critical) ways of investigating the experiences, understandings and practices of engaged political ethnography. To what extent can autoethnographies be radical (Holman-Jones, 2005), effecting organisational change?

Here, we have selected four articles that attempt to achieve a critical perspective and effect change. Interestingly, they are all situated in an apparently dynamic – yet often domineering, oppressive – higher education context. Liana Beattie shares an autoethnographic journey examining the idiosyncrasies of leadership across two different socio-political environments. Employing critical analysis of her embodied autobiographical accounts, Liana detects some parallels between current “transformational” leadership within the UK higher education and a soviet system of “clientilism” – and also uses autoethnography as a tool to explore power conflicts.

Similarly, Esther Fitzpatrick and Sandy Farquhar offer a duoethnography as a means of critical engagement and discussion leading to personal transformation. Employing their conversations about the inter-related issues of duty, gender and leadership, they expose the shift from “service” (their “calling”) to “leadership” in the New Zealand academic context. Esther and Sandy share a sense of existential crisis in their negotiation of who they may be (allowed to become) in what they see as the narrowing pedagogical space of an education faculty. They call for more inclusive and transformative service and leadership in the academy.

Employing narratives, Ryan D'Souza and Mahuya Pal draw on their personal experiences as postcolonial students and teachers in north America. Ryan and Mahuya make a compelling case for transnational diversity, revealing ways of dealing with the dominant Eurocentric discourses and practices of diversity in academia that demand assimilation with Western expectations and norms that maintains the status quo.

In a similar vein, Claude-Helene Mayer and Michelle May draw on their own personal experiences as women leaders in the South African higher education context, from a systems psychodynamic stance. Claude-Helene and Michelle utilise various notes and reconstructive memory to create narratives, offering a critical perspective on issues of racialised and gendered roles, marginalisation and inclusion, authority and decision-making, workplace stereotyping, gendering and racism. They call for South African HEIs to open space for discussion and awareness of, and respect for, female leadership roles.

These papers reveal some of the critical issues autoethnographers face in their own work organisations and call for ways of addressing, challenging, and changing them.

Editorial edits and ethics

Having introduced the papers in this special issue, we now briefly share some of the possibilities, politics and pitfalls we faced on this editorial journey. As Guest Editors, we obviously wish to champion the possibilities of organisational autoethnography, whilst acknowledging all the ethical dilemmas this might raise and the political fallout it may present. During our journey, we have certainly encountered ethical dilemmas, which we share below, and we hope to have revealed a critical perspective in this concluding autoethnographic section.

Originally, the Guest Editors for this SI were going to be Sally and Alex Lewis (pseudonym), offering us another exciting possibility to work together. But as we wrote the proposal and call for papers, “work” started to get in the way (we both had heavy workloads, and Sally was only working part-time). We had to sit down and very carefully (and honestly) evaluate whether we could pull this off[...] Yes, we could! Then, as the

months rolled on, Sally decided to take early retirement and go off travelling, raising issues of whether she could continue with the SI, and in what capacity. Alex approached Andrew to explore whether he would like to join us to share the load. Yes, he would! Of course, we then had to consider the politics of editorship, which are probably similar to those faced by our authors. Who would be the lead; how to divide up the work; what order of names? We had an exchange of e-mails:

Alex: I'm really not bothered about order of authors on this SI – I'm suggesting the following (because this is how I think the work load will end up falling) – Lewis, Herrmann and Sambrook – but I sincerely won't be offended if you have another preference be it for strategic/CV or other reasons.

Sally: OK, let's see how the workload pans out. (Sally felt a little cheated, having written the original proposal and Call for Papers but realized her work status had evolved [...])

Andrew: Yes the order of authors works for me. I tend not to worry about those things too much. As far as I am concerned, they should go in the order of the person who needs it most for promotion. Since I just became Associate, I'm good.

But this issue did not trouble us for long. Sadly Alex had to withdraw from the project for personal reasons, so that created a number of further possibilities and potential pitfalls. Sally desperately did not want to give up this SI, and so offered to lead (her need for control?). She had not worked with Andrew before – how would that work? What was his work ethic? Sally has admitted to being a workaholic, setting tough standards and deadlines (which Alex could certainly confirm)! Yet, just as she was now trying to let go off her academic shackles, she found herself back in the game, and quickly playing catch up. We (Sally and Andrew) had never met in person, so how would we gel in this new online editorship? The automated ScholarOne system provided some solutions but created other problems. It was difficult to “share” access to all the manuscripts and therefore all the associated activities. Sally could have “muddled through” with Alex as they were closely located geographically and had worked together successfully over a number of years. As lead Guest Editor, how would she (could she?) share the load with Andrew, located across the Atlantic Ocean, in a different time zone?

Andrew experienced similar concerns. Luckily – or perhaps sadly – he too is a workaholic. He was actually in a conference call regarding a different special issue of a journal on popular culture when he received the e-mail from Alex about having to give up this special issue. Having never met Alex (although they had had e-mail and Facebook Messenger conversations) he felt they had a decent rapport. Sally, although he had read much of her work, was an unknown. Needless to say there was, to put it in terms of Weick (1998) a lot of ambiguity, organising and sensemaking for all of us involved. We can attest to the fact that we sent and received emails at all hours of the day and night.

As well as these editorial team edits, we also faced two other contrasting ethical issues: anonymity and disclosure, in both the review and publication stages. During the process of submitting manuscripts, Jo Brewis *et al.* alerted us to the fact that they could be easily identified by the specific funded project they were reflecting on. The authors were not unduly worried about revealing themselves. We suggested Humphreys and Watson's (2009) fictionalisation strategy as a means of disguising the project – and authors – for the review process but, given the topic, there were limits to this.

More alarmingly, one author requested anonymity if the manuscript was accepted for publication, not wishing to be revealed for fear of personal (professional and political) harm. This immediately draws our attention to the potential (perilous) pitfalls of autoethnographic research. When we write autoethnographies we are warned to protect our accomplices (work colleagues, friends and family) and ourselves. There are various strategies available to us, such as fictionalisation, but how can you become a fictional author? One possibility is the use of a pseudonym, but this also raised practical problems for us, culminating in a

series of questions to the managing editor and publishers. Sally has been an Associate Editor on another journal for a number of years and never faced this ethical issue. Was this solely “caused” by the autoethnographic element? How might this be addressed? An email from the publishers noted:

Okay so Rights have said the following.

As long as their reasons for requesting anonymity are clear and logged, we can publish it under a pseudonym with the understanding that if we are ever pressed to by a court order, we may have to reveal their name. This is all on the basis that the article is not risky or exposing us to legal risk by itself!

The author would also have to submit via ScholarOne using their own name, otherwise their copyright form would be meaningless.

I should say, if this article mentions anything particularly sensitive, Case study consent or interview consent maybe required.

Conversely, our other ethical dilemma featured disclosure. One reviewer requested to be “outed”, to reveal her identity to the manuscript’s author. AE allegedly gives voice to the silenced, and Sally wondered whether reviewers’ voices (not exactly silent but “protected”) could be revealed? Again, Sally had never encountered this before but in the spirit of autoethnography wished to respect the reviewer’s request. Again, we needed to “check” with managing editors and publishers. It would be interesting to consider the author’s perspective, too. How did she feel knowing her reviewer? What does this add – or detract – from the review process?

Of course, the final problem we faced was selecting papers for this special issue. This reveals our “power” as guest editors, although we tried our best to ensure the selected papers matched our hopes (and declared aims) for the special issue. We are grateful to those authors whose work we were unable to include here and wish them well in their writing careers.

So, after our own editorial endeavours, we are truly delighted and relieved to share this special issue with you, and extend our sincere thanks to the authors, reviewers, managing editors and publishers.

Sally Sambrook

Bangor University, Wales, UK, and

Andrew F. Herrmann

*Department of Communication and Performance, East Tennessee State University,
Johnson City, Tennessee, USA*

References

- Allen, C. (1997), “When sociologists deceive their subjects”, *Lingua Franca*, Vol. 30 No. 8, pp. 31-39.
- Alvesson, M. and Einola, K. (2018), “On the practice of at-home ethnography”, *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 212-219.
- Anderson, L.B. (2018), “When the Lord builds the house: an autoethnographic account of working in an evangelical for-profit organizational culture”, *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 74-93.
- Andrew, S. (2017), *Searching for An Autoethnographic Ethic*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Aubrey, J.S., Click, M.A., Dougherty, D.S., Fine, M.A., Kramer, M.W., Meisenbach, R.J., Olson, L.N. and Smythe, M.J. (2008), “We do babies! The trials, tribulations, and triumphs of pregnancy and parenting in the academy”, *Women’s Studies in Communication*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 186-195.
- Blenkinsopp, J. (2007), “The ties that double bind us: career, emotion and narrative coping in difficult working relationships”, *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 251-266.

- Bloland, H.G. (1979), "Interpretive sociologies and the study of higher education organizations", *The Review of Higher Education*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 1-14.
- Bochner, A.P. (1997), "It's about time: narrative and the divided self", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 418-438.
- Bochner, A.P. (2008), "Communication's calling", *Spectra*, Vol. 45, pp. 3-4.
- Bochner, A.P. (2016), *Coming to Narrative: A Personal History of Paradigm Change in the Human Sciences*, Routledge, London.
- Boyle, M. and Parry, K. (2007), "Telling the whole story: the case for organizational autoethnography", *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 185-190.
- Boylorn, R. (2014), "Five lessons from my mentor", *Storytelling, Self, Society*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 341-354.
- Brommel, B.J. (2017), "Sensemaking in the dialysis clinic", in Herrmann, A.F. (Ed.), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, London, pp. 87-106.
- Butcher, T. (2013), "Longing to belong", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 242-257.
- Cain, C.C. and Trauth, E. (2017), "Black men in IT: theorizing an autoethnography of a black man's journey into IT within the United States of America", *ACM SIGMIS Database: The DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 35-51.
- Chang, H., Ngunjiri, F. and Hernandez, K.A.C. (2012), *Collaborative Autoethnography (Vol. 8)*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
- Coghlan, D. (2007), "Insider action research: opportunities and challenges", *Management Research News*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 335-343.
- Cohen, L., Duberley, J. and Musson, G. (2009), "Work – life balance? An autoethnographic exploration of everyday home – work dynamics", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 229-241.
- Davie, S.S. (2008), "An autoethnography of accounting knowledge production: serendipitous and fortuitous choices for understanding our social world", *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 1054-1079.
- de Andrade, M. (2014), "Public relations and Aca-media: autoethnography, ethics and engagement in the pharmaceutical industry", *Public Relations Inquiry*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 113-136.
- Denker, K.J. (2017), "Power, emotional labor, and intersectional identity at work: I would not kiss my boss but I would not speak up", in Herrmann, Andrew F. (Ed.), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, London, pp. 16-36.
- Doloriert, C. and Sambrook, S. (2009), "Ethical confessions of the 'I' of autoethnography: the student's dilemma", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An international Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 1746-5648.
- Doloriert, C. and Sambrook, S. (2011), "Accommodating an autoethnographic PhD: the tale of the thesis, the viva voce and the traditional business school", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 582-615.
- Doloriert, C. and Sambrook, S. (2012), "Organisational autoethnography", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 83-95.
- Duarte, F. and Hodge, B. (2007), "Crossing paradigms: a meta-autoethnography of a fieldwork trip to Brazil", *Culture and Organisation*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 191-203.
- Ellis, C. (1986), *Fisher Folk: Two Communities on Chesapeake Bay*, The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- Ellis, C. (1995), "Emotional and ethical quagmires in returning to the field", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 68-98.
- Ellis, C. (1999), "Heartful autoethnography", *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 669-683.
- Ellis, C. (2004), *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

- Ellis, C. (2007), "Telling secrets, revealing lives: relational ethics in research with intimate others", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 3-29.
- Ellis, C., Allen, M., Bochner, A.P., Gergen, K.J., Gergen, M.M., Pelias, R.J. and Richardson, L. (2017), "Living the post-university life: academics talk about retirement", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 575-588.
- Etherington, K. (2007), "Ethical research in reflexive relationships", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 559-616.
- Foster, E. (2014), *Communicating at the End of Life: Finding Magic in the Mundane*, Routledge, London.
- Foster, E. (2017), "Academic labor in the age of anxiety: autoethnography matters", *Cultural Studies, Critical Methodologies*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 320-326.
- Foster, K., McAllister, M. and O'Brien, L. (2006), "Extending the boundaries: autoethnography as an emergent method in mental health nursing research", *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 44-53.
- Frandsen, S. (2015), "Doing ethnography in a paranoid organization: an autoethnographic account", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 162-176, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOE-07-2014-0020>
- Goodall, H.L. (1994), *Casing a Promised Land: The Autobiography of an Organizational Detective as Cultural Ethnographer*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL.
- Grenier, R.S. (2015), "Autoethnography as a legitimate approach to HRD research: a methodological conversation at 30,000 feet", *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 332-350.
- Grenier, R.S. and Collins, J.C. (2016), "'Man, have I got a story for you': facilitated autoethnography as a potential research methodology in human resource development", *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 359-376.
- Griffiths, D.E. (1979), "Intellectual turmoil in educational administration", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 43-65.
- Hackley, C. and Hackley, R.A. (2016), "Autoethnography and subjective experience in marketing and consumer research", *Revista Interdisciplinar de Marketing*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 3-10.
- Haynes, K. (2006), "A therapeutic journey? Reflections on the impact of research on researcher and participant", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 204-221.
- Haynes, K. (2013), "Sexuality and sexual symbolism as processes of gendered identity formation: an autoethnography of an accounting firm", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 374-398.
- Herrmann, A.F. (2011), "Narrative as an organizing process: identity and story in a new nonprofit", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 246-264.
- Herrmann, A.F. (2012a), "'I know I'm unlovable': desperation, dislocation, despair, and discourse on the academic job hunt", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 247-255.
- Herrmann, A.F. (2012b), "Never mind the scholar, here's the old punk: identity, community, and the aging music fan", in Denzin, N.K. (Ed.), *Studies in Symbolic Interaction (Vol. 39)*, Emerald, London, pp. 153-170.
- Herrmann, A.F. (2017), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, London.
- Herrmann, A.F., Barnhill, J.A. and Poole, M.C. (2013), "Ragged edges in the fractured future: a co-authored organizational autoethnography", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 57-75.
- Higate, P. and Cameron, A. (2006), "Reflexivity and researching the military", *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 219-233.
- Hokkanen, S. (2017), "Analyzing personal embodied experiences: autoethnography, feelings, and fieldwork", *Translation & Interpreting*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 24-35.

- Holbrook, M.B. (2005), "Customer value and autoethnography: subjective personal introspection and the meanings of a photograph collection", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 58 No. 1, pp. 45-61.
- Holman-Jones, S. (2005), "Autoethnography: making the personal political", in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 763-791.
- Humphreys, M. (2005), "Getting personal: reflexivity and autoethnographic vignettes", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 840-860.
- Humphreys, M. and Watson, T. (2009), "Ethnographic practices: from 'writing-up ethnographic research' to 'writing ethnography'", in Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H. and Kamsteeg, F. (Eds), *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexities of Everyday Life*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 40-55.
- Hunnicut, J. (2017), "Stroking my rifle like the body of a woman: a woman's socialization into the US army", in Herrmann, A.F. (Ed.), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 37-58.
- Jago, B. (2002), "Chronicling an academic depression", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 729-757.
- James, M. (2012), "Autoethnography: the story of applying a conceptual framework for intentional positioning to public relations practice", *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 555-564.
- Jones, N. (2012), "Full circle: employee engagement in the Welsh public sector", unpublished doctoral thesis, Bangor University, Bangor.
- Jones, N. and Sambrook, S. (2016), "Employee engagement in the public sector", in Blackman, D., Teo, S. and O'Donnell, M. (Eds), *Human Capital Management Research: Influencing Practice and Process*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 31-45.
- Kempster, S. and Iszatt-White, M. (2013), "Towards co-constructed coaching: exploring the integration of coaching and co-constructed autoethnography in leadership development", *Management Learning*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp. 319-336.
- Kempster, S. and Stewart, J. (2010), "Becoming a leader: a co-produced autoethnographic exploration of situated learning of leadership practice", *Management Learning*, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 131-145.
- Kempster, S., Stewart, J. and Parry, K.W. (2008), "Exploring co-produced autoethnography", working paper, Bond University, Gold Coast, available at: http://epublications.bond.edu.business_pubs/112 (accessed 28 July 2011).
- Kidd, T.T., Ashe, C. and Carroll, N. (2013), "A journey through the wilderness: an autoethnographic study of the ERP system implementation process as created by IT project managers and team members", *International Journal of Information Technology Project Management*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 1-34.
- King, D. (2015), "The possibilities and perils of critical performativity: learning from four case studies", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 255-265.
- King, D. and Learmonth, M. (2015), "Can critical management studies ever be 'practical'? A case study in engaged scholarship", *Human Relations*, Vol. 68 No. 3, pp. 353-375.
- Kramer, M.W. (2017), "Managing multiple group roles: an autoethnography of communication and perceived role incompatibility", *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, pp. 1-19, available at: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00909882.2017.1409905?journalCode=rjac20
- Krizek, R.L. (1998), "Lessons: what the hell are we teaching the next generation anyway?", in Banks, A. and Banks, S. (Eds), *Fiction and Social Research: By Ice or Fire*, AltaMira, Walnut Creek, CA, pp. 89-114.
- Krizek, R.L. (2017), "Sport and ethnography: an embodied practice meets an embodied method", in Billings, A.C. (Ed.), *Defining Sport Communication*, Routledge, New York, NY, pp. 59-78.
- Land, C. and King, D. (2014), "Organizing otherwise: translating anarchism in a voluntary sector organization", *Ephemera*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 923-950.
- Learmonth, M. and Humphreys, M. (2012), "Autoethnography and academic identity: glimpsing business school doppelgängers", *Organization*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 99-117.

- Lee, M.M. (2016), *On the Nature of Human Resource Development Holistic Agency and an Almost-Autoethnographical Exploration of Becoming*, Routledge, London.
- Lindemann, K. (2017), "Working on it: family narratives of masculinity, disability, and work-life balance", in Herrmann, A.F. (Ed.), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, London, pp. 59-70.
- Mackenzie, S.H. and Kerr, J.H. (2013), "Stress and emotions at work: an adventure tourism guide's experiences", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 3-14.
- Medford, K. (2006), "Caught with a fake ID: ethical questions about slippage in autoethnography", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 853-864.
- Murphy, S.A. (2008), "The role of emotions and transformational leadership on police culture: an autoethnographic account", *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 165-178.
- Nash, S. (2017), "On researching shame in the church", *Practical Theology*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 396-406.
- Neumann, M. (1999), *On the Rim: Looking for the Grand Canyon*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- Parry, K.W. (2008), "Viewing the leadership narrative through alternate lenses: an autoethnographic investigation", *Management Review*, Vol. 19 Nos 1/2, pp. 126-147.
- Patterson, A. and Baron, S. (2010), "Deviant employees and dreadful service encounters: customer tales of discord and distrust", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 438-445.
- Pelias, R.J. (2003), "The academic tourist: an autoethnography", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 369-373.
- Poulos, C.N. (2010), "Spirited accidents: an autoethnography of possibility", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 49-56.
- Rambo, C. (2007), "Handing IRB an unloaded gun", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 353-367.
- Ramsey, M.A. (1975), "The administrator-observer as policy maker", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Riad, S. (2007), "Under the desk: on becoming a mother in the workplace", *Culture and Organisation*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 205-222.
- Roberts, C. (2007), "Intraprelearning within two Welsh NHS Trusts: an autoethnography", Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor, ME.
- Sambrook, S. (2010), "Get me out of there – I'm on sabbatical!", *Fifth Annual International Ethnography Symposium, Queen Mary, University of London, London, September 1–3*.
- Sambrook, S. (2015), "In (re)search of the self: autoethnography in HRD research", in Saunders, M. and Posey, T. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods on HRM: Innovative Techniques*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 92-107.
- Sambrook, S. (2016), "Autoethnography: a novel way to study HRM", in Townsend, K., Loudoun, R. and Lewin, D. (Eds), *Handbook of Research Methods on Human Resource Development*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 42-157.
- Sambrook, S. (2017), "Making sense of our self in HRD through autoethnography: self-less, self-ish and self-ie?", *Human Resource Development International*, Special 20th Anniversary Issue, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 382-392.
- Sambrook, S., Jones, N. and Doloriert, C. (2014), "Employee engagement and autoethnography: being and studying self", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 26 Nos 3/4, pp. 172-187.
- Sambrook, S., Stewart, J. and Roberts, C. (2008), "Doctoral supervision: a view from above, below and the middle", *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 71-84.
- Scarles, C. (2010), "Where words fail, visuals ignite: opportunities for visual autoethnography in tourism research", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 905-926.

- Scott, T. (2009), "Catching a wave: auto-ethnographic notes on love and war in Hawaii", *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 5 Nos 3/4, pp. 257-273.
- Sidoti, F. (2015), "Untangling the narratives of precarious work: an auto-ethnography", *Social Alternatives*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 43-49.
- Sobre-Denton, M.S. (2012), "Stories from the cage: autoethnographic sensemaking of workplace bullying, gender discrimination, and white privilege", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 220-250.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2002), "Autoethnography: self-indulgence or something more?", in Bochner, A.P. and Ellis, C. (Eds), *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA, pp. 209-232.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2007), "Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: a story seeking consideration", *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 7 No. 24, pp. 521-550.
- Trujillo, N. (2013), "Reflections on communication and sport: on ethnography and organizations", *Communication & Sport*, Vols 1-2 No. 1, pp. 68-75.
- Trujillo, N. and Krizek, R.L. (1994), "Emotionality in the stands and in the field: expressing self through baseball", *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 303-325.
- Tull, A. (2017), "Dolly, Ellie may, and me: my southern appalachian working identity", in Herrmann, A.F. (Ed.), *Organizational Autoethnographies: Power and Identity in Our Working Lives*, Routledge, London, pp. 71-86.
- Tullis, J.A. (2012), "Personhood and communication at the end of life", *Journal of Medicine and the Person*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 103-113.
- Tullis, J.A. and Holman Jones, S.J.A. (2014), "What would Nick T. do? Lessons from a mentor", *Storytelling, Self, Society*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 355-373.
- Van Maanen, J. (1998), *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*, Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Vicary, A. and Jones, K. (2017), "The implications of contractual terms of employment for women and leadership: an autoethnographic study in UK higher education", *Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 7 No. 2, p. 20, available at: www.mdpi.com/2076-3387/7/2/20/html
- Vickers, M.H. (2007), "Autoethnography and sensemaking: a story of bullying in the workplace", *Culture and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 223-237.
- Wainwright, D. (2010), "An autoethnographic study of the psychological contracts of health and social care employees in a learning disability service", unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor, ME.
- Wainwright, D. and Sambrook, S. (2010), "The ethics of data collection: unintended consequences?", *Journal of Health Organisation and Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 277-287.
- Wall, S.S. (2016), "Toward a moderate autoethnography", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Weick, K.E. (1998), "Introductory essay: improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9 No. 5, pp. 543-555.
- Yarborough, J. and Lowe, K. (2007), "Unlocking foreclosed beliefs: an autoethnographic story about a family business leadership dilemma", *Culture and Organisation*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 239-249.
- Zavattaro, S.M. (2011), "An autoethnographic tale of image-generation tactics on employees", *Employment Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 1-16.

Further reading

- Herrmann, A.F. (in press), "Working more, communicating less: reframing the EVLN via relational dialectics", in Turner, L., Short, N.P., Grant, A. and Adams, T.E. (Eds), *International Perspectives on Autoethnographic Research and Practice*, Routledge, New York, NY.