

Problematism Qualitative Research in Organisations: Three voices, three subjectivities, three struggles

Hayes, L, Hopkinson, C & Taylor, A

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Hayes, L, Hopkinson, C & Taylor, A 2016, 'Problematism Qualitative Research in Organisations: Three voices, three subjectivities, three struggles' *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, vol 11, no. 2, pp. 127 - 146

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/QROM-07-2014-1234>

DOI 10.1108/QROM-07-2014-1234

ISSN 1746-5648

Publisher: Emerald

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.



Emerald

Qualitative Research
in Organizations
and Management

Problematizing Qualitative Research in Organisations: Three voices, three subjectivities, three struggles

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management</i>
Manuscript ID	QROM-07-2014-1234.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	post-structuralism , feminism, power , Queer Theory, intersectionality, critical reflexivity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Problematizing Qualitative Research in Organisations: Three voices, three subjectivities, three struggles

Abstract

Purpose: In this paper three of us illustrate our multiple subjectivities, in research and in practice which are ever shifting in context with each other. We present richness of understanding which can be revealed when we eschew consensus, certainty and easy solutions. We aim to show that plurality of ontological and epistemological approaches combined with diversity in understanding and subjective experience is necessary in qualitative research in organisations.

Approach: We take a playful and incomplete narrative approach in our critical reflection on our subjectivities being silenced or ignored in organisations and in academia.

We present an unsettling and ambiguous read but our aim is to question the formulaic, linear, simplistic solutions and structures evident in organisations and academia that silence uncertainty, emotions, voice and creativity through standardisation and the rhetoric of collaboration for performance enhancement. This process we have termed philosophical violence.

Findings: We identify philosophical violence as a dominant theme in qualitative research, in organisational practice and within academia. In contrast, our embodied subjectivities preclude us reaching agreement or consensus too quickly, or indeed, at all. Our embodied struggles add to our understanding of ambiguity, difference, critical reflexivity and understanding, providing richness and accommodating diversity and paradox in our inquiries in our organisations.

Originality/ Value: We show our struggles as hopeful and our non-collaborative collaboration as a resource from which we can individually and jointly develop new understandings of working and thus survive the philosophical violence found in organisations and in research. Honouring subjectivities is essential for rich qualitative research in organisations.

Key Words: intersectionality, post-structuralism, feminism, power, queer theory, critical reflexivity

Ladies and gentlemen, we introduce your narrators

The three of us met whilst working on our PhDs in a group environment from 2003 to 2010. Liz Hayes, *The Reluctant* (2010), worked with reluctance, playful subversion and fundamentalist thinking in her management consultancy practice with organisations. Clare Hopkinson, *The Reflective* (2010), inquired into nurses reflecting in the hospital ward and Alan Taylor, *The Queer* (2009), queried and queered the organisation. Each of us presented our work in creative ways that included our 'selves' and passions as we sought to be critically reflexive about our inquiries in an applied subjective way.

We have used the terms Reluctant, Reflective and Queer to discriminate the three authors of the text, given that convention dictates that anonymity of authorship is essential to the peer review of submitted academic papers. To some degree, however, this immediately draws attention to our troubled voices and subjectivities, and enacts the struggles we elucidate through the remainder of this paper. We are immediately silenced as identifiable subjects to some degree. We know it's a big ask of our readers to tolerate the subsequent complexity, ambition and ambiguity, but we see no other way to invite you to enter into the ontological and epistemological dilemmas we stumble over in our academic lives.

Since the completion of our PhDs we have found ways of inquiring together. Philosophically we differed in positioning our PhDs: *The Reluctant* used feminist approaches (Naples, 2003), and praxis wisdom, *The Reflective* used Bourdieu's (1990) Logic of Practice and *The Queer* drew upon Queer Theory (de Lauretis, 1991) as well as the work of Deleuze and Guattari (1983). Our research interests interweave around leadership and health and social care. Two of us work at universities in the UK and one is an organisational development practitioner in Ireland. Within and against a possible framing of commonality of interest and/or focus, we are discovering that our embodied subjectivities preclude us reaching agreement or consensus too quickly, or often indeed, at all. For example, we write from our own subjectivities that include our differing experiences and body of knowledge and we come from different disciplines and positioning yet we all hold the position of living life as inquiry (Marshall, 2004). We don't always agree as our passions and strength of voice can be different at different times. Sometimes when two of us are in agreement, and the other is not, the other can feel an outsider or experience the disagreement as a personal attack. This taps into our fragilities. *The Reflective*, as a nurse, sometimes brings her own personal and cultural "baggage" of being dismissed raising feelings of anger or being personally criticised. This can work to fuel a deeper conversation alternatively she can feel as if her voice has less influence and is less important. Furthermore, as a heterosexual woman how can she fully appreciate the lived experience of *The Queer's* working life in an organisation or how the *Reluctant* experiences the pressures of resisting fundamentalist thinking whilst creating and sustaining her consultancy business? What level of authority does she have to comment on the direction of the paper when it is positioned using the theory of intersectionality and post-structuralism when her embodied subjectivity finds some structures comforting for example Bourdieu's (1990) notions of habitus and field during her own PhD, an author at odds with post-structuralism?

1
2
3 Rather than see these tensions as problematic, however, we understand our
4 diversity and our various subjectivities as resources from which we can
5 individually and jointly develop new understandings. We three have found we
6 have to agree to disagree, and we have developed a methodology of non-
7 collaborative collaboration to ensure that the reflexive subjectivity of each of us
8 is honoured.
9

10 We find this work challenging and at the same time hopeful. We will argue that
11 this philosophical pluralism and nomadism, fluid and contingent, contextual and
12 transient sustains and supports our personal resilience in challenging practice
13 contexts, as well as deepening our learning and enriching our research.
14

15 And now, as we struggle with our early-career post-doctoral research identities
16 (while we grow into our mid-fifties in chronological age) we work at the
17 interstices of two systems which are both predicated on the certainties and
18 consensus of science: Higher Education, specifically in post-1992 institutions in
19 the UK; and healthcare. It's both diverting, and terrifying, to be navigating this
20 environment with postmodern and post-structural feminist sensibilities. As
21 experienced professionals seeking to enhance our teaching, mentoring,
22 consulting and organising, we find that our subjective identities, and our
23 different approaches, are not easily accommodated by healthcare research,
24 academic norms or organisational praxis. When we remind ourselves that those
25 identities in themselves are fluid and shifting (McDonald, 2013) we realise that
26 the systems we find ourselves in are doubly terrified of our subjectivities and
27 terrifying to our subjectivities. Indeed we find that health and social care, and
28 perhaps public administration in general are sometimes viciously at odds with
29 our subjectivities. So we can agree that neither an intersectional approach nor
30 the notion of habitus, nor acceptance of reluctance are given much credence in
31 an organisational or healthcare environment which values evidence-based
32 practice or certainty above all else. We thus experience dissonance and
33 paradoxes when our notions of knowledge or truth(s) are not readily
34 accommodated within our research and practice contexts.
35
36
37

38 So we find ourselves living life as inquiry (Marshall, 2004) in our exploration of,
39 or re-searching, research itself, particularly in its relation to practice. Thus we
40 challenge each other in a critically reflexive process. We are trying to find ways
41 to establish our own academic credentials while paying attention to the learning
42 we have *experienced*, which has enabled us to develop our voices, yet which may
43 have condemned us to struggle with our subjectivities in an environment where
44 even radical perspectives have a powerful grammar and set of taken-for-granted
45 assumptions. While this is somewhat in line with Caroline Ramsay's (2014)
46 argument that a scholarship of practice should be focussed on attention rather
47 than knowledge, our attention to our experience drives it home to us that too
48 often it is *knowledge* which is privileged. So social work and social policy
49 colleagues who espouse anti-oppressive practice are sometimes the most
50 dirigiste in their insistence on a Marxist paradigm; queer theorists and feminists
51 may engage in oppositional dialectic which refuses nuance and paradox; and so
52 post-modernism and post-colonialism can feel more -ism than post anything.
53
54
55

56 A renowned academic writing on gender seems to be sexist and bullying at a
57 conference, and a fellow delegate reflects that he's always like that. A colleague
58
59
60

1
2
3 known for anti-oppressive writing dogmatically closes down discussion,
4 insisting that it's neo-liberalism at play again.

5
6 We thus experience many struggles to respect and build on knowledge and
7 academic tradition, sometimes finding it does not fully serve our purposes, it
8 does not allow us space to articulate our thinking, which we illustrate later in the
9 paper in a story of attempting to get a paper published that does not use the
10 traditional research structure. We recognise that you the reader may struggle, in
11 turn, as we explicitly honour contradiction and confusion, but we do not intend
12 to cause *unnecessary* confusion and hope this writing contrasts with the
13 generally accepted nature of academic discourse, with its theses and antitheses
14 its propositions and contestations. This paper is rhetorical, motile, performative
15 as well as non-collaborative in keeping with a post-structural philosophy.

16
17 The hope is that the text becomes open to you the reader and through exposing
18 our three subjectivities we find a proliferation of meaning, an opening potential
19 for interpretation rather than what we could describe as a coherent or
20 collaborative-conclusion.
21

22 23 **Writing into our subjectivities and positioning this paper**

24 What is subjectivity in research anyway? Bourdieu argued in *The Logic of*
25 *Practice* (1990) that setting subjectivism against objectivism is an artificial
26 divide; a polarisation that is unhelpful in social science research. In much
27 empirical and social science research, detached propositional knowing and
28 objective positioning is highly regarded with subjective and action orientated
29 inquiry seen as less worthy (Brydon-Miller et al 2003; Heron 1996). In positivist
30 approaches relationships exist but are often denied as relevant or as not
31 influencing the process at all. Bourdieu (1993) would argue that a doxa exists;
32 that is, an assumption so taken for granted that it is not noticed or questioned. So
33 rather than deny our plural subjectivities, here we query the fantasy of
34 objectivity. The cut of our knives alienates objectivity at precisely this juncture in
35 a reversal of the norm, naming the doxa.
36
37

38 In healthcare research, action research does not appear in the hierarchy of
39 research evidence and you will nowhere find a post-structural research
40 approach. Additionally, randomised control trials are at the top of the taxonomy
41 (Evans, 2003) denying the existence of subjectivity. We have all experienced this
42 bias against subjective research directly through ethics research committees.
43 Specifically, they have insisted that I, the Reflective, could not include students I
44 was currently teaching and assessing in a piece of action research. In contrast,
45 the participatory action research paradigm presupposes that the specific and
46 situated nature of the research is what makes a real difference to those engaged
47 with the process. Interpretations obtained through a detached observer are less
48 likely to provide the richness and validity of those arrived at through inquiry
49 with others (Reason & Bradbury, 2006). I learnt from my ethical approval
50 encounters how unquestioning of ontological positioning is the scientific
51 mainstream. Nevertheless, as Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) and Foucault
52 (1980) argued those who determine the value of knowledge hold the power. We
53 see that in healthcare research|practice we experience, resist and survive (and
54 enact) power and its concomitant violence against ourselves, our subjectivities,
55 as well as each other.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We consider ourselves practitioners as well as researchers, and as mentioned
4 above, are self-consciously re-searching research, to make sense for ourselves
5 and hopefully for others. By this we mean that together we are inquiring into the
6 enactment of research; our struggle to find academic voice; and the particularity
7 of our own subjectivities in an ontological arena which would seem to preclude
8 any notion of subjectivity in itself. The tensions in representing the self
9 elucidated by Kathryn Haynes (2011) in this journal, are multiplied, braided and
10 interwoven in trying to collaborate in our writing together.

11
12 We offer a mosaic of stories, which are incomplete reflections of our struggles as
13 we develop the practices of critical reflexivity within our own research | practice.
14 We recognise that “narration is the quintessential form of customary knowledge,
15 in more ways than one” Lyotard (1984: 19) and therefore attempt to provide a
16 story that nomadically meanders in line with the reality of practice. Ordinarily,
17 “(w)riting conventions typically prevent a text from appearing too contradictory
18 and confusing for the reader” (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000: 78), so it is a delicate
19 balance to accommodate the paradoxes in this display.

20
21 We narrate the risks associated with encouraging an empowerment dynamic
22 through a deliberate focus on investigating culture and context with a critical
23 eye. We also reflect on the constraints of publication illustrating how our plural
24 subjectivities, and the underpinning philosophical positions, become radically
25 challenging, if not totally unacceptable, to the mainstream consensus on research
26 within our field(s) of practice. As we endeavour to enact, or reify, or express our
27 positions, our philosophies of knowledge, of research, and of practice are
28 frequently labelled as too difficult, or too complex to be even acknowledged
29 within a field which is forever demanding clearly defined research practices, pre-
30 definition of research questions, processes, protocols and predetermined
31 outcomes.

32
33 In the context of this paper, we also express some of our nervousness around the
34 split between practice and research by adopting the term research|practice. This
35 may also appear as practice|research as both terms (and both activities) are
36 equally important to us, and for us, impossible to untangle from one another. So
37 the first paradox we identify explicitly is that we seek to be grounded in day-to-
38 day action, as much as philosophical abstraction, and perhaps conflate these in
39 our subjectivities, in a sustained tension.

40
41 For example in the practices of adult learning and organisational development
42 we have experienced how practice demands a critically reflexive muscle that
43 permits the messiness (Schön and Rein, 1974) to be more visible. Linden West,
44 (1996) argues that higher education also has the potential to offer learners some
45 space to experiment with questions of identity and learn from that experience.
46 But in researching how this happens, he highlights the challenges of separating
47 medium and message, narrative and experience, reality and representation, self
48 and story. From an organisational standpoint, Shaw (2002: 29) characterises
49 inquiry processes in organisations as being about ‘thinking in the middle’ in a
50 paradoxical process of continuity and change. Our respective journeys as
51 practitioner academics working in health and inquiring and supporting
52 leadership narratives that travel through the “malestream” leave us wanting to
53 grapple with these messy, mercurial worlds in this more co-creative fashion.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In this paper we first outline how we currently practice|research by showing
4 how we began the creation of this paper, then we link our stories of our work
5 inquiries to illustrate the interplay of our philosophies and of our subjectivities.
6 Next we will consider non-collaborative collaboration before questioning
7 subjectivity in the context of the academy as an example of a large organisation,
8 as well as generator of what is taken for knowledge. However, these stories and
9 discussions meander into other sections to show the fluidity and nomadic nature
10 of our working together. It is our working together which we do not like to
11 regulate or categorise, we are not claiming a new discipline.

12
13
14 We challenge ourselves to write in a way that reflects the impossibility of
15 consensus, and we challenge our readers with complexity, dissonance,
16 disruption and paradox. We write together and we write as individual voices
17 within this piece. We know it's ambitious, and we know it's different from the
18 norm.

19
20 It's not from a sense of belligerently *wanting* to experiment or to push the
21 boundaries of the mainstream/male stream but rather we're inviting you the
22 reader to see if any of our reflections speak to your own struggles with voice and
23 subjectivity. We're attempting to honour our various subjectivities the
24 reviewers' and the reader's too.

25 26 **Making our dilemmas and writing decisions visible**

27
28 The trouble with subjectivity is its very subjectivity. In relation to qualitative
29 research we can observe that subjectivities are troublesome and often
30 irreconcilable. We find that divergence and contingency have to be accepted as
31 normal; in relation to organisational and research contexts, which often privilege
32 certainty and consensus, or agreement, irreconcilable subjectivities therefore
33 pose a fundamental challenge. We three have found we have to agree to disagree,
34 and we have developed a methodology of non-collaborative collaboration to
35 ensure that the reflexive subjectivity of each of us is honoured.

36 37 **Discovering our voices in the stories of writing this paper**

38
39 We began this paper by preparing a presentation for the Qualitative Research in
40 Organisations and Management (QROM) conference in New Mexico 2014. At that
41 time our conversations seemed to coalesce around our determination to embody
42 our several subjectivities and we began to inquire about how our hybrid and
43 shaky selves might find a form that dares to question from the margins while still
44 being implicated in a system that gives us our living and identity. In our weekly
45 Skype conversations, it became clear that even as we shared experience of the
46 struggle of finding voice while taking a deliberately subjective stance, we were
47 entering into what seemed to be a philosophical dialogue about the nature of
48 research and about what it means to be the three of us researching individually
49 and collectively. We gave one another encouragement that doesn't come from a
50 top-down institutional or paid work context but from our experience of thinking
51 together in a critically reflexive organic process – built on our shared experience
52 in taking up our respective professional roles as scholarly practitioners in
53 healthcare and other leadership contexts. We voiced our subjectivities and we
54 noticed our differences, in philosophies, approaches, and understandings.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We three do not share an agreed philosophy, but we are accepting of the range of
4 philosophies that each of us, and all of us, can embrace in our approach to
5 research and practice. We do not necessarily agree with one another, in fact we
6 often don't agree with our (individual) selves from moment to moment!
7

8 Thus we embrace a plurality of approaches, a proliferation of understandings
9 and a recognition of multiple possibilities, as essential to help us understand an
10 increasingly complex working environment, and a milieu where there is *actually*
11 little agreement about diagnoses, interventions, and outcomes but dominant
12 discourse(s) assumes that there always *is* agreement. One thing we can agree on
13 is that, as a result of the above, we all have an acute sensitivity to the operations
14 of power - that vested interests are often producing pre-determined truths,
15 which meet the interests of those in power. Or that vested interests are making
16 life what seems to be easier, but is based on hidden violence.
17

18 There are three of us writing this paper, but only one of us, the Reluctant, was
19 able to present at the QROM Conference. Now we reveal, through narrative, how
20 we dealt with the dilemmas of multiple subjectivities in our preparation and
21 delivery of a paper, and how this informed the writing.
22

23 For the conference presentation, I (the Reluctant) was inquiring about the
24 potential to present knowledge (Heron, 1996) by 'breaking the silence' around
25 the unseen and the unsayable when it comes to the contradictions and use and
26 abuse of power and people in organisations. I sensed that we wanted to
27 acknowledge our different experiences and our own internal power struggles as
28 expressed in our Skype conversations and as we wrote into the same themes. For
29 example, I constantly shared my on-going dilemmas around noticing how
30 organising and managing in organisations is often so reductive and haphazard in
31 practice. As a consequence, people go to extraordinary lengths to survive in
32 organisational environments that are often bereft of human connection or a
33 spirit of hope and kindness.
34

35 In our conversations, I began to see the potential for how our nomadic post-
36 structural positioning (Braidotti, 1994) might provide another lens and help
37 with reframing organisational experience. On later reflection, I wondered if I'd
38 somehow positioned the Queer and the Reflective as the properly tenured
39 academics that should provide the relevant theory and expertise. I'd somehow
40 created a binary where I as the labouring organisational 'Ms Fix it' just had to get
41 on and survive while the full-time academics should try to make neater sense
42 and theorise from my experience.
43

44 The "properly tenured academics", of course, wondered if we had positioned the
45 Reluctant as the one who properly "knows" through her practice, while we
46 struggle to express our own doing, as much as our thinking.
47

48 I, (the Reflective) couldn't go to the conference but crafted a presentation
49 beforehand which covered what I would have said if I had been the one
50 presenting on behalf of myself and my colleagues. Of course this was very
51 different to what the Reluctant actually presented and would have been different
52 from what the Queer would have done. This reflects our different voices,
53 struggles and subjectivities. We struggle with who takes the lead; has
54 dominance; whose ideas are utilised or rejected; whether to make a coherent
55 whole out of conversations that struggle to articulate meaning, often wondering
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how we maintain collaboration and challenge without two pairing against the
4 third, for example. These reflect the struggles of working in a wider system such
5 as the academy or in health care. How do we incorporate our three voices when
6 we are all different, how do we approach the research and ideas differently
7 through our own subjectivities? We too have a need for certainty in the midst of
8 inaction, and we also have our own frailties and sensitivities. We know we need
9 to acknowledge these.

10
11 We thus ask, what choices do we have, and what choices do we make, both
12 individually and as three authors of conference presentations, and papers
13 submitted?

14
15 The Reluctant: I enjoyed the opportunity to present a version of our paper at the
16 conference. But this was no well-polished singular narrative. I rejected The
17 Reflective's presentation even though it seemed to me to be more attuned to the
18 norms and conventions expected of academics at an academic conference. Our
19 agreement – based on trust and mutual respect – was that I should feel free to
20 appropriate our material and invite conference colleagues to wonder about my
21 and our subjective stance(s). We have all experienced how such a presentation,
22 including our articulation of the associated struggles, can be constructed as
23 deeply troublesome as we complicate the linear, the positivist, and confront
24 ourselves and our audiences with the responsibility of being in the midst of
25 (open, still evolving and becoming) systems (Grosz, 2004; Braidotti, 2002) and
26 sets of relationships that refuse simplistic explanations and require a tolerance
27 for ambiguity. Immediately after presenting, reflecting in and reflecting on the
28 experience (Schön, 1983) I emailed my impressions of the conference feed-back
29 to the others:
30
31

32
33 Some people interpreted what I said as us being little more than a support
34 group. One woman rather stridently wondered why I could not just say
35 that we were obviously collaborating together. She just could not get our
36 concept of subjectivities as non-collaborative, collaboration!

37
38 Another delegate asked to check if she got my meaning. She picked up on
39 'the violence of organisation' and also wondered if we were illustrating
40 the violence of the academy. I was invited to think about the extent to
41 which our paper also spoke to the 'violence of the academy' and whether
42 in those circumstances we were interested or engaged in constructing a
43 healing narrative
44

45 I was also asked if it was possible to write with all these subjectivities and
46 disjunctures playing out. I said it was a challenge but it was also the
47 reason why we 'stick at it' together.
48

49 My main sense is, that for some people, they interpreted our work as that
50 of some 'young' academics attempting to establish themselves. This is
51 nothing new as it's just a familiar story of competing for tenure and
52 recognition. Others may well have dismissed it completely it as it was not
53 unfamiliar in the worlds of pre-defined research projects and clearly
54 articulated outcomes. Maybe a few people were left wondering about
55 their own philosophy and practice of research." (Email 18thApril2014)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We include the above story to make very clear that as well as our own
4 subjectivities, this paper was created through dialogue with others. Indeed we
5 can also draw attention here to the insight given by one of the reviewers of this
6 paper, who reminded us that a Foucauldian view would indicate that violence
7 would also be enacted “in the regulation of subjectivities” (citation required), in a
8 particularly reflexive turn. Therefore there are even *more than* three
9 subjectivities herein. Recognising this, we are being unrealistically over-simple
10 in our title – merely *three* subjectivities? We can understand that the subjectivity
11 of the conference attendees, the reviewer, the editor and the reader also come
12 into play. And all of these are potentially regulated, and disciplined. Indeed we
13 have benefited from the multiple subjectivities of our reviewers through their
14 comments in the shaping this paper. Is that also a form of ontological violence?
15
16

17 So what? Isn't this proliferation and braiding of meaning merely complicating
18 everything unnecessarily? We argue that the impact of these subjectivities, as
19 well as their suppression and regulation, on our research|practice, is so
20 significant that we do a disservice to our work, when we elide and regulate
21 subjectivities, and that we thus do violence in our organisations and in our
22 research|practice.
23

24 Too often, this proliferative richness of meaning, and understanding, and insight
25 is reduced to simple, certain and comfortable propositions through elision of
26 most of the variety of perspective into the reduction of one particular (and
27 perhaps dominant) perspective. We consider this a loss, and we consider this
28 philosophical and ontological violence. The potential diversity and richness is
29 elided such that some subjectivities are effectively silenced. *This is violence, and*
30 *nothing is more important in these postmodern times.*
31
32

33 We posit that there is violence in organisations, violence in the academy,
34 violence in qualitative research in organisations and management. We don't wish
35 to replicate these cycles of violence yet again, so let us try to show you, through
36 narrative, so that you can perceive whether or not you think there is violence at
37 play.
38

39 Firstly, then a story from practice, which we will then develop through to a story
40 of publication in academic journals. As well as containing the complexity we wish
41 to communicate in this paper, such stories also enable us to recognise our
42 subjectivities, and ontological nuances in our conversations together. We
43 consider narrative as something of a protection against ontological violence, as
44 complexity, contradiction and paradox can be illustrated. So we use stories such
45 as this all the time (Richardson, 1997; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000).
46

47 *With ten minutes to the start of proceedings, new hospital board members are*
48 *busily chatting and eyeing up the seating arrangements in an old fashioned, wood*
49 *panelled boardroom. Public Hospital Board membership may not come with a*
50 *generous expense account but it offers a mild form of public celebrity for a few*
51 *members of the party faithful and the occasional positive deviant.*
52

53 *Their mission is to take on the mantle of governance and make the delivery of*
54 *cheaper, faster, safer healthcare look like a credible endeavour. This involves laying*
55 *down the paper trail to evidence quality and patient safety and ensuring that all*
56 *documentation is filed for the purposes of justification and potential litigation. And*
57 *in the midst of all the busyness, they must remember to avoid implicating the*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Health Minister, the Government and even the medical fraternity no matter what*
4 *shameful stories and experiences are uncovered. This is all about perpetuating*
5 *'business as usual' – no matter what the difficulties.*
6

7 *A renowned academic – the sort beloved of organisations looking for the latest*
8 *business school fad - is about to present his dumbed down version 'of*
9 *transformational change for challenging times. He has already promised a non-*
10 *academic, pragmatic 'Back to basics approach' to change in organisations. So in*
11 *this atmosphere of tentative introductions and unacknowledged anxiety, the*
12 *familiar creed of Kotter's eight-step model of change (Kotter 1996) is already*
13 *flickering and poised to reassure everyone that change is all about mitigating error*
14 *and following the eight key steps for leading change.*
15

16 *Rita, the CEO sits half way down the rosewood table and worries that her robust*
17 *rationale for investing in staff engagement programmes might not be enough to*
18 *reassure the new Board members that the hospital is of a sound organisational*
19 *mind and possessed of a credible backbone of transformational intent. The*
20 *previous day, a local newspaper requested a statement from the new Board around*
21 *why taxpayers' money was now being wasted on outbreaks of irony and hilarity*
22 *when it's so obvious that the frontline of health care is being massacred on a daily*
23 *basis.*
24

25
26 *Apparently, the hospital HR Department was launching a new on-line 'Performance*
27 *Enhancement Framework.' Following the carefully crafted powerpoint*
28 *presentation, a painstakingly, well-branded CD-Rom, containing the new tool-kit,*
29 *was to be presented to the sixty hospital staff. The HR Director was 'on message'*
30 *and as he stressed the importance of 'enhancing clinical and corporate*
31 *performance in the cut and thrust of delivering acute care.' Then at the call for*
32 *comments and questions, some smartass prefaced his remarks by wondering if*
33 *performance enhancement sounded more like a government sponsored health*
34 *promotion programme designed to offer a lifetime supply of Viagra to all staff! He*
35 *even suggested that it could even be an added extra on the latest 'Reducing Stress*
36 *by Building Resilience' initiative. After that the whole event degenerated into*
37 *sexual innuendo and uproarious laughter.*
38
39

40 *Could this be another case of discovering the Emperor's New Clothes of Targets,*
41 *Business Cases, Toolkits and Timelines had yet again appeared in full colour*
42 *technical grandeur and magnificence and for once, nobody was capable of taking it*
43 *too seriously? (The Reluctant: Free fall writing March 14)*
44

45 This was my roughly hewn attempt – born of frustration and exhaustion - after
46 listening to more stories that hinted at the levels of incredulity and cynicism,
47 which are barely below the surface in most organisations. It was juxtaposed with
48 the image of the expert that was about to provide all the answers for the less
49 knowledgeable but well-intentioned public interest volunteer. I was poking fun
50 at the dominance of business jargon and drawing attention to assumptions that
51 seem to suggest that the latest performance management tool will eliminate all
52 those negative behaviours and silence the constant mantra of those who trade in
53 gripes and blame in the canteen and along the corridors.
54

55
56 Although the above story is fictional, the actual presentation that provoked the
57 writing was about being asked to design a staff consultation event for a new
58 model of performance management. The new framework seemed simple, logical
59
60

1
2
3 and utterly devoid of the actual context or any reference to assumptions that
4 might be at play in that particular organisational culture. The 'bells and whistles'
5 presentation offered a magic potion would efficiently manage and possibly cure
6 the negative behavioural challenges that seep into the life of a well-controlled
7 organisation. More poignantly, the carefully researched model of best practice
8 was unable to acknowledge other perspectives; most especially the experience of
9 those who know that structural, rule-bound processes that enforce external
10 demands are so often at the expense of open conversation and human
11 connection. Nancy Naples articulates such tensions when she writes about an

12
13
14 'irreconcilable tension between the search for a secure place from which
15 to speak, within which to act and the awareness of the price at which the
16 secure places are bought, the awareness of the exclusions, the denials and
17 the blindnesses on which they are predicated' (Naples, 2003:161 citing
18 Wildavsky (1979).
19

20 As an experienced organisational development practitioner with a keen interest
21 in relating an organisation's context and culture to its work, I notice the
22 exclusions, the denials and the blindness that are best served by the habitual and
23 the taken for granted assumptions that keep us silenced. Consequently, I wonder
24 if my bouts of ironic writing are a response to what I experience as a form of
25 violence when matters of human connection, culture and context go missing
26 from the dominant organisational narrative. Drawing on feminist research
27 methods, the concept of 'survivor' narratives (Naples, 2003) was helpful in
28 repositioning and writing about troubling organisational experiences as a form
29 of 'speaking truth to power' (Wildavsky, 1979).
30

31 The concept of an intersectional approach (Crenshaw,1989) that refuses to
32 abstract gender from other dimensions of social identity and diverse contexts
33 reminded me to avoid abstracting power from other dimensions such as social
34 status, competition and the dominance of leader discourses that make up the
35 hidden stories in my experience of working with organisations.
36

37 From working with organisations seeking to address issues of violence against
38 women informed by a feminist analysis, I'm familiar with the concept of a
39 survivor discourse i.e. where knowledge is grounded in personal experience and
40 emotional pain and is often presented in the form of public witness or the
41 making of creative artefacts such as poetry and other forms of creative
42 expression. Naples comments on how the survivor discourse is often contrasted
43 with an expert discourse that is positioned as being more systematic and
44 objective in its claims to truth. In reflecting on the development of my standpoint
45 as an academic practitioner, it was a comfort to position myself as a 'survivor' of
46 the dominance of technocratic, reductionist thinking in organisations.
47

48 The Reflective and the Queer, in their own turn, recognise themselves as
49 survivors too. Survivors in their different subjectivity, having experienced a
50 different violence, but this much connects us.
51

52 Mary Jo Hatch et al (2005) characterised the reach of management culture as
53 greater than any colonial power exercised in the twentieth century and called for
54 the counterbalancing powers of democracy to reinforce values of ethical
55 responsibility and freedom among its members (Hatch, et al, 2005:129) As
56 someone living in and working with organisations in a post-colonial context, I
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 began to make connections with how colonial power reaches into how we think
4 and what we judge as acceptable. It teaches us to dismiss our own opinions as
5 primitive, uncultured, and lacking in sophistication. Irish people are well
6 schooled in these processes. We learn to play the game of acquiescence and we
7 find ways to subvert the system – often for reasons that are critical to our
8 survival. Such experiences are indeed familiar coping mechanisms in surviving
9 the dominance of a managerialist culture.
10

11 Specifically then we can understand the reach of management culture as a
12 primary mechanism for the articulation and negotiation of power. Qualitative
13 research with its potential for the recognition of subjectivity is therefore a key
14 arena for the negotiation of power, in our post-colonial contexts. It's essential
15 therefore, for us, that suppressed subjectivities are aired, developed and
16 negotiated.
17

18 **Subjectivity and Intersectionality**

19 One use of intersectionality in this context then, is to foreground and honour
20 subjective tales. While the Reluctant chose to foreground the story above, the
21 Reflective and the Queer, had they been presenting at the conference would have
22 foregrounded another story.
23

24 That's why the weekly Skype conversations and our fledgling attempts to write
25 and present our ideas and experience are so important. It's about finding a space
26 that provides us with some framings and a language that enables us to continue
27 to survive (and possibly flourish) in organisational contexts that refuse to engage
28 with subjectivities, struggle and voice. It's about being comfortable with
29 proliferation. This is not something that we find particularly common in
30 organisational or academic practice|research contexts. Dissonance and non-
31 collaboration do not seem to be comfortable for many of us.
32

33 Even with knowledge of relevant theories and a shared intellectual commitment
34 to ideas of complexity and responsiveness, our experience has taught us that
35 day-to-day communicating and so called ordinary intentions are just as likely to
36 draw one into 'the complications' of voice, unrest, and discomfiting experiences
37 in organisations. There are not enough stories that tell us that this is normal and
38 that the gendered workings of power are not just an occasional apparition when
39 some woman or, more rarely, a man draws it to our attention.
40

41 We developed our strategy in *writing* this paper together, from our thinking
42 together, one of us presenting at one particular conference, gaining feedback
43 from other people, then further thinking together and writing individually and
44 together throughout. It's really to show that difference and subjectivity can be
45 celebrated and that we then develop understandings which are richer than
46 merely one objective (or rather one particular subjective) argument.
47

48 As we mentioned earlier, of course, more than this, the paper we finally present
49 to QROM is of course informed by reviewers and an editor, so there are other
50 voices, other subjectivities and other struggles interwoven.
51

52 How much do we experience this as violence, as synthesis, or as life-affirming?
53 We now go on to discuss some of the violences of the academy, but first affirm
54 the positive potential of academic dialogue, returning again to the conference
55 involved.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Intersectionality can also help in our understanding and application of our
4 ontological underpinnings. This is not a paper with a single explicit theoretical
5 framework. Instead we are moving through queer theory, feminist theory, post-
6 colonial theory and other implicit theories, no doubt, which we do not even
7 name. Our subjectivities, always in the process of being expressed, also imply
8 multiple and perhaps contingent and unsteady theoretical frameworks.
9

10 Indeed, we see a plurality of approach, an awareness of intersectionality, a
11 recognition of multiple possibilities, as essential to help us understand an
12 increasingly complex working environment, and a milieu where there is indeed
13 little agreement about diagnoses, interventions, and outcomes. Where we do find
14 agreement is noticing where power is in operation, and that vested interests are
15 actually producing the desired pre-determined truths, which actually meet the
16 interests of whoever is in power.
17

18 We are thus rather attached to our different voices, struggles and subjectivities,
19 and ontologies recognising that in a threesome this is *also* problematic: who
20 takes the lead; has dominance; whose ideas are utilised or rejected; how do we
21 make a coherent whole out of conversations that struggle to articulate meaning,
22 how do we maintain collaboration and challenge without two pairing against the
23 third? These are in essence a microcosm of the struggles of working in a wider
24 system such as the academy or in health care. How do we incorporate our
25 various voices when we are all different, approach research and underpinning
26 ideas differently through our various subjectivities, reconciling our individual
27 needs for certainty in the midst of inaction, still recognising our own frailties and
28 sensitivities?
29

30 Particularly, how much do our *gendered* subjectivities get enacted, and come into
31 play at this juncture. Just like the boardroom story, above, wouldn't it be entirely
32 natural for the male in the group to come in here with an answer? Power and
33 gender are also at play in our research|practice together and separately.
34

35 So, with just a little slip it could be me, the Queer, presenting Kotter's lovely
36 staircase, or other certainty, for the client in the Reluctant's story. It could be the
37 male co-opting the work of female colleagues to the furtherance of his career. So
38 very often, as a man I am asked or exhorted to perform this very function. I'm a
39 male academic. I have research targets. I am encouraged to peddle my wares,
40 demonstrate impact, and translate research into practice. Here I could be, the
41 male thrusting academic, with mastery of my subject, offering up a simple tool
42 for you to play with.
43

44 What the above tale alerts the Queer subjectivity to is the violence against all of
45 us, and the violence perpetrated by all of us. That subjectivities, always and
46 already gendered are alive here. As is evidenced above, too often in our research,
47 inquiry and practice, the answer is to find the man who knows, who can explain,
48 as the most comforting violence. But in a post-structural feminist take, let's
49 query this. We will attempt this by opening up the philosophy and subjectivity
50 playing through our practice|research. We attempt this by silencing the thrusting
51 male academic at exactly this point, ensuring his withdrawal from intercourse.
52 We three are all eschewing violence (sadism, and masochism) at this
53 intersection, and we now recount a story of how all this gets played out in
54 writing and in the processes of academic publication.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reflexively turning to the quest for academic publication

Our conference abstract suggested that subjectivity is an important way of questioning power and embodied culture while placing context as a central feature of research. Paradox, tensions and subjectivity, with which we are all comfortable, and indeed use as powerful support to knowledge generation, are often vilified as timewasting, self-absorbed navel-gazing antics that can never produce any significant generalizable and authoritative truth. Moreover we all have encountered a perception of philosophy as “all that theory” being somehow a barrier to REAL research when we attempt to critically reflect on the meaning, purpose or validity of our research|practice.

For me, the Reflective, this means in practice that our embodied subjectivities our reaching consensus and as a nurse I find this lack of obvious action and certainty unsettling. I was trained in pragmatism after all, with assessment skills so embedded in my practice, that I seek interpretation and connections everywhere. Our embodied struggles add to our understanding of ambiguity, difference and critical understanding as we work in our respective organisations. These struggles provide a richness and paradox to our inquiries that is both hopeful and challenging. The diversity and challenge is a struggle to work with, both in my organisation and in our collaborations, which we carry out in our own time.

We know that in understanding our experience as a struggle it's easy to slip into negative, over-critical judgments. However, we all feel negative at some time working in our organisations: not feeling our work is understood, or appreciated by our colleagues and managers. This is a common refrain in health and social care, higher education and public service more broadly. Therefore, as we write about our subjectivity and develop our awareness of the potential for violence it begs the question: how do we sustain a hopeful struggle that does not sink into the victimhood and defeatist attitudes in the face of the dominant discourse?

We are arguing that this is never as simple as presenting a vigorous, clear, well-argued and rational critique, or an objective, clearly articulated summary of our agreed position, thereby merely acting as a mirror to the dominant. Thus we would replicate violence. We are modestly (we hope) trying to present our subjective experiences of engagement in practice|research in a way which opens up avenues for discussion, and proliferates understanding.

Philosophical violence in the academy

We now narrate a tale of a struggle to get a paper published about using poetry with nurses. The story highlights the resilience required in the face of comments, which are critical, in the many understandings of that term. Furthermore, the significant learning for us as researchers|practitioners coming into the writing world later in life with our own more-established subjectivity and identities, is to not personalise the feedback but remain open to the challenge, to show subjectivity without further propagating violence.

The Reflective continues:

I am on my third journal and sixth version of the paper about how I used poetry in a critically reflexive action research inquiry. In the paper I questioned traditional linear versions of published research. I was struck by the irony when the feedback

1
2
3 from the journal said could I please re-submit the paper under the following
4 headings: Aims, Research Question, Methodology and Design, Findings/Results/
5 Discussion and Recommendations. Was it a discussion paper? No – then it must be
6 research and so had to have those headings! In my opinion it was both – but where
7 is the space for that? Thus, I am reminded of a Wittgenstein quote from
8 *Philosophical Investigations*, cited in Bourdieu:

10 How am I able to follow a rule? – if this is not a question about causes, then
11 it is about the justification of following a rule in the way I do. If I have
12 exhausted the justifications I have reached bedrock, and my spade is turned.
13 Then I am inclined to say: 'This is simply what I do.' (Bourdieu, 1990: 25)

14
15 Returning to the paper I made some changes, asked a colleague to read it, re-wrote
16 it twice (but my paper was still not following the traditional style) and tried a
17 different journal. This time the paper was accepted but with a large number of
18 major changes. I was advised to look at theories in linguistic discourse especially
19 the use of metaphor and poetry; I had made assumptions about a collaborative
20 inquiry process that I had used; why had I used three strands to the inquiry as this
21 was complicated, ambiguous and confusing? I had managed to convey this in my
22 thesis effectively without any changes so I was particularly flummoxed by that
23 comment. I should be less tentative in my approach, more confident in my claims;
24 what were the benefits for the nurses in using poetry; I needed to show what I had
25 done rather than question the traditional approach to research – most of these
26 comments were helpful. As I continued working on the paper I found I had lost the
27 argument about linear approaches to research. There was a word count and I
28 needed to trim the extraneous argument away and keep to the core message 'using
29 poetry with nurses as a co-inquiry process seemed to engender empathy'. There
30 you go again, 'seemed to': why are you so tentative and not forceful with your line
31 of argument?
32
33
34

35 Then the *Queer* saw a special call for action research in healthcare. This journal
36 had published poetry before, valued multiple ways of knowing and encouraged new
37 and fledgling writers. My paper was accepted with five points to address. The
38 feedback indicated it was well crafted with a thought provoking contribution. The
39 areas for improvement were mostly helpful: it would help to provide clearer aims
40 and objectives for the research. This was not quite so easy to address, as it was an
41 emerging nonlinear research process, but I could give it a go. I reflected on how
42 challenging it is for researchers, using iterative and emerging designs, to create or
43 establish clear objectives in the midst of practice.
44

45 The feedback asked me to show why poetry is particularly relevant or appropriate
46 as an intervention tool in the healthcare sector rather than any other (hang on, I
47 am not claiming that at all, I have no way of knowing that and the word 'tool'
48 always antagonises me). The paper would benefit from explicit positioning in the
49 dialogic/linguistic traditions of action research - but this isn't my field. I positioned
50 my work using Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and field albeit probably not very
51 well as the second reviewer had said.
52
53

54 I made the changes, and a report of how I had addressed the comments. It was a
55 struggle to keep to the word limit but as a nurse I mostly follow the rules, and
56 managed it. I knew I hadn't addressed Bourdieu's concepts as well as I could if I had
57 had more words but something had to give. The paper was better than before; I
58
59
60

1
2
3 was pleased with it and I expected it to be published. The comments came back; yes
4 it's better but not publishable in its current form. This time, the first reviewer has
5 made 20 suggestions for improvement including referring to the piece as having
6 linguistic sloppiness with areas where the text is poorly written.
7

8 However it's not all bad - there is some hope. The second reviewer tells me it is a
9 very well-written manuscript with a really interesting contribution to the action
10 research field and healthcare sector. I ask myself: is it possible to be both sloppy
11 and well-written? And I realise I have returned to dualistic thinking. Of course it is.
12 I still haven't integrated Bourdieu's concepts as well as I could (yes that's fair
13 comment). Then, the special editor tells me the paper would benefit from: a section
14 on the purpose and the research questions (that's in the introductory paragraph, so
15 I don't understand this), then a section on Research Design and Methods (I've
16 addressed this as well but used a different title), then Analysis and Results (ah, ...
17 the usual linear approach!).
18
19

20 I feel angry and deflated by the dominant discourse which is trying to force me
21 down a traditional route once again.
22

23 In our next Skype conversation I talk about how deflated I am and the Reluctant
24 reminds me of a Tony Benn quote about two ways to control people: create a
25 culture of fear and de-moralise them. I certainly feel demoralised. I have never
26 claimed to be a linguist. I don't particularly want to make strong claims about
27 poetry as an intervention tool. I don't believe in authoritative truth. But I feel
28 like I am being driven into providing certainty - "Use poetry - it's great - it
29 makes people cry and then they feel a whole lot better! The crying gives them
30 empathy for others." Somehow I seem to have stumbled across the invisible
31 electric fence of the publishing/academic world that keeps giving me shocks. I
32 am a practitioner academic - I straddle both camps - am I only flirting with the
33 academy?
34
35

36 **Reflexively returning to this paper**

37 Here, then, in a paper on subjectivity, offered up to the journal, *Qualitative*
38 *Research in Organisations and Management*, we have offered tales with holes in
39 them - incomplete and incoherent tales - to subvert our own assumptions and
40 those of the reader. The discursive freedom within any of our research|practice
41 roles is limited, and determines who we can be, as a subject, of course; and in a
42 Foucauldian analysis, the options for resistance are limited, but by drawing
43 attention to our located and determined subjectivities we hope to trouble
44 ourselves and the academy.
45

46 We wish to draw attention to the undiscussable violence of research|practice.
47 We argue that qualitative research is necessarily subjective, and by eliding the
48 subjectivity from our approaches we inflict real violence on ourselves, our
49 subjects, and even others distant from the research.
50

51 We relate our subjective survival narratives, as healing narratives for ourselves
52 of course, yet also as illuminatory, in terms of the weaving and play of
53 philosophy in our practice|research, our experience of
54 submission|surrender|survival and their relationship to violence. Violence in
55 research|practice, violence in practice and violence in the academy. Our
56 understanding of our research|practice is indeed personal, survival-oriented,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 narrative, and subjective – we thus re-articulate the concept that the personal is
4 political.

5
6 We would add to this that we can consciously use and subvert the form, content
7 and style of our subjectivity towards political and communicative ends.

8
9 It is fundamentally necessary to draw attention to the way that our
10 thinking is always and already determined by otherwise unexamined
11 assumptions. “What is feminist, or perhaps, more recently, queer, is
12 that which performs its own parody, its own excesses” (Grosz, 1995:
13 17)

14
15 So we acknowledge our own identities, our own parodies and our own excesses.

16
17 In this paper, as well as the accounts written by the two women, there is also an
18 authorial voice which is the ‘other’; queer man. Serendipitously a subjective
19 narrative doesn’t appear. Is this because men remain invisible in subjective
20 work, or are we performing the abstraction and use of women’s experience
21 under the gaze of the man? Perhaps we are self-consciously enacting gendered
22 violence, and can never escape it. To draw attention to the subjectivities of men
23 as well as women in the academy is a dangerous pastime. We discuss this in our
24 Skype calls sometimes.

25
26 Here we offer the possibility that the man is less visible in this submission,
27 because we are enacting a submission of man to woman, and a privileging of the
28 woman rather than male dominance. Or is the male merely hidden but still
29 powerful. By eliding the male subjectivity (which is often dressed up as
30 objectivity) are we furthering insight or not?

31
32 We are instead, self-consciously, offering a set of uncertain, weak, dis-articulated,
33 subjective and philosophical speculations on our own research|practice.

34
35 For most people in the real world uncertainty is taken as a sign of
36 weakness. Which has devastating effects on those who try it, unless
37 they already have high status.(...) But – this is the argument – one
38 possibility is for those who are told as privileged to perform their
39 multidiscursive writing as weak, inconclusive and limited, in the hope
40 that this will make it easier for those who are less privileged in turn to
41 perform their writing as orderings rather than orders.(Law, 1994: 191-
42 192)

43
44 In our own work together, at any one time, and in this paper, in this suite of
45 narratives, who knows who is exploiting whom? Who is privileged? Who is the
46 subaltern? Because we are white and relatively wealthy, but also female, queer,
47 colonised, reluctant and thus abject, we don’t know whether we are privileged or
48 not. We suspect we are, with our aspirational academic lives, and therefore we
49 attempt *this* writing as a narrative of failure as much as success. A narrative of
50 critical failure, or a refusal to take up the norm of the research paper or the
51 perfect form of the heroic narrative.

52
53 We feel that as privileged academics and particularly those researching
54 organisations and management we MUST advocate for subjective non-
55 consensual, contradictory approaches. If we, who are privileged and who
56 understand intersectionality, feminism and post-modernism to some degree, end
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 up merely replicating the violence of the academy, then we (re-)inflict violence
4 on ourselves and most importantly on those who truly have no voice within
5 organisations.
6

7 In terms of materiality, then, it is essential in *this* text to foreground and perform
8 our own subjectivity, however que(e)ried and performed to excess. We reveal
9 our frailty, and our violence, we also attempt to play with our own accounts and
10 our own identities, confusing male and female, and revealing and hiding a phallic
11 voice in this writing. We wish to draw attention to the violence of masculist and
12 autocratic tendencies and accept that all of us, including the Queer, are complicit,
13 and that all researchers|practitioners are complicit with violence either
14 intentionally or unintentionally to others.
15

16 We suggest that there is usually a patronising, deficit model, and it's a gendered
17 model, often at work in narratives around subjectivity in organisational
18 practice|research. In daily research|practice there is barely a week goes by when
19 the Queer does not notice the normal of professors appending their name to
20 research and publications which they did not create; the normal of male
21 academics being "paid to think" while women actually do the work; the normal
22 of women's experience being co-opted and scrutinised and 'othered' and thus
23 worthy of research and inquiry.
24
25

26 In the above stories, we have more experience of the women in our
27 trium(vir!)jate: is this the powerful admitting and self-consciously indulging in
28 appropriate violence towards himself, and emasculation to allow space for the
29 subaltern? The patriarchy, an objectivity which is also a performance, a
30 narrative, and most importantly, a subjectivity, is sometimes overwhelming,
31 particularly when dressed up as the truth.
32
33

34 **Conclusion**

35 We are arguing that within the academy and in organising there is a governing
36 narrative to the role of the academic which is comforting, yet crushing. When we
37 try to introduce some questioning, querying and troubling from a reluctant
38 viewpoint, a reflective viewpoint, or a queer viewpoint, then we are truly
39 problematizing qualitative research in, on, around and through organisations.
40 This becomes a problem for all of us, and for our subjectivity: how do we
41 maintain our values when our subjectivity is seduced by our own desire for
42 dominance and potentiality, and succumbs to our own violence? With our
43 postmodern subjectivities, we sometimes fear complete invisibility,
44 inauthenticity, the impossibility of our subjective and contingent philosophical
45 position(s). We also fear a response that regards us as emotional, not rational, a
46 support group and therefore dismissible.
47
48

49 A further struggle and tension is the inevitability of not always incorporating all
50 our ideas equally. The Reflective struggles with this by sometimes feeling
51 insecure if her ideas are not incorporated. On an intellectual level she sees our
52 differences in experiences, understanding and knowledge of academic literature
53 creates our unique subjectivity but emotionally this difference can sometimes
54 feel like a personal attack, two against one, or all of us differing completely and a
55 lack of achievement to complete our work.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The Queer struggles with a lifetime's experience of being 'other', yet privileged,
4 knowing that something was different from an early age, and yet still finding it
5 difficult to advocate over and against difference without being overwhelmed by
6 his own emotional response.
7

8 However, we challenge each other and remain vigilant to our own weakness and
9 blind spots which can get played out during our reflexive conversations.
10

11 We write into each other's texts, then withdraw gracefully or petulantly; two of
12 us reach agreement and the third becomes strangely silent; we write three
13 accounts, and then our fear of incoherence defeats us and the paper moves no
14 further forward. We persevere and encourage one another to accept the
15 dissonance, incoherence and sometimes ugliness of our text, for these are our
16 stories, however disarticulated. We have to accept that our failure is inevitable
17 herein, but it's not comfortable for any of us.
18

19 All our stories are borne of critically reflexive subjectivities and represent the
20 lived experience of struggling to voice stories from what feels like the margins of
21 dominant theories in organisation studies and the norms that emanate from a
22 business school education or even the more qualitative research paradigm. We
23 listen to the rhetoric of education design and practices that support leaders,
24 produce leaders and managers that are more cognisant of supposed new
25 paradigms such as the new 'triple bottom lines' of people, planet and profit and
26 often we're full of fear and despair. The violence of each makes us struggle, but
27 the violence of *three* linear demands is overwhelming. The fantasy of three
28 measurable objectivities is crushing to *all* of our subjectivities.
29
30

31 We hope we have presented ourselves as contradictory as much as cohesive, as
32 open as much as closed, as potential as much as history, sometimes incomplete,
33 and incoherent. And academics, practitioners, researchers are not supposed to
34 be like that. But if qualitative research, which could be seen as always already
35 subjective, merely reverts to the patterns of consensus and certainty, seeking
36 clarity, collaboration and objectivity then we are doubly implicated and doubly
37 guilty of colluding in that philosophical violence.
38

39 We have acknowledged that our own subjectivities/surrender/survival can be
40 experienced as deeply troublesome as we complicate linear, positivist consensus.
41 This confronts us with the responsibility of being in the midst of systems and
42 sets of relationships that refuse simplistic explanations and require a tolerance
43 for ambiguity and critical reflexivity. As in the Reflexive's account of her journey
44 towards publication we are often struck by multiple ironies in our reflexivity
45 (Corlett, 2013) – and when we are *collaboratively* struck, then we both feel
46 validated, but also somewhat intimidated with these insights gained through
47 recognising our multiple and non-collaborative subjectivities. We are thus
48 hesitant about any claim to authority or truth. We have seen the damage that
49 such totalising and demotic claims to truth can make. We cannot avoid making a
50 claim to our *voices* in the world, but we can disassociate ourselves from any
51 reified truth claims or from anything that smacks of authority.
52
53

54 The writing of this paper has been a challenge, and we surmise that the reading
55 of it has been a challenge, too, but we hope a worthwhile one. For ourselves,
56 writing into the somewhat rigid demands of a journal paper, including the
57 structured abstract, has been a profound challenge to our heartfelt subjective
58
59
60

1
2
3 desires to communicate our lived truths. We could, and will at another time,
4 draw on queer theory, post-colonial theory and no doubt others to help us
5 understand but for the moment we choose an extended quote from a feminist
6 source:
7

8 Feminist research undoubtedly has radical potential for negotiating
9 alliances across profound differences, for listening to experience of
10 'othering' for addressing the effects of privilege and identifying the
11 situatedness and politics of any research process. The point of
12 investigating gendered lives across difference is still to establish the best
13 possible stories of diverse gendered social realities. Political
14 transformation requires being able to judge between competing
15 knowledge claims and being able to locate the exercise of power in the
16 production of knowledge. (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002:120)
17

18
19 We fundamentally believe that being able to judge between, does not mean then
20 choosing the single theoretical framework, the single narrative or the mutually
21 agreed consensus to govern our research|practice, as that merely replicates the
22 violence of power. For us, being able to judge between knowledge claims
23 necessitates the preservation of multiple and contradictory subjectivities
24 wherein the fluidity of experiences and knowledges remains alive. We have to
25 embrace our diverse, messy, contradictory and sometimes incoherent
26 subjectivities in our production of knowledge.
27

28 We suggest that this account of our practice|research can be conceptualised as a
29 submission or surrender narrative or a hopeful narrative. By offering up
30 incomplete and fragmentary text we hope this might be considered as a
31 surrender to the reader, to the dominant, and comfortable with its own
32 incompleteness and unknowing. We have no idea what you will make of this;
33 and that's fine. We hope to continue a conversation with you too, a non-
34 collaborative collaboration. It may be a struggle at times, and it's languishing in
35 subjectivity, but this text has our authentic voices, troubled though they may be.
36

37
38 We hope it may also support yours.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reference List

- Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (2000), *Doing Critical Management Research*, Sage, London, UK.
- Boje, D. M. (2001), *Narrative Methods for Organizational & Communication Research*, Sage, London, UK.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The Logic of Practice*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993), *The Field of Cultural Production*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992), *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Braidotti, R. (1994), *Nomadic subjects : embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Braidotti, R. (2002), *Metamorphoses : Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Brydon-Miller, M. Greenwood, D. and Macquire, P. (2003), Why Action Research? *Action Research* Vol. 1 No. 2, pp.9-28.
- Butler, J. (1999), *Gender Trouble : Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* 10th anniversary edn., Routledge, London, UK.
- Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (2000), *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Corlett, S. (2013), "Participant Learning in and through Research as Reflexive Dialogue: Being 'struck' and the Effects of Recall". *Management Learning* Vol. 44 No. 5, pp 453-469.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1989), "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics", *Chicago Legal Forum, special issue: Feminism in the Law: Theory, Practice and Criticism* (University of Chicago) 1989, pp 139-167.
- Cunliffe, A. (2009), the Philosopher Leader: On Relationalism, Ethics and Reflexivity. A critical perspective on Teaching Leadership, *Management Learning* Vol.40 No.1, pp 87-101.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1983), *Anti-Oedipus : Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Athlone, London, UK.
- Evans, D. (2003), Hierarchy of evidence: a framework for ranking evidence evaluating healthcare interventions, *Journal of Clinical Nursing* Vol.12, pp.77-8.
- Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge, Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977*, Harvester Press, Brighton, UK.
- Grosz, E. A. (1995), *Space, Time, and Perversion : Essays on the Politics of Bodies*, Routledge, London, UK.

- 1
2
3 Grosz, E. A. (2004), *The Nick of Time : Politics, Evolution, and the Untimely*, Duke
4 University Press, Durham, NC.
5
6 Hatch M.J., Koster M. and Kozminski.A.K .(2005), *The Three Faces of Leadership*,
7 Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
8
9 Hayes, L. (2010) *In my practice, Working with Reluctance, playful subversion and*
10 *fundamentalist thinking in organisations* PhD Diss, Bristol Business School,
11 University of the West of England, Bristol, UK.
12
13 Haynes, K. (2011), "Tensions in (re)presenting the self in reflexive
14 autoethnographical research", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and*
15 *Management: An International Journal*, Vol.6 Iss. 2, pp.134-149.
16
17 Heron, J. (1996), *Co-operative Inquiry: Research into the Human Condition*, Sage,
18 London, UK.
19
20 Hopkinson, C. (2010) *More than A Good Gossip? An Inquiry into Nurses' Reflecting*
21 *in the Ward*. PhD Diss., SOLAR (Social and Organisational Learning as Action
22 Research) University of the West of England, Bristol, UK.
23
24 Kotter J.P. (1996), *Leading Change*, Harvard Business Review Press, Boston, MA.
25
26 Lao-Tzu (n.d.) www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/l/lao_tzu.html (accessed
27 7th May 2014)
28
29 De Lauretis, T. (1991), *Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities*, Indiana
30 University Press, Bloomington, IN.
31
32 Law, J. (1994), *Organizing Modernity*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
33
34 Lyotard, J. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition : A Report on Knowledge*,
35 Manchester University Press, Manchester, UK.
36
37 Naples (2003), *Feminism and Method – Ethnography, Discourse Analysis and*
38 *Action Research*, Routledge, New York, NY.
39
40 Marshall J. (2004), "Living Systemic Thinking Exploring quality in first-person
41 action research", *Action Research* Vol.2 No.3 pp.305-325.
42
43 McDonald, J. (2013), "Coming Out in the Field: A Queer Reflexive Account of
44 Shifting Researcher Identity", *Management Learning* Vol. 44 No. 2, 127-143.
45
46 Parker, M. (2001), "Fucking Management: Queer theory and reflexivity",
47 *Ephemera*, Vol.1 No.1, pp. 36-53.
48
49 Ramazanoglu C. and Holland J. (2002), *Feminist Methodology*, Sage, London, UK.
50
51 Ramsey, C. (2014), "Management Learning: A Scholarship of Practice Centred on
52 Attention?", *Management Learning* Vol. 45 No. 1, pp 6-20.
53
54 Reason, P., Bradbury, H. (2006), *The Handbook of Action Research (Shortened*
55 *version)* Sage, London, UK.
56
57 Richardson, L. (1997), *Fields of Play : Constructing an Academic Life*, Rutgers
58 University Press, New Brunswick, NJ.
59
60 Ricoeur, P. (1974) *The Conflict of Interpretations. Essays in Hermeneutics*, trans. D.
Ihde, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, IL

1
2
3 Schön, D. A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner*, Basic Books, New York, NY.

4 Schön, D. A. and Rein, M. (1994), *Frame Reflection : Toward the Resolution of*
5 *Intractable Policy Controversies*, BasicBooks, New York, NY

6
7 Shaw, P. (2002), *Changing Conversations in Organizations: A Complexity Approach*
8 *to Change*, Routledge, London, UK.

9
10 Taylor A.G. (2009) *queering the organisation*. PhD diss., SOLAR (Social and
11 Organisational Learning as Action Research) University of the West of England,
12 Bristol, UK.

13
14 West L. (1996), *Beyond Fragments Adults; Motivation and Higher Education A*
15 *Biographical Analysis*, Taylor and Francis, London, UK.

16
17 Wildavsky, A. B. (1979), *Speaking Truth to Power : The Art and Craft of Policy*
18 *Analysis*, Little, Brown, Boston, MA.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review