Please use proper reference: Frandsen, S & Pelly, D.M. (2020). Organizational resistance and autoethnography. In Herrmann, A. F. (Ed.). (2020). *The Routledge International Handbook of Organizational Autoethnography*. London: Routledge, 252-268.

Organizational resistance and autoethnography

Sanne Frandsen and R. Duncan M. Pelly

Organizational autoethnography is a powerful form of research for examining organizations from a critical perspective. The autoethnography may reveal hidden subtleties and challenge the taken for granted "truth" by shedding light on underlying processes of power and control. Madison (2005) describes how a critical orientation has implications for the ethnographer – an argument that in our view is equally relevant to autoethnographers; namely, that the critical (auto-) ethnographer should "use the resources, skills and privileges available to her to make accessible – to penetrate the borders and break through the confines in defense of – the voice and experiences of subjects whose stories are otherwise restrained and out of reach" (p. 5). The autoethnographer speaks not only on behalf of subject but also the culture or community of others experiencing the same forms of struggles, oppression, or marginalization.

Autoethnographies are particularly valuable because they not only expose hidden power structures, but they also illustrate how oppressive powers are experienced from "inside." By reading autoethnographies we witness power struggles and contextual complexity that can be best understood from a position of both "being wrapped up in it" (experiencing it) as well as "being outside of it" (reflecting upon it, writing about it, theorizing it).

Disassembling the word "autoethnography" reveals three principle components – "auto" or self (whether an individual or organizational self), "ethno" or culture, and "graphy" or writing. Organizational autoethnography is reminiscent of Van Maanen's (2011) confessional tales that

begin with the individual level of analysis and progress to the organizational level. Alternatively, Spry (2001) describes autoethnography as a narrative that examines the situatedness of the self in a variety of contexts and hence blurs the line between self and other. Chang (2008) defines autoethnography as "not focusing on self alone, but about searching for an understanding of others (culture/society) though self. Thus, self is a subject to look into and a lens to look through to gain an understanding of a societal culture" (p. 49). In an organizational context, autoethnographies are often used to describe cultural experiences of the researchers' *own* community. Thus, the reflexive "auto" may translate into the organizational "auto" due to narratives linking the self to the other and whole (Brown, 2006; Doloriert & Sambrook, 2011). In our book chapter, we shift between two overlapping positions, of both "being wrapped up in it" (Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes) as well as "being outside of it" (Frandsen's theoretical vignettes). The format for this paper is thus the layered account autoethnography (Pelly, 2016, 2017; Ronai, 1995). The layered account is designed as the abstractionist living story. We use storytelling vignettes of Duncan Pelly's deployment to Korea as a Human Resource officer of the US army, which is supplemented with theoretical vignettes designed to guide the reader to understand the evocative components of the narrative in the context of broader theories of resistance in organization studies.

Context of the Lieutenant Pelly's autoethnographic vignettes

Data sources for the vignettes are diverse. They include a diary of field notes made as these events unfolded (Pelly hoped to write an autobiography of my military experiences for historical purposes), a variety of documents saved from the unit (such as memoranda, standard operating procedures, and PowerPoint presentations), and professional and personal correspondence. All of this information is unclassified. The documents are not designed to provide a monolithic

interpretation of the events. Rather Pelly revisited these documents and then recorded the emotional responses he had into the evocative vignettes. In support of Rambo's *Strange Accounts* (Rambo, 2016; Rambo & Pruitt, 2019), the characters are anonymized and the stories are not designed to represent exact people or places, because the signified is more important than the signifier in studies of resistance.

* * *

The unit described in this paper is the headquarters of a large missile defense brigade stationed in the Republic of Korea. The overwhelming majority of the characters described in this story are senior service members, normally with more than ten years of experience in the army. Air defense officers are unlike any other type of personnel I experienced in the army. They are somewhat of a nerdy, intellectual type of officer, the kind who is smart enough to understand the computers that run missile defense systems, while simultaneously being devoid of the common sense that characterizes the rest of humanity.

Serving as a member of a support staff is particularly colorful in an Air defense unit. For some reason, support personnel were always stuck with a slew of tasks outside of their training, and these were always the least desirable of duties. These included supervising weapons ranges for qualification, keeping latrines cleaned, supervising catering for visiting dignitaries, and preparation for endless meetings – I don't mean preparing to present at meetings, but rather ensuring snacks, water, and name plates were arranged at every meeting, and in an average day there were at least four meetings for a staff that numbered less than 100 service members.

The one duty that caused the most hatred and discontent among support staff was Brigade Operations Center (or BOC) duty. BOC duty consisted of sitting in the Operations Center for a 24-hour period. The BOC duty staff was selected by a rotating duty roster and consisted of a

junior officer, a senior non-commissioned officer, and a junior enlisted soldier. During the 24-hour shift, the three individuals simultaneously watched a large monitor, a ticker, a special classified email system, and a classified phone system for any sign that the North Koreans were going to launch missile attacks, aerial or artillery bombardments, or a ground invasion. Additionally, BOC duty entailed driving to various locations on base to ensure doors were locked and a variety of other minutiae that apparently served no purpose.

Pulling 24-hour duty in some type of operations center is not unusual in the army. Officers conduct this type of activity perhaps once a month, depending on the number of junior officers in a unit. Additionally, following a 24-hour duty shift, individuals are given the next day off to recover. In this particular unit, there were very few junior officers. Additionally, the attitude of the unit was that because we were stationed in Korea, we had nothing else to do other than work. This combination resulted in officers conducting 4 24-hour duty shifts per month and not taking the next day off. Additionally, the normal work day was 12 hours (9 am until 9 pm) and physical training began at 5:45. Work days frequently exceeded the twelve-hour shift, extending to occasionally 2 am. To pour salt on an open wound, somehow several air defense officers were exempt from BOC duty, for reasons I am still unable to ascertain.

Terror in the BOC

My first commander in this missile defense unit was the terrifying COL Garcia. He was a man of incredible physical prowess and had a very distinct military style – he was in fact known as a Colonel who routinely reduced "iron" majors to tears during weekly meetings. COL Garcia was obsessed with the BOC. It was, even by contemporary standards, an impressive place. It had a massive 72-inch flat screen monitor with an advanced sound system that was used not only for teleconferences with our counterparts in the United States but also was the center of our

classified briefings. The pinnacle of this multimedia set up was a touch panel with around 20 buttons that controlled everything from the sound, power, internet, telephone, and computer connections in the BOC.

When I arrived at my unit, part of my orientation was "BOC University," a two-day workshop on how to operate the multimedia system in the BOC, and how to conduct a force readiness briefing if COL Garcia or any other officers came by for a surprise visit. Of course, this was problematic for me, since I was not a missile defense officer but was instead trained as a personnel officer. I didn't understand how missile defense systems worked, how to use computer simulations to calculate "an umbrella of coverage," how many missiles were required at each missile defense battery, and I had no idea where to get more if we were running low. I repeatedly advised my supervisor of my concerns, and all of his explanations were designed to make himself feel smart and make me feel stupid. I left the meeting, praying COL Garcia would not visit me by surprise.

About two weeks later, at 2 am, I received a phone call to report to the BOC immediately. It was yet another of COL Garcia's "readiness drills." I threw on my clothes and arrived within the prescribed ten-minute window. COL Garcia had conducted one of his surprise inspections. Evidently, he asked some very technical air defense questions to the officer on duty, who was not an air defender, but was a food service officer, Chief Warrant Officer Joe Martinson. Like me, he didn't understand any of the information as would a seasoned air defense officer. COL Garcia began screaming at us. "The might of the North Korean Army is right across the border, ready to kill us at any minute, and the only thing keeping them at bay is this sack of shit, 'Cookie' Martinson."

The next week we had forty hours of BOC university, followed by returning to our regular duties to work 8 hours into the night. At the end of the forty hours, I could use the plethora of technical multimedia equipment, but I still only had a rudimentary understanding of air defense tactics. I knew I could never hope to survive COL Garcia's trick questions. "What the hell did I get myself into?" I asked myself.

12 Days and 192 hours in the BOC

As the human resources officer of a brigade, one of my jobs was to assist the lower level, or battalion level human resource officers, when they had difficulties. At all of my other units, this mentorship was one of the rare pleasures of the job. Unfortunately, any support officer with any sense at all avoids being in an air defense unit like the plague. This meant that all of the support officers at the battalion level were air defense officers who failed their job qualifications. They really were the worst of the bunch. In two particular months, I spent three weeks (one week each) at our battalions, literally doing the jobs of the disinterested air defense officers who didn't think human resources was an important function. I didn't do any teaching but rather completed monumental tasks like printing forms, hole punching them, and placing them in binders for their inspections. They literally were too lazy to push print, hole punch the forms, and put them in the binders, even after I personally completed all of their forms. In between these two months I had two weeks back at brigade headquarters to get some rest and catch up on all of the work I missed while at the battalions. Or so I thought....

For the first month, I noticed that in a seven-day window, I had to be in the BOC for duty four times. Instead of cutting me some slack while I was away, I had to make up the entire month of BOC duty in one week, while still working 12-hour office day shifts. At the end of the month, I

thought I would sleep the entire day Saturday, until I got a call at 6 in the morning "You have duty today, please report to the BOC".

"What??!! I just pulled it four times last week!" I screamed.

"Well, this is what the roster says, you'll have to figure it out," said the sergeant on duty.

At that moment, from being drunk with fatigue, I snapped. I may have thrown some things and punched a hole in the wall. I said, "Fuck it, I'll be there but I'm sick of this horseshit."

For lunch that day, I didn't skip my meal like I normally did when pulling BOC duty. I went to the food court on base and ordered a pizza for everyone on duty that day. I also bought an inflatable mattress so I could sleep in the BOC at night. I still had four more 24-hour duty shifts, so no way in hell was I going to not eat or sleep, then go back to the grinder of 3 weeks at the battalions. Everyone on duty was simultaneously pleased and horrified when I brought a steaming, hot, delicious pizza to the BOC, but they lapped it up like hungry dogs. At 5 that evening, I went to sleep on my inflatable mattress under the table in the brigade conference room. I woke up the next morning, refreshed, and a touch happier than normal.

As I got in the car on my way to work, I took the pump out of my inflatable air mattress and placed it in the middle of my desk. One of the air defense officers, the man who wrote the duty roster, asked what it was for. "It is my way of saying 'blow me'". He began to yell, but I turned on the pump and the loud, mechanical noise drowned out his voice, and I promptly returned to my human resource work.

This simple use of this pump was to be the first of my acts of resistance.

Power struggles and acts of resistance in organizations

In this chapter, we draw upon a number of different definitions of resistance to illustrate its nuanced and complex nature. Collinson (1994) defines resistance in this way:

> Workplace resistance may seek to challenge, disrupt or invert prevailing assumptions, discourses and power relations. It can take multiple material and symbolic forms, and its strength, influence and intensity are likely to be variable and to shift over time … resistance constitutes a form of power exercised by subordinates in the workplace.
>
> (p. 49)

Jermier, Knights, and Nord (1994) similarly write that resistance is a "reactive process where agents embedded in power relations actively oppose initiatives by other agents." (p. 9). Both of these definitions highlight resistance in organizations arising in a power relationship, whereby the reactive power of resistance is to challenge, disrupt, and change the dominating power structures (Fleming & Spicer, 2007). Resistance acts may constitute "a wide range of behaviors – from failure to work very hard or conscientiously, through not working at all, deliberate output restrictions, practical joking, pilferage, sabotage and sexual misconduct" (Thompson & Ackroyd, 1999, pp. 1–2). While these definitions highlight very active forms of resistance that explicitly seek to shift and alter power dynamics, other types of micro-level resistance which are much more covert, subtle, and disorganized seem to be equally prevalent in organizations today (Thomas & Davies, 2005).

To examine the different types of resistance seen in Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes, we draw upon Fleming and Spicer's (2007) framework, which links various forms of resistance to their corresponding forms of power. Fleming and Spicer (2007) argue that

> resistance represents a particular relationship with power, one which does not simply repeat or reiterate its discursive logic but blocks it, challenges it, reconfigures it or subverts it in a way not intended by that power and which has 'favorable' effects for subordinates.

The definition highlights that resisters may resist dominating power structures and discourses not only by blocking them, challenging them, or reconfiguring them, but also by subverting them, which is a far more subtle (and perhaps "less effective") form of resistance. Table 16.1 summarizes Fleming and Spicer's (2007) framework.

<COMP: Place Table 16.1 Here>

Refusal and other types of organizational resistance

Refusal is probably the most overt form of resistance to coercive power. When people in authoritative positions use coercive power to tell their subordinates to do something that they would not otherwise have done, they may refuse to follow through on the "order" as an act of resistance. Resistance as refusal is evident in Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes. In the previous vignette, Lieutenant Pelly does not directly refuse to follow orders but still refuses to go without food and sleep during the excessively long shifts at the BOC. As such, he refuses to comply with the (flawed) bureaucratic rules and instead breaks them to make the shifts more human, ordering pizza for everyone and sleeping on the air mattress. Notably in the vignette, the acts of resistance could have been hidden in the form of sneaking food in or dozing off on a chair; however, in this case, the refusal is made overt in a deliberate way – sharing the pizza with his colleagues and leaving his pump on display at the BOC. "This is my way of saying 'blow me'." Lawrence and Robinson (2007) argue that resistance towards organizational power often arises as a result of frustration. A frustration over discrepancy between a current state of affairs and a perceived ideal state of affairs, which often leads to a sense of injustice and feelings of loss of autonomy. Such

frustration may drive deviant behaviors that are largely provocative and serve both instrumental and expressive purposes as is seen in Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes.

Other autoethnographies have illustrated similar forms of refusal, most notably in Jonrad's (2018) narrative about nurses' resistance towards their new role as enforcing a ban against smoking – for both nurses themselves and for patients in the outdoor areas of the psychiatric ward. Her story is based on a colleague's confession that she sometimes smuggles in cigarettes to the patients and takes them out smoking in the outdoor courtyard as act of kindness. The colleagues' refusal to comply with the ban, let alone her ascribed role of policing the band, shows a much more cautious and hidden form of resistance in contrast to Lieutenant Pelly's, who "makes a point" with his acts of resistance. Refusal may not always be as demonstrative but happens under cover. The fear of consequences for the resistance even leads Jonrad (2018) to write her autoethnography under an "undercover" pseudonym.

Stealing from soldiers

Our operations staff (also known as the S-3), consisted of a major, four captains, a sergeant major, and a dozen or so senior non-commissioned officers. These individuals decided to behave as entrepreneurs in both the BOC and the brigade headquarters building. Since most of us on the brigade staff worked long hours, we would frequently not have sufficient time to take meal breaks, and at the end of the work day, most restaurants on base were closed. Therefore, members of the operations staff began selling snacks, drinks, and frozen meals at greatly inflated prices.

I spoke to the officer in charge of operations, MAJ Hernandez.

"It is morally wrong to profit off of the soldiers, especially the junior enlisted," I informed him.

"Hey man, it's a free country, I can do what I want," he quipped.

"No, sir this is not a free country. You are on a military installation. You are using a government provided refrigerator, cabinetry, and microwave, to make a profit. This is also illegal."I proceeded to show him the regulation he was violating.

"No man, I'm a major, and the JAG (military lawyer) ain't gonna prosecute. So go fuck yourself and your regulation!" raged MAJ Hernandez.

It turns out, he was right. The JAG officer was investigating several politically sensitive cases and had no interest in prosecuting service members for this scheme. I therefore decided to spring into action. I went to the exchange and bought an ice chest and a locker box. I filled the ice chest with cold drinks and the locker box full of snacks the soldiers would love. I filled an empty Quaker Oats jar with small change.

I brought this entire ensemble to the office the following day. I even put up a price placard to match MAJ Hernandez'. Instead of overcharging for the snacks, I made all of the prices negative. In other words, soldiers would take a snack, then take a piece of change from the Quaker Oats jar. Yes, this meant I was paying people not to participate in the S-3's "commissary." I placed a second placard next to the price placard with prices for the operations staff. I made sure these prices were triple what they charged in their own refrigerator. I called this the "S-3 hatefulness tax" and was designed to subsidize my buying snacks to take care of service members who were practically working themselves to death. My coupe de grace was buying locks and using them to lock the S-3's refrigerators and cabinets so no one could buy their sundries.

For extra fun, I even went to the M&M's website and placed a special custom order. On M&M's, it is possible to make a custom order with text, or even an image. Most people have something

like "Happy Anniversary" or "I Love You." Mine just said "S-3 Sucks." Needless to say, everyone liked the new candy.

Resistance as voice

Voice is a different form of resistance, which does not seek to block power (as refusal), but rather to change power by gaining access to it and/or undermining hegemonic structures by establishing an alternative voice. Voice is typically a reaction to manipulative power, which is less overt than coercive power as it includes exclusion from decision-making processes and the establishment of "value free" rules and discourses, which prohibit others from participating. Fleming and Spicer (2007) argue that voice is an active form of resistance, which may be organized in the form of strikes, marches, or whistleblowing activities, but it may also be less obvious, less identifiable, and less organized – such as sporadic sabotage. In Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes, we see such sporadic sabotage as an act of gaining voice for the moral rights of the service personnel. By putting locks on MAJ Hernandez' food storage, and replacing the unjust food-supply regime with his own alternative food supply for service members, he establishes an alternative narrative of what is considered "right" and "wrong" in his military base. While his first attempts to gain voice, by reasoning with MAJ Hernandez failed, the second more creative attempts were more successful. Playing on MAJ Hernandez' initial reply, "this is a free country," Lieutenant Pelly orders the offensive "S-3 sucks" M&M's since such provocative statements are allowed because "it is a free country."

Autoethnographies of organizational life are often motivated by "giving voice" or creating voice for groups of people, who are seen as suppressed, marginalized, and excluded from equal participation (Doloriert & Sambrook, 2012). Yet, rarely do they provide straightforward examples of 'direct voice' aimed to change organizational power or provide alternative

discourse, which runs counter to the dominant organizational/managerial discourses. Instead, autoethnographies become acts of resistance in the form of voice. For example, O'Boyle (2014) gives voice to midwives who are marginalized due to criminalized and stigmatized practices of assisting in at home births. Similarly, Kidd and Finlayson (2010) and Jago (2002) give voice to employees suffering mental illness. In each of the three examples, the marginalized are deprived of the opportunity to resist the organizational power structure "in situ," yet they use the autoethnography as their megaphone at a later point in time. We will return to this point.

A shitty day

The deputy commander, an air defense lieutenant colonel, was obsessed with my whereabouts at all times. He loved to come by my office and just look at me, not say anything, then walk away. If I was in the next office over, he would shout "Lieutenant, where are you?"

Obviously, this was annoying. When we were all provided with government issued cell phones, the problem got worse. Every time I went to the bathroom he would call me. If I did not answer, he would continue to call until I answered. When I would finally pick up, he desperately needed something very mundane that could have certainly waited.

"Sir, I'm on the toilet losing about ten pounds. I promise you I will give you that memo. It will be the first thing I do after I pull up my pants," I finally told him.

I then put a giant industrial sized roll of toilet paper on my desk. He asked me what it was for.

"Sir, you have me spinning around in so many circles that I don't have time to wipe my ass. This way I can do it at my desk, and you'll have the luxury of knowing where I am at all times."

Strangely, he began to bother me less after that incident.

Resistance as escape

Resistance as escape is a passive form of resistance in which subordinates disengage themselves mentally from the dominating organizational power, which is intended to shape subordinates' preferences, attitudes, and values. The cultural, normative, or ideological "regimes" become taken for granted, normal, and natural. Escape as a form of passive resistance may include cynicism, irony, or skepticism, even daydreaming or other forms of mental distancing and disengagement. Fleming and Spicer's (2003) concept of cynical distancing highlights that subordinates who mentally disengage fail to act differently. They may cognitively and emotionally dis-identify with the dominating discursive construct of "appropriate" performance or appearance; however, they will still perform according to the dominating power and thus not change anything. As such, they remain dependent on the power structure, which they could change. This type of resistance is particularly difficult to research as it is not directly observable; however, autoethnographies are able to provide interesting insights into the process of escape and the emotional strains that accompany it. Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes provide insight in the exhaustion he feels as he is facing yet another shift at the BOC, the sense of unfairness he feels as the S-3 capitalizes on service members' limited access to food, and the annoyance with the surveillance of the deputy commander. The provocative, expressive, yet micro-level forms of resistance provide Lieutenant Pelly with a sense of autonomy and perhaps identity (I am not one of them), yet in the bigger picture these acts fail to change "the way things work around here," the standards, procedures, rules, way of work, ideologies, and discourses of military base(s). As such, is his resistance unlike the McDonald's employee who underneath her uniform wears a "McShit" t-shirt (Fleming & Spicer, 2003)? Cynical distancing provides a mental escape from the organizational power, but since work is still done, rules are still followed, managers are still obeyed, and the status quo still remains.

The autoethnographic work of workplace resistance brings insight into different emotional reactions to powerful superior's unfair treatment or to dominant discourses and cultures within the organization. Such mental escape strategies are often labeled coping. For example, Anderson (2006) describes how autoethnography provides him with an escape from his boss and boring academic meetings. Blenkinsopp (2007) highlights his narrative coping strategies towards a bad manager. Sobre-Denton (2012) and Vickers (2007) illustrate the coping strategies of being bullied at their workplace – also by bad managers. Hunniecutt (2017) describes her coping as a woman in the hyper masculine culture of the army, and Riad (2007) highlights her coping as mother within the 'childless' culture of academia. While escapism and coping have been studied as a rather typical form of resistance in 'communities of coping' (Korczynski, 2003), autoethnographies often highlight the lonely struggles of individuals or the outliers' attempts to cope when facing abusive power or marginalizing ideologies. While these studies along with Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes illustrate creative ways of coping and mentally escaping the constant scrutiny of others around them, the autoethnographic stories also reveal that their protagonists still go a long way to comply with the organizational power structures (even the abusive managers) in ways that maintain the struggles they face.

Keeping meetings on schedule

This particular unit had several meetings per day, and they were all in the BOC. The BOC was about two miles away from the brigade headquarters office, so we all had to drive to our meetings. Of course, there was never enough parking for everyone, so I arrived about 30 minutes early for each meeting just to find a spot to park. Yes, you can imagine, doing this four times per day made it tough to get anything done.

The meetings themselves were equally wasteful. Because COL Garcia was such a legend in the air defense field, every officer saw every meeting as the perfect time to show off just how much they knew in the hopes that they might make their next promotion a week early. Even the most basic statements suddenly required sidebar conversations and tangents that quickly turned simple 30 second tasks into half hour discussions. I was tired physically, emotionally exhausted from the meetings, and wanted nothing more than to go back to my office job so I could go to sleep before midnight, so I decided to take action.

Upon arriving 30 minutes early to the BOC meeting, I would enter the conference room and turn up the heat. Our conference room had powerful Korean heaters designed to heat up the room quickly during northern winters. Within the half hour before the meeting, I was able to heat the room to close to 95 degrees Fahrenheit. I was also not drinking much caffeine at the time, so I was continuously eating ginseng candy for a little boost of energy. I noticed during the meeting in the burning room, no one had any comments or questions. Meetings began running more efficiently than ever. However, on one particular day my boss was in a foul mood.

"Why is it so goddamn hot in here? And why does it always smell like bug spray and ass?" he exclaimed. He whipped around and looked right at me.

"It's my ginseng candy, sir. Would you like some?"

Resistance as creation

Resistance as creation is linked to the Foucauldian ideas of subjectification, where dominant structures in organizational life attach actors to a particular identity, 'the appropriate employee,' (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002). Modern organizations often work through new forms of surveillance to create self-disciplining by producing certain identities and subject positions that link the individuals' notion of self with organizational values. Subjectification seeks to engage

individuals in their subjugation to remove potential opposition. This may be done through rewards, leadership, division of labor, hierarchies, promotion methods, corporate communication, documentation processes, evaluation, coaching, recruitments, training, etc. Subjectification is an "invisible" form of power, as it works through normalizing. Normalizing power establishes our experiences of the world as normal – it constructs our view of the world and of ourselves. We thus think of our beliefs and decisions as our own, while they are instead constructed in larger discourses and power structures that exist everywhere. Alvesson (2010) highlights this as he states, "There is no individual before Discourse works upon him or her" (p. 207). Resistance here is understood as "the creation of alternative identities and discursive systems" (Fleming & Spicer, 2007, p. 43), for example, through critique, parody, or counter-narratives (Humle & Frandsen, 2016). Yet resistance may also be difficult, as self-subjectification is an important part of normalizing power, in which the discursively carved out identity positions become internalized and self-regulated.

Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes bring evidence of how support staff are seen as subordinate and "less than" in many different situations. The ideal identity of support staff is constructed by the flawed bureaucratic system and the vicious superiors as being obedient, and following orders without resisting or complaining, regardless of how exhausted the individual may be – or how absurd or unjust the situation may be. The vignettes also show how Lieutenant Pelly attempts to challenge this discursive construct in creative and sometimes even rather provocative and expressive ways.

Such examples are rare in other autoethnographic studies, which primarily represent concomitant resistance as well as self-disciplining according to the normalized discourse. In that sense, autoethnographies provide a particularly nuanced window to the powerful and intricate ways the

normalization, resistance and self-discipline are intertwined (for further examples see Engstrom, 2012; Ford & Harding, 2010; Lee, 2018; Pinney, 2005; Raineri, 2013; Riad, 2007). Denker's study of her former-life identity as bartender serves as an illustrative example. Her research illuminates the intricate, yet powerful ways that a female bartender, "bartender Kathy," suffers in labor that is sexualized and stigmatized and highly demanding emotionally. She enacts the identity prescribed to her as she "smiles" herself through the workday, despite feeling shamed, guilty, and inauthentic. "The smiling mask" of the emotional labor is complemented with small tops and tight skirts to live up to the aesthetic labor of being an attractive bartender. Her performance and enactment of the role constantly monitored as the panopticon by (sleezy) customers, peers, and the (equally sleezy) manager. The subtle forms of resistance are located in her refusal to wear heels while spending hours standing up. She describes her bartender work as a loss of identity, loss of autonomy, and loss of power. The study provides unique insight to the self-disciplining aspects of emotional labor, the subtle forms of resistance, and escape strategies that enable "bartender Kathy" to continue doing the job despite her resentment to the job. Hunniecutt (2017) provides similar insights. Her autoethnography of being a female soldier in the US army illustrates how archetypical images in the media and among her male peers of women as being weak, passive, submissive and in need of protection dictated the identity space of women in the hyper masculine culture of the army. In contrast, the "ideal soldier" were constructed as male – a strong, aggressive, dominant, a killer, and destroyer. Private Hunniecutt found herself engaged in gendered strategies to navigate between negating the sexual objectification of her male peers and dismissing encouragement of being feminine and attractive, while at the same time trying to misidentify with femininity and to cope with feelings of being "stripped of all things feminine." She points out how she internalized the discourse of women as

sexualized objects. “I was subconsciously internalizing the message that women are weak, passive, subpar, need to be protection” (p. 83).

The pen thief

As a fresh young lieutenant, I always brought nice pens to work. Unfortunately, my boss would always “borrow” them during meetings, or even steal them off of my desk. A few hundred dollars later, I went to a hello kitty store and bought about a dozen of the most girlish pens I could find. One of them even had a small feather boa on the end. Like clockwork, my boss told me to give him a pen during a meeting. I then handed him my pink pen with the pink feather boa. He grabbed it, then threw it across the desk like it was contaminated with the plague.

“What the fuck is that??!!” he exclaimed.

“It’s a pink fluffy,” I helpfully explained.

“You did ask for a pen, didn’t you?”.

The rest of the officers began laughing at my boss. He looked at me and just grumbled. In about five minutes I learned that using the pink fluffy to tickle his ear was a step too far.

Being in a position to resist?

Autoethnography rarely shows a straight forward, dichotomous understanding of power and resistance in organizations, as illustrated earlier. Fleming and Spicer (2007) highlight that power and resistance should not be understood as divided contrasts but instead as intertwined dynamics. They propose the concept of “struggles” to highlight the antagonism between power and resistance. By reading autoethnographies, it becomes evident that such power struggles are indeed nuanced, complex, contextual, and messy. As a reader, it becomes evident how power structures intersect to create particular identities. Autoethnographies further highlight

perspectives from both oppressors (critical of their practice and role) (Jonrad, 2018; Kamsteeg & Wels, 2017) and oppressed (entangled in self-subjugation of the very power dynamics they seek to resist) (Ford & Harding, 2010). Autoethnographers use their own life to interrogate societal, systemic, cultural, and discursive forms of power as well as the individual manager's misuse of his or her own (referent) power.

Discussion: organizational autoethnography of resistance

Autoethnography has a history of studying resistance (i.e. Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011; Rambo, 2005). In our chapter, we have focused specifically on organizational autoethnographies to illustrate resistance to a range of organizational phenomena, to bureaucracies (Pelly, 2016, 2017), bullying managers (Sobre-Denton, 2012; Vickers, 2007), discrimination (Lee, 2018); organizational policies and rules (Jonrad, 2018), emotional labor and dirty work (Alexander Clarke, 2014; Denker, 2017; O'Boyle, 2014; Pinney, 2005; Rivera & Tracy, 2014), gendered cultures (Ford & Harding, 2010; Hunniecutt, 2007; Riad, 2007), and academic conventions (Anderson, 2006; Engstrom, 2012; G Raineri, 2013; Rambo, 2007; Wall, 2006). These studies show that autoethnography is particularly important in studying, understanding, and theorizing about organizational resistance, bringing out issues and problems that would otherwise have remained untold or hidden in our traditional means of researching organizational life. The autoethnography can open doors to new and interesting research domains that have remained under explored (Boyle & Parry, 2007). Finally, as a narrative method, the autoethnography is designed not to provide linear forms of storytelling, but instead forms a reciprocal relationship with the reader, so the audience interprets the text in their own ways and for their own reasons (Lyotard, 1979).

The organizational autoethnographies referenced in this chapter illustrate findings that conventional methods would not be able to depict. Whereas Cartesian methods focus on the "what," "who," and "when" aspects of behavior, antenarrative and narrative analysis, as conducted through autoethnography, explores the "how" and "why" in a variety of settings (Gartner, 2007). Antenarrative (Boje, 2011; Rosile, Boje, Carlon, Downs, & Saylors, 2013) is the pre-bet on potential futures of any given action. The study of antenarratives involves examining actors' potential thought patterns regarding competing courses of action before a decision is made. The "how" and "why" are especially important because resistance is inherently complex; it is both expressive and provocative, subtle, and hidden. It is emotionally charged and, in some cases, primarily a mental activity (as escape) decoupled from the actions of individuals. It is both targeting discourses around, managers or others "above" us, and the internalized identity within us. The "who," "when," and "what" questions may be less salient than attempting to understand the processes behind resistance.

Additionally, autoethnography, when written in the form of *petit recits* (Lyotard, 1979), bridges the divide between reader and writer much like a Vulcan mind meld. By chopping up the action into petit tableaux and interspersing theory with story, the autoethnography shifts from article to abstractionist living story (Rosile et al., 2013). The abstractionist living story allows the reader to connect the minutiae of process and emotions to larger themes. The autoethnography thus does more than conveying abstract, theoretical knowledge, and brings to the fore the important embodied and emotional knowledge needed for a more nuanced understanding of resistance in organizations (Boyle & Parry, 2007; Rivera & Tracy, 2014). It enables the reader to form a reciprocal relationship with the text (Follett, 1940) in such a way she or he can react to the text for his or her own ways and reasons (Lyotard, 1979). This merging of the theoretical and

narrative aspects of the autoethnography adds an embodied element to the story, which may be adequately described as embracing the plus zone challenge (Hindle, 2007). In other words, the autoethnography allows the reader to pick up the autoethnography when the author's voice departs and enables the reader to visualize themselves in the actual story (Follett, 1940). This is especially important in cases of resistance, because the autoethnographer can communicate with the audience and provide a message of hope in lieu of a linear step by step checklist or p-value.

Autoethnography *as* a form of resistance

This book chapter has shown something remarkable about the autoethnography not only as a method but as a genre. The text itself may serve as a piece of resistance from both an abstractionist and from a living story point of view (Svane, Gergerich, & Boje, 2016). As an abstractionist article, discussing resistance provides deeper insight from a theoretical perspective. As an example of living story literature, the autoethnography uses insights from personal resistance to assist others as they forge their own path. This guiding of the reader or audience can emancipate the oppressed, identify anomalous dominant narratives, and challenge or change the social order perpetuated by the powerful (Spinosa, Flores, & Dreyfus, 1999). Autoethnographies become a voice of resistance on behalf of others in the same or similar situation. Holman Jones, Adams, and Ellis (2013) state that autoethnography

> breaks silences around experiences as they unfold within cultures and cultural practices. In privileging subjectivity, personal voice, emotional experience, autoethnographies subvert traditional norms of scholarship that silences the 'complex and fragility' of life.
>
> (p. 5)

As an autoethnography is often a retrospective account, our chapter highlights, that it draws upon experiences from a time and space, where possibilities of change were limited, to a new time and space as academics where lived experiences gain new power in challenging the status quo. For example, Sobre-Denton (2012) in the autoethnographic stories of bullying make the distinction between the "then," the "now" and the "next time," as weaving different temporary stories and interpretive lenses together. This interweaving of different temporality, the merging of the "then" versus "now" is reminiscent of antenarratives (Boje, 2011; Rosile et al., 2013). From an antenarrative perspective, autoethnographies reconcile competing retrospective and prospective bets into a coherent narrative, which bring to the fore power struggles that has been previously overlooked. Doloriert and Sambrook (2012) describe such autoethnographies as "problematized and politicized autoethnography moving beyond a world of harmonious social order into a political radical world where dissensus and power conflicts prevail" (p. 84).

As a living story, Lieutenant Pelly's vignettes is a form of resistance for two reasons. First, from the author's perspective, the writing of this document was extremely cathartic. At the time, these acts of resistance were borderline insubordinate and could have resulted in serious consequences. Writing about these actions while still in uniform would have resulted in equally unpleasant outcomes. However, as civilians, and more importantly, as faculty observing academic freedom, exploration post hoc of these events is helpful and healing. We as writers benefit from discussion of these activities, as the temporal separation from the events provides the necessary freedom to potentialize counterpoints to dominant discourses (Biehl & Locke, 2010). Second, the evocative content of this autoethnography can help others cope with difficult situations, whether they are able to resist or not. Factual and fictional stories benefit from emotions as robust sensemaking devices (Campbell, 2004; Gartner, 2004). The open-ended nature of Lieutenant Pelly's

storytelling vignettes is akin to native stories (Rosile et al., 2013). By resisting the dominant western approach to narratives with a beginning, middle, and end as well as a clear moral (Rosile et al., 2013), these vignettes use emotion to connect with the reader and allow them to interpret each vignette in their own way and for their own reasons. The space between the text and the reader forms a type of heterotopia (de Certeau, 1984; Hjorth, 2005) where the reader can explore the text in relation to his/her own experiences. In this way, the autoethnography on resistance can serve as a guide to other individuals in similar situations. This text can either serve as a beacon of hope, or through the use of humor, introduce a new social order.

The autoethnographic genre is often used within academia as a form of resistance towards established conventions of academic life (in example Ford & Harding, 2010; Raining, 2013). Wall (2006) describes her inability to reconcile the needs of writing her thesis with the need to respect the privacy of individuals resisting disease – so she wrote an autoethnography about this ethical conflict. She furthermore describes the autoethnography itself as an act of resistance and truthfulness. On one hand, it is an act of resistance to dominant academic conventions that seek a Cartesian notion of objectivity or truth. On the other hand, her acts of resistance against journal reviewers and dominant narratives in academia drive a type of retrospection that enables her to be truer to herself.

Doloriert and Sambrook (2009, 2011) also use autoethnography to describe tales of resistance. In their 2009 work, they describe the challenges associated with writing an autoethnographic dissertation and the sizable prejudice they encountered as they attempted to resist Cartesian conventions of academia. In their 2011 article, they use an autoethnographic encounter with a rape that occurred during Doloriert's Ph.D. program to describe the professional, ethical, and personal struggles that occur as a Ph.D. student. Finally, Rambo (2007) writes an

autoethnography about fighting her institutional review board, her chair, her dean, and finally, her university. In this article, she struggles against attempts to suppress her academic freedom. The autoethnography is about her institution discouraging her publishing an autoethnography about an almost affair with a student. The original (unpublished) paper endeavored to explore the difficult power dynamics between professor and graduate student, and how this may lead to inappropriate relationships. The end result is an autoethnography about being told not to publish her original autoethnography. In this piece, Rambo illustrates how the autoethnography itself is an act of resistance. In the same vein, Pelias (2003) writes an autoethnography about the mundanity, absurdity, and meaninglessness of academic life by writing an autoethnography that is stylistically mundane, absurd, and meaningless. His use of ironic content and style is a humorous attempt at resistance.

From a postmodern perspective (Lyotard, 1979), to simply discuss a phenomenon is to acknowledge it, rendering it possible to resist. Autoethnographies turn private struggles into public concerns (Blenkinsopp, 2007; Sobre-Denton, 2012) in ways that highlight power dynamics in order to change social order. Autoethnography shares similarities with other forms of narrative storytelling in that it potentializes contexts and persuades readers to act (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994; Hjorth, 2007; Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001) by narratively uniting timelines (Foss, 2004) to evoke potentiality (Boutaiba, 2004). It may be argued that academicians who study resistance validate this behavior and bring to light the very problems that necessitate resistance as a phenomenon. In addition to theorizing about resistance, it also highlights problems of the oppressor, so composing this autoethnography is likewise an act of resistance. Exposing power asymmetry (with some risks) supports emancipation of those suffering (including the suffering self) from the power asymmetry. The driving force of critical autoethnographers is thus rarely

only theory building or empirical examination of an organizational phenomena but also the ambition to create a better world through autoethnographic writing. Such critical orientation is marked by an interest in "democracy, empowerment, participation and freedom" (Frandsen & Kärreman, 2016). More traditional critical research within organization studies have been critiqued for not living up to the obligations of the critical orientation (Foster & Wiebe, 2010; Klikauer, 2015). Yet by reading and writing autoethnographies, it is evident that this approach to studying resistance is particularly suitable and capable of giving voice to the silenced as a first – yet crucial – step towards emancipation imagination of extraordinary alternatives in organizational life.

Table 16.1 A summary of Fleming and Spicer's (2007) framework for understanding power and resistance

Forms of power	Forms of resistance
Power as coersion	Refusal
Power as manipulation	Voice
Power as domination	Escape
Power as subjectification	Creation

References

Aldrich, H., & Fiol, C. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry formation. *The Academy of Management Review, 19*, 645–670. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-48543-8_5

Alvesson, M. (2010). Self-doubters, strugglers, storytellers, surfers and others: Images of self-identities in organization studies. *Human Relations, 63*, 193–217. doi:10.1177/0018726709350372

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: Producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*, 619–644. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00305

Anderson, L. (2006). Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*, 373–395. doi:10.1177/0891241605280449

Biehl, J., & Locke, P. (2010). Deleuze and the anthropology of becoming. *Current Anthropology, 51*, 317–351. doi:10.1086/651466

Blenkinsopp, J. (2007). The ties that double bind us: Career, emotion and barrative coping in difficult working relationships. *Culture and Organization, 13*, 251–266. doi:10.1080/14759550701486639

Boje, D. M. (Ed.) (2011). *Storytelling and the future of organizations: An antenarrative handbook*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Boutaiba, S. (2004). A moment in time. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert (Eds.), *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship* (pp. 22–56). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Boyle, M., & Parry, K. (2007). Telling the whole story: The case for organizational autoethnography. Culture and Organization, 13(3), 185-190.

Brown, A. D. (2006). A narrative approach to collective identities. *Journal of Management Studies, 43*(4), 731–753.

Campbell, K. (2004). Quilting a feminist map to guide the study of women entrepreneurs. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert (Eds.), *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship* (pp. 194–209). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Clarke, A. J. (2014). What a performance! the influence of call centre workflows on workers' skills and emotional wellbeing. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 3*(2), 259–274. doi:10.1108.JOE-12-2012-0060

Collinson, D. (1994). Strategies of resistance: Power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In J. M. Jermier, D. Knights, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and power in organizations* (pp. 25–68). New York, NY: Sage.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Denker, K. J. (2017). Power, emotional labor, and intersectional identity at work: I would not kiss my boss but I did not speak up. In A. Herrmann (Ed.), *Organizational*

autoethnographies: Power and identity in our working lives (pp. 32–52). New York, NY: Routledge.

Doloriert, C., & Sambrook, S. (2009). Ethical confessions of the "I" of autoethnography: The student's dilemma. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 4*, 27–45. doi:10.1108/17465640910951435

Doloriert, C., & Sambrook, S. (2011). Accommodating an autoethnographic PhD: The tale of the thesis, the viva voce, and the traditional business school. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 40*, 582–615. doi:10.1177/0891241610387135

Doloriert, C., & Sambrook, S. (2012). Organisational autoethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 1*, 83–95. doi:10.1108/20466741211220688

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung, 12*, 273–290. Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1589/3095

Engstrom, C. (2012). An autoethnographic account of prosaic entrepreneurship. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry, 10*(1–2). Retrieved from https://tamarajournal.com/index.php/tamara/article/view/146

Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2003). Working at a cynical distance: Implications for power, subjectivity and resistance. *Organization, 10*, 157–179. doi:10.1177/1350508403010001376

Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2007). *Contesting the corporation: Struggle, power and resistance in organizations.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Follett, M. (1940). *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Ford, J., & Harding, N. (2010). Get back into that kitchen, woman: Management conferences and the making of the female professional worker. *Gender, Work and Organization, 17*, 503–520. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00476.x

Foss, L. (2004). "Going against the grain…" Construction of entrepreneurial identity through narratives. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert, (Eds.), *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship* (pp. 80–104). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Foster, W. M., & Wiebe, E. (2010). Praxis makes perfect: Recovering the ethical promise of critical management studies. *Journal of Business Ethics, 94*, 271–283. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-0756-6

Frandsen, S., & Kärreman, D. (2016). Examining branding in organizations by using critical organizational ethnography. In A. R. Pedersen, & D. M. Humle, (Eds.), *Doing organizational ethnography* (pp. 66–88). New York, NY: Routledge,

Gartner, W. (2004). The edge defines the (w)hole: Saying what entrepreneurship is (not). In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert, (Eds.), *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship* (pp. 245–254). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Gartner, W. B. (2007). Entrepreneurial narrative and a science of the imagination. *Journal of Business Venturing, 22*, 613–627.

Hindle, K. (2007). Teaching entrepreneurship at university: From the wrong building to the right philosophy. In A. Fayolle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in entrepreneurship education, Vol. 1* (pp. 104–126). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Hjorth, D. (2005). Organizational entrepreneurship with de Certeau on creating heterotopias (or spaces for play). *Journal of Management Inquiry, 14*, 386–398. doi:10.1177/1056492605280225

Hjorth, D. (2007). Lessons from Iago: Narrating the event of entrepreneurship: *Journal of Business Venturing, 22*, 712–732. doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.10.002

Holman Jones, S., Adams, T., & Ellis, C. (2013). Introduction: Coming to know autoethnography as more than a method. In S. Holamn Jones, T. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of Autoethnography* (pp. 17–48). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Humle, D. M., & Frandsen, S. (2016). Organizational identity negotiations through dominant and counter-narratives. In S. Frandsen, T. Kuhn, & M. W. Lundholt (Eds.), *Counter-narratives and organization* (pp. 105–128). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hunniecutt, J. (2017). Stroking my rifle like the body of a woman: A woman's socialization into the U.S. army. In A. F. Herrmann (Ed.), *Organizational autoethnographies: Power and identity in our working lives* (pp. 37–58). London, UK: Routledge.

Jago, B. J. (2002). Chronicling an academic depression. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 31*, 729–757. doi:10.1177/089124102237823

Jermier, J. M., Knights, D. E., & Nord, W. R. (1994). *Resistance and power in organizations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jonrad, E. (2018). “Resisting the Ban”: A story and commentary about the morality and pragmatism of nurses policing a “smoke free” policy. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 7*, 263–284. doi:10.1108/JOE-11-2017-0056

Kamsteeg, F., & Wels, H. (2017). Breaking white silences in South African-Dutch collaboration in higher education. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 6*, 26–45. doi:10.1108/JOE-01-2017-0001

Kidd, J. D., & Finlayson, M. P. (2010). Mental illness in the nursing workplace: A collective autoethnography. *Contemporary Nurse, 36*, 21–33. doi:10.5172/conu.2010.36.1-2.021

Klikauer, T. (2015). Critical management studies and critical theory: A review. *Capital & Class, 39*, 197–220. doi:10.1177/0309816815581773

Korczynski, M. (2003). Communities of coping: Collective emotional labour in service work. *Organization, 10*, 55–79. doi:10.1177/1350508403010001479

Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain’t misbehavin: Workplace deviance as organizational resistance. *Journal of Management, 33*, 378–394. doi:10.1177/0149206307300816

Lee, C. (2018). Culture, consent and confidentiality in workplace autoethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 7*, 302–319. doi:10.1108/JOE-06-2017-0032?fullSc=1

Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal, 22*, 545–564. doi:10.1002/smj.188

Lyotard, J. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics & performance*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

O’Boyle, C. (2014). “Being with” while retaining and asserting professional midwifery power and authority in home birth. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 3*, 204–233. doi:10.1108/JOE-03-2013-0005

Pelias, R. (2003). The academic tourist: An autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*, 369–373. doi:10.1177/1077800403009003003

Pelly, R. D. M. (2016). A bureaucrat’s journey from technocrat to entrepreneur through the creation of adhocracies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 28*, 487–513. doi:10.1080/08985626.2016.1221226

Pelly, R. D. M. (2017). The story of captain baby face and the coffee maker: An entrepreneurial narrative perspective on corruption. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 26*, 390–405. doi:10.1177/1056492616675977

Pinney, A. (2005). Ethics, agency and desire in two strip clubs: A view from both sides of the gaze. *Qualitative Inquiry, 11*, 716–723. doi:10.1177/1077800405276815

Raineri, N. (2013). The PhD program: Between conformity and reflexivity. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography, 2*, 37–56. doi:10.1108/JOE-04-2012-0021

Rambo, C. (2005). Impressions of grandmother: An autoethnographic portrait. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 34*, 560–585. doi:10.1177/0891241605279079

Rambo, C. (2007). Handing IRB an unloaded gun. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*, 353–367. doi:10.1177/1077800406297652

Rambo, C. (2016). Strange accounts: Applying for the department chair position and writing threats and secrets “in play”. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *45*(1), 3-33.

Rambo, C., & Pruit, J. C. (2019). At Play in the Fields of Qualitative Research and Autoethnography: A Strange Account. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, *12*(3), 219-242.

Riad, S. (2007). Under the desk: On becoming a mother in the workplace. *Culture and Organization, 13*, 205–222. doi:10.1080/14759550701486522

Rivera, K. D., & Tracy, S. J. (2014). Embodying emotional dirty work: A messy text of patrolling the border. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 9*, 201–222. doi:10.1108/QROM-01-2013-1135

Ronai, C. R. (1995). Multiple reflections of child sex abuse: An argument for a layered account. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 23*, 395–426. doi:10.1177/089124195023004001

Rosile, G. A., Boje, D. M., Carlon, D. M., Downs, A., & Saylors, R. (2013). Storytelling diamond: An antenarrative integration of the six facets of storytelling in organization research design. *Organizational Research Methods, 16*, 557–580. doi:10.1177/1094428113482490

Sobre-Denton, M. S. (2012). Stories from the cage: Autoethnographic sensemaking of workplace bullying, gender discrimination, and white privilege. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 41*, 220–250. doi:10.1177/0891241611429301

Spinosa, C., Flores, F., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1999). *Disclosing new worlds: Entrepreneurship, democratic action, and the cultivation of solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Spry, T. (2001). Performing autoethnography: An embodied methodological praxis. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*, 706–732. doi:10.1177/107780040100700605

Svane, M., Gergerich, E., & Boje, D. M. (2016). Fractal change management and counter-narrative in cross-cultural change. In S. Frandsen, T. Kuhn, & M. W. Lundholt (Eds.), *Counter-narratives and organization* (pp. 137–162). New York, NY: Routledge.

Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2005). Theorizing the micro-politics of resistance: New public management and managerial identities in the UK public services. *Organization Studies, 26*, 683–706. doi:10.1177/0170840605051821

Thompson, P., & Ackroyd, S. (1999). *Organizational misbehaviour*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Van Maanen, J. (2011). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vickers, M. H. (2007). Autoethnography as sensemaking: A story of bullying. *Culture and Organization, 13*, 223–237. doi:10.1080/14759550701486555

Wall, S. (2006). An autoethnography on learning about autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*, 146–160. doi:10.1177/160940690600500205