BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Dickens, L. and Butcher, Melissa (2016) Going public? Re-thinking visibility, ethics and recognition through participatory research praxis. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 41 (4), pp. 528-540. ISSN 0020-2754.

Going public? Re-thinking visibility, ethics and recognition through participatory research praxis.

Luke Dickens [corresponding author*]

School of Geography and the Environment, University of Oxford, UK

Melissa Butcher

Department of Geography, Environment & Development Studies, Birkbeck College, UK

* **School of Geography and the Environment,** Oxford University Centre for the Environment, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3QY, United Kingdom. Telephone: +44 (0)1865 285070; Fax: +44 (0)1865 275885; Email: luke.dickens@ouce.ox.ac.uk

Abstract:

Recent work in human geography has articulated the principles of an emerging 'participatory ethics'. Yet despite sustained critical examination of the participatory conditions under which geographical knowledge is produced, far less attention has addressed how a participatory ethics might unsettle the conventional ways such knowledge continues to be received, circulated, exchanged and mediated. As such, the uptake of visual methods in participatory research praxis has drawn a range of criticism for assuming visual outputs 'tell their own stories' and that publics might be straightforwardly engage with them. In response, this paper develops an argument for adopting an ethical stance that takes a more situated, processual account of the ways participants themselves might convene their own forms of public engagement, and manage their own conditions of becoming visible through the research process. To do so the concept of an ethics of recognition is developed, drawing attention to the inter- and intra-subjective relations that shape the public research encounter, and signalling ways that participants might navigate such conditions in pursuit of their intuitive desire to give an account of themselves to others. This ethical stance is then used to rethink questions of visibility and publicness through the conditions of reception, mediation and exchange that took place during the efforts of a London-based participatory research project to 'go public'. Drawing in particular on the experiences of one of the project participants, we suggest how a processual and contingent understanding of public engagement informed by such an ethics of recognition might be anticipated, approached and enacted.

Keywords:

Ethics, Participatory research, Public engagement, Recognition, Visibility, Visual methods.

Going public? Re-thinking visibility, ethics and recognition through participatory research praxis.

I   Introduction.

Drawing on a tradition of critical research praxis (see Wynne-Jones et al. 2015), human geographers have played a leading role in articulating what a 'participatory ethics' might entail for the social sciences (Cahill et al. 2007; Manzo & Brightbill 2007). This is a situated and relational stance orientated around an ethos of care and responsibility (Massey 2004; McEwan & Goodman 2010; Ritterbusch 2012), ongoing negotiation of the nature and scope of participation (Hay 1998; Kearns 1998; Kindon & Latham 2002) and a commitment to take action in order to achieve affirmative social transformations among, and on behalf of, those participating (Fuller & Kitchen 2004; Kesby 2005; Pain & Francis 2003).

These ethical waypoints have developed largely as a result of opposition to a dominant institutional ethics of mitigation (Bradley 2007), particularly for the ways such a regulatory stance reinforces values associated with paternalism (Miller & Wertheimer 2007; Skelton 2008), ethnocentrism (Mistry & Berardi 2012) and medical governance (Dyer & Demeritt 2009), as well as the epistemological limitations imposed by an overreliance on predictability (Thrift 2003). Importantly, rather than rejecting institutional regulation outright, the maturing of such debates has extended ethical concerns beyond "the imposition of moral minimums" and towards offering "guidance for the navigation of ethical and political complexities" (Manzo & Brightbill 2007, 36) in ways that might enhance geographical knowledge production.[i]

Yet despite addressing the participatory conditions under which geographical knowledge might be produced, less critical attention has concerned how participatory ethics might unsettle the conventional ways such knowledge continues to be circulated, exchanged and received (however, see: Cahill & Torre 2007; Fine & Torre 2008; Kindon et al. 2012;

Miller & Smith 2012; Wheeler 2012). Thus, the prevalence of visual methods in participatory research has drawn a range of criticism for assuming visual outputs 'tell their own stories', give audiences privileged access to what participants 'really think' or feel, necessarily constitute critical practices, or lead more smoothly towards social transformations than apparently less 'innovative' methods (c.f. Buckingham 2009; Kindon 2003; Mitchell et al. 2012; Rogers In press). Moreover, critical practitioners have shown how participants' intentions when producing visual imagery - often depicting themselves and the personal worlds they inhabit - can vary significantly from those of the professional researchers and facilitators involved, who themselves rarely feature so prominently under the gaze of the camera (Blazek & Hraňová 2012; Leddy-Owen 2014; Mistry et al. 2014; Shaw In press). Yet even where such motivations are shared among professional and community participants, ambiguities remain about how visual outputs might or might not be seen, by who, and to what ends (see Kindon et al. 2012).

The aim of this article, therefore, is to develop an argument for adopting an ethical stance that accounts for the conditions under which participants become publicly visible through the research process. To do so, we offer a critical development of the concept of recognition, suggesting ways to advance an emerging participatory ethics by addressing the pivotal conditions under which participants themselves might establish the potential for their personal accounts to become acknowledged publicly, both to themselves as well as others. Our particular concern is with how public engagement might be anticipated, approached and enacted in such ethical terms (see also Beebeejaun et al. 2015).

Given the prevalence of visual methods in participatory geographical research, our argument for developing an ethics of recognition addresses Cahill's call to more clearly "consider the political ramifications of making the invisible visible" (Cahill 2007, 367). We build on Brighenti's definition of 'social visibility' (2007; 2010) for the ways it draws

together the literal-sensorial and the metaphorical-symbolic meanings attributed to the visible, and parallels recent challenges to straightforward assumptions about 'giving voice' in participatory research (Dickens & Lonie 2013; Kanngieser 2012; Kraftl 2013). For Brighenti, social visibility is organised as a relational, mediated, and socio-spatial field - much as visual anthropologists have approached notions of 'scopic regimes' (see Deger 2006; 2007) - and is therefore 'inherently ambiguous, highly dependent upon contexts and complex social, technical and political arrangements' (Brighenti 2010, 3).

Premised on the imbalance between a participatory ethics of research production, and the overlooked conditions of research reception, this article responds to two emerging institutional agendas. Firstly, the growing influence of an 'impact agenda' in UK higher education has been the focus of much debate concerning whether it presents an opportunity to prioritise inclusive research practices, or reflects an instrumental impulse towards further tightening research regulation (Pain et al. 2011; 2012; Rogers et al. 2014; Slater 2012). Nominally, this agenda appears conducive with participatory ethics. Yet there remains a need for further reflection on what constitutes 'public' and 'engagement' within the drive for 'impact' (Blazek et al. 2015); how participation can take place ethically within ostensibly public contexts; and how this imperative is reconciled with a dominant ethics of mitigation or tendencies that are antithetical to the conduct of participatory research (Back 2015).

Secondly, an 'innovation agenda', where creative methods and media technologies are increasingly valorised for the 'cutting-edge' ways they produce and disseminate research content, poses distinct ethical challenges. Critical human geographers now use social media and online platforms as a means of producing new forms of public geography and digital praxis (Cook et al 2014; Kitchin et al. 2013a; 2013b). The significant uptake of digital visual technologies in this context is leading the development of participatory forms of videographic (Garrett 2011; Oldrup & Carstensen 2012) and cartographic knowledges (Gerlach 2015) in

human geography. Yet, any easy assumptions around the 'public engagement' that such approaches afford recasts traditional ethical concerns (Madge 2007), while raising new ethical challenges regarding ever more mediated, distanciated and 'inter-faced' research relations.

This article also responds to an important consequence of the growing prevalence of participatory research in human geography. Specifically, the distinction between an instrumental 'toolkit' of participatory methods (Cooke & Kothari 2001; Hickey & Mohan 2004), and the critical, reflexive and disruptive impulses of a participatory praxis that seeks equitable forms of knowledge production and wider social transformations (Kesby 2005; 2007; Kindon et al. 2007; Pain 2004; Pain & Francis 2003). As we detail below, our approach has necessarily navigated between these diverging positions and contradictory institutional contexts, demonstrating the reflexive ways that participatory research praxis of this kind unfolds in practice.

Empirically, this article examines how such conditions of visibility and recognition emerged during a year-long process of 'going public' with various outputs from a participatory, London-based research project called Creating Hackney as Home (2013-15), which explored young people's diverse experiences of home and belonging in their rapidly transforming London borough.[ii] This process occurred towards the end of the first year of the project, enabling various public engagements to be folded back into the reflexive approach of the production process over the subsequent year. Therefore, the public articulation of the research was not undertaken as a final output at the end of the project, but instead as an evolving outcome initiated *within* the research itself. Project resources were prioritised around working in-depth over a sustained period with a small collective of two young women and three young men aged between 16 and 19. Using project funding, these young people were employed throughout as 'Peer Research Assistants' (PRAs), and were recruited through

a local youth-led and estate-based theatre company, Immediate Theatre, who had an established track record of working with marginalised and excluded young people in the borough on a range of creative, place-based activities.[iii]

Hackney, an inner-London borough becoming iconic for its mounting social cohesion challenges, was an important location for this research at the time. Unrest during the London riots in 2011, alongside 'Olympic borough' status triggering widespread gentrification, have amplified challenges faced by a growing, 'superdiverse' population (Wessendorf 2014). In particular, the research sought to respond to the intense ways many young people in this area were experiencing a complex, ambiguous sense of affective displacement and exclusion (Butcher & Dickens In press; Butcher & Dickens Forthcoming), in part shaped by existing in the public-eye at what Brighenti (2007) describes as the 'thresholds of visibility'. This condition was characterised by being either socially 'invisible' within public and policy discourses regarding the redevelopment of their borough; or as 'hyper-visible' agents of social unrest. These stereotypes were deeply racialized, gendered and classed – reflected by the subsequent policy priority area devoted to supporting 'young black men' by Hackney Council - and were widespread at the time (e.g. Addley et al. 2011; Garner 2009). Unsurprisingly, such stereotypes were also regularly cited by young people on the project as negatively affecting their lives through the ways they believed they were seen by others.

This context drove the decision to develop a participatory visual methodology, centred on the production of a collection of short films, whereby each PRA developed their own personal story about belonging to the place where they had grown up. Our aim was for these five films to be produced in ways that supported the PRAs to develop their own authorial approach to professional digital film production. Moreover, we intended for their films and wider accounts to be taken up as counter narratives within local public debates and wider urban policy decision making.

In the following section, we define the conceptual terrain that underpins an ethics of recognition, reflecting specifically on questions of risk, visibility and publicness. Section III contextualises the participatory visual methodology developed on the Creating Hackney as Home project before examining how one of the PRAs, Shekeila, navigated her own conditions of visibility throughout a year long process of 'going public'. In detailing how her reflections over time elaborate on the critical development of an ethics of recognition, Shekeila's account is taken as an instance of exemplification, in order "to remain faithful to the singularity of the event-full qualities of relation-specific circumstances" (McCormack 2013, 12). As such, her experiences are intended to speak to the processual, mediated conditions of visibility taking place as participatory research goes public. This account makes particular reference to both the inter- and intra-subjective dimensions of an ethics of recognition, while arguing that forms of emotional risk must be reconceived as both a necessary and generative component of such transformative encounters. In conclusion, we assess these findings in view of the present conjuncture, outlining how an ethics of recognition might advance contemporary participatory research praxis within and beyond human geography.

II   Recognition, risk and the conditions of public visibility

Theories of recognition suggest that our sense of self emerges through the extent to which we come to be recognised by others. Viewing the self in such inter-subjective, dialogic terms has gained traction in recent scholarship, returning to Hegelian insights via the influential work of political theorists (Butler 2000; 2005; Fraser 2000; Taylor 1994). In particular, the direct ethical questions around recognition found in the work of Honneth (1995; 1997; 2001; 2007) offer a useful means of revisiting the challenges that participatory ethics poses to conventional ethical regulation, while advancing a more developed stance towards navigating

the public reception and mediation of participatory geographical knowledge.

Honneth's (1995) argument centres on the inherent importance of '*mutual recognition*' to identity formation, a normative stance in which a sense of self is always dependent on a preceding expectation of, or claim for, recognition from The Other. He proposes that the self emerges through three progressive yet simultaneous modes of 'ethical relations', which correspond to three orders of recognition. The primary form of ethical relation is self-confidence, which emerges through close relationships of love, care and friendship, often in the context of parent-child relationships, establishing a form of intuitive or affective recognition based on attachment. The second is that of self-respect, where an individual's formal right to autonomy and agency under the law establishes a 'cognitive' or conceptual mode of recognition. The third layer of ethical relations is that of self-esteem, where the 'intellectual intuition' of recognition - or, 'affect that has become rational' (Honneth 1995, 25) - emerges as respect and solidarity through the ways an individual's participation in a wider community, society or State comes to be valued and appreciated *within* that context.

It is the normative component of Honneth's framework that is significant here, insisting that subjectivities emerge only through the iterative development across all three stages of ethical relations. This articulates an ethics of recognition that places the individual in relation to the social in ways that are sensitive to the affective conditions under which such forms of recognition occur. Crucially, Honneth argues that the intersubjective self is only capable of having identity claims confirmed through an ongoing yet always incomplete process of struggle for recognition. These struggles are conceived as the result of 'moral injury' (1995; 1997), since to experience forms of mis- and non-recognition is ultimately a refusal of the self; or in Taylor's seminal phrasing, concerns the denial of 'a vital human need' (1994, 26). For Honneth, it is precisely these multiple misrecognitions and contested

encounters that give shape to the conditions of agency necessary to raise the capacity for pursuing mutual recognition.

Critical development of Honneth's concept of recognition among poststructural scholars has insisted that questions of power, domination, and embodiment (McNay 2008a; 2008b), as well as those concerning the material conditions and distribution of resources to enable such struggles (Fraser 2000; Fraser & Honneth 2003), must be addressed; a point Honneth (2007) later acknowledges. Others have encouraged a more politicised notion of agency within such theories of recognition (Basaure 2011; Deranty & Renault 2007), and highlight the need to focus more directly on its socio-political practices (Kallio 2014). Moreover, the inter-subjective claims that underpin an ethics of recognition are complicated by more recent understandings that any notion of a 'fully formed' subject is flawed. Studies centred on youth and cultural change, for example, have indicated that even intersectional notions of subjectivity tend to obfuscate the fluid expression of multiple and hybrid selves (Butcher 2011; Noble 2009). This processual notion of a sense of self suggests that while a struggle for recognition may be essential for self-development, it must always remain incomplete (e.g. Hooper & Gunn 2014; Thomas 2012). In addition, Noble (2009) argues that it is necessary to conceive of identity in terms of capacities rather than categories. This perspective has synergies with Fraser's (2000) insistence on the centrality of redistributing resources, which includes recognition in this definition, and simultaneously points to the affective conception of capacity as *potential*. Thus it is vital to consider the unfolding ethical relations that constitute the public research encounter explicitly as an unfolding process of seeking mutual *re*-cognition, both inter and intra-subjectively.

The development of Honneth's work therefore offers a crucial adjustment to the notion of risk in research ethics, since risk is inherent in the normative expectation of recognition and the struggle necessary to achieve it. Specifically, while we expect recognition

of others whom we also recognise, we are continually exposed to the possibility that we might not receive recognition or be misrecognised. This is where Butler's (2000; 2005) later work concerning vulnerability and Honneth's account come close to concurring on an ethical stance (Ferrarese 2011), and which is pertinent to rethinking how a participatory ethics might address increasingly visible forms of public research praxis (Honneth 2001). Significantly, while there is a risk of moral injury through misrecognition – what institutional regulation has traditionally sought to mitigate – both Butler and Honneth posit that the greater risk to self-development is to not enter into the struggle for recognition in the first instance. A central question, therefore, concerns the ways we might rethink the ethical stance within participatory praxis in order to approach such risks as both necessary and generative in the struggle for recognition.

In terms of visibility and risk, Cahill et al. (2007, 312) remind us that relations of *researching with* rather than *research on* participants have profound epistemological implications, in particular raising the "need to reconceptualize risk within in [sic] the everyday social and political context of our research in order to address ethical issues of representation, political strategy and emotional engagement" (Ibid, 361). They discuss how participants navigate taking emotional, personal and political risks in participatory visual research, which they conceive of as layers in ways that resonate with Honneth's incremental framework, moving from the pre-cognitive to the inter-subjective. However, while they outline how such visibility is ethically important in theory, they stop short of examining the ways such reception might occur in practice.

Recent efforts to unpack the relationships between visual research methods and visual culture offer a useful way of reflecting on the seeming intractable ethics of visibility as they are mediated through research practices (Rose 2014; Rose & Tolia-Kelly 2012). Yet, evidence also suggests over-caution based on a slippage between the visual and the visible.

For example, examining academics' experiences of ethical regulation when using visual methodologies, Wiles et al. (2012) found that researchers showed a preoccupation with anonymising visual data, despite participants often consenting to being visually identifiable, and were especially 'overcautious' in publications and other publicly available outputs (see also Baroncelli & Freitas 2011; Prosser et al. 2008; Sweetman 2009).

With regard to the ways participatory ethics might rethink questions of public engagement, our interest is in the transient and impersonal relations between strangers that nonetheless present the fundamental conditions for mutual recognition. Indeed, the uncertainty defining this relation speaks directly to our concern since, as Barnett suggests, public action requires a 'hazardous, chance-ridden gesture that only works by risking not getting any response at all, or getting a response from wholly unanticipated quarters' (2008, 413). Our understanding of what constitutes a 'public', therefore, follows Barnett's contention that public action occurs 'through the force of convening, that is, through a set of relationships between addressing and responding' (Ibid). Thus, defining publics – as opposed to audiences - depends on "whether, when and how the activities of particular, located audiences constitute a form of cultural engagement that matters to the public sphere" (Livingstone 2005, 36). Moreover, drawing on the influence of thinkers like Dewy and Lipmann in recent scholarship (e.g. Marres & Lezaun 2011), we conceive of publics here as relations situated through the processual events that emerge "around the problematisation of combinations of subjects, mediums and objects of action, care and concern" (Mahony et al. 2010, 9).

III   Going public with the Creating Hackney as Home project.

Our account here necessarily begins half-way through a participatory project, focusing on the later stages of our various public engagements. While there is limited scope to fully account

for the participatory processes of production that took place in the summer of 2013 here (see Butcher In press; Dickens Forthcoming; Dickens and Butcher Forthcoming), some details of this process offer useful context.[iv] Firstly, the PRAs individual film production was supported by a professional social enterprise, Mouth That Roars, an organisation that specialises in working at the intersection of outreach youth work and media production.[v] Practically, this meant that the PRAs – alongside both authors - undertook a number of group workshops on storyboarding, scripting and professional digital video equipment use, before working on an individual basis with a trained, qualified adult in both media production and youth work. Participation was developed using a range of informal, situated pedagogical techniques and outreach principles – an ethos of working with the young PRAs 'where they are' – whereby ideas for scripts, dialogues, locations and imagery were discussed, defined and used as opportunities for critical reflection in both a research and youth work capacity. This meant that process and product remained in creative tension, rather than one supplanting the other; while editorial decisions were led by each PRA but subject to supportive professional feedback (see also Tolia-Kelly 2007).

Significantly, film production took place within a wider reflexive visual methodology. At the beginning of the project, much like the film production training, the PRAs undertook a series of research focused workshops with the authors, in which visual methodologies were a core component. We subsequently held weekly team meetings and one-to-one sessions with the PRAs to discuss the development of their wider individual research for their film. These meetings centred on the PRAs' ongoing video diary keeping and capturing photo essays, using 'Flipcams' that they were each provided with. Visual materials were shared in these meetings with other members of the team and/or the authors, as key points of reflection on themes related to home and belonging. Given the personal nature of these insights - often dealing with the experiences of precarious housing, exclusion and discrimination, as well as

visually capturing the very personal spaces of homes, bedrooms, and neighbourhoods where the PRAs lived - we agreed that these visual materials would not be made available publicly in an unedited form.[vi] Nonetheless, through a regular, year-long process of sharing and discussing such insights together, our participatory relations as a team were defined by a number of potent transformative encounters and mutual recognitions as we came to learn about each other.

Becoming visible, becoming recognisable

The trajectory of one of the PRAs over the course of the project, Shekeila, exemplifies the processual ethical dynamics and conditions of visibility under which struggles for recognition might unfold. In the initial scripting workshops, Shekeila expressed an intuitive appeal for recognition through her early ideas for making a film simply about being 'Me, Myself and I' (Workshop 13/05/13). Upholding this approach over the resulting production process, her finished film, 'Hackney, Space and Me', depicted a walking journey through the borough, narrated using an internal monologue about places that were important to her and her sense that Hackney was an irreducible part of her life. Suggesting an emerging form of affirmative action, her stated motivation in producing the film in this way was to offer others an insight into her otherwise private experiences of what she called 'Shekeila time' (Video diary 22/05/13). This practice involved her walking alone through Hackney streets, along the canal towpath or in parks in order to enact a space through which she could process her inner thoughts.

The first public screening of Shekeila's film at a launch event in Hackney was therefore both a remarkable emotional risk – in the sense of being the kind of 'chance ridden gesture' that Barnett (2008) discusses - and a significant opportunity in realising her intuitive desire for others to recognise her *personal* story. As she explained to the audience at the time,

'The best experience for me was actually making it personal. I just wanted it to be about myself [and] I wanted to portray a side of me that some people haven't *seen*' (Public screening, 24/09/13). Her emerging desire to make visible a part of herself not seen before was initially focussed on sharing this story with her immediate family and friends in the audience, rather than any wider public, and was a sensibility that operated on a foundational expectation of love, care, and friendship in Honneth's framework. As she later noted:

> I've never done something like that before and it was really good for me as well because a lot of my family members had turned up, and that made me really happy, and made me more proud of the film that I made, to share it with all my family first
>
> (Video diary, 03/10/13).

Yet the opportunity to present her personal experiences to others in the audience with whom she was less familiar also became something she had recognised as important to her. Recalling her subsequent discussion with the audience, Shekeila explained that 'I was quite surprised [because] a lot of people were very interested in the topic, *why* we chose this topic for our project, but also our *individual* aims' (Video diary, 03/10/13). These included positive comments from youth workers and other young people invited by the PRAs themselves, but also others less familiar, such as academics and Hackney Council staff. Shekeila's surprise that these 'significant others' in the audience had explicitly acknowledged her personal experiences of growing up in Hackney, therefore began to constitute the kinds of inter-subjective relations of respect and esteem that Honneth argues are essential for a more developed experience of mutual recognition.

As such, the launch screening for the Creating Hackney as Home project demonstrated how the emotional risks of expecting recognition by strangers might begin to nurture subjectivities through the process of becoming visible. In particular, having their personal, diverse experiences of growing up in Hackney acknowledged through both the

public screening and subsequent discussion was significant for all the PRAs. As Brighenti contends:

> the relationship of looking at each other constitutes the site of mutual recognition, misrecognition or denial of recognition of the other – in short, the site where we constitute ourselves as "subjects". Vision is subject-making: something like a "subject" is born only through the creation and development of the visibility relationship itself. While such visibility is not simply visual, vision still occupies a crucial role in it.
>
> (Brighenti 2010, 27)

The signs of mutual recognition between the PRAs and senior policy officers in particular, had offered the young research team a rare but important opportunity to build self-esteem around the acknowledgement of their own subjective expertise on local policy debates. Therefore having their story acknowledged by unknown others, who together shared an interest in how young people were experiencing the changes in Hackney, had established the conditions for recognising their perspectives as relevant to such debates.

However, our collective efforts to shape the conditions under which such publics were formed, and the visibility relationships they appealed to, had raised the possibility for such recognition to take place. For example, the support of the authors in chairing the discussion perhaps minimised both the potential hazards of struggle or misrecognition. Nonetheless, the opportunity for recognition among a wider audience was there, especially since the audience was openly invited on a number of professional networks and mailing-lists. Indeed, it was significant that the screening was undertaken not as a traditional end-of-project celebration but, taking Honneth's insights seriously, was used to initiate a more challenging and less predictable process of public engagement over subsequent months.[vii] The following examples of Shekeila's experiences focus on the more problematic encounters she faced, in order to unpack the kinds of ethical dilemmas we experienced through a research process concerned with prioritising questions about public forms of recognition.

The illusion of recognition?

The launch of the films at the cinema was followed by their online release, one-per-week, on a purpose built website, www.hackneyashome.co.uk, which enabled each PRA to upload their own research content and moderate their own corresponding comments areas. The website was linked to a number of social media platforms with individual user-accounts for team members, in order that content on the site could be dispersed across a wider media ecology than the website itself. [viii] Our collective aim in designing the website was to use it as an accessible, youth-focused means of convening a different form of public to that at the cinema, one with a wider reach to audiences with less immediate connection to the project, perhaps even with some international scope, and with the ultimate hope of forging solidarities with a diverse range of those interested in young people's experiences of home, belonging and urban change.

The peer researchers' capacities to participate in the use of such social media platforms raised important ethical considerations among the team. In participatory terms, assumptions about capacities take on particular resonances, as young people are often designated variously as either competent 'digital natives', or ill equipped to manage the risks associated with an online presence. Thus, while such digital platforms might, in principle, afford new opportunities for research participants to relate and respond to one another, our discussions about participating online attempted to strike a finer balance (Livingstone & Haddon 2009). On the one hand, we were concerned that placing an undue expectation on the PRAs to participate online without suitable support and resources to do so might make them more likely to 'fail' in a number of ways, and thus risk causing harm as a result of the research itself; as per Fraser's (2000) critique of Honneth. Indeed, while social media platforms might offer the potential for inverting power relationships through participatory approaches, they might equally result in 'digital dead ends' (Eubanks 2011). Yet, on the other

hand, we wanted to follow the lead of the PRAs, who felt confident they could assess the range of potential risks themselves. In so doing, we as a team attempted to support direct public interactions between the PRAs - whose personal work was the focus of the project - and those viewing such content online.

Our approach was informed by scholars interested in how the use of digital media infrastructures might enable new, civic forms of mutual recognition, driven by principles of digital storytelling (Couldry et al. 2014a; Couldry et al. 2014b; Dickens et al. 2014). For example, Couldry et al. demonstrate not only how digital storytelling facilitates recognition between researchers and participants, but can prompt wider recognition of the latter's capacities, involving 'subtle changes in the everyday habits of producing narrative and recognising each other as actors with narrative skills' (Couldry et al. 2014a, 15). As such our interest was in the extent to which the project website might enable our outputs to be further layered with the exchange of narratives among wider publics, becoming reworked as part of seeking recognition through distanciated, processual relations of public addressing and responding (Barnett 2008).

Associated risks were addressed in ways that prioritised an ethics of recognition at the second stage of Honneth's framework; the inter-subjective relations of autonomy and agency. For example, practical features of the website enabled both the PRAs and those interacting with them to elect pseudo-identities through usernames, while interaction took place under comments threads that included clear terms and conditions covering consent to participate and data use. Moderation was overseen by the authors, who were simultaneously alerted to comments received on the site, but this measure served primarily as a backstop to support the PRA team to undertake their own careful considerations about suitable responses before posting them publicly. Our team meetings also established a peer-to-peer model of skills sharing around public engagement, whereby the PRA who had spent a week moderating

during the launch of their film passed on their learning to the next PRA who was about to embark on their own moderation period.

Returning to Shekeila's experiences shows how these points developed in relation to the conditions of visibility and an ethics of recognition at this stage of the project. Of particular interest to Shekeila was the way the social media tools embedded in the website offered user analytics, which could be seen as proxies for measuring social interaction and, perhaps, mutual recognition. Thus, during the launch of her film, Shekeila followed her viewing figures with keen interest:

> I'm just gonna check and see how many people viewed it so far… 34 views… which is pretty cool for the first day… my aim by the end of the week is to get 100 views plus maybe 15 comments
>
> (Video diary, 03/10/13)

However, throughout the week, Shekeila became increasingly discerning between the quality and quantity of the recognition she was receiving, satisfied by the number of her film 'views' but nonetheless attaching more value to the comments of friends and family. Thus, while we hoped that the online launch of the project would straightforwardly engage a wider audience, our ambitions were tempered by the reality that it was this highly-localised audience who offered the most active signs of mutual recognition. This situation was indicative of Honneth's suggestion that ethical relationships of love and care underpin the potential for more public forms of agency or respect, through the mutual, iterative call and response of recognition claims. Indeed, during one moderation session, Shekeila exclaimed that:

> My friends have liked the page! Daniel, Dwayne … Right now I'm doing some promotion, seeing if I can get people to comment so I can get working on my first comments… aw, bless, and my cousin liked it, woo-hoo!
>
> (Video diary, 03/10/13)

Shekeila thus began to take more direct affirmative action in order to generate comments to

her film by 'promoting' it on other social media platforms. Clearly this had potential risks which were discussed in team meetings, as ultimately we did not know where the films would be used. However, Shekeila increasingly proved adept at reflecting on how different publics might be convened through the particular features of different social media platforms, and managing her own online visibility as a result:

> It's hard to separate… I think it's OK for me to promote the film on my personal [Facebook] page, but for Twitter, I think that's too open and not even private […] I use the separate Twitter account just for [PROJECT] stuff, to get a different response from a different amount of people

> (Video diary, 09/10/13)

Despite Shekeila's desire for wider responses to her film, the comments thread mainly featured her existing friends, family and those already linked to the project. Nonetheless, by risking these exchanges as more open, public expressions, Shekeila gradually explored her own motives and meaning in her film over the course of her moderation stint. In one instance, for example, she recalled that 'I was sitting there for a good twenty minutes trying to think of a reasonable response. Because it was a question I didn't know the answer to until I had thought of it' (Video diary, 09/10/13). A further challenge that Shekeila encountered was that 'Some of the people I knew and some of the people I didn't. I was thinking, "Okay, do I address them personally?"' (Video diary, 09/10/13). This was resolved using '@mentions' of given usernames, but such examples suggested that, while cautious, Shekeila was increasingly concerned with *re*-cognising both her own sense of self and those who had responded to her, pointing to the inter-subjective ways *mutual* recognition might, or indeed, might not take place through such distanciated and mediated encounters.

However, as the anticipated breadth of substantive feedback on her online film appeared somewhat lacking, Shekeila began to question whether this was related to its personal focus. Moreover, she suggested that the more passive yet quantifiable proxies for

social interaction, such as 'views' and 'likes', simply did not feel like they were leading to mutual recognition as she saw it: 'I'm actually regretting not doing something with a subject that I could have really got conversation going. Because, forget the [website] views, I actually *want* the conversation!' (Video diary, 21/12/13). As a result, Shekeila's experiences drew our attention to the perhaps naïve assumptions about our abilities to broadcast to, and engage with, wider online publics that we had first made, at least without undertaking the significant work in establishing the underlying conditions of care, agency, respect and solidarity that such assumptions would seem to depend on.

Such experiences suggest that, while social media platforms might offer the potential for mutual recognition, they are structured by a number of significant constraints on the conditions for doing so. In particular our online approach to public engagement was in fact taking place through subtle, ambiguous interrelations between what was notionally perceived as separate public and private spheres (Delli Carpini 2000; Driscoll & Gregg 2010; Zimmer 2010), and across open and 'proprietary ecologies' (Donovan 2014). Thus, it remained an unresolved question among the team whether the individual esteem measures embedded in this 'like economy' (Gerlitz & Helmond 2013), might be distorting, obscuring or giving the illusion of mutual recognition, rather than constituting the fundamental social conditions under which mutual recognition might occur (Couldry et al. 2016).

Negotiating public conditions of (in)visibility and (un)recognisability
Following her online moderation stint, Shekeila's initial positivity became further tempered by a concern that, as she put it, 'my film is a bit boring, it hasn't really generated any discussion and I don't think it ever would because it's not that type of controversial discussion like the others' (Video diary, 21/12/13). Her concern was that, while some of the PRAs had made films focused on topics with a more obvious 'public appeal' - such as gentrification or 'hipsters' – Shekeila's insights into her personal experiences of growing up

in Hackney appeared harder to stimulate public responses to, let alone prompt the kinds of attitudinal changes she desired. As she reasoned at the time:

> I wanted to change people's perceptions of ways that young people use space in Hackney. Because not everyone uses it like a youth club. But it's also about expressing myself personally, because it's not something I used to do very well. Finding a different way to do it gave me the opportunity. But I don't think I had a clear cut message, it's like, what you took from it you took from it. This is my memories, my experiences… It's an insight really
>
> (Interview, 11/09/14)

These tensions highlight an internal struggle around what Shekeila felt the process of publicly circulating her film could potentially offer; an indication of the *intra*-subjective potential of the process of *re*-cognition. Her ambivalence was that, without either a discursive context around her film in which she was active and visible, or the conditions established for presenting and contesting her personal perspectives directly, such insights risked becoming unrecognised altogether.

The challenges of creating spaces for such personal expressions to resonate meaningfully with unknown others were made especially clear at a later screening, this time of the film that another PRA, Monét, had produced. The audience in this instance was comprised of older teenagers from across London working with a peer outreach team. However, given time constraints neither Monét nor her fellow PRAs were able to attend, which required the authors to attempt to contextualise Monét's equally personal experiences to the audience. After showing the film, one young person began the feedback session by responding that 'the *visuals* need to be a lot stronger. If I didn't know Hackney, I would think "God, this place is a really boring place"'; and another commented, 'it needs to be a bit more *explicit*, cause that was really more about her own story, and if you're not from Hackney […] it's hard for us to *picture* what she'd be talking about' (Group discussion, 07/02/14). Others

in the audience made a number of more affirmative responses, being more familiar with Hackney or recognising in the film the pressures on young people in London more broadly. However, these initial comments highlighted that the personal nature of the films sat awkwardly at times with judgements informed by a visibility regime defining what a 'proper film' should be like, and perhaps, reflecting our lack of sensitivity to the ways visual methods might intersect with visual cultures (Rose 2014). Indeed, we continued to find that a broad cross-section of adults were more receptive to the films than young people at various subsequent screenings held in youth centres around Hackney.

Given that an aim of the Creating Hackney as Home project had been to pursue mutual recognition among a dispersed youth audience in particular, such misrecognitions led us as a team to reflect about the expectations we placed on this group to always constitute a receptive public, the practical opportunities we might find in order for further struggle over such misrecognitions to take place, and the merits of showing the films to wider audiences without carefully preparing the conditions under which they might be seen. But equally, such misrecognitions seemed to reflect a lack of familiarity with Hackney as a place, which made it hard for this particular public to appreciate the personal insights that Shekeila and Monet articulated in their films. This suggests not only that participatory research must work at an inter-subjective register, but that such research is often profoundly situated in the relational geographies that shape the conditions under which respect, solidarities and mutual recognitions might depend on.

Thus, as the public phase of the project came to a close, Shekeila remained clear about the need to define for herself which publics saw her film and under what conditions. Her stance was exemplified by one of our final team meetings, in which we discussed an invitation from BBC Three to screen some of the films. While the other PRAs felt excited by the prospect of broadcasting their work, Shekeila stressed that she did not want her film

included. This raised an ethical dilemma, much debated among the team, about withdrawing consent once material had been made publicly available. Indeed, as one of the other PRAs pointed out to Shekeila, her film was 'published online already' (see Zimmer 2010). Yet, for Shekeila, her concern was about the medium through which such public audiences might be convened. As she reasoned, 'with them already being public, that's fine because someone that I haven't told will have to search for it [but] for it to be on BBC Three, let me just repeat, [it's the] *British Broadcast Corporation!'* (Group discussion, 28/11/13). Her stance thus raised the need to consider more directly the limits of 'going public' to achieve mutual recognition; that placing the ethical imperative on recognition is not the same as unfettered public exposure, and that perhaps our own regimes of visibility - as professional researchers seeking demonstrable 'impacts' - did not inevitably coincide with the geographical conditions under which the peer researchers were comfortable participating or being seen.

Despite clear instances of realising her intuitive desire to share her personal story, by attempting to foster mutual recognitions through her interactions both online and in public screenings, Shekeila remained conflicted about the ways her account might be received. On the one hand she remained adamant that her participation in the project was motivated by the chance to 'portray a side of me that some people haven't seen' and even seeking to 'change perceptions'; while, perhaps understandably, never quite being comfortable that this would be received as she intended:

> It was tricky. Having to share, where the film went afterwards [and] the possibility of who could view my film. I didn't realise it until after I made the film but it was actually *very* personal. I shared things that not many people knew about me.
>
> (Interview, 11/09/14)

Yet at the same time, Shekeila had come to regard such unfolding experiences as valuable precisely for their potential to build respect, however uncertain this might be, by sharing her

personal worlds with others both within and beyond her familiar relations:

> I think it was valuable to a certain extent. But I still feel a bit defensive, like, obviously if someone was going to disrespect me for the way I feel and my thoughts then that's going to hurt. I would have wanted to keep it to myself, but it's about taking risks and I think it was good that I did.
>
> (Interview, 11/09/14)

In this sense then, Shekeila's experiences of navigating her visibility and engagement with others exemplify the generative potential for both inter- and intra-subjective development through the appeal for mutual recognition, despite being an ever chance-ridden gesture. Crucially, for Shekeila, such emotional risks were worth taking because she felt cared for within, and in control of, the participatory conditions under which such encounters unfolded.

IV   Conclusions

This article has sought to advance an emerging participatory ethics in geographical research by arguing for a deeper reflection on the conditions under which participatory research develops in pursuit of public engagement and wider impacts. In particular we have responded to a growing body of critique suggesting that participatory research has shown limited appreciation for the ways various outputs developed through a preference for visual methods might be received once they circulate beyond the confines and control of the production process. Our approach was driven by the belief that participatory visual researchers must conceive of more adequate ways of organising, assembling and mediating publics around their work, in order to better ensure the possibility of the kinds of meaningful, mutual transformations they seek.

Central to this argument has been an insistence on the need to address an ethical distinction between the importance of ensuring participants' rights and desires to use public research encounters as opportunities to develop forms of self-confidence, self-respect and

self-esteem, and the conventional consideration given to the potential harm that such participation might be assumed to present. Put another way, we have argued that the risk of *not* undertaking research production in ways that subsequently support participants to pursue their own intuitive desires to give an account of themselves to others (Butler 2005), is perhaps greater than any inherent risks associated with participants being identifiable or addressable in public contexts, discourses and debates. Such thinking derives from Honneth's (1995) fundamental insight that it is only through engaging in struggles to be listened to or seen differently by remote others, might the conditions necessary for self-development begin to be met. Shekeila's personal experiences demonstrate how conducting research focused at the level of the inter- and intra-subjective - as a relational participatory praxis undertaken from the foundations of love and care, autonomy and agency, and tentatively towards forms of respect and solidarity – can be approached as an ethically-sound means of pursuing the kinds of public engagement that impels much critical, participatory research.

In particular we have taken this argument beyond notions of participant 'voice', and towards forms of praxis concerned with supporting specific conditions of visibility; those in which participants themselves are recognised as already possessing the competencies to seek, define and manage the ways they might become visible to others in a range of mediated contexts. Moreover, we have shown here how the emotional, personal and political risks and rewards that such opportunities present can be collectively born across the networks of ethical relations that constitute participatory research encounters, negotiated between those more or less 'expert' to do so, and supported by forms of social, technical and practical resource distribution necessary to participate in such forms of research practice in the first instance.

Our empirical emphasis on the ways Shekeila negotiated her own conditions of visibility at the intersection between her public and private self, highlights how the visible

can be a productive terrain through which to further our critical understandings of what it might mean to recognise, and be recognised, through the research process. Significantly, our collective approach on the Creating Hackney as Home project was not just about producing *visual* narratives in the hope they might challenge prevalent visual discourses about young people, important as this ultimate aim was for the project. Instead, our collective efforts sought to shape the conditions under which participants became visible to both themselves and others; moments where various forces of representing, convening, mediating, exchanging, and reflecting with unfamiliar others might be played out. Indeed, as this case exemplifies, instances of invisibility or misrecognition, can be at least as productive for reflecting on the motivations for publicly-engaged research, and the range of impacts these might have on participants, as more outwardly 'impactful' affirmations.

This article has synthesised a number of ways that scholars have begun to define the theoretical terrain for a renewed consideration of recognition in terms directly relevant to the current concern with public engagement and research impact in human geography. In particular, a number of important contributions signal ways of developing an ethics of recognition through the relations of public action (Barnett 2008), the generative capacities of digital infrastructures in expanding practices of civic culture (Couldry et al. 2014a; Couldry et al. 2014b), and by re-conceiving social visibility as a contingent field of spatial relations (Brighenti 2007; 2010). Such approaches, we contend, demonstrate the potential for an ethics of recognition to inform the production of geographical knowledge beyond 'moral minimums' (Manzo & Brightbill 2007) and towards sustaining the transformative potential of a publicly-orientated participatory praxis.

Acknowledgements

References

Addley E, Taylor M, Domokos J and Lewis P 2011 UK riots: 'Those who seek to racialise this problem are taking us backwards' in *The Guardian* 10/08/11

Back L 2015 On the side of the powerful: the "impact agenda" and sociology in public, *The Sociological Review Blog*, http://www.thesociologicalreview.com/information/blog/on-the-side-of-the-powerful-the-impact-agenda-sociology-in-public.html (accessed 29/09/15)

Banks S Armstrong A Carter K Graham H Hayward P Henry A Holland T Holmes C Lee A McNulty A Moore N Nayling N Stokoe A and Strachan A 2013 Everyday ethics in community-based participatory research. *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, **8**(3): 263-277.

Barnett C 2008 Convening publics: the parasitical spaces of public action in Cox KR, Low M and Robinson J eds *The Sage handbook of political geography,* Sage, London 403-417

Baroncelli L and Freitas A 2011 The visibility of the self on the web: A struggle for recognition *Proceedings of the ACM WebSci'11* Koblenz, Germany 1-2

Basaure M 2011 In the epicenter of politics: Axel Honneth's theory of the struggles for recognition and Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot's moral and political sociology *European Journal of Social Theory* **14** 263-281

Beebeejaun Y, Durose C, Rees J, Richardson J and Richardson L 2015 Public harm or public value? Towards coproduction in research with communities *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* **33** 552-565

Blazek M and Hraňová P 2012 Emerging relationships and diverse motivations and benefits in participatory video with young people *Children's Geographies* **10** 151-168

Blazek M, Smith FM, Lemešová M and Hricová P 2015 Ethics of care across professional and everyday positionalities: The (un)expected impacts of participatory video with young female carers in Slovakia *Geoforum* **61** 45-55

Bradley M 2007 Silenced for their own protection: how the IRB marginalizes those it feigns to protect *Acme: an International E-journal for Critical Geographies* **6** 339-349

Brighenti AM 2007 Visibility: a category for the social sciences *Current Sociology* **55** 323-342

Brighenti AM 2010 *Visibility in social theory and social research* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke

Brydon-Miller M 2012 Addressing the Ethical Challenges of Community-Based Research. *Teaching Ethics*, **12**(2): 157-162.

Buckingham D 2009 `Creative' visual methods in media research: possibilities, problems and proposals *Media, Culture & Society* **31** 633-652

Butcher M 2011 *Managing cultural change* Ashgate, Farnham

Butcher M In press Visualising home: re-imagining the multiple meanings of place in Kraftl P and Nairn K eds *Geographies of children & young people: space, place and environment,* Springer.

Butcher M and Dickens, L In press Spatial dislocation and affective displacement: youth perspectives on gentrification in London *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.*

Butcher M & Dickens L Forthcoming Precarious belonging: the impact of urban disruption on feeling at home.

Butler J 2000 Longing for recognition: commentary on the work of Jessica Benjamin *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* **1** 271-290

Butler J 2005 *Giving an account of oneself* Fordham University Press, New York

Cahill C 2007 Repositioning ethical commitments: participatory action research as a relational praxis of social change *Acme: an International E-journal for Critical Geographies* **6** 360-373

Cahill C, Sultana F and Pain R 2007 Participatory ethics: politics, practices, institutions *Acme: an International E-journal for Critical Geographies* **6** 304-318

Cahill C and Torre ME 2007 Beyond the journal article: representations, audience, and the presentation of Participatory Action Research in Kindon S, Pain R and Kesby M eds *Participatory action research approaches and methods* Routledge, Oxford, 196-205

Cammarota J and Fine M eds 2008 Revolutionizing Education: Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion. Routledge, London.

Cook et al I 2014 Organic public geographies and REF impact *Acme: an International E-journal for Critical Geographies* **13** 47-51

Cooke B and Kothari U eds 2001 *Participation: the new tyranny?* Zed Books, London

Couldry N, Fotopoulou A and Dickens L 2016 Real social analytics: a contribution towards a phenomenology of a digital world *British Journal of Sociology* **67** 118-137

Couldry N, MacDonald R, Stephansen H, Clark W, Dickens L and Fotopoulou A 2014a Constructing a digital storycircle: digital infrastructure and mutual recognition *International Journal of Cultural Studies* **18** 501-517

Couldry N, Stephansen H, Fotopoulou A, MacDonald R, Clark W and Dickens L 2014b Digital citizenship? Narrative exchange and the changing terms of civic culture *Citizenship Studies* **18** 615-629

Deger J 2006 *Shimmering screens* University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis

Deger J 2007 Seeing the invisible: Yolngu video as revelatory ritual *Visual Anthropology* **20** 103-121

Delli Carpini MX 2000 Gen.com: youth, civic engagement, and the new information environment *Political Communication* **17** 341-349

Deranty J-P and Renault E 2007 Politicizing Honneth's ethics of recognition *Thesis Eleven* **88** 92-111

Dickens L Forthcoming World building and the radical geographical imagination: where youth work meets participatory research

Dickens L & Butcher M Forthcoming Witnessing intimate worlds: approaching experience through participatory, reflexive and videographic methods

Dickens L, Couldry N and Fotopoulou A 2014 News in the community? *Journalism Studies* **16** 1-18

Dickens L and Lonie D 2013 Rap, rhythm and recognition: Lyrical practices and the politics of voice on a community music project for young people experiencing challenging circumstances *Emotion, Space and Society* **9** 59-71

Donovan G 2014 Opening proprietary ecologies: participatory action design research with young people in Gudmundsdottir GB and Vasbø KB eds *Methodological challenges when exploring digital learning spaces in education* Sense, Rotterdam 65-77

Driscoll C and Gregg M 2010 My profile: The ethics of virtual ethnography *Emotion, Space and Society* **3** 15-20

Dyer S and Demeritt D 2009 Un-ethical review? Why it is wrong to apply the medical model of research governance to human geography *Progress in Human Geography* **33** 46-64

Eubanks V 2011 *Digital dead end: fighting for social justice in the information age* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA

Ferrarese E 2011 Judith Butler's 'not particularly postmodern insight' of recognition *Philosophy & Social Criticism* **37** 759-773

Fine M and Torre ME 2008 Theorizing audience, products and provocation in Reason P and Bradbury H eds *The Sage Handbook of Action Research,* Sage, London 407-420

Fraser N 2000 Rethinking recognition *New Left Review* **3**

Fraser N and Honneth A 2003 *Redistribution or recognition?* Verso, London

Fuller D and Kitchen R 2004 Radical theory/critical praxis: academic geography beyond the academy? in Fuller D and Kitchen R eds *Critical theory/radical praxis* Canada: Praxis (e)Press, Vernon and Victoria, BC 1-20

Garner R 2009 'Hoodies, louts, scum': how media demonises teenagers in *The Independent* 13/03/09

Garrett BL 2011 Videographic geographies: using digital video for geographic research *Progress in Human Geography* **35** 521-541

Gerlach J 2015 Editing worlds: participatory mapping and a minor geopolitics *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **40** 273-286

Gerlitz C and Helmond A 2013 The like economy: social buttons and the data-intensive web *New Media & Society* **15** 1348-1365

Hay I 1998 Making moral imaginations. Research ethics, pedagogy, and professional human geography *Philosophy & Geography* **1** 55-75

Hickey S and Mohan G eds 2004 *Participation: from tyranny to transformation* Zed Books, London

Honneth A 1995 *The struggle for recognition* Anderson J trans MIT Press

Honneth A 1997 Recognition and moral obligation *Social Research: An International Quarterly* **64** 16-35

Honneth A 2001 Invisibility: on the epistemology of 'recognition' *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* **75** 111-126

Honneth A 2007 *Disrespect* Polity Press, Cambridge, UK

Hooper C-A and Gunn R 2014 Recognition as a framework for ethical participatory research: developing a methodology with looked after young people *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* **17** 475-488

Kallio KP 2014 Intergenerational recognition as political practice in Vanderbeck R and Worth N eds *Intergenerational space,* Routledge, London 139–154

Kanngieser A 2012 A sonic geography of voice: towards an affective politics *Progress in Human Geography* **36** 336-353

Kearns R 1998 Interactive ethics: developing understanding of the social relations of research *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* **22** 297-310

Kesby M 2005 Retheorizing empowerment-through-participation as a performance in space: beyond tyranny to transformation *Signs* **30** 2037-2065

Kesby M 2007 Spatialising participatory approaches: the contribution of geography to a mature debate *Environment and Planning A* **39** 2813-2831

Kindon S 2003 Participatory video in geographic research: a feminist practice of looking? *Area* **35** 142-153

Kindon S, Hume-Cook G and Woods K 2012 Troubling the politics of reception in participatory video discourse in Milne E-J, Mitchell C and de Lange N eds *Handbook of participatory video,* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, 349-364

Kindon S and Latham A 2002 From mitigation to negotiation: ethics and the geographic imagination in Aotearoa/New Zealand *New Zealand Geographer* **58** 14-22

Kindon SL, Pain R and Kesby M 2007 *Participatory action research approaches and methods* Routledge

Kitchin R, Linehan D, O'Callaghan C and Lawton P 2013a Public geographies through social media *Dialogues in Human Geography* **3** 56-72

Kitchin R, Linehan D, O'Callaghan C and Lawton P 2013b The creation and circulation of public geographies *Dialogues in Human Geography* **3** 96-102

Kraftl P 2013 Beyond 'voice', beyond 'agency', beyond 'politics'? Hybrid childhoods and some critical reflections on children's emotional geographies *Emotion, Space and Society* **9** 13-23

Leddy-Owen C 2014 'I had a hard time actually trying to catch the essence of Englishness': participant photography and the racialised construction of place and belonging in a South London suburb *Social & Cultural Geography* **15** 747-768

Livingstone SM ed 2005 *Audiences and publics* Intellect, Bristol

Livingstone SM and Haddon L eds 2009 *Kids online* Policy Press, Bristol

Madge C 2007 Developing a geographers' agenda for online research ethics *Progress in Human Geography* **31** 654-674

Mahony N, Newman J and Barnett C eds 2010 *Rethinking the public* Policy Press, Bristol

Manzo LC and Brightbill N 2007 Towards a participatory ethics in Kindon S, Pain R and Kesby M eds *Participatory action research approaches and methods* Routledge, Oxford, 33-40

Marres N and Lezaun J 2011 Materials and devices of the public: an introduction *Economy and Society* **40** 489-509

Massey D 2004 Geographies of responsibility *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* **86** 5-18

McCormack DP 2013 *Refrains for moving bodies* Duke University Press

McEwan C and Goodman MK 2010 Place, geography and the ethics of care: introductory remarks *Ethics, Place & Environment* **13** 103-112

McNay L 2008a *Against recognition* Wiley, Oxford

McNay L 2008b The trouble with recognition: subjectivity, suffering, and agency *Sociological Theory* **26** 271-296

Miller E and Smith M 2012 Dissemination and ownership of knowledge in Milne E-J, Mitchell C and de Lange N eds *Handbook of participatory video,* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, 331-348

Miller FG and Wertheimer A 2007 Facing up to paternalism in research ethics *Hastings Center Report* **37** 24-34

Mistry J and Berardi A 2012 The challenges and opportunities of participatory video in geographical research: exploring collaboration with indigenous communities in the North Rupununi, Guyana *Area* **44** 110-116

Mistry J, Bignante E and Berardi A 2014 Why are we doing it? Exploring participant motivations within a participatory video project *Area* DOI: 10.1111/area.12105

Mitchell C, Milne E-J and de Lange N 2012 Introduction in Milne E-J, Mitchell C and de Lange N eds *Handbook of participatory video,* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, 1-15

Noble G 2009 'Countless acts of recognition': young men, ethnicity and the messiness of identities in everyday life *Social & Cultural Geography* **10** 875-891

Oldrup HH and Carstensen TA 2012 Producing geographical knowledge through visual methods *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* **94** 223-237

Pain R 2004 Social geography: participatory research *Progress in Human Geography* **28** 652-663

Pain R and Francis P 2003 Reflections on participatory research *Area* **35** 46-54

Pain R, Kesby M and Askins K 2011 Geographies of impact: power, participation and potential *Area* **43** 183-188

Pain R, Kesby M and Askins K 2012 The politics of social justice in neoliberal times: a reply to Slater *Area* **44** 120-123

Pink S 2013 Doing Visual Ethnography. Third edition. Sage, London

Prosser J, Clark A and Wiles R 2008 *Visual resarch ethics at the crossroads,* ESRC Working paper #10, University of Manchester

Ritterbusch A 2012 Bridging guidelines and practice: toward a grounded care ethics in youth participatory action research *The Professional Geographer* **64** 16-24

Rogers A, Bear C, Hunt M, Mills S and Sandover R 2014 Intervention: the impact agenda and human geography in UK higher education *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* **13** 1-9

Rogers M In press Problematising participatory video with youth in Canada: the intersection of therapeutic, deficit and individualising discourses *Area* DOI: 10.1111/area.12141

Rose G 2014 On the relation between 'visual research methods' and contemporary visual culture *The Sociological Review* **62** 24-46

Rose G and Tolia-Kelly D 2012 *Visuality/materiality* Ashgate, Farnham

Shaw J In press Emergent ethics in participatory video: negotiating the inherent tensions as group processes evolve *Area* DOI: 10.1111/area.12167

Skelton T 2008 Research with children and young people: exploring the tensions between ethics, competence and participation *Children's Geographies* **6** 21-36

Slater T 2012 Impacted geographers: a response to Pain, Kesby and Askins *Area* **44** 117-119

Sweetman P 2009 Just anybody? Images, ethics and recognition in Leino R ed *Just anybody,* Fotonet / The Winchester Gallery, 3-6

Taylor C 1994 The politics of recognition in Gutmann A ed *Multiculturalism,* Princeton University Press, 25-73

Thomas N 2012 Love, rights and solidarity: studying children's participation using Honneth's theory of recognition *Childhood* **19** 453-466

Thrift N 2003 Practicing ethics in Pryke M, Rose G and Whatmore S eds *Using Social Theory,* Sage, London, 105-121

Tolia-Kelly D 2007 Participatory art: capturing spatial vocabularies in a collaborative visual methodology with Melanie Carvalho and South Asian Women in London, U.K. in Kindon S, Pain R and Kesby M eds *Participatory action research approaches and methods,* Routledge, Abingdon, Oxford, 132-140

Tuck E and Yang KW eds 2014 Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change. Routledge, London.

Wessendorf S 2014 *Commonplace diversity* Palgrave Macmillan, London

Wheeler J 2012 Using participatory video to engage in policy processes: representation, power, and knowledge in public screenings in Milne E-J, Mitchell C and de Lange N eds *Handbook of participatory video,* AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, 365-379

Wiles R, Coffey A, Robison J and Prosser J 2012 Ethical regulation and visual methods: making visual research impossible or developing good practice? *Sociological Research Online* **17** 8

Wynne-Jones S, North P and Routledge P 2015 Practising participatory geographies: potentials, problems and politics *Area* **47** 218-221

Zimmer M 2010 "But the data is already public": On the ethics of research in Facebook *Ethics and Information Technology* **12** 313-325

Notes

---

[i] Outside academic geography, the development of participatory ethics owes much to debates taking place within visual anthropology (e.g. Deger 2006, 2007; Pink 2013), and at the intersections of education studies, environmental psychology and social work (e.g. Banks et al 2013; Brydon-Miller 2012; Tuck and Yang 2014; Cammarota and Fine 2008).

[ii] See www.hackneyashome.co.uk

[iii] http://www.immediate-theatre.com

[iv] See http://www.hackneyashome.co.uk/about/approach

[v] http://mouththatroars.com/

[vi] Some photo essays were included on the website. See
http://www.hackneyashome.co.uk/content/photo

[vii] These included screenings and discussion sessions with young people at the Hackney Youth Parliament and the Greater London Assembly; youth engagement workshops at the Hackney Youth Hubs; two presentations to Hackney Council scrutiny committees; and an academic paper presentation alongside participants at Kings College, University of London.

[viii] Including Disqus, Facebook, Twitter, Soundcloud, Storify and YouTube.