Geographical Review

ISSN: 0016-7428 (Print) 1931-0846 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/utgr20

DOING STRONG COLLABORATIVE FIELDWORK IN HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Noella J. Gray, Catherine Corson, Lisa M. Campbell, Peter R. Wilshusen, Rebecca L. Gruby & Shannon Hagerman

To cite this article: Noella J. Gray, Catherine Corson, Lisa M. Campbell, Peter R. Wilshusen, Rebecca L. Gruby & Shannon Hagerman (2019): DOING STRONG COLLABORATIVE FIELDWORK IN HUMAN GEOGRAPHY, Geographical Review

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1111/gere.12352

Published online: 06 Dec 2019.

DOING STRONG COLLABORATIVE FIELDWORK IN HUMAN GEOGRAPHY*

NOELLA J. GRAY, CATHERINE CORSON, LISA M. CAMPBELL, PETER R. WILSHUSEN, REBECCA L. GRUBY and SHANNON HAGERMAN

ABSTRACT. Although increasingly common in the academy, collaboration is not yet the norm in human geography. Drawing on insights from ten years of experience with collaborative event ethnography (CEE), we argue that strong approaches to collaborative fieldwork offer rich opportunities for human geography. CEE involves teams of researchers conducting fieldwork together at large international events, collaborating on all aspects of the research process from research design to analysis and writing. This paper considers the benefits and challenges of CEE. Some of the benefits associated with strong collaborative fieldwork include: robust, collective interpretation of embodied data that makes room for difference; intellectual and social support for individual researchers; professional development and mentoring; and adaptability. Challenges encompass: Collectively interpreting data produced through individual, embodied experiences; managing team dynamics related to seniority, gender, and disciplinary training; meeting professional and institutional expectations and norms; valuing and recognizing individual contributions; and ensuring sufficient funding to support team preparation, data collection, and analysis. Strong collaborative approaches to fieldwork, like CEE, can cultivate slow scholarship and innovative knowledge production. *Keywords: fieldwork, collaboration, ethnography, interpretation, slow scholarship, qualitative methods.*

In 2008, a team of researchers arrived at the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona to experiment with a new fieldwork methodology: collaborative event ethnography (CEE). While relying on traditional ethnographic methods (primarily participant observation and interviews), the methodology was novel in

*We would like to thank all of the researchers that have participated in the five collaborative event ethnographies discussed in this paper. Core funding for some of the fieldwork that informed this paper came from the Advancing Conservation in a Social Context project, funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the US National Science Foundation (award nos. 1027194, 1027201, and 1560812).

Dr. NOELLA J. GRAY is an Associate Professor in the Department of Geography, Environment and Geomatics at the University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1; [grayn@uoguelph.ca]. Dr. CATHERINE CORSON is the Miller Worley Associate Professor of Environmental Studies, and the Leslie and Sarah Miller Director of the Miller Worley Center for the Environment at Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075 ;[ccorson@mtholyoke.edu]. Dr. LISA M. CAMPBELL is the Rachel Carson Professor of Marine Affairs and Policy at Duke University's Nicholas School of Environment, based at Duke University Marine Lab, Beaufort, North Carolina 28516; [lisa.m.campbell@duke.edu]. Dr. PETER R. WILSHUSEN is Professor and Chair in the Department of Environmental Studies and Sciences at Bucknell University in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837; [peter.wilshusen@bucknell.edu]. Dr. REBECCA L. GRUBY is an Associate Professor in the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources at Colorado State University, based in Fort Collins, Colorado 80523; [rgruby@colostate.edu]. SHANNON HAGERMAN is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Forestry at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z4; [shannon.hagerman@ubc.ca].

Geographical Review 00(00): 1–16, 2019
DOI: 10.1111/gere.12352

two respects. First, we approached the large international event as a field site— a place where ideas about environmental conservation are circulated, performed, and negotiated (Campbell and others 2014). Second, in order to better manage the complex multitude of topics and events that comprise a single international meeting, we coordinated our research efforts as a group (Brosius and Campbell 2010). The result was a ten-year endeavor to develop and continually refine a collaborative ethnographic methodology.

In this paper, we focus on this second innovation, reflecting on what we have learned about doing collaborative fieldwork as we developed the CEE methodology. We argue that collaborative fieldwork offers rich opportunities for human geography. While we have written about the CEE methodology elsewhere, describing its use at particular events (Brosius and Campbell 2010; Campbell and others 2014) and exploring its utility for understanding global environmental governance (Corson, Campbell, and MacDonald 2014; Corson and others in press), we have not yet examined the specific mechanisms, benefits, and challenges of conducting research together. CEE has involved more than fifty researchers over time, some participating in single events only; the author list on this paper includes long-term participants still actively engaged in CEE. The paper proceeds in three parts. We begin by characterizing collaborative qualitative fieldwork, why it is beneficial, and how it can be conducted in teams of researchers. Next, we document the evolution of CEE across five events, focusing specifically on how we have organized our collaborative efforts and how this has changed over time. The remainder of the paper explores the specific benefits and challenges of CEE, including interrelated theoretical and practical aspects.

Collaborative Qualitative Fieldwork: What And Why?

Collaboration is increasingly common in the academy, including geography, although it is not yet the norm in human geography (Rigg, McCarragher, and Krmenec 2012). Collaborative approaches to social science fieldwork have arisen primarily in other fields, such as anthropology, sociology, and education. We suggest that collaborative ethnographic approaches offer benefits for contemporary geographic fieldwork that are currently under-realized, particularly the rich insights generated from negotiating different interpretations of data.

CEE is an adaptation of team ethnography, in which a group of researchers collaborate formally on all aspects of research, including data collection, interpretation, analysis, and writing, while focusing on a shared research objective or purpose (Erickson and Stull 1998). Collaborating on all aspects of a project is a fundamental aspect of CEE, and we thus distinguish between collaborative fieldwork and collaborative writing (for example, based on collective writing about distinct individual fieldwork experiences, or collective thinking about a topic, or writing that reports on mentor-student collaboration, in which a student conducts fieldwork and a mentor participates in advising and writing).

Meetings are a distinct kind of field site (Campbell and others 2014), with logistical features that make them suitable for collaborative fieldwork—they are time-constrained, accessible to groups, and composed of multiple simultaneous sessions that would be impossible for a single individual to observe. However, any field site (or collection of field sites) could be integrated into a collaborative project (see for example Choy and others 2009a).

Collaborative Field Work

We also differentiate between forms of collaboration characterized by a division of labor among researchers, where the aim is the production of outputs that represent the sum of this labor, and strong collaboration, which focuses on productive tensions, difference, dialectics, multivocality, and an openness to rethinking questions, assumptions, and disciplinary relations (Choy and others 2009a; Choy and others 2009b). We share Timothy Choy and others' (2009a; 2009b) commitment to strong collaboration—to exploring difference and tension, rather than simply using more bodies to divide tasks or to collect more data across more sites. In CEE, the whole is both more and less than the sum of its parts, offering multiple understandings rather than consensus.

The main strength of strong collaborative qualitative methodologies is the insight generated through negotiating differences in the interpretation of data (that is, understanding things that happen in the field). Differences may arise because researchers observe different things and/or because of their different theoretical/disciplinary approaches, positionality, or personal experiences (Gerstl-Pepin and Gunzenhauser 2002). Strong collaboration allows researchers to account for divergences in observations and to negotiate multiple understandings or disagreements over the meaning of data, while also building on one another's insights (Creese and Blackledge 2012). Such efforts do not get closer to a definitive interpretation or 'the truth'; rather, they incorporate multiple interpretations of and perspectives on the data (Gerstl-Pepin and Gunzenhauser 2002). Although it is challenging to create the time and space to work through differences, it is the collective engagement in this interpretive zone—agreement and disagreement, negotiation, and iterative interpretation—that allows knowledge to be constructed (Creese and Blackledge 2012; Gerstl-Pepin and Gunzenhauser 2002). We developed our own model of strong collaborative fieldwork over ten years of conducting CEE.

The Evolution of Strong Collaboration Through Collaborative Event Ethnography

We have conducted CEE at five major environmental conferences: the 2008 IUCN World Conservation Congress (WCC) in Barcelona; the 10th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, held in Nagoya, Japan in 2010 (CBD COP10); the United Nations Conference on Sustainable

Development ('Rio+20'), held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 2012; the 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress, in Sydney, Australia (WPC); and the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress (WCC) in Honolulu, USA.[1] Our approach has evolved toward strong collaboration over time, although this has not been a linear path (see Table 1 for overview).

We first came together in 2008 as part of the Advancing Conservation in a Social Context (ACSC) project, focused on the question of trade-offs in conservation—namely, how various values, interests, and concerns for biodiversity conservation, human well-being, and economic development are traded-off in conservation decision making. Funded by a grant from the MacArthur Foundation, the ACSC project hosted several workshops; it was at one of these workshops that the idea for CEE emerged (Brosius and Campbell 2010). Workshop host Pete Brosius and participants Ken MacDonald and Lisa Campbell developed the idea further, and recruited interested graduate students and earlycareer researchers affiliated with the network of workshop participants to join the inaugural CEE.[2] Campbell participated in the 2008 WCC as a faculty member, while both Gray and Hagerman participated as graduate students.

Our initial experience at the 2008 WCC was modeled after conservation organizations and national delegations who send large teams to these events in order to bring diverse expertise, divide tasks, and share information (Brosius and Campbell 2010). Our collaborative approach enabled us to better make sense of these large, complex, fragmentary meetings. However, although we shared an overarching focus on trade-offs between conservation and development and met daily to share insights and perspectives during a debriefing session, we still worked primarily as individuals; we followed distinct topics and interests, collected and analyzed data individually, and wrote papers alone (with a few exceptions).

Reflecting on our initial CEE afterward, we realized that we had underestimated the potential for stronger collaboration. Very few of the insights generated during our collective debriefs—such as the impacts of the orchestration of the event or cross-topic thematic linkages—appeared in the final publications by individual team members. We wanted to ensure our collective interpretive efforts translated into research outputs. With this motivation, core members of the 2008 team decided to work together again, adopting a more structured approach to collaboration for our next CEE at CBD COP10 (Campbell and others 2014). Catherine Corson joined this CEE as an early-career faculty member, having learned about the methodology from Ken MacDonald, while Rebecca Gruby joined as a graduate student working with Campbell. Similar to Corson, Peter Wilshusen joined the 2012 CEE as a senior faculty member, on the recommendation of MacDonald.

We have continued to adapt the CEE methodology over time, purposefully moving toward stronger forms of collaboration while also working within

TABLE 1.—DEVELOPMENT OF A STRONG COLLABORATIVE APPROACH THROUGH CEE AT FIVE EVENTS

EVENT DETAILS	RESEARCH TEAM*	RESEARCH/ANALYTICAL FOCUS	COLLABORATIVE APPROACH AND METHODOLOGICAL ADAPTATIONS
IUCN World Conservation Congress (WCC), Barcelona, Spain, 2008	21 people including: • 10 men, 11women • 4 senior faculty, 1 earlycareer faculty, 11 PhD students, 1 undergraduate, and 3 early-career independent scholars	Trade-offs between conservation and development	– Pre-event training via webinars – Individuals pursued their own research interests in relation to shared focus on trade-offs – Daily collective debriefing in the field – Alliance of individuals, with mostly individual writing – No data sharing – Core funding from MacArthur Foundation
Tenth Conference of the Parties(COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD),Nagoya, Japan, 2010	17 people including: • 6 men, 11women • 3 senior faculty, 2 earlycareer faculty, 4 post-doctoral scholars 4 PhD students, and 2 early-career independent scholars	Politics of Knowledge, scalar politics, and market-based approaches to conservation	– Shared research questions and participant observation guides – Pre-event training and group webinars – Daily collective debriefing to share information and coordinate activities, discuss observations, and reflect/share insights – Individuals on multiple subteams, organized according to a matrix of topics and cross-cutting themes – Individuals dispersed strategically to "cover" event – Some data sharing – Collective writing in subteams – Writing retreat to support collective analysis and writing – Core funding from US National Science Foundation

(continued)

TABLE 1.—CONTINUED

EVENT DETAILS	RESEARCH TEAM*	RESEARCH/ANALYTICAL FOCUS	COLLABORATIVE APPROACH AND METHODOLOGICAL ADAPTATIONS
United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development ('Rio+20'), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2012	13 people including: • 4 men, 9 women • 3 senior faculty, 3 earlycareer faculty,3 PhD students, and 4 undergraduate students	Economization of environmental governance (the green economy), rights and resistance to the green economy, and global oceans governance and the "blue economy"	– Collaboration in 3 subteams (green economy, blue economy, and rights/ resistance) – Mix of formal and informal debriefing in field, within and across subteams; only a few debriefings with entire team because of logistical constraints – Data sharing in subteams – Simultaneous observation of key sessions by multiple team members – Undergraduate mentorship in "rights" team – Extended collaborative fieldwork temporally, by tracing civil society engagement in the process leading up to Rio+20 – Collective analysis and writing in subteams – No core funding
Sixth IUCN World Parks Congress (WPC), Sydney, Australia, 2014	13 people including: • 5 men, 8 women • 5 senior faculty, 6 earlycareer faculty, 2 PhD students	Hegemony of protected areas as conservation tool, with ongoing attention to key themes (for example, economization, rights) and new focus on large-scale marine protected areas (LSMPAs)	– Formal collaboration in 2 subteams and informal collaboration with several affiliated researchers – Mix of formal and informal debriefing in field, within and across subteams and with affiliated researchers – Mix of dispersed and simultaneous observation – Data sharing in subteams, although not with affiliated researcher – Collective analysis and writing in subteams – No core funding

IUCN World Conservation Congress (WCC), Honolulu, USA, 2016	13 people including: • 4 men, 9 women • 4 senior faculty, 2 earlycareer faculty, 2 PhD students and 5 undergraduate students	Marine conservation politics, LSMPAs; economization; rights/justice	– Focus on ongoing interests – Collaboration in 3 subteams – Pre-event training and group webinars – Daily collective debriefing in the field with all team members, to share information and coordinate activities, discuss observations, and reflect/share insights – Some researchers participated in sessions at the event, in addition to observing – Cascade mentoring model – Data sharing across entire team, via uploading to a centralized, secure data repository hosted at one institution – Collective analysis and writing – within and across subteams – Writing retreat to support collective analysis and writing – Core funding from US National Science Foundation

*In total, 50 different researchers participated in these 5 CEEs; 36 people participated in one CEE, seven people participated in two CEEs, two people participated in three CEEs, three people participated in four CEEs, and two people participated in all five CEEs

logistical constraints. Some of our purposeful adaptations, designed to support strong collaborative work, include: building in pre-event training webinars; collaborating in smaller subgroups; experimenting with how to disperse researchers across an event so as to gather comprehensive data, sometimes doubling-up at sessions in order to facilitate collaborative interpretation; and writing retreats to support collective interpretive work. These purposeful adaptations have fostered collaboration by providing the time and space to develop a shared understanding of research questions, methodologies, theoretical approaches, and the meaning of data. However, at times we have had to adapt the method in response to logistical constraints. For example, typical conferences have multiple, simultaneous events, which take place over long days and often in multiple buildings, so it has not always been possible to find time/space for daily debriefing sessions. Similarly, we have not been able to consistently fund preevent training, postevent writing retreats, or general logistical support, which are key for collective analysis and writing.

Although we have changed CEE in each of its five iterations, we have retained a commitment to being in the field together, with an understanding of the field that extends beyond the temporal and spatial boundaries of the event (Hyndman 2001). Our collective interpretive work is grounded in the shared fieldwork experience. Based on our experiences collaborating across these five CEEs, we have identified both benefits of and challenges for pursuing strong collaboration in human geography fieldwork.

Benefits and Challenges of Collaborative Fieldwork Benefits

We have experienced several benefits associated with strong collaborative fieldwork, including: robust, collective interpretation of embodied data that makes room for difference; ability to study phenomena comprehensively at large events; intellectual and social support for individual researchers; professional development and mentoring; and adaptability. First and foremost, CEE has allowed us to develop a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding that would not have been possible working alone. For example, our efforts to understand the dominance of protected areas as conservation tools were strengthened by our different perspectives on how protected areas are invoked, by whom, and for what purposes (Corson and others 2014; Gray, Gruby, and Campbell 2014). Our initial discussions in relation to the Corson and others (2014) paper focused on trying to reconcile differences among our various individual observations and perspectives; some team members observed a dominance of market-based approaches and economic logic, while others emphasized the framing of protected areas in relation to Indigenous rights or science-based planning. Some of these differences arose because we observed different events (for example, those featuring Indigenous actors vs. private sector actors vs. international NGOs), while others resulted from distinct theoretical orientations. Working through our differences led us to a negotiated, collective understanding of protected areas as

a hegemonic conservation tool. This collective understanding allows for a conceptualization of the role of protected areas in conservation governance that would not have been possible otherwise—it is a whole that is different than the sum of its parts.

Collective interpretation of data is further supported through our continual learning from one another. Through collective debriefings in the field and ongoing collaboration, we learn about both the substance of other team members' observations as well as how they interpret these observations—a kind of active learning facilitated by doing fieldwork together. For example, the blue economy subteam at Rio+20 (Corson and others in press; Silver and others 2015) benefited from learning from other team members' analyses of green grabbing (Corson and MacDonald 2012) and economistic approaches to environmental governance (Wilshusen and MacDonald 2017). By working alongside each other in the field, and discussing our interpretations of shared observations during debrief sessions, we could see how our colleagues applied their theoretical frameworks to their observations, enabling continual reflection on how our own theoretical frameworks shape what we see in our field sites and how we interpret this data. Later, when writing up our results, the subteam returned to these shared fieldwork experiences—both observations and debrief sessions—regularly. Our large-group debriefs helped us to understand how framings of oceans as natural capital echoed throughout the conference and sought to align with a broader discourse of natural capital in relation to the green economy. However, we were able to contextualize this framing of the blue economy as contested and incomplete when we returned to our subteam's shared observations of competing discourses related to the rights of small-scale fishers and the interests of small island developing states (Silver and others 2015). While our collaborative efforts extend beyond the fieldwork phase of research, they are always and necessarily grounded in our shared fieldwork experiences.

A second benefit of collaborative fieldwork is the intellectual and social support that individuals get from working in a team. Fieldwork can be a lonely, isolating experience. Conducting fieldwork as a group provides an important support mechanism, offering researchers the opportunity to share concerns, challenges, and uncertainties. CEE has involved sharing accommodations, discussing observations over meals as well as during formal debriefing sessions, lamenting the absence of wi-fi or electrical outlets, sharing stories of over or underheated rooms, venting after stressful encounters, sending texts and instant messages to stay in contact, bouncing ideas during subway and bus rides, and sharing a knowing smile when an "aha" research moment happens.

At Rio+20, the blue economy subteam exchanged excited looks when a World Bank vice-president hosting an overcrowded event attended by then Secretary-General of the United Nations Ban Ki-moon as well as several heads of state and senior government officials, announced that "we cannot put oceans

events in small rooms anymore" (Silver and others 2015). While we had been working to document and explain the rise of oceans on the international policy agenda, we had not previously observed such a high-level official explicitly recognizing this fact. Shared experiences of significant fieldwork moments generate intellectual excitement and camaraderie, making fieldwork enjoyable.

This personal benefit for researchers should not be underappreciated. Amidst changing working conditions for many academics within neoliberal institutions, including an increase in competition, working hours, record-keeping, and productivity expectations, collaborative fieldwork is one way to invoke the ideals of slow scholarship (Mountz and others 2015) and to cultivate joy within our academic labor (Kern and others 2014). We have not conducted CEE in order to maximize productivity through increased publications, the academic unit of currency. Rather, we have developed our collective approach in order to support good scholarship and intellectual growth while cultivating an ethic of care toward one another. If slow scholarship is about "cultivating caring academic cultures and processes" (Mountz and others 2015, 4), then strong approaches to collaborative research deserve greater attention as a means of fostering slow scholarship.

A third benefit of collaborative fieldwork is the opportunities it affords individuals for professional development and mentoring. Corson led us in the development of more formal approaches to mentoring students, including the development of a "cascade mentoring" model across institutions at the 2016

WCC CEE (Corson and others 2015; Corson and others in review). In this model, senior team members mentor midcareer team members, who mentor early-career team members, who mentor graduate students, who mentor undergraduate students. While our approach to mentoring has evolved across CEEs, from an informal, unintended version at the 2008 WCC to more formal, structured, and intentional versions at subsequent events, we have all benefited from it. As senior team members, it has given us the opportunity to develop our own mentoring skills over time, while also receiving feedback on our mentoring experiences from one another. This cross-institutional mentoring support of each other and our students has spanned large research universities to small liberal arts colleges, creating a collective learning community that spans stage of career. Perhaps most importantly, it has given our student team members, including some of us in early CEEs, the opportunity for more hands-on fieldwork training than is typical in human geography.

Finally, CEE is not a rigid methodology, to be implemented uniformly across field sites and research teams. Instead, its strength, and that of strong collaborative approaches more generally, is in its flexibility. While CEE supports robust, collective interpretation, and facilitates slow scholarship and professional development and mentoring, it also accommodates and fosters individual research interests. For example, Gruby first participated in a CEE at CBD-COP10, while

still a graduate student. She contributed to multiple subteams and collective writing projects (for example, Corson and others 2014; Gray, Gruby, and Campbell 2014), while also pursuing her own individual research interests (Gruby and Campbell 2013). She later co-led a "marine team" at the 2014 World Parks Congress. Similarly, Corson and others (2015) adapted the methodology to lead a team of students in tracking UN negotiations over eighteen months, in order to better understand what happens prior to as well as at major events. CEE can be modified to suit different field sites, research questions, interests, areas of expertise, and capacities, of individuals as well as teams.

Challenges

Strong collaboration is not easy (see also Campbell and others 2014). There are a number of specific challenges to conducting this work, including collectively interpreting data produced through individual, embodied experiences; managing team dynamics related to seniority, gender, disciplinary training, and other researcher characteristics; dealing with professional and institutional expectations and norms; defining and valuing individual contributions; and funding.

Much team-based research is characterized by a division of labor, with individual researchers taking responsibility for particular tasks, or for individual projects that are combined but not synthesized. However, qualitative data, whether fieldnotes or interview transcripts, are produced through located, embodied experiences within a fieldwork context; this renders a "division of labor" approach to collaboration epistemologically problematic. Furthermore, to pursue strong collaboration, teams must adopt reflexive research practices that engage all team members in all aspects of the research process, including fieldwork and writing (Mauthner and Doucet 2008). Although our first CEE effort was an alliance of individuals rather than a reflexive team, we made a concerted effort thereafter to adapt our collaborative practice in order to achieve this goal of reflexive, collective interpretation. Nonetheless, we have encountered challenges with collaboratively interpreting data.

Even though all members of our collaborative teams have been physically in the field together, we have still had unique field experiences. In most of our CEE fieldwork, we have distributed ourselves across the multiple, simultaneous sessions that comprise an international meeting. Even in those cases where we have been to the same session, we may still interpret data differently. Although we can share fieldnotes and discuss our divergent interpretations, we can never fully share the embodied experience of generating data nor the perspective we bring to interpretation. While our collective interpretive discussions are rich, producing robust knowledge about social processes and meaning, it is sometimes difficult and time consuming to achieve intersubjective understanding. For example, in the case of the Corson and others (2014) paper discussed above, some of us wondered if we would have interpreted sessions observed by others

differently, had we been in the room. We asked questions of one another's interpretations and fieldnotes, trying to parse what was most significant.

In addition to the challenges of sharing embodied data, there is the related but distinct challenge of synthesizing across differences in theoretical and methodological orientations. While we can document what we see and hear, and can discuss what we think it means and why, our ability to reach consensus within a single writing project, or at least a somewhat shared understanding of meaning, has been greatest in those cases where the theoretical and disciplinary approach of sub-team members has been shared (for example, Corson and MacDonald 2012) and/or team members have jointly observed the same sessions (for example, Silver and others 2015).

Arising from and going beyond these epistemological and methodological challenges, there are a variety of practical and political challenges for conducting collaborative fieldwork (see also Erickson and Stull 1998). Team dynamics have affected our individual and collective experiences with CEE. For example, we have previously acknowledged a gender imbalance in our work (Campbell and others 2014). Women have tended to share more, and richer, data; women have been more willing to perform team tasks vs. individual tasks (for example, collect data for collective projects vs. individual projects); and women have performed more tedious, logistical tasks associated with conducting fieldwork (completing ethical applications, arranging access, booking tickets, finding accommodations, coordinating fieldwork activities). While there have been notable exceptions to this imbalance, and it is sometimes a function of team composition, it is worth considering how gender inequality, which pervades academic work in a variety of ways, also affects collaborative research.

However, gender has also been critical to the social support described above. We have had many female team members who have been pregnant, breastfeeding, dealing with teenage children in crisis from a distance, and otherwise navigating the challenges of combining motherhood and fieldwork; having other female team members was a valuable support mechanism, as senior team members shared accommodations so young mothers did not have to, or helped other team members cope with pregnancy complications or parenting challenges while in the field. Support for women has also extended beyond fieldwork, as senior team members have mentored junior team members across institutions in the tenure process, grant writing, and networking, as examples. The fact that five of the authors on this paper are women suggests that appreciation for the benefits of CEE, including gendered forms of support and mentorship, has outweighed the challenges related to gender inequality. We have also worked to address our concerns regarding the gendered division of labor over time, both by recognizing it within the group and through more explicit communication regarding expectations and team commitments.

The time and effort required for strong collaborative fieldwork and writing is no less than for individual fieldwork and single authorship—in fact, often the collaborative negotiation takes more time. However, the accounting system of the neoliberal academy does not consistently reward this effort, attuned as it is to individual accomplishments (Choy and others 2009a). Several of us have received institutional feedback (both formal and informal) that we ought to write more single-authored or first-authored papers to demonstrate our contributions as scholars. Others of us have been encouraged to better account for our contributions to collaborative work, either by documenting our specific role or offering a percentage next to each publication. What this accounting system fails to recognize is that strong collaborative work is also strong individual work —each author on a CEE paper has participated in all aspects of the research, and the collective interpretation reached would not be possible without the contribution of each individual involved.

In addition to the challenge of effectively communicating the value of our efforts to external audiences, we have struggled to negotiate appropriate authorship strategies with one another. In more than one instance, one of us or one of our collaborators has felt insufficiently recognized by their position in a list of authors—being the eighth of nine authors suggests a minor effort that is inconsistent with the work of CEE. However, we have maintained the practice of listing authors as individuals, in order based on their relative contribution to the text of any given paper, to meet institutional demands. In some instances, we have included footnotes to document equal contributions of authors. We have sometimes used collectively agreed language to acknowledge all members of a given CEE team, even where they are not authors, and we use this language to document our work for our institutions. Other strategies are possible, including explaining coauthors' contributions in methods sections and using unconventional author naming, such as collective names or merged names (Creamer 2005). (We have had many fun conversations about what our collective name could be!) Our goal of challenging traditional, individualist modes of knowledge production is difficult to reconcile with institutional demands and academic conventions, particularly for members at postdoctoral or pretenure stages.

Relatedly, we have also grappled with how to define and bound collective vs. individual ownership of ideas and data generated through collaborative fieldwork. The distinction between data and ideas is often quite blurry, given the constructed, embodied nature of ethnographic data. It has been essential to set clear and transparent expectations and to agree on processes for addressing any conflicts or misunderstandings that arise. Since our second CEE at the 2010 CBDCOP, we have always committed to sharing our data collectively. We have defaulted to sharing certain kinds of data (for example, recordings/transcripts, descriptive and sometimes verbatim fieldnotes), while limiting our sharing of interpretive fieldnotes to subteams working on publications together. We have developed formal data-sharing and authorship protocols, but these have

required ongoing negotiation and communication. Strong collaborative work requires humility regarding the individual ownership of both data and ideas, alongside processes that aim to properly recognize and value individual contributions.

A final, very practical challenge of strong collaborative fieldwork is funding. In those CEEs where we had core funding to support all fieldwork and related activities, for all participants, we were better able to support the processes

necessary to facilitate successful collaboration. Collaborative fieldwork does not just happen in the field. It happens before arriving in the field, as team members build a shared sense of purpose, get to know one another, identify collective interests, and build familiarity with data-collection protocols, relevant literature, and the topics and institutions of study. It also happens after leaving the field, as collaborators continue to engage in the interpretive zone to analyze data and write up results. While some of this work can happen remotely, meeting in person is critical for advancing collective interpretive work. Funding to support pre-event training and postevent writing retreats helps (and has enabled this paper.) Without dedicated funding, it is difficult to support the collective labor and administrative tasks needed for all phases of fieldwork.

Conclusion

Geographic research increasingly focuses on connection, mobility, multiscalar relations, networks, and assemblages. And while geographers have developed and adapted a range of innovative methodological approaches for studying these socio-environmental forms and processes, there are limitations to what an individual researcher can do. Following Choy and others (2009b), we argue that strong forms of collaboration can strengthen these approaches, thereby better illuminating the consequences of contemporary political, economic, and social processes for both human and nonhuman life (see also Corson and others in press). Although our focus on large international events makes collaboration particularly appropriate and useful, we argue that qualitative human geography fieldwork more broadly could benefit from greater engagement with collaborative practices. Collaborative fieldwork challenges the tradition of singular, authoritative accounts and enables robust interpretation of qualitative data that makes room for difference, thereby offering possibility for all human geographers to develop more "accountable analyses" (Hyndman 2001, 262).

However, if the scholarly potential of such work is to be achieved then collaboration must go beyond team-based work premised on a division of labor, adopting reflexive research practices consistent with strong collaboration. In such efforts, more hands do *not* make light work. Collaborative fieldwork is difficult, time-consuming, and often fraught; we have also found it deeply rewarding, both personally and intellectually. In the 2001 special issue of the *Geographical Review*, Saunders (2001) cautioned researchers to choose their field

site carefully. For collaborative fieldwork, it is as important to choose your collaborators carefully, as it is they who will make it possible to find joy in collaborative fieldwork (Kern and others 2014).

In their appeal for slow scholarship, Alison Mountz and others (2015, 9) ask: "What if we counted differently? Instead of articles published or grants applied for, what if we accounted for thank you notes received, friendships formed, collaborations forged?" Ultimately, as we have developed CEE as an approach to collaborative fieldwork, we have inadvertently cultivated a commitment to slow scholarship. We are interested in spending time to collectively develop our ideas, rather than producing publications as quickly as possible. We are committed to long-term learning, deliberate reflection, and methodological refinement. We value one another's well-being over our labor. We appreciate one another's friendship as well as our ideas. We resist the demands of academic metrics for individual products. And we celebrate the collective over the individual, while still nurturing individual careers. This, we argue, produces strong scholarship and provides an innovative model of human geography fieldwork.

Notes

[1] Of the five CEEs listed here, the six authors of the paper have participated in all five (Campbell, Gray), four of the five (Corson, Gruby), or three of the five (Hagerman, Wilshusen).

[2] Pete Brosius credits Adam Henne with the original idea for CEE; Henne was unable to participate in our 2008 CEE, but sent a graduate student to join us.

References

Brosius, J., and L. Campbell. 2010. Collaborative Event Ethnography: Conservation and Development Trade-offs at the Fourth World Conservation Congress. *Conservation and Society 8 (4): 245–255.*

Campbell, L. M., C. Corson, N. J. Gray, K. I. MacDonald, and J. P. Brosius. 2014. Studying Global Environmental Meetings to Understand Global Environmental Governance: Collaborative Event Ethnography at the Tenth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Global Environmental Politics 14 (3): 1–20.*

Choy, T. K., L. Faier, M. J. Hathaway, M. Inoue, S. Satsuka, and A. L. Tsing. 2009a. A New Form of Collaboration in Cultural Anthropology: Matsutake Worlds. *American Ethnologist 36 (2): 380–403*

———. 2009b. Strong Collaboration as a Method for Multi-Sited Ethnography: On Mycorrhizal Relations. In *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*, edited by M.-A. Falzon. New York: Routledge.

Corson, C., L. M. Campbell, P. Wilshusen, and N. J. Gray. In press. Assembling Global Conservation Governance. *Geoforum.*

———., B. Brady, A. Zuber, J. Lord, and A. Kim. 2015. The Right to Resist: Disciplining Civil Society at Rio+20. *The Journal of Peasant Studies 42 (3–4)*: 859–878.

———., L. M. Campbell, and K. I. MacDonald. 2014. Capturing the Personal in Politics: Ethnographies of Global Environmental Governance. *Global Environmental Politics 14 (3): 21–40.*

———., R. Gruby, R. Witter, S. Hagerman, D. Suarez, S. Greenberg, M. Bourque, N. Gray, and L. Campbell. 2014. Everyone's solution? Defining and Redefining Protected Areas at the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Conservation and Society 12 (2): 190–202.*

———., and K. I. MacDonald. 2012. Enclosing the Global Commons: The Convention on Biological Diversity and Green Grabbing. *Journal of Peasant Studies 39 (2): 263–283.*

Creamer, E. G. 2005. Promoting the Effective Evaluation of Collaboratively Produced Scholarship: A Call to Action. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning 2005 (102): 85–98.*

Creese, A., and A. Blackledge. 2012. Voice and Meaning-Making in Team Ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly 43 (3): 306–324.*

Erickson, K., and D. Stull. 1998. Doing Team *Ethnography: Warnings and Advice* .Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Gerstl-Pepin, C. I., and M. G. Gunzenhauser. 2002. Collaborative Team Ethnography and the Paradoxes of Interpretation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 15 (2): 137–154.*

Gray, N. J., R. L. Gruby, and L. M. Campbell. 2014. Boundary Objects and Global Consensus: Scalar Narratives of Marine Conservation in the Convention on Biological Diversity. Global *Environmental Politics 14 (3): 64–83.*

Gruby, R. L., and L. M. Campbell. 2013. Scalar Politics and the Region: Strategies for Transcending Pacific Island Smallness on a Global Environmental Governance Stage. *Environment and Planning A 45 (9): 2046–2063.*

Hyndman, J. 2001. The Field as Here and Now, Not There and Then. *The Geographical Review 91 (1–2): 262–272.*

Kern, L., R. Hawkins, K. F. Al-Hindi, and P. Moss. 2014. A Collective Biography of Joy in Academic Practice. *Social & Cultural Geography 15 (7): 834–851.*

Mauthner, N. S., and A. Doucet. 2008. 'Knowledge Once Divided Can Be Hard to Put Together Again': An Epistemological Critique of Collaborative and Team-Based Research Practices. *Sociology 42 (5): 971–985.*

Mountz, A., A. Bonds, B. Mansfield, J. Loyd, J.Hyndman, M. Walton-Roberts, R. Basu, R. Whitson, R. Hawkins, T. Hamilton, and W. Curran. 2015. For Slow Scholarship: A Feminist Politics of Resistance through Collective Action in the Neoliberal University. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies 14 (4): 1235–59.*

Rigg, L. S., S. McCarragher, and A. Krmenec. 2012. Authorship, Collaboration, and Gender: Fifteen Years of Publication Productivity in Selected Geography Journals. *The Professional Geographer 64 (4): 491–502.*

Saunders, R. H. 2001. Home and Away: Bridging Fieldwork and Everyday Life. *The Geographical Review 91 (1–2): 88–94.*

Silver, J. J., N. J. Gray, L. M. Campbell, L. W. Fairbanks, and R. L. Gruby. 2015. Blue Economy and Competing Discourses in International Oceans Governance. *The Journal of Environment & Development 24 (2): 135–160.*

Wilshusen, P. R., and K. I. MacDonald. 2017. Fields of Green: Corporate Sustainability and the Production of Economistic Environmental Governance. *Environment and Planning A 49 (8): 1824–1845.*