Article

Organizational Research Methods
2018, Vol. 21(2) 366-385

DOI: 10.1177/1094428116656238
journals.sagepub.com/home/orm
SAGE

"Zooming With": A Participatory Approach to the Use of Video Ethnography in Organizational Studies

Michael Jarrett[1] and Feng Liu[2]

Abstract

The desire to better understand the micro-behaviors of organizational actors has led to the increased use of video ethnography in management and qualitative research. Video captures detailed interactions and provides opportunities for researchers to link these to broader organizational processes. However, we argue there is a methodological gap. Studies that focus on the detail of the interactions "zoom in." Others that focus on the interactions in context "zoom out." But few go further and "zoom with"—that is, incorporate participants' interpretations of their video-recorded interactions. Our methodological contribution is that zooming with participants enhances research findings, helps to develop theory, and provides new insights for management practice. The article develops this idea by exploring and describing the method and applying it to top management teams, as well as showing how each focus provides different theoretical insights depending on which perspective or combination of perspectives is used. We conclude with the suggestion that a three-pronged approach to video ethnography be taken. The final section of the article discusses the implications for research and highlights the benefits of reflexivity in management practice.

Keywords

ethnography, qualitative research, field research methods, research design, interpretivism, qualitative research

> The psychological and social processes by which executive profiles are converted into strategic choices still remain largely a mystery—the proverbial black box.
>
> —Hambrick (2007, p. 337)

[1]INSEAD, Singapore
[2]Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Canada

Corresponding Author:
Michael Jarrett, INSEAD, Organizational Behavior, 1 Ayer Rajah Ave., 138676, Singapore.
Email: michael.jarrett@insead.edu

> Individuals go along with current interaction arrangements for a wide variety of reasons, and one cannot read from their apparent tacit support of an arrangement that they would, for example, resent or resist its change. Very often behind community and consensus are mixed motive games.
>
> —Goffman (1982, p. 5)

The curiosity and challenge of management researchers are perversely captured in these two quotes. On one hand, Hambrick's call to reveal and explain the social processes within top management teams (TMTs) remains, with few exceptions, unanswered (Carpenter, Geletkanycz, & Sanders, 2004; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). His comments are particularly salient in identifying the links between the psychological and social interactions within TMTs and the strategizing processes and strategic outcomes. On the other hand, Goffman suggests that things are not always as they seem. A recent methodological contribution to help resolve these challenges has been the use of video ethnography in management studies (Cooren, Brummans, & Charrieras, 2008; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Smets, Burke, Jarzabkowski, & Spee, 2014).

Some researchers argue that video ethnography is valuable because it allows close scrutiny of social interactions between organizational players. Thus, analytically, it allows researchers to "zoom in" on these interactions. But understanding the context in which these interactions occur also enhances this approach. It's like the camera panning back and taking a broader picture and thus including additional information. The camera "zooms out," in other words, often capturing unfolding processes as well as their context. Although researchers acknowledge that both perspectives are valuable, many miss a third important view. Our main contribution in this article is to provide a "novel method" (LeBreton, 2014, p. 115) to the management research community and add a third dimension that we call "zooming with." We define it as a reflective process that explicitly solicits the participants' interpretations of their video-recorded interactions. We outline the practice of this methodological extension and argue that this complementary lens enhances research findings, helps to develop theory, and provides new insights for management practice.

In this article, we aim to explain the value of zooming with by first explaining the origins of video ethnography and identifying its core principles. Then we highlight and examine its current application to management research. In the main part of our article, we compare the differences in analysis, interpretation, and theorizing that we associate with zooming in, zooming out, and zooming with. We do so by using illustrative data from a flash point of conflicting interactions within a TMT meeting. Our focus is on examining naturally occurring events in situ.

In the rest of this article, we examine and describe zooming with in the context of management research. We argue that video ethnography is especially useful for zooming in on the rich details of transient events, for zooming out from processes that are evolving, and for zooming with TMT participants to glean their perspectives on their video-recorded interactions. Although these ideas are illustrated in the context of TMTs, they are equally applicable to other fields of management research, such as customer interactions (Moore, Whelan, & Gathman, 2010) and operational effectiveness and hospital management (e.g., Iedema, Long, & Forsyth, 2006). Finally, how researchers apply each of these three perspectives will depend on their research goals, questions, orientations, and resources. We conclude with a discussion on the implications for both research and practice.

A Video Ethnographic Approach

The roots of Video Ethnography

Other scholars have produced reviews of video ethnography (see Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010; Streeck & Mehus, 2005). Thus, by design, our approach has been selective. Video ethnography is a

methodological approach that involves capturing and conducting microscopic analysis of recorded pieces of naturally occurring activities and interactions (Streeck & Mehus, 2005). We emphasize a particular form of video ethnography coined by Erikson as 'micro ethnography'. It continues the work of Goffman's interaction order, where each interaction "can be identified narrowly as that which transpires in social situations, that is, environments in which two or more individuals are physically in another's response presence" (Goffman, 1982, p. 2). This method, as currently practiced, has many parents—anthropology, sociology, education, psychology, and linguistics, to name a few—and its roots can be found in Franz Boas's early films of Northwest Coast tribal practices such as ritual dances (Erickson, 2011), along with Gregory Bateson's and Margaret Mead's studies in the 1940s of Balinese dancers teaching young apprentices (Bateson & Mead, 1942; Derry et al., 2010; LeBaron, 2008a). In the 1970s, a few groups of educational researchers started to use the newly available video technology to collect audiovisual samples of classroom behavior and examine moment-by-moment interactions in classrooms (e.g., Erickson, 1982; Mehan, 1979).

Video ethnography research has also been strongly influenced by Goffman's work on interaction order (Goffman, 1971, 1982); by Mead's symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934); and by conversation analysis research, which examines, by analyzing naturally occurring talk, the micro-processes through which participants perform social actions and thus become interactive (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks, 1984; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Earlier video ethnographic studies focused on microscopic analysis of behaviors, speech, and body motions—that is, the tradition of zooming in. Other studies expanded the phenomena to include material settings as a resource and medium of interaction. These studies began the tradition of zooming out, to broaden the range of questions that they could ask (Streeck & Mehus, 2005). More recently, video ethnography has become part of a wider movement that includes visual as well as more innovative methods to capture human activity in the raw (Bell & Davison, 2013; Vesa & Vaara, 2014). Nevertheless the credo of this method remains the same as ever, that "big" social and organizational phenomena can profitably be explored through detailed, moment-by-moment analysis of smaller moments of human activity, attending especially to the sequence of interactions (LeBaron, 2008b; Streeck & Mehus, 2005). Together, these key elements of video ethnography rest on ethnographic roots, social-interaction theory, conversation analysis, semiotics, materiality, and situated context. Increasingly, researchers are also calling for "multimodality," where attention is paid to the combination of different modes talk, gestures, tools, movement, and so on that are used in concert to produce meaning (Jarzabkowski, Burke, & Spee, 2015; LeBaron, 2008b; Streeck, Goodwin, & LeBaron, 2011). Not all studies will use every method, but all provide criteria for assessing the integrity of video ethnography work.

Video Based Methods in Organizational Studies

Video based and ethnographic work has been used in other fields for a long time, but only recently has it been applied to management studies (Llewellyn & Hindmarsh, 2010). A key assumption underlying its use in management studies is that "social interactions" underpin our understanding of what happens in organizational settings, forming the micro-foundations of organizational processes. Examples of these studies include explorations of team members' displayed emotions (Bartel & Saavedra, 2000), change-management interventions (Engeström et al, 1996), and practical problems of video-based methods in management studies (Meyer, Höllerer, Jancsary, & van Leeuwen, 2013; Smets et al., 2014).

For example, in the field of strategy as practice, video ethnography has become widespread. Johnson, Langley, Melin, and Whittington (2007) argue that this method is highly suited to identifying and analyzing micro-behaviors and interactions, the "stuff" of strategic practice (see too Vesa & Vaara, 2014). Researchers have also highlighted the value of video ethnography in examining

''everyday strategic management practice-as-interactionally-done'' (Samra-Fredericks, 2010, p. 198; see also Brundin & Melin, 2006; Gylfe, Franck, LeBaron, & Mantere, 2016; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Samra-Fredericks, 2000). Interest in this method might also be due to its usefulness when researchers seek to identify the ''infinitely rich detail of transient events'' (Cohen, 2010, p. 34), such as the nuanced and rich emotional expression from facial/vocal/verbal/body movement cues that are beyond their ability to identify in situ (Bartel & Saavedra, 2000; Cohen, 2010; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). Liu and Maitlis (2014) state that when they examined the relationships between displayed emotions and discussed strategy,

> we could capture and systematically code displayed emotion in an unusually fine grained, holistic, and consistent manner, using non-verbal cues both as primary indicators of displayed emotion and as confirmatory indicators (e.g. the tightening and raising of one lip corner for contempt) alongside individuals' verbal statements (e.g. hard, glaring eyes and raised voice alongside the statement ''Don't f *** this up. Don't mess with our beautiful Gangster''). (p. 207)

This method is good also in connection with the multimodal nature of strategy in practice (Streeck et al., 2011). For instance, in their study of organizational identity in a newly formed political party in Quebec, Chaput, Brummans, and Cooren (2011) revealed not only the richness of participants' talk and variations of tone and gesture, but also their mobilization of documents and artifacts. Using video ethnographic methods, Jarzabkowski et al. (2015) revealed the complementary and important role of organizational players' interactions with their space, surrounding materials such as artifacts, and their nonlinguistic and bodily cues as factors that enabled and constrained strategic processes and outcomes. Furthermore, Gylfe and colleagues revealed middle mangers' use of specific body postures, hand gestures, and gazes. The managers used these in patterned ways across the organization, to explain strategy and engage subordinates in strategic change (Gylfe et al., 2016). These authors enriched our understanding of strategy in ways that went beyond the work of other researchers, who had provided only partial views of what goes on (see also Streeck et al., 2011; Vaara & Whittington, 2012).

Finally, video ethnography reveals strategizing activities as they evolve. The significance of some of the activities may not be evident during the researcher's data-collection stage (Leonard-Barton, 1990), but video recording enables the retrospective identification of significant activities (Liu & Maitlis, 2014). Moreover, this method keeps a faithful record of the data—long after the fieldwork is finished it allows repeated scrutiny of important episodes during the data analysis, because the data can be re-viewed, analyzed, reanalyzed, and shared by many researchers (Armstrong & Curran, 2006; LeBaron, 2008b). So video ethnography offers ''a means of close documentation and observation and presents unprecedented analytical, collaborative, and archival possibilities'' (Derry et al., 2010, p. 5).

We suggest that the limited use of video ethnography in management research in general is due to the problem of confidentiality, which can make gaining access to the research setting (access to participants) extremely difficult (Brundin & Melin, 2006; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). It is also hard to justify why and how micro-interactions have implications on a more macro level. Of greatest interest for our argument is the second problem. We illustrate our argument by referring to strategizing researchers, who have been calling for using video ethnography to reveal actions in vivo. This should help us to understand the micro-processes of strategizing in real time, to explore the evolution of strategizing activities, and to connect micro-actions and interactions to macro-organizational strategy outcomes (e.g., LeBaron, 2008b; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Smets et al., 2014; Smets, Jarzabkowski, Spee, & Burke, 2015). Building on this evidence, we argue that our method should extend from zooming in and zooming out, which are in common use, to include zooming with participants, viewing recorded interactions with them to get their perspectives. Drawing on our own use of the latter method, we show how all three methods (zooming in, out, and with) provide distinctive

theoretical insights and implications. In addition to our own study, we use others to illustrate our points.

Zooming In, Out, and With: A Comparative Analysis

In this section, we explain each approach, illustrate key methodological points, and show how we combined them. In addition, we show how other researchers can combine them in various sequences to suit their epistemological orientations and research questions.

Whether the focus of research is a momentary episode or one that takes many meetings over many months, current research tends to draw on extensive observation of the participants, documents, and/or other artifacts to develop extended knowledge of the organization. Immersion in the organization enables the researchers to identify interesting and theoretically important phenomena (e.g., Gylfe et al., 2016; Jarzabkowski et al., 2015; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Nicolini, 2009; K. Tracy, 1995).

The setting of our research was the TMT of a large publicly quoted company that has its headquarters in Europe, ''International & Co'' (a pseudonym). During the period of study, the company experienced huge strategic and structural changes. These generated many strategic dilemmas that arose due to changing markets, rising costs, and an outdated organizational structure.

The study continued for 18 months, with video data collected for over 8 months, including 8 full days of meetings that involved discussion of many strategic and operational problems. Access to videoing the TMT meetings was gained through careful negotiations in which we highlighted confidentiality and the establishment of ethical ground rules—among them, that any of the team might withdraw at any time during the video recording, that data would be stored in password-protected safe space, and that the anonymity of the participants was guaranteed. We also highlighted the benefit the TMT might gain by participating in this kind of research—they would gain a level of understanding of how they work as a team in vivo that other research methods, such as interviews and surveys, are not able to provide. Though it took great effort on our part to negotiate access, this organization's willingness was not idiosyncratic, in that other TMTs and board teams had already accepted this kind of research (e.g., Pugliese, Nicholson, & Bezemer, 2015; Liu & Maitlis, 2014; Smets et al., 2015). Video was one source of data gathering; other sources were semistructured interviews, field notes, questionnaires, archival materials, and concurrent secondary sources such as the minutes of meetings and press and analysts' reports (Charmaz, 2005; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Spradley, 1979; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Of greatest interest to us were the interactions of the nine TMT members and how these affected strategizing through their problem-solving, decision-making, and strategy execution. Drawing on Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis*, we identified 53 episodes in the recorded meetings. An episode is defined as a significant moment or a ''slice'' (Goffman, 1974, p. 10) in the team's ongoing activity, and a team member characterized these episodes as occasions of heavy engagement, salient interaction dynamics, and strategically important decisions. In each episode, there was a common theme of discussion that had a beginning, middle, and end. In our study, we draw on the work of Luhmann (1995) and Hendry and Seidl (2003), who define an episode as a sequence of events structured in terms of a beginning and an ending. In addition, Jarzabkowski and Seidl (2008) highlight that episodes have three critical aspects: initiation, conduct, and termination. Initiation is characterized by a decoupling of ongoing organizational processes—crossing a boundary of termination of a prior event; conduct represents the activities within the episode, which we discuss below; and termination is the point of ending due to completion of the task, a ''resolution,'' or the end of the time allocated. We used these reference points to guide our analysis. In our study, an episode could take from a few minutes to as long as 20 minutes. The average episode lasted 7.5 minutes, consistent with other similar studies (see Jarzabkowski et al., 2015). For our purposes here, we will focus on one of the episodes, and the perspectives provided by zooming in, zooming out, and zooming with.

Zooming In

The focus of zooming is in the granularity of behaviors. By this, we mean the details of micro-behaviors and talk-in-interactions of the key actors in critical moments. Researchers from various methodological traditions choose to foreground some aspects of these micro-interactions and push other aspects to the background (Nicolini, 2009). For instance, conversation analysis researchers might choose to focus on text, timing, prosody, and turn-taking (Drew & Heritage, 1992). Others might choose to focus on discourse and artifacts (e.g., Benoit-Barné & Cooren, 2009; Chaput et al., 2011); body postures, gestures, and gaze (Gylfe et al., 2016); space (Jarzabkowski et al., 2015); or emotions (Liu & Maitlis, 2014). We chose to use Karen Tracy's action-implicative discourse analysis to zoom in on the episode of interaction because it focuses on discursive practices and relatively long interactions. More important, this method served our purpose since it has been used to analyze displayed emotions ("expressed feelings," per Tracy) of TMT/board members in their meetings (e.g., K. Tracy, 2004, 2007). In addition, compared to conversation analysis, action-implicative discourse analysis "is attracted to the study of institutionally related communicative occasions during which actors are likely to experience conflicts between competing institutional and personal goals" (Tracy, 1995, p. 202).

The content of the episode we have chosen for illustrative purposes is a discussion regarding the potential appointment of a new head of digital advertising, a strategic role defined by the managing director (MD) of the company's western region as "one of the most important hires in the entire business," which represented a future trend and a way of expanding the business. The focus of our analysis is the interaction between three team members: the MD just quoted and the CEO, who had held those posts for roughly 5 years when our research began, and the sales and marketing director (SMD), in her post for less than a year, who played a peripheral role. (Note that these team members do not represent the "core" members and other team members the "peripheral," as defined by Roberto [2003], since other team members, who were also present, would become the focus of our analyses in other episodes.)

In the meeting, the group sat around on three sides of a table in one of the company's smaller local offices, facing a screen at the other end of the table, on which the skills required for the post were projected. The members had already read the role specifications and potential candidates' key abilities in papers circulated beforehand, as well as a recommendation for the preferred internal candidate, Chris. Table 1 provides a transcript of the episode, including transcribed symbols to help convey changes in members' tone of voice, pauses, and gestures.

The episode begins with the MD's stress on the strategic importance of the role "within the entire business" (line 2 [L2]) and again "in the entire organization" (Line 4). The use of repetition as a strategy to emphasize his point is further deployed when he twice uses the term "incredibly important" (L6). He repeats it again later to continue his point (L17). Throughout he is looking at both the SMD (the role is in her division) and then to the CEO (L5), trying to gain his attention. The latter neither agrees nor disagrees, but responds with a question, which presents itself as a challenge rather than a joining of the opening conversation. His question "What's the implications of that?" is accompanied by wide hand gestures and a fixed staring down of the MD (L8). The CEO's talk is sharp and to the point, but the MD's response is calm. He sits back and responds: "I don't know ... you've had time to think about it" (L9-L10). Appearing to lose his patience at this point, the CEO interrupts, gesturing vigorously toward the MD, and states, "I have ... and I have taken a decision" (angry, L11-L12). Midway through the CEO's forceful announcement of his decision for the post, the SMD breaks into laughter and looks at him (amused, L13).

The opening scene depicted the discursive narrative of an impending conflict, which was interacted through difference in orientation and mismatching until the standoff was broken by the CEO's "decision." The MD's orientation was one of enquiry, drawing on the strategic imperative as a

Table 1. Discussion Among TMT Members About Appointing a Head of Digital Marketing.

Three actors: the CEO, a managing director (MD), and the sales and marketing director (SMD), who says nothing but supports the CEO nonverbally.

1. MD: This to me (looking at SMD),
2. is possibly one of the most important hires (.) in the entire business
3. (CEO looks at MD) (0.2),
4. I think in the entire organization, if you think about roles
5. (CEO adjusts himself in his seat to face MD directly),
6. I think this is incredibly important, this role, . **incredibly important**.
7. CEO: >And what's the implication of that?<
8. (Looks directly at MD, and uses hand gesture as a challenge)
9. MD: (sits back) I don't know, (hand gesture toward CEO)
10. ↑ you've have time to think about it ↑=
11. CEO: =>↑ I have ↑ (direct eye contact, active hand gesturing toward MD)
12. (.) [and I've taken a decision about it<]=
13. SMD: [ha: ha: ha: ha: ha: ha: haha: ha: ha] (Turns to look at CEO)
14. MD: =I took a sharp intake of breath when you said, er, Chris, (.)
15. so when I, I, er, I read the papers
16. I didn't see anything about Chris.
17. I was just thinking, wow, this is an incredibly important role.
18. You best get it right, ↑ that was what I was thinking ↑ (0.1)
19. Hmm. I have no idea, hence my question (with active hand gestures)
20. how easy is it going to be to find someone out there=
21. CEO: =It's not . . . [(it's) very difficult.]
22. MD: [Er] I think Chris's got some skills (.) but (.) rr:: (0.3)
23. CEO:>>Well, you just got to trust my judgment on this.<<

Symbol key (adaptation of Jefferson's transcription symbols in Tracy & Anderson, 1999):
. Falling intonation
↑ Rising intonation
:: Prolonging of sound
word Stressed syllable or word
word Quiet speech (the more asterisks, the quieter)
>word< Quicker speech
[ ] Simultaneous or overlapping speech
= Latched speech, where one utterance immediately follows another without a gap
(.) Noticeable pause
(.30) Pause to nearest tenth of a second
(ha) Syllable of laughter

selection criterion, using repetition and being mostly calm. He attempted to use institutional norms to counter the CEO, who held almost the opposite orientation using personal challenge, advocacy, and in the end, authority.

After hearing of the CEO's decision, the MD responds with a rhetorical challenge and declares his disbelief at the selected candidate: "I took a sharp intake of breath when you said Chris" (neutral, L14). He continues by saying that Chris doesn't match the profile. This would be an important job, so "you best get it right" (neutral, L15-L18). But even here he is still reflective: "I have no idea, hence the question." He refrains from an eyeball-to-eyeball challenge, but uses argumentation to counter the CEO's claims. However, the CEO interrupts the MD (L21) and concludes, "Well, you just got to trust my judgment on this" (angry, L23).

At one important level, this scene depicted a dialogue about institutional interests and the CEO's desire to control the outcome of the decision, and the two interests were in conflict (K. Tracy, 1995). The MD remained calm throughout the conversation and used the strategy of questioning as a form

of dissent rather than direct confrontation. This equanimity contrasted sharply with the overt interruptions, gesticulations, and force of the CEO. Underlying this interaction was the notion that the MD was challenging the CEO's judgment. In this analysis of zooming in, we identified a type of status interaction in which a forceful CEO used his status, a sense of complicity with the SMD as evidenced by her laughter, and his physical presence—hand gestures, eye contact, speed and tone of voice, and displays of intense negative emotions—to push through the decision. This finding supports that of current literature on status: dominant and high-status people tend to stay at the top (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Magee & Galinsky, 2008). So, zooming in can help to explain the pattern of what has happened and how it happened at the micro level.

This kind of study provides rich and in-depth analysis of these critical moments to show how specific phenomena occur in real time. The rationale behind such a choice is that the moment of zooming in is something special and salient. Analyzing it provides an opportunity to extend theories on, for instance, organizational identity and authority building.

Most of the current video ethnographic studies do not stop at just zooming in, because it misses the opportunities to investigate whether one kind of interaction persists in other episodes, whether there are other kinds of interactions, and how these are both like and unlike each other. Moreover, it does not reveal how these interactions evolve. This explains the value of zooming out.

Zooming Out

Researchers argue that to understand a specific practice or interaction "here-and-now" we need also to investigate it "elsewhere-and-then" (Nicolini, 2009, p. 1392). This does not mean that zooming in becomes redundant, because zooming out builds on it. Using zooming out, several studies have identified the durability of consistent patterns. For instance, Gylfe and colleagues (2016) found that middle managers use similar patterns of body postures, gestures, and gazes to engage subordinates and to support strategy from one episode to another. Jarzabkowski and colleagues (2015) found three kinds of work practices, each of which relied on traders' engagement of material, bodily, and discursive resources. Liu and Maitlis (2014) studied a TMT's displayed emotional dynamics and strategizing, which provided an analysis of the many meetings at which strategies evolved. By doing so, they were able to illustrate not only how each emotional dynamic developed around a specific issue, but also how different kinds of emotional dynamics evolved around different types of strategizing processes. More important, by comparing and contrasting these different pairs, they were able to draw out a common mechanism that explained the relationship between emotion and strategizing across them.

Zooming in on only one episode, according to our study, would lead to one conclusion, that a bullying leader dominates the team. But although there is no doubt that the CEO had a strong personality, zooming out to a wider analysis of all 53 episodes showed that this particular episode belonged to a distinctive type of interaction on this team, a type where one's place in the social hierarchy allows them to dominate. We also drew on data from other sources to provide a richer, more complicated, and more nuanced portrait of the interactions in this TMT. With this zooming out, we could show three key points.

First, we could show that some patterns endured. For example, we found that some participants consistently dominated others. Second, we found variation among the patterns of different "types" of interaction. Third, we could demonstrate the evolution of these patterns. The episode we just used to illustrate TMT interactions recorded during our research occurred toward the end of the CEO's tenure. He was less dominant at first than he was later on. Therefore, we were able not only to categorize the interaction dynamics into different patterns, but also to identify the changes that occurred within those patterns over time.

Together, zooming in and zooming out reveal the joint benefits of examining granularity, the details of micro-behaviors, and the patterns and contexts of social interaction. However, in general, zooming in and out do not necessarily capture the beliefs and motivations that guide team members' conduct. During the last stage of our data collection and analysis, we identified the value of zooming with the participants, which we will explain next.

Zooming With

In our initial research design, we wanted to understand the participants' perspectives. It was not until we invited the participants to watch some of the episodes that we identified the value and emerging process of zooming with them. They did validate our extrapolations—for example, about the CEO's behavior—but the novelty lay in their providing another reality, one that we could never have deduced either from our observations alone or from any other contextual data that we had collected. More important, they shared with us their motivations, intentions, and experienced (vs. displayed) emotions during actions and interactions. In addition, they made explicit for us social processes that had been implicit. These data and insights provided new aspects of the social reality and triggered our deeper and richer analysis. Thus, by integrating zooming in, zooming out, and zooming with, we achieved a more complex and in-depth understanding of this TMT's strategizing activities in their meetings (see Ellingson, 2008, and S. Tracy, 2010, for the associated idea of "crystallization"). This research process surprised us and enhanced our theorizing from the data.

The Process of Zooming With. The process of zooming with draws on the methodology of Armstrong and Curran (2006; see also Clarke, 2002), which offers a "voice" to the research participants. However, unlike their study, ours did not rely on participants who spent time reviewing and editing entire video scenes. That would have been too intrusive and therefore would have reduced involvement. Instead, our participants viewed two or three episodes, what the MD called the "heavy flash points" in their discussions. All participants indicated that these episodes had been important moments to capture. By doing so, we discovered yet another layer of the story.

The process of zooming with *emerged* from the final session that we held with each TMT member. We called these meetings dialogue sessions, because we planned them as opportunities to listen and collect further data. We originally planned a two-stage zooming-with process, a first zoom with each TMT member individually to avoid group conformity (Asch, 1956), and then a second zoom with participants as a group. However, organizational events did not take us to the second stage.

Zooming with individual participants involved three steps: setting the scene, showing the video, and hearing the participants' interpretations of what was going on in the video clips, with the ethnographic goal of "gaining the participants' perspective" always uppermost in the process. We set the context to create the conditions for constructive dialogue by reminding participants about the research process and our goals for the session, and by answering any questions and reestablishing rapport between them and the researchers. Most meetings were held face-to-face in a comfortable and well-appointed conference room on site, and began with the participant discussing his or her role and interactions with others on the team. This step took approximately half an hour. It set the scene for Step 2, showing the video clips. We identified critical episodes that illustrated TMT conflicts (our research interest). As one of the TMT members remarked, "The video shows a fairly representative overview of the discussions in the top team." Sometimes, a participant would ask to stop the video to make comments. Otherwise, we set the video on pause at the end of each episode, and embarked on Step 3, asking participants what they had seen and how they interpreted it. This step involved the comments of participants—their recollections, motives, and feelings—in dialogue with the researcher. This is how we arrived at our interpretation of the meaning of each episode.

The dialogue included *recollections* that the video itself had stimulated (''Ah, I remember this . . . . He [the CEO] was a bit grumpy that day . . . .''); *reflections* (''As I look at that *[pointing at the video],* just look at my body language—no wonder I'm always going to the physiotherapist with my neck, my posture . . . my body language is [saying] we are not getting anywhere here''); and *reflexivity* (See Finlay, 2002) for managerial insights (''As I watch this, I am more frustrated [than ever]''). That last comment denoted the restimulation of an emotional reaction, and the participant added comments about not wanting his team of reports to experience what he had in the TMT and about what this attitude might mean for his leadership style. The notion that the videos provided a form of ''projective interview,'' allowing participants to express themselves in unexpected ways, links to earlier works using photographs as a means of eliciting information from Peruvian villagers or residents in a housing project in the Netherlands (see Collier, 1967; Collier & Collier, 1986; Van der Does, Edelaar, Gooskens, Liefting, & Mierlo, 1992).

The Findings of Zooming With. Zooming with the participants not only confirmed the understanding of what was going on in the episodes that we developed after zooming in and out, but also brought to light participants' motivations, the discrepancy between their experienced and displayed emotions, their intentions, and the implicit social structures that we did not have access to when we zoomed in and out. Thus zooming with provided us with new aspects of the social reality, enabled us to provide a more complex and in-depth interpretation of the TMT's strategizing activities in their meetings, and opened up new possibilities for theorizing (cf. S. Tracy, 2010, crystallization). As noted by Knoblauch and Tuma (2011), the elicitation procedures of showing video to the people in them while also interviewing them ''can retrieve their intentions, their understandings and their knowledge'' (p. 426).

For example, zooming with the CEO highlighted the intense levels of his experienced emotions: He complained of being ''frustrated, angry and . . . pissed off.'' After zooming in, we could see that his actions involved bullying. After zooming out, we could see him bullying the MD during several episodes, which occurred in a broader context of pressure on the CEO. After we zoomed with the CEO, however, his behavior expressed his passion for helping the company. He challenged the impotence of the project manager, relayed his sense of urgency due to ''procrastination,'' and sought to avoid the impending company ''disaster.'' Thus, zooming with the CEO reframed his behavior. No matter how well intended, nonetheless, his behavior would have structural consequences, as we discuss below.

Although the MD was amused by the CEO's antics, the video clip of the relationship between the SMD and the CEO concerned him. This clip revealed how their relationship played out to the MD's disadvantage and the depth of negative feeling he had toward the SMD as a result. It was so deep that he had little, if any, self-control in her presence. He stated that nobody else had the same emotional impact on him. He confessed that the relationship was like ''a lightning rod.'' Even though he disagreed with the CEO and felt angry, he was able to remain calm and ''salute the flag,'' a form of organizational citizen behavior. Finally, the SMD's comments when we zoomed with her enabled us to have a fuller understanding of what was going on, by acknowledging her strong bond with the CEO and her political naivety. In short, the account provided another part of the jigsaw puzzle. Taken together, these remarks revealed a recursive, toxic relationship between the SMD and the MD, as well as a difficult one between the MD and the CEO. To explain further, the more isolated the SMD felt, the more she relied on the CEO. This angered the MD, who then isolated her more, to a point at which he ''stopped trying,'' which strengthened the CEO–SMD relationship. Thus, zooming with the participants singled out a recursive, three-way ''triangle of fragility.'' Each person was driven by a fear of failure: the CEO on a mission, the MD who wanted approval, and the SMD who wanted her agenda aired. These were revealed neither by zooming in nor by zooming out. Only

zooming with showed the *implicit structural dynamic* that continually made matters worse but which no one actor, on his or her own, had understood.

These elaborations help us to understand the psychological and social processes of TMTs and extend theorizing in several ways. To illustrate, we will examine the relation between displayed and experienced emotions. When we zoomed in, we observed an intimidating CEO but a calm MD. When we zoomed with the MD, however, he reported feeling irritated, being "wired" and resentful. Yet in the recorded episode, he managed his emotions and did not express how he really felt with the CEO. The disparity between displayed and experienced emotions may have further encouraged the CEO's dominance in multiple interactions with the MD, forming an implicit contract between them. In addition, the MD tended to "salute the flag," respect authority relations, and thus maintain his professional role. By zooming with him, though, we saw that both sides of his interactions—with the SMD and CEO—established, developed, and maintained dysfunctional implicit structures.

Zooming with participants provided a different angle through which to see another facet of the social reality, one we would not have noticed otherwise. Even in our prior interviews, during which we specifically asked participants about the events, they did not provide us with these additional details. Watching the video clips helped participants to relive the experiences and triggered them to recall more vividly and in more detail what was going on there and then (see Bower, 1981). These critical details enabled us to refine the model that we had developed at the end of zooming out.

To sum up, a model that begins with a focus on the CEO's behaviors (zooming in) shifts first to a focus on observable and manifest contextual behaviors (zooming out) and then concludes to reveal latent cognition and emotions that underlie conflict interactions (zooming with). Finally, zooming with participants takes the analysis beyond the dyad, turn-taking, and "talk" as the units of analysis, opening up a wider frame of reference. Zooming with draws on the role of ritual interaction chains, which Collins (2004) defines as a "mechanism of mutually focused emotion and attention producing a momentarily shared reality, which thereby generates solidarity and symbols of group membership" (p. 7). In our case, this mechanism illustrates a breakdown in effective interaction chains and the dysfunctional triangle of fragility that had become embedded in the TMT's processes, though they were unaware of it.

Methodological Implications of Zooming With

Few management scholars have used this method (see Bell & Davison, 2013), but other researchers—especially in the fields of teaching and education and counseling therapy—have zoomed with participants in their use of "stimulated recall" (Calderhead, 1981; Stockton, Morran, & Clark, 2004). Like them, we found that it afforded the opportunity to examine intentions and feelings because participants concurrently explored their interactions while viewing themselves on video. Zooming with goes beyond triangulation, capturing like a crystal the "different colors, patterns, and arrays, casting off in different directions. What we see depends upon our angle of repose" (Richardson, 2000a, p. 934). In zooming with us, belying his calm exterior in the video, the MD revealed deep emotions about the SMD, emotions that bordered on distain. The method also increased his awareness about his interactions with both the CEO and the SMD and highlighted his role in the difficult social structure in which the three were embedded. These revelations might have remained invisible by only zooming in or out.

Our zooming with differs from stimulated recall, however, in several ways: First, the former is an ethnographic approach in which significant time is also spent in the field, compared with the teaching or therapy studies using the latter, which have tended to focus immediately on videoing and to be short term. Second, we used a graduated approach of recall before participants reflected with us on the video. Thus, the time invested in building rapport before showing the video played an important role in setting the right tone. This differed, for example, from procedures used in Bower's

Table 2. A Summary of the Three Approaches.

	Research Goals/ Orientation (Focus and Scope of Enquiry)	Methods (Data Gathering and Analysis)	Ontology (the Notion of Reality and Being)
Zooming in	To understand the microscopic, detailed interactions and their effects	Conversation analysis (including attention to visual and vocal cues), discourse analysis, action-implicative discourse analysis	Reality is a product of the interactions that take place between participants
Zooming out	To understand patterns, temporal and relationships between actors within a situated context	Ethnography, including interviewing, nonparticipatory and participatory observation, action-implicative discourse analysis	Interpretations are embedded in social relations and interactions, material and organizational context and culture
Zooming with	To understand the perspectives of the research participants	Recall elicitation, projective interviews, reflexive dialogue	Facets of reality are embodied and revealed through observation, dialogue, and reflexivity; these are held in the minds and perspectives of individuals whereby they can engage in unfolding meaning making

(1981) work, which elicited recall induced from hypnotic suggestion. Finally, we noted a high incidence of spontaneous reflexivity. A typical comment during zooming with one of our participants was, "I guess if I was being honest with myself, I'd ask the question how many times have I felt [comfortable] in a team (Pauses) it's an interesting question *[pauses and thinks to self]*."

Zooming with participants also provided insights into their management practice. One participant remarked,

> I've always been quite big on coaching for people and for myself. But I find this [process] really very powerful because sometimes when I have coaching conversations, I always feel you are … it's very difficult to be completely in context. It's helpful because regardless, you have a conversation and you describe it. Just to hear yourself and whatever … but *[pointing at screen]* I'm really quite impressed by being able to see myself in a situation.

By saying that, it highlighted the value of self-reflection, the process itself and insights from viewing themselves within context, often missed from practices such as coaching. Finlay (2002) highlights several dimensions of reflexivity, including personal introspection by the participant, interpersonal reflection, and mutual collaboration. Zooming with incorporates all of these elements.

The value of zooming with participants is that it provides an additional perspective. It helps to make explicit the implicit—feelings, motivations, and relationships—retriggering both cognition and affect, which leads to a meta-interpretation of their experience. Participants experience the common paradox of being both embodied and disembodied simultaneously. But the word that emerged most powerfully from the discussion with our participants was "reflexivity."

Finally, a summary of the three approaches is presented in Table 2. We do not claim these are so clearly delineated in reality, as there will be overlaps. However, in our attempts to emphasize the differences, it may help researchers locate their study's orientation to a video ethnographic approach.

Choosing, Combining, and Sequencing Zooming Processes

We have explained zooming in, zooming out, and zooming with in detail in the previous section. Now we summarize a process model that uses zooming with as a part of video ethnographic studies within an organizational context. What follows are guidelines rather than a one-size-fits-all template, since what approaches to use and how to combine them depend on considerations such as researchers' topic and questions, their resources (a doctoral study vs. a multisite team study supported by a large grant), their theoretical stance (symbolic interactionist vs. structuralist), and their discipline (psychology vs. sociology), to name just a few. In addition, the research process is typically more iterative and integrative than described below. For analytical purposes, though, we have made these distinctions to help researchers decide which methods to use and when to do so. However, we encourage researchers to immerse themselves in the field to develop extended knowledge of the organization.

Choosing a Zooming Process. Researchers may choose to zoom in for various topics to focus on details. This might involve a dyadic relationship in a doctor–patient interaction or how a presenter engages with his audience, but in each case, with participants engaged with their material world (e.g., Heath & Hindmarsh, 2002; Knoblauch & Tuma, 2011). The focus is mirco-behaviors, but the zooming-in process nevertheless captures the critical moments, for example, in an organization's strategic change (e.g., K. Tracy, 2007). This compares with zooming out, where the focus is on identifying whether/how certain patterns of interactions persist and/or evolve over time and whether there exist diverse patterns of interactions (e.g., Gylfe et al., 2016; Jarzabkowski et al., 2015; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). There might be studies that privilege zooming out, where ethnographic methods are likely to prove convincing. This larger focus might include the emergence, development, and maintenance of, say, a political party's identity (Chaput et al., 2011). Of greatest importance would be how it emerged. However, in reviewing the literature, we found that most management researchers zoomed both in and out, differing in the emphasis they placed on the two. As discussed, a third option is for researchers to zoom with participants directly (e.g., Armstrong & Curran, 2006; Calderhead, 1981). In fact, researchers can combine these three processes, with one in the foreground and the others in the background.

Combining and Sequencing Processes. Schutz (1962) provides us with a useful analytic device toward developing our theoretical and epistemological contribution by distinguishing between "first order" and "second order" constructs on meaning. The former represents the meaning that participants themselves link with their actions. The latter represents how outsiders, such as researchers, interpret them (see also Van Maanen, 1979). This is consistent with the notion of double hermeneutics that Giddens (1984) developed, arguing that both interpretations of meaning (that of the insider and that of the outsider) are valid and necessary in social research. Knoblauch and Tuma (2011) suggest that the interaction between these two "must not be considered merely as a problem, but constitutes a resource for understanding the subject matter under investigation" (p. 416).

Video ethnographers often zoom in and out (e.g., Gylfe et al., 2016; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). In our study, we focused over several meetings on collecting, analyzing, and interpreting video data of the team's dynamics. We looked for nuances in actions, reactions, and interactions, and later zoomed out to gain a view of patterns, temporal evolutions, and context. Only using this shift in focus were we able to make better sense of the data. However, despite all the data, we still viewed it predominantly from a *second order* point of view. It was not until the final part of the data collection that we zoomed with participants, finding a reflexive view, the *first order* point of view.

In terms of sequencing, the study had three stages of focus in the foreground: (a) zooming in, (b) combining these findings with zooming out, and (c) bringing both together in our zooming with participants. We do not argue that this combination suits all situations; it merely describes our

research process. As an alternative, one might start by zooming with participants and then engaging in a different kind of dialogue in which researchers negotiate a different type of reflexivity than what we negotiated in this study. Our point is that planning, combining, and sequencing of the zooming options in the research design provide researchers with choices in video ethnographic research.

Discussion and Conclusions

We have used our data to illustrate the synergy that arises from three kinds of focus in video ethnography: zooming in, zooming out, and zooming with. We have shown that each can make a specific contribution. They build on each other: We use zooming in to examine in detail the micro-behaviors and interactions, and zooming out to widen our lens by including multiple relevant episodes, to find contextual information from the video-recorded data and from other data sources, and thus to provide a richer and more contextualized interpretation. Both methods provide the basis for well-grounded video ethnography. However, our main contribution is the addition of zooming with participants, inviting them to interpret what is going on during critical episodes, which builds on the other two methods by more explicitly soliciting participants' point of view. This is to compensate for the fact that video ethnographers in the field do not have the luxury of living with study participants to understand particular phenomena from their points of view (as traditional ethnographers do), which is what makes zooming with so important. This resonates with Knoblauch and Schnettler's (2012) argument for "focused ethnography," in which study of short but intense intervals provides insights into the internal workings of an organization's social order.

We argue that researchers should consider adding zooming with to zooming in and out (Gylfe et al., 2016; Liu & Maitlis, 2014). This would enhance the rigor of video ethnographic research, and offer the opportunity for richer and deeper interpretations, extended theorizing, and reflective practice.

One of the criteria for judging qualitative research is its credibility, which is usually enhanced by drawing on various data sources, using various methods, and applying various theoretical lenses (e.g., Bloor, 2001; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2012; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; S. Tracy, 2010) to explore diverse aspects of a topic. This is because complexity deepens understanding (Richardson, 2000b). In our case, by zooming with participants and listening to their understanding of what was going on in the clips, we noticed nuances and gained a richer understanding of each episode from their perspectives.

Areas for Development

Legitimate concerns about zooming with might include self-representation, inaccurate reporting of either events or the original thoughts or feelings that participants forget. These points are common to many forms of qualitative research. However, in addition to the usual safeguards with respect to these concerns, we make the following suggestions: (a) keep the interval between the original event and the dialogue sessions as short as possible (in our case, this averaged 4 months); (b) gather data from multiple and varied sources; and (c) use informal interview techniques, which reduce self-consciousness and self-editing by participants and allow for clarification and elaboration (Do & Schallert, 2004). We used all these ideas. In addition, contrary to our concerns that participants might not reveal negative emotions, we found that they were open about their emotions. We would argue that the focused ethnography and the lived experience of our having spent time with their teams facilitated an open discussion.

Another legitimate concern arises from the power relationship between the researchers and the participants. Although zooming with participants enables us to integrate their explanation into our interpretation of the meaning of the episode, the power relationship between the two tends to remain uncontested. The researcher often chooses the clips to be shown for both practical and theoretical

reasons. Finlay (2002) proposes two additional variants of reflexivity: social critique and discursive deconstruction. These are areas for further exploration, where one might speculate on the use of auto–video ethnography and participants determining what should be analyzed, increasing the legitimacy of their narrative, thereby changing power relationships and the construction of reality (see also Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2009).

Finally, we suggest that an opportunity lies in developing clinical practices with implications for management development and practice: zooming with management practitioners to enhance their reflexive and critical thinking—about themselves, their role, their interactions, further power relationships within the organization, legitimacy, and institutional patterns of authority. Other studies (outside of the management field) have provided reports of video autobiographies and collective video narratives (see other studies in this special issue).

In summary, our argument illustrates a particular stance in terms of the relationship between us, as researchers, and our participants. Other researchers might involve the participants more than we did in integrating their understanding into our interpretations (e.g., Armstrong & Curran, 2006; Clarke, 2002). For instance, Wang and Burris's (1994) study describes community-based empowerment using photographs. It represents a standpoint that puts the participants' perspective first. In such cases, "The power to seek out images and consciously to document them belongs not to outsiders, strangers, nor photo-journalists, but rather to the people who experience powerlessness as their dominant social reality" (Wang & Burris, 1994, p. 185). There might be many stances along a spectrum of zooming with in video ethnography, just as there are in other kinds of qualitative research in which researchers decide why and how research participants are involved in interpretations (e.g., Cho & Trent, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maxwell, 1992; Wolcott, 1990). In the same vein, there might be many stances along a spectrum of zooming out and zooming in. For instance, the interactions and episode that we chose to zoom in on are much more macro than the gazes and gestures that Gylfe and colleagues zoomed in on (Gylfe et al., 2016). By zooming out further than we have, moreover, researchers could design comparative studies across many organizations. This would enable them to analyze social interaction patterns, for instance, on various top teams across many organizations. Therefore, researchers can choose regarding where to locate their studies along any kind of zooming, using dimensions based on their own epistemological stances, their own research questions, and their own hypotheses.

By using this three-pronged approach, as our study illustrates, we were able not only to go beyond using proxies for TMT interactions as the current upper-echelon research does (e.g., Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996; Finkelstein, Hambrick, & Cannella, 2009), but also to reveal their psychological and social processes. This approach has implications for practitioners too. A zooming-with process supports reflective practitioners. Scholars have been helping practitioners to reflect on their learning and produce knowledge that is useful for them (e.g., Bartunek, 2007; Kolb, 1984; McKelvey, 2006; Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006) and have emphasized the crucial need to provide "site- and time-specific insights" to make the knowledge more relevant (McKelvey, 2006, p. 826). Zooming with provides practitioners such an excellent opportunity. Each of the key participants in our study found that replaying the video generated insightful and reflexive moments. Our participants offered unprompted thoughts on what they learned and what they might do differently.

In closing, zooming with is a novel approach to qualitative research in the fields of management and organizational studies. Combining it with zooming in and out expands our understanding of the research field and provides new perspectives by incorporating double hermeneutic. Moreover, this method provides new vistas for theoretical development and questions assumptions that are commonly held about the power relationships between researchers, their participants, and the nature of knowledge. Finally, this method lays out questions for further research and opportunities for development in management practice.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Jennifer Petriglieri, Glen Kreiner, Michael Pratt, and Paula Jarzabkowski for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. Appreciation also goes to the members of the "Organizational Research Methods" mini conference at Sundance Utah, hosted by the Marriott School of Management at Brigham Young University. In addition, very special thanks go to Curtis LeBaron as an associate editor and three anonymous reviewers, whose thoughtful comments helped to refine the ideas in this article. Finally, we wish to acknowledge the research support of Alicia Cheak-Baillargeon.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: We gratefully acknowledge the support of the INSEAD R&D Committee and the INSEAD Alumni Fund.

References

Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage.

Anderson, C., & Kilduff, G. J. (2009). Why do dominant personalities attain influence in face-to-face groups? The competence-signaling effects of trait dominance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 491-503.

Armstrong, V., & Curran, S. (2006). Developing a collaborative model of research using digital video. *Computers & Education*, *46*, 336-347.

Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. A majority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *70*, 1-70.

Bartel, C. A., & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *45*, 197-231.

Bartunek, J. (2007). Academic-practitioner collaboration need not require joint or relevant research: Toward a relational scholarship of integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 1323-1333.

Bateson, G., & Mead, M. (1942). *Balinese character: A photographic analysis*. New York, NY: New York Academy of Sciences.

Bell, E., & Davison, J. (2013). Visual management studies: Empirical and theoretical approaches. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *15*, 167-184.

Benoit-Barné, C., & Cooren, F. (2009). The accomplishment of authority through presentification: How authority is distributed among and negotiated by organizational members. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *23*, 5-31.

Bezemer, P. J., Nicholson, G., & Pugliese, A. (2014). Inside the boardroom: Exploring board member interactions. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*, *11*, 238-259.

Bloor, M. (2001). Techniques of validation in qualitative research: A critical commentary. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research* (pp. 383-396). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Bower, G. H. (1981). Mood and memory. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 129-148.

Brundin, E., & Melin, L. (2006). Unfolding the dynamics of emotions: How emotion drives or counteracts strategizing. *International Journal of Work Organization and Emotion*, *1*, 277-302.

Calderhead, J. (1981). Stimulated recall: A method for research on teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *51*, 211-217.

Carpenter, M. A., Geletkanycz, M. A., & Sanders, W. G. (2004). Upper echelons research revisited: Antecedents, elements, and consequences of top management team composition. *Journal of Management*, *30*, 749-778.

Chaput, M., Brummans, B. H. J. M., & Cooren, F. (2011). The role of organizational identification in the communicative constitution of an organization: A study of consubstantialization in a young political party. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *25*, 252-282.

Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 507-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research*, *6*, 319-340.

Clarke, D. (2002, April). *The learner's perspective study: Methodology as the enactment of theory of practice*. Paper presented at the International Perspectives on Mathematics Classrooms interactive symposium at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Cohen, A. J. (2010). Audiovisual recording. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *The Sage encyclopaedia of case study research* (pp. 32-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collier, J. (1967). *Visual Anthropology: Photography as Research Method*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Collier, J., & Collier, M. (1986). *Visual Anthropology: Photography as Research Method*. Albequerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cooren, F., Brummans, B. H. J. M., & Charrieras, D. (2008). The coproduction of organizational presence: A study of Médecins sans Frontières in action. *Human Relations*, *61*, 1339-1370.

Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., . . . Sherin, B. L. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *19*, 3-53.

Do, S. L., & Schallert, D. L. (2004). Emotions and classroom talk: Toward a model of the role of affect in students' experiences of classroom discussions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *96*, 619-634.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ellingson, L. L. (2008). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Engeström, Y., Virkkunen, J., MerjaHelle, H., Pihlaja, J., & Poikela, R. (1996). Change laboratory as a tool for transforming work. *Life Long Learning in Europe*, *1*, 10-17.

Erickson, F. (1982). Audiovisual records as a primary data source. *Sociological Methods and Research*, *11*, 213-232.

Erickson, F. (2011). Uses of video in social research: A brief history. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *14*, 179-189.

Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D. C. (1996). *Strategic leadership*. St. Paul, MN: West.

Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D. C., & Cannella, A. A. (2009). *Strategic leadership: Theory and research on executives*, *top management teams,and boards*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Finlay, L. (2002). Negotiating the swamp: The opportunity and challenges of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research*, *2*, 209-230.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Gioia, D., Corley, K., & Hamilton, A. (2012). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, *16*, 15-31.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1982). The interaction order: American Sociological Association 1982 presidential address. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 1-17.

Gylfe, P., Franck, D., LeBaron, C., & Mantere, S. (2016). Video ethnography. *Strategic Management Journal*, *37*, 133-148.

Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 334-343.

Heath, C., & Hindmarsh, J. (2002). Analysing interaction: Video, ethnography and situated conduct. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 99-120). London, UK: Sage.

Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage.

Hendry, J., & Seidl, D. (2003). The structure of significance of strategic episodes: Social systems theory and the routine practice of strategic change. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*, 175-196.

Iedema, R., Long, D., & Forsyth, R. (2006). Visibilising clinical work: Video ethnography in the contemporary hospital. *Health Sociology Review*, *15*, 156-168.

Jarzabkowski, P., Burke, G., & Spee, P. (2015). Constructing spaces for strategic work: A multimodal perspective. *British Journal of Management*, *26*, 26-47.

Jarzabkowski, P., & Seidl, D. (2008). The role of meetings in the social practice of strategy. *Organization Studies*, *29*, 1391-1426.

Johnson, G., Langley, A., Melin, L., & Whittington, R. (2007). *Strategy as practice: Research directions and resources*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Knoblauch, H., & Schnettler, B. (2012). Videography: Analysing video data as a "focused" ethnographic and hermeneutical exercise. *Qualitative Research*, *12*, 334-356.

Knoblauch, H., & Tuma, R. (2011). Videography: An interpretative approach to video-recorded micro-social interaction. In E. Margolis & L. Pauwels (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of visual research method* (pp. 414-430). London, UK: Sage.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

LeBaron, C. (2008a). Microethnography. In W. Dursbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication* (Vol. *7*, pp. 3120-3124). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

LeBaron, C. (2008b, August). *Video-based methods for research on strategy as practice: Looking at people, places and things*. Keynote presentation at the Strategy as Practice: Methodological Challenges professional development workshop at the Academy of Management meeting, Anaheim, CA.

LeBreton, J. M. (2014). Editorial. *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*, 113-117.

Leonard-Barton, D. (1990). A dual methodology for case studies: Synergistic use of a longitudinal single site with replicated multiple sites. *Organization Science*, *1*, 248-266.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic enquiry*. London, UK: Sage.

Liu, F., & Maitlis, S. (2014). Emotional dynamics and strategizing processes: A study of strategic conversations in top team meetings. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*, 202-234.

Llewellyn, N., & Hindmarsh, J. (2010). *Organisation, interaction and practice: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*, 351-398.

Maxwell, J. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*, 279-300.

McKelvey, B. (2006). Response: Van de Ven and Johnson's "engaged scholarship": Nice try, but . . . . *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 822-829.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meyer, R. E., Höllerer, M. A., Jancsary, D., & van Leeuwen, T. (2013). The visual dimension in organizing, organization, and organization research: Core ideas, current developments, and promising applications. *Academy of Management Annals*, *7*, 487-553.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moore, R. J., Whelan, J., & Gathman, E. C. H. (2010). The work of the work order: Document practice in face to face service encounters. In N. Llewellyn & J. Hindmarsh (Eds.), *Organisation*, *interaction and practice: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 172-197). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nicolini, D. (2009). Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections. *Organization Studies*, *30*, 1391-1418.

Pugliese, A., Nicholson, G., & Bezemer, P. (2015). An observational analysis of the impact of board dynamics and directors' participation on perceived board effectiveness. *British Journal of Management*, *26*, 1-25.

Richardson, L. (2000a). Evaluating ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *6*, 253-256.

Richardson, L. (2000b). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 923-948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roberto, M. A. (2003). The stable core and dynamic periphery in top management teams. *Management Decision*, *41*, 120-131.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 21-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organizations of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696-735.

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2000). An analysis of the behavioural dynamics of corporate governance—A talk-based ethnography of a UK manufacturing "board-in-action." *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *8*, 311-326.

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2010). The interactional accomplishment of a strategic plan. In N. Llewellyn & J. Hindmarsh (Eds.), *Organisation*, *interaction and practice: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp. 198-217). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schutz, A. (1962). Common sense and scientific interpretation of human action. In M. Natanson (Ed.), *Collected papers I: The problem of social reality* (pp. 3-47). The Hague, Netherlands: Nijhoff.

Smets, M., Burke, G., Jarzabkowski, P., & Spee, P. (2014). Charting new territory for organizational ethnography: Insights from a team-based video ethnography. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, *3*, 10-26.

Smets, M., Jarzabkowski, P., Spee, P., & Burke, G. (2015). Reinsurance trading in Lloyd's of London: Balancing conflicting-yet-complementary logics in practice. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*, 932-970.

Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stockton, R., Morran, D. K., & Clark, M. B. (2004). An investigation of group leaders' intentions. *Group Dynamics: Theory*, *Research, and Practice*, *8*, 196-206.

Strauss, B., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Streeck, J. C., Goodwin, D., & LeBaron, C. (2011). *Embodied interaction: Language and body in the material world*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Streeck, J., & Mehus, S. (2005). Microethnography: The study of practices. In K. L. Fitch & R. S. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 381-404). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tracy, K. (1995). Action-implicative discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *14*, 195-215.

Tracy, K. (2004). Action-implicative discourse analysis: A communication approach to analyzing talk. *Texas Linguistic Forum*, *47*, 219-237.

Tracy, K. (2007). Feeling-limned talk: Conduct ideals in the Steinberg succession meeting. In F. Cooren (Ed.), *Interacting and organizing: Analyses of a management meeting* (pp. 77-94). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tracy, K., & Anderson, D. L. (1999). Relational positioning strategies in police calls: A dilemma. *Discourse Studies*, *1*, 201-225.

Tracy, S. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*, 837-851.

Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. (2012). Strategy-as-practice: Taking social practices seriously. *Academy of Management Annals*, *6*, 285-336.

Van der Does, P., Edelaar, S., Gooskens, I., Liefting, M., & Mierlo, M. (1992). Reading images: A study of a Dutch neighborhood. *Visual Sociology*, *7*, 4-67.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 902-921.

Van Maanen, J. (1979). The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*, 539-550.

Vesa, M., & Vaara, E. (2014). Strategic ethnography 2.0: Four methods for advancing strategy process and practice research. *Strategic Organization*, *12*, 288-298.

Wang, C., & Burris, M.A. (1994). Empowerment through photo novella: portraits of participation. *Health Education Quarterly*, *21*, 171-86.

Wolcott, H. (1990). On seeking—and rejecting—validity in qualitative research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 121-52). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Author Biographies

Michael Jarrett is a senior affiliate professor in organizational behavior at INSEAD, Singapore. He received his PhD from Cranfield School of Management, UK, and a master's in economics at Birkbeck College, University of London. He also trained at the Tavistock Institute, London. His research explores the role of implicit emotions and organizational politics on the outcomes of radical change, strategy execution, and the dynamics of top management teams.

Feng Liu is an assistant professor of strategy at Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University, Canada. She received her PhD from the University of British Columbia, Canada and an MSc from the University of Lancaster, UK. She uses video methods in her research on emotion in organizations and board and top management team strategizing activities.