Collaborative research in a pandemic: Co-Producing solutions to a crisis

Gillian is a Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Ulster. Mark is the founder of the User Voice organisation and the CEO of Lived Expert. Shadd is a Professor of Criminology at Queen's University Belfast. Dan is a founding member of User Voice and the Chief Operating Officer of Lived Expert. Hazel was previously the Head of Research for User Voice.

This paper will explore one innovative attempt at promoting knowledge equity in a largescale prisons research project utilising Participatory Action Research (PAR). PAR has a long history in the social sciences but is utilised less frequently in prison research for a variety of pragmatic reasons. This paper will discuss the trials and tribulations of this collaborative method of data collection, and put forward reflections on how prisons could promote a greater culture of peer-research.

In March 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic transformed society as we knew it on a global level, resulting in lockdowns across nations and the mass introduction of Covid-responsive public health measures to contain the virus. Nowhere was this intervention more crucial than in prisons, historically hotbeds for contagion.[1] Prisons are vulnerable to disease due to the disproportionate prevalence of prior health conditions among those in prison, the rotation of short-term and transient populations, and an environment predisposed to overcrowding with limited access to health care.[2] This became apparent in the early stages of the pandemic — at the end of February 2020 half the reported cases of the virus in Wuhan, China, were within prisons,[3] while in the United States, penal institutions were at the epicentre of the pandemic with a rate of infection 5.5 times that of the general population.[4] In response to the heightened risk within jails and prisons, governments and prison institutions had two primary response options: decarceration measures, such as early release programmes and increased bail provision; or, stringent containment within facilities.[5] In the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Justice initially announced the intention to release up to 4,000 prisoners, approximately 5 per cent of the prison population, however this was abandoned by October 2020 with only 275 prisoners released.[6] What was implemented instead, was a heavily restricted lockdown, with the majority of prisoners contained in their cells for 23 hours a day and the core regime of prisons suspended.[7]

To ascertain the impact of these measures, researchers from Queen's University Belfast partnered with the User Voice organization for the Economic and Social Research Council funded project, 'Coping with Covid in Prisons'. The aim of the project was to capture the lived experience of the pandemic from the point of view of prisoners during this period (early 2021 to early 2022). As an organisation led and staffed by those with lived experience of the criminal justice system, User Voice was uniquely equipped to carry out this task. Founded in 2009 by Mark Johnson (now CEO of the Lived Expert organisation with a similar structure but focused on knowledge production), User Voice was created to help democratise prisons, setting up prison councils across the HMPPS estate, and to carry out user-led research on a range of issues pertaining to the implementation of justice — from the point of view of those who experience it. Even before founding User Voice, Johnson pioneered a unique peer-led methodology for collecting data that has been utilised across dozens of important studies and consultations. With the help of Johnson and the User Voice

1. See Maruna, S., McNaull, G., & O'Neill, N. (2022). The COVID-19 Pandemic and the Future of the Prison. *Crime and Justice, 51*(1), 59-103.
2. Akiyama, M., Spaulding, A., & Rich, J. (2020). Flattening the curve for incarcerated populations—Covid-19 in jails and prisons. *New England Journal of Medicine, 382*(22), 2075-2077.
3. Barnert, E., Ahalt, C., & Williams, B. (2020). Prisons: amplifiers of the COVID-19 pandemic hiding in plain sight. *American Journal of Public Health, 110*(7), 964-966.
4. Byrne, J., Hummer, D., Rapisarda, S., & Kras.K. (2022). The United States Government's Response to COVID-19 Outbreaks in Federal, State, and Local Corrections. In The Impact of COVID-19 on Prison Conditions and Penal Policy, edited by Frieder Dünkel, Stefan Harrendorf, and Dirk van Zyl Smit. London: Routledge.
5. Maruna, S., McNaull, G., & O'Neill, N. (2022). The COVID-19 Pandemic and the Future of the Prison. *Crime and Justice, 51*(1), 59-103.
6. Grierson, J. (2020). Early-release scheme for prisoners in England and Wales to end. *The Guardian,* August 19.
7. Queen's University Belfast & User Voice. (2022). 'Coping with Covid in Prison: The Impact of the Prisoner Lockdown,' *User Voice.* Available at: https://www.uservoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/User-Voice-QUB-Coping-with-Covid.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2024).

organisation, this project was therefore conceived, designed and implemented with the subjectivity of those with lived experience at its centre, using an innovative Participatory Action Research (PAR) methodology.

Below, we discuss the history and background of PAR and the methodology of including lived experience in criminal justice research. We then outline the 'nuts and bolts' of how we modified the PAR methodology for this study, outlining the three stages of the project: research design, data collection, and data analysis. In section three, we discuss reflexively the trials and triumphs of implementing a PAR methodology in the prison setting. Finally, we conclude with User Voice and academic reflections on best practice for PAR in prisons moving forward.

"Nothing about us without us" : the value of lived experience

Even the most well-intentioned traditional academic research raises discomforting issues regarding narrative ownership and exploitation of others for personal gain. Advocates in the health, recovery and disability rights communities have led the call for 'nothing about us without us', a recognition that service-users have their own voice, and do not need others to speak for them.[8] The value of service user involvement in criminal justice is well established, with criminalised people having a potential role as 'wounded healers' or 'credible messengers' who can use their histories to inspire and benefit others.[9] The UK's penal voluntary sector is perceived as pioneering service-user involvement in criminal justice practice, amplifying the voices of

'experts by experience' to contribute their insights to inform policy and implementation.[10] Peer support/mentoring programmes are increasingly prominent,[11] exemplar being the Samaritans Listener scheme which has been running since 1991.[12]

Yet, as Buck and colleagues caution, while activation of lived experience in criminal justice can be a positive, rewarding and inclusionary experience for participants, equally, implementation can result in 'exclusionary, shame-provoking and precarious' practice.[13] Aspirations of the Penal Voluntary Sector (PVS) to centre lived experience in their practice can in parallel enact the diluting of prisoner voice and limit peer participation in knowledge production and institutional direction.[14] This could and should be redressed, with user-led organizations such as Lived Expert, the Prisoner Policy Network, Groupe d'information sur les prisons (France) and KROM (Sweden) instead aiming to 'shape policy, affect delivery of services, and build grassroots confidence in self-determination.'[15] This means moving beyond traditional professional-led models that utilise the epistemology of lived experience, to ensure practice has an ontological foundation in prisoner agency and subjectivity, such as the movement for 'convict criminology' in academia.[16]

PAR has become another well utilised research tool for amplifying the voice of lived experience across multiple fields, holding the promise of converting research participants into co-researchers and collaborators in the production of knowledge.[17] Emerging from the field of psychology and the 'action research' theories of Kurt Lewin,[18] expanded by

> With criminalised people having a potential role as 'wounded healers' or 'credible messengers' who can use their histories to inspire and benefit others.

8 . Charlton, J. (1998). *Nothing about us without us: Disability oppression and empowerment.* Univ of California Press.
9. LeBel, T., Richie, M,. and Maruna, S. (2015). 'Helping others as a response to reconcile a criminal past: The role of the wounded healer in prisoner reentry programs,' *Criminal justice and behavior, 42*(1), pp.108-120.
10. Clinks. (2017). *Criminal Justice Policy and the Voluntary Sector.* Clinks: London. Available at https://www.clinks.org/sites/default/files/2018-10/clinks_clinks-thinks-2017.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2024).
11. Buck, G., Tomczak, P., and Quinn, K. (2022). 'This is how it feels: Activating lived experience in the penal voluntary sector.' *The British Journal of Criminology, 62*(4), pp.822-839.
12. Jaffe, M. (2012). *Peer support and seeking help in prison: a study of the Listener scheme in four prisons in England* (Doctoral dissertation, Keele University).
13. Buck, G., Tomczak, P., and Quinn, K. (2022). 'This is how it feels: Activating lived experience in the penal voluntary sector.' *The British Journal of Criminology, 62*(4), pp.822-839.
14. Aresti, A., Darke, S., and Manlow, D. (2016). 'Bridging the gap: Giving public voice to prisoners and former prisoners through research activism.' *Prison Service Journal, 224,* pp.3-13; Harriott, P. and Aresti, A. (2018) 'Voicelessness: A call to action,' *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons, 27*(2), pp.17-53.
15. Harriott, P., and Aresti, A. (2018). 'Voicelessness: A call to action,' *Journal of Prisoners on Prisons, 27*(2), pp.17-53.
16. Earle, R. (2018). Convict Criminology in England: Developments and Dilemmas. *British Journal of Criminology, 58*(6) pp. 1499–1516.
17. Schubotz, D. (2019). 'Participatory action research,' In *SAGE research methods foundations.* Sage.
18. Lewin, K. (1946). 'Action research and minority problems,' *Journal of social issues, 2*(4), pp.34-46.

psychologists 'in the trenches of social movements' including Myles Horton and Ignacio Martín-Baró,[19] the methodology was embraced and adapted across disciplines — for example, the Participatory Research Network was established in the education field by 1977.[20] At its foundation, PAR has an ethos of democracy and social justice, as an epistemology enacted through a lens of democratic participation. This lens understands that 'knowledge and expertise are widely distributed even if legitimacy is not', particularly among marginalised populations where knowledge is 'born in embodied intimacy with injustice…not a limit on objectivity, but a resource.'[21] The act of PAR then, can be 'revolutionary' in creating collaborative space for subjective experience that broadens participation of non-academic community-based members in knowledge construction.[22] The process of participation also breaks down power imbalances and hierarchies between the researcher and the researched, transforming both individuals participating, and the field of the discipline.[23] Moreover, PAR produces research, education and action directed towards fundamental social change, as critical reference groups and researchers explore problems and issues to improve social situations.[24] In this way PAR creates impetus for actions to produce changes in the community of those participating,[25] reducing socio-political inequities though 'empirically grounded liberation campaigns.[26 27]

Although PAR practices have been at the heart of work carried out by the User Voice organisation since its inception, as a discipline, criminology has been particularly slow to embrace and incorporate PAR principles.[28] Recent examples of creative PAR in criminal justice settings include Harding's photovoice research with a women's centre community in England and Jarldorn and Deer's photovoice and poetry research with formerly incarcerated people in Australia. PAR has been utilised less frequently in prison research for a variety of pragmatic reasons — with Haarmans and colleagues' co-produced project exploring the experience of male prisoners on an OPD pathway in the HMPPS estate a prominent, recent outlier. In the USA, prison-based PAR has a longer history, rooted in education/prison partnerships that have produced action research outcomes.[29 30 31 32] Perhaps the most famous example of prison-led research was the survey, designed by Eddie Ellis (then incarcerated in New York State) with the help of psychologist and educator Kenneth B. Clark, which sought to capture the geography of incarceration state-wide and had a huge impact on the development of justice reinvestment.[33] Michelle Fine and her collaborators have also been prominent proponents of PAR in prison. Over 25 years, Fine and colleagues worked to fight the precarity of prison/college education partnerships through generation of peer-led evaluations.[34] More recently, recognising the over representation of people of colour

19. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8), p.687.
20. Hall, B. (1981). Participatory research, popular knowledge and power: A personal reflection. *Convergence, 14*(3), p.6.
21. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8), p.687.
22. Billies, M., Francisco, V., Krueger, P., and Linville, D. (2010). Participatory action research: Our methodological roots. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 3*(3), pp.277-286.
23. Brydon-Miller, M. (1997). Participatory Action Research: Psychology and Social Change. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*: 657-666.
24. Wadsworth, Y. (1998). What is participatory action research? *Journal of Public Health, 15*, pp.52-60.
25. Billies, M., Francisco, V., Krueger, P., and Linville, D. (2010). Participatory action research: Our methodological roots. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 3*(3), pp.277-286.
26. Lenette, C., Stavropoulou, N., Nunn, C., Kong, S., Cook, T., Coddington, K., and Banks, S. (2019). Brushed under the carpet: Examining the complexities of participatory research. *Research for All, 3*(2), pp.161-179.
27. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8), p.687.
28. Haverkate, D., Meyers, T., Telep, C., and Wright, K. (2020). On PAR with the yard: Participatory action research to advance knowledge in corrections. *Corrections, 5*(1), pp.28-43.
29. Harding, N. (2020). Co-constructing feminist research: Ensuring meaningful participation while researching the experiences of criminalised women. *Methodological Innovations, 13*(2)
30. Jarldorn, M., and 'Deer'. (2020). Participatory action research with ex-prisoners: Using Photovoice and one woman's story told through poetry. *Action Research, 18*(3), pp.319-335.
31. Haarmans, M., PAR Team., Perkins, E., and Jellicoe-Jones, L. (2021) "It's Us Doing It!" The Power of Participatory Action Research in Prison: A Contradiction in Terms? – Phase 1. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 20*(3), pp.238-252.
32. Fine, M., Torre, M., Boudin, K., and Wilkins, C. (2021). Participation, power, and solidarities behind bars: A 25-year reflection on critical participatory action research on college in prison. In P. M. Camic (Ed.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (2nd ed., pp. 85–100).
33. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8)
34. Fine, M., Torre, M., Boudin, K., and Wilkins, C. (2021). Participation, power, and solidarities behind bars: A 25-year reflection on critical participatory action research on college in prison. In P. M. Camic (Ed.), *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design* (2nd ed., pp. 85–100). American Psychological Association

in correctional settings, Payne and Bryant initiated an in-prison Street PAR methodology which provides 'culturally competent and comprehensive analysis of street-identified people of colour through an agency-theoretical, methodological and empirical paradigm.'[35]

PAR methodology then, recognises the critical knowledge of those incarcerated, knowledge of the policies, implementation, and impacts of prison life and accompanying ideas improving the system.[36] From a pragmatic point of view, PAR can produce better empirical results; peer researchers can establish trust with incarcerated research participants, gather data from hard to access research sites, and do so in 'the subjects' own language,'[37] producing more authentic, accurate findings. This was certainly the experience of this project, where peer-led focus-groups and survey collection in the prison led to the generation of engaging and powerful data.

PAR in a pandemic

Our own recent adventure in PAR took place in a time of Covid-responsive lockdowns inside the prisons, when most outside organisations had asked to withdraw from the prisons and a peer-led research model guaranteed the least intrusive and resource-intensive strategy for institutions already under strain. However, our interest in PAR transcended these pragmatic considerations.

From the offset, our research aimed to involve incarcerated and formerly incarcerated researchers at every stage of the project. The project commenced with the collaborative development of a six-module Peer Researcher Training package (Level 2, Open College Network) by a collective of four academic researchers from Queen's University Belfast and senior User Voice team members with experience in peer research and training. The training had six core theoretical elements: an introduction to peer research and the aims of social science research; an overview of research design including qualitative and quantitative methodologies

> PAR can produce better empirical results; peer researchers can establish trust with incarcerated research participants, gather data from hard to access research sites, and do so in 'the subjects' own language, producing more authentic, accurate findings.

and research methods; research ethics broadly, and specifically to prison research; data collection considerations and sampling; data analysis and dissemination; skills practice. The co-produced training was delivered to ten paid staff members of User Voice (all with lived experience of the justice system) — who then acted as peer-researchers for the design stage of the research. Collectively, this group developed the mixed method research design, decided on criteria of selecting host prisons, developed focus group interview themes and format, and, most importantly, designed the peer survey that would be used to collect the quantitative data.

The next stage of the research involved recruiting and training 99 additional research collaborators across 9 prisons (research was initiated at 11 different prisons, but only 9 were able to participate fully). These included a mix of local prisons, training prisons, and resettlement prisons, one women's prison, one young offenders institute, two contracted prisons, three Cat A prisons, and one Cat D prison. Peer researchers from each prison were recruited through one of 24 focus groups across the 11 prisons. Interested volunteers were offered an accredited six-module training on peer research methods (OCN Level 1) that covered similar ground (in less depth) as that offered to the User Voice researchers at the design stage of the research. The training was delivered over one or two days depended in prison capacity. Like the Level 2 Peer Researcher training, it was developed by QUB and User Voice staff and was based on student-led learning pedagogy.

Once they were introduced to the basics of peer research, these volunteers then set to work designing a bespoke research strategy for their own institutions, showing tremendous creativity in figuring out how to survey their peers about their experiences of a lockdown that meant that peer interaction was greatly curtailed. These methods were then agreed with prison management and the peer researchers were left to carry out the surveys autonomously, with the User Voice

35. Payne, Y., and Bryant, A. (2018). Street participatory action research in prison: A methodology to challenge privilege and power in correctional facilities. *The Prison Journal, 98*(4), p452
36. Farrell, L., Young, B., Willison, J., and Fine, M. (2021). Participatory research in prisons. *Washington, DC: Urban Institute.*
37. Toch, H. (1967). The convict as researcher. *Trans-action, 4*(9), pp.72-75.

staff available via email and freephone number to provide support. The User Voice team would then return after a few weeks to collect completed surveys, complete the training process and where possible, carry out a data analysis session of the focus group findings for each prison.

Surveys, including translations into four different languages, chosen by the peer researchers in each prison who had knowledge of their prison populations, were distributed between June 2021 — February 2022. Overall, 1,421 surveys were returned from nine prisons, with sample size ranging from a 52 (YOI) to 360 (Cat A male prison). Response rates from individual wings and house blocks ranged from 21 per cent (Cat B Prison) to 72 per cent (Cat A Prison), averaging around 30-40 per cent of the total possible population — a strong rate in the context of a global pandemic and comparable to recent publications of prisoner surveys.[38]

The PAR methodology centres the intention to produce actionable change for those who participate. As a result, the research team produced rapid response reports for each individual prison to be presented back to stakeholders including peer researchers and the management teams of hosting prisons alongside HMPPS and NHS leadership. These reports highlighted both key findings and 'solutions' produced by research participants. As the research progressed, cumulative findings were fed back to additional stakeholders including HM Inspectorate of Prisons, HM Inspectorate of Probation, and HMPPS Gold Command, the directorate charged with developing a recovery strategy for transitioning from the Covid lockdown.

The data analysis stage was an iterative process of inductive thematic analysis, which also centred the participation of those with lived experience of prison. Where possible initial findings were brought back to the in-prison peer researchers to garner input and feedback. However, the primary team of peer researchers involved in the analysis process were members of the User Voice National Council, a volunteer body of formerly incarcerated individuals, several of whom had been incarcerated during COVID, including a few who had been peer researchers on the Covid project before their release. The National Council volunteers served a quality control function during the process of data analysis, making sure we understood the findings correctly, and were especially charged with developing the 'solutions for change' emerging out of the research.

The trials and tribulations of PAR in prisons

Using PAR in prisons during a global pandemic is not for the faint hearted. Undoubtedly, the biggest obstacles faced were Covid related. Traditional research methods like focus group interviewing and survey distribution are made much more difficult in an environment in which social distancing is required and interpersonal contact could put people at risk.

Indeed, most prisons we approached were not able to facilitate the research. Even two of the 11 prisons that agreed to host the project had to withdraw from the study prior to the data collection stage. Key to success (and failure) was staff buy-in. In one prison, we got no response from staff champions after the initial training stage, and peers were not given time out of cell to distribute surveys. In another case, completed surveys were taken from peers during security searches which led to the cessation of research at the institution. Peer researchers in participating prisons were able to negotiate strategies with the prison for the safe and confidential storage of completed surveys — a key difficulty in the prison environment that was a major sticking point for ethics committees.

An additional issue which immediately became apparent post-training, was our ability to achieve a representative sample across prisons. Time out of cell, and movement between landings/houses was severely inhibited due to the combination of Covid-responsivity and staff shortages across the prison estate. Even in

> Traditional research methods like focus group interviewing and survey distribution are made much more difficult in an environment in which social distancing is required and interpersonal contact could put people at risk.

38. Ross, M., Diamond, P., Liebling, A., and Saylor, W. (2008). Measurement of prison social climate: A comparison of an inmate measure in England and the USA. *Punishment & Society, 10*(4), 447–474.

prisons with the largest samples, peer researchers faced challenges in distributing and collecting the surveys due to obstacles such as 'double-jobbing' when unlocked, competing obligations during time out of cell (including maintaining family connectivity, showering and exercising), and negative staff attitudes towards their role. As a result of all these factors, peer researchers were limited to sampling only their own wings, or houses at best. However, the demographic profile of the final sample was roughly similar to that of the wider prison population, bar the oversampling of the female population (14 per cent) in comparison to their proportion of the whole estate (4 per cent).[39]

Beyond the tensions of project implementation, this project raises methodological issues pertinent to prison research more broadly. When we look at the history of criminal justice research on reducing offending, what often happens is that information is removed from the hands of people that need it. It is collected from the ground — from prison landings and wings — removed, regurgitated back to the system, and implemented in a top-down way that is derived from the point of view of the collector. When research neglects partnership in this way, people in prison can become highly suspicious and cynical about the point of engaging with research altogether. The peer researchers who were responsible for data collection in this research were able to overcome these barriers through a peer-to-peer approach stressing solidarity and mutual empowerment in a hugely difficult time.

At the same time, although peer researchers were quick to gain the trust of their incarcerated peers, they had more difficulties earning the trust of the wider prison institution, and this manifested at each stage of the research. At the data collection phase, peer researchers at some institutions were supported and recognised for the important work they were doing. Whereas, at others, they were accused of manipulation, using the research as an excuse to try to circumvent restrictions on movement or peer contact. Likewise, at

> As exemplified by our collaborative Covid project, peer-research can offer empowerment by facilitating agency to change their environment and create the generativity to produce outputs.

the dissemination phase, some governors were highly receptive to the findings, treating the rapid reports almost as inspection reports and showing peer researchers how each of their conclusions were being addressed. However, at other prisons, the findings were largely dismissed due to the 'biases' of peer researchers and the agenda they may bring to the research.

Finally, the collaboration between academic and lived experience partners was not always smooth or easy. Although the two groups unquestionably learned a great deal from one another, inherent tensions between the two groups have been undeniable (even in the production of this article). Many of the problems have resulted from academic contributors finding it difficult to step back and not take the familiar lead role, especially around aspects of the work like writing up findings and analyses. Partnerships of this sort require a substantial amount of humility on the part of both LE and academic collaborators that takes work and effort, but is worth the pay off.

Shared reflections

The use of PAR in prisons has the potential to offer rich rewards. As exemplified by our collaborative Covid project, peer-research can offer empowerment by facilitating agency to change their environment and create the generativity to produce outputs.[40] For the academic, while these rewards may not be grounded in grant funding achievements and high impact journal publications, they can result in a rich diversity of knowledge that ensues from collaborative work — working 'with' and not 'on' incarcerated colleagues:

We may uncover stories that contest current ideologies and inequalities, honor the resilience and resistance of those who have already suffered, build community power and new solidarities, and dare to widen the social imagination for policies that challenge inequality.[41]

Importantly, though, enacting PAR methods 'is not simply a matter of signing on disenfranchised members

---

39. See User Voice and Queen's University Belfast (2022). Coping with Covid in Prison, for full table of demographic profile. Queen's University Belfast & User Voice (2022). 'Coping with Covid in Prison: The Impact of the Prisoner Lockdown,' User Voice. Available at: https://www.uservoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/User-Voice-QUB-Coping-with-Covid.pdf (Accessed 19 February 2024).
40. Haverkate, D., Meyers, T., Telep, C., and Wright, K. (2020). On PAR with the yard: Participatory action research to advance knowledge in corrections. *Corrections, 5*(1), pp.28-43.
41. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8)

---

of a community to one's agenda or collecting favourable quotes for one's project', nor is it research to 'simply further academic careers.'[42] In the hyper controlled setting of carceral institutions, multiple tensions exist, not least the security concerns posed by translating PAR to a prison setting. Ethically and responsibly implementing these methods in prison requires careful thought on how to minimise potential harm of participants and avoid tokenism (on one hand) or exploitation (on the other). As Michelle Fine outlines, key to minimising potential harm is ensuring co-produced narratives, with researchers morally obliged to provide counter-discourse to sanitised official narratives, challenging 'dominant stories being told.'[43] For Fine, this means that:

We can no longer endorse empirical gated communities of demographically homogeneous researchers, distant from the conditions of oppression, who study and develop policy for Others and confuse the products and sources of oppression…we must resist the impact factor publication rituals that may unwittingly reproduce epistemological violence.[44]

At the most fundamental level, the lesson of our own PAR research was that this work can be done; indeed, it can be done in the most extraordinarily difficult of circumstances (i.e. a global pandemic). We see no reason why greater use of participatory methods could not be used in more normal times, and cannot imagine reverting back to traditional structures of knowledge inequality ourselves.

42. Billies, M., Francisco, V., Krueger, P., and Linville, D. (2010). Participatory action research: Our methodological roots. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 3*(3), pp.277-286
43. Fine, M. (2013). 'Echoes of Bedford: A 20-year social psychology memoir on participatory action research hatched behind bars,' *American Psychologist, 68*(8)
44. ibid