

Ethnography, Ethics and Ownership of Data Amendments

- We now hope to have amended grammatical errors – all amendments are highlighted in yellow throughout the revised manuscript – please see for example the ‘whom’ amendments highlighted.
- On page 2 the word ‘more’ has been removed
- On page 2 the ‘emerging from semiotics’ has also been removed in favour of ‘emerging from colonial critiques and neo-Marxism (Pels, 2014)’
- Page 3 now states ‘studying-down’, rather than ‘top-down’ in line with Nadar to avoid confusion. The word ‘top-down’ has been simply removed from the conclusions on page 16
- Page 6 Wolf (1996) reference has been removed
- Page 11 –the sentence has now been amended to read, ‘that on some occasions trumped their participation in field research at a certain point in time’
- Pels et al (2018) are now acknowledged in the conclusion via the following, ‘Thus, in agreement with Pels et al (2018), a theory of intersubjectivity is postulated as an alternative viewpoint that has implications for how ethnography understands and manifests itself methodologically as a process and how data is viewed as co-produced and thus co arguably –owned’
- Pels, P. (2014). After objectivity: An historical approach to the intersubjectivity in ethnography. *Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4(1), 211-236 – has been added to the reference list