

THE DOCUMENTARY IMAGINATION

An investigation by video practice into the performative application
of documentary film in scholarship

Trevor William Hearing

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of
Bournemouth University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2015

Bournemouth University

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.

ABSTRACT

THE DOCUMENTARY IMAGINATION

An investigation by video practice into the performative application
of documentary film in scholarship

The aim of the research has been to discover new ways in which documentary film might be developed as a performative academic research tool. In reviewing the literature I have acknowledged the well-established use of observational documentary film making in ethnography and visual anthropology underpinned by a positivist epistemology, but I suggest there are forms of reportage in literary and dramatic traditions as well as film that are more relevant to the possibility of an auto-ethnographic approach which applies documentary film in an evocative context. I have examined the newly emerging field of Performative Social Science and the "new subjectivity" evident in documentary film to investigate emerging opportunities to research and disseminate scholarly knowledge employing reflective documentary film methods in place of, or alongside, text. This inquiry has prompted me to consider the history of the creation and transmission of scholarship. The research methodology I have employed has been auto-ethnographic reflective film practice. Specifically, I have drawn on images from my previous documentary films and woven them together into a research film to explore the possibility of provocative, evocative filmmaking as a "creative academic research tool", whilst noting the value of a relevant skill-set to deliver a quality threshold in applying such a method. In this particular instance of filmic scholarship, I have questioned the notion of the 'B' roll to illustrate and interrogate the performative application of auto-ethnographic film production. I became interested in the idea of the performative artefact as an expression of investigation when I spent a year documenting the construction of Sir Antony Gormley's landmark sculptures *Another Place* and *The Angel of the North*. Gormley's statement in the film that sculpture might be thought of as "a witness to life", has informed my own practice as a filmmaker and informs the film that has become the data for this thesis. The following year when I made a film about a fishing community, *Village By The Sea*, I began to develop the idea that film or video artefacts might also be viewed like sculpture, as "an inert, benign object that stands somewhat outside time, somewhat outside the span of human life, but that acts as a witness to it" (Gormley, 1998). I have incorporated what Gormley terms this "impulse" into my research by creating a hybrid 'para-documentary' using 'B' roll footage: an experiment in a performative method that I am reporting on here, and an experiment which obliges the filmmaker to engage with the ethical questions which arise when grappling with the imaginative and the documented. The outcome of the research is

described as the discovery of the research experience that while I have been walking around in the world, that world has been walking about in me. Three implications are identified from this outcome. Firstly, that the concept of the Creative Academic Research Tool might be a useful systematic matrix with which to frame the specific traces of a practice-based research and from which to draw more generic outcomes. Secondly, counter-intuitively to the conventions of other media documentary forms that prioritize character and dialogue, the application of the wider angle of the 'B' roll filmic technique might offer a particularly powerful evocative tool in Performative Social Science. Thirdly, the documentary sensibility identified in this research, when placed performatively in the hands of the audience, might place the imagination at the heart of the scholarly documentary project.

Table of Contents

	Page
Statement of original authorship	II
Abstract	III
Table of Contents	V
List of Accompanying Material	VII
Preface	VIII
Acknowledgement	XVI
Chapter I: Introduction	1
A. Background to the research	2
1. Scholarly Argument: Ingraham’s call to action	2
2. Performative Social Science: re-thinking scholarly argument	5
3. The Research Gap	6
B. The Research Problem	9
1. The Aim of the Research	9
2. The Research Problem and Sub-Questions	10
C. Justification For The Research	11
1. Disruption to Pedagogy	11
2. Disruption to Technology	12
3. Disruption to Methodology	13
D. Methodology	14
E. Outline of the Report	15
F. Definition of Terms	15
G. Conclusion	20

Chapter II: Literature Review	21
A. Introduction to the Literature Review	21
B. The Historical Context of Scholarly Discourse	24
C. Ong's Typology of Orality and Literacy	26
D. The Uncommon Discourse	38
1. Language as Local Practice	40
2. Critical Thinking	41
3. The Bartholomae/Elbow Debate	43
4. Bourdieu: Scholarship and Power	48
E. Rorty: a philosophy of irony	52
F. Beyond Specialisation	53
G. The Transgressive Screen	55
H. Literary Journalism: Art's Status as Document	60
I. Documentary Film: The Performative Space of the 'B' Roll	66
Chapter III: Methodology	73
A. Introduction to Methodology	73
B. Performative Methodology	74
C. Narrative Research Methods	80
1. The filmmaker's narrative journey	83
2. The researcher's narrative journey	83
3. Interview as narrative journey	84
4. The audience's narrative journey	86
D. Our Storied Selves	87
E. Auto-ethnography	89
F. Practice-as-Research method	92
G. Embodied Research	97
H. The Synthesis of Methodology and Method: The Creative Academic Research Tool (CART)	100
I. The Ethical Application of Documentary Film Making in Performative Scholarship	103
J. Conclusion to the Methodology	108

Chapter IV: Research by Practice: Ships That Pass In The Night (DVD)

Chapter V: Conclusion	110
A. Introduction	110
B. Conclusion About Research Question 1: How might knowledge be constructed performatively in documentary film?	112
C. Conclusion About Research Question 2: How might documentary film be employed as a Performative Social Science research tool?	113
D. Conclusion About the Research Problem	117
E. Implications for Theory and Practice	118
F. Limitations of the Research	120
G. Implications for Future Research and the Development of the Thesis	120
References	123

LIST OF ACCOMPANYING MATERIAL

Incorporated with this text-based document is the audio-visual element submitted on DVD as Chapter 4.

It is suggested that readers of the thesis view the DVD after reading chapters I-III.

The DVD contains the research film “Ships That Pass In The Night”.

PREFACE

~ Letting Daylight In Upon Magic ~

On Art 6

The hand that uses a pen must be stronger
Than ten Hannibal elephants

You must help to haul the baggage cart
Through the pass

Then you can sit in the grass at the top
And eat with the rest

No one eats unless the cart is hauled
Through the pass

After your meal write
Art is not magic

Edward Bond (1978)

Art, magic, *imagination* and the scientific method of the academy are embedded in the core of this thesis. In adopting the phrase of the Romantic poet John Keats as the title of his book, *Unweaving The Rainbow*, the scientist Richard Dawkins (1998) teases out the relationship between art and science by critiquing Keats' assertion that Newton "has destroyed all the poetry of the rainbow, by reducing it to the prismatic colours" (Keats cited Dawkins, 1998, p.39). Similarly, the art critic Mark Lawson borrows the nineteenth century essayist Walter Bagehot's phrase about the English Constitution (Bagehot 2001) to make the point that there is a risk in "letting daylight in upon magic" (Lawson 2006). In writing about artists speaking about their work, Lawson notes:

"The case for silence is easy to make. Good art is ambiguous but good journalism has clarity, and these ambitions inevitably clash in the published preview. The playwright Michael Frayn complained (in a pre-publication interview) that "you don't spend two years writing a play and then sum it up impromptu over lunch".

(Lawson, 2006)

The common theme is that whilst the artist must shroud the truth of their message in silence and ambiguity, or risk losing the very thing that makes the art work, by contrast the journalist must report clearly, and the scientist must catalogue and explain. Indeed for Dawkins, and for many scientists, the ‘wonder’ is not destroyed but magnified by removing the mystery and explaining the how and the why. In contradiction to this, in recent years there has been a growing body of work that has promoted the use of creative or ‘performative’ practice as a research method across a number of fields in academic research. Therefore, the question arises as to how the researcher might both use the ‘magic’ of artistic methods and let daylight in upon knowledge. This forms the problem presented in this thesis, a question that has been tested and embodied by my own practice as a documentary filmmaker and reported on here and, because the research is embodied in the researcher, I must tell you how I came to be here, seeking the answer to this question, even if it is not over lunch.

When the digital archaeologists of the future are pouring over the archaically-labelled “Regional Variations” in the pages of the *TV Times* from the 1970s, 80s, and even 90s, they will uncover clues to a hidden and neglected culture that will send them scurrying to the vaults of the long-forgotten television formats of 16mm. reversal film stock and one-inch videotape. They will have hit the bedrock of ‘Jurassic’ television: analogue, public-service broadcasting embedded in the output of the 15 regional ITV companies in the second half of the twentieth century. Some of my programmes will be amongst those gathering dust (BFI 2014).

Picture this: it is the summer of 1980, the Vapors had their one-hit wonder, *I think I'm turning Japanese (I really think so)*, and I thought I was turning “professional”, standing behind a camera on the floor of Studio 2 at Tyne Tees Television. I was being well paid to do something I would gladly have done for no pay. I was a trainee cameraman, allowed to operate a camera on the regional television news magazine, *Northern Life*. I had just graduated from one of only two ‘media’ degree courses in the country, called at that time “Communication Studies”. One of the other two trainee cameramen had been sacked for having shaky hands and the head of the camera department was highly suspicious of anyone with a degree. Although I had enjoyed theoretical debates about modernism and realism, ideology and discourse, and structuralism and

semiotics whilst studying television documentary as an undergraduate, I soon learned that the concepts that were common currency in academic circles had no meaning for the people making the programmes day-in and day-out, in “the business”. Instead, it became clear that survival in the television industry meant knowing how to fill in the pink expense forms, mount a lens on a camera at the racecourse, and, above all, how to get on with people. It was a privileged occupation, and it only became more attractive as I went on to become a researcher, director, producer, and executive producer over a twenty year career discovering, celebrating and helping to shape the identity of a region: the North East of England, a place with a very distinct sense of itself. This was the cultural, industrial and commercial context of the past 30 years in which I, and many other film-makers, cut our teeth as researchers, producers and directors, and were able to make innovative regional and network documentaries, arts programmes and even low-budget dramas. This was because, under the public service quota system of the ITV regional licences, nobody was taking any notice: at least, nobody who mattered. In this protected space, and thanks to the patronage of benevolent executives who had been programme makers themselves, there was a unique opportunity to make guerrilla-like forays into thoughtful television. In fact, thanks to the quota system, I suspect there were years when more hours of arts programmes were produced in the North East ITV region alone than in the whole of the national output of the BBC (Fitzwalter 2008). (Note the in-coming Director General of the BBC Tony Hall’s belated recognition of the paucity of the BBC’s coverage of the arts in 2013-14 (BBC 2014)).

The opportunity to make innovative and imaginative programmes gradually waned following the deregulation of broadcasting initiated by Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government in the 1980s and the 1991 franchise auction. The consequence of no longer being held to costly public service commitments and quotas was that dedicated production teams were disbanded and such production as there was emanated from the culture and resources of the newsroom. Uneconomic one-hour, and then half-hour regional features became an anachronism as the number of slots was reduced by the increasingly centralized ITV Network Centre and as the franchise holders attempted to meet their significantly increased licence payments in cooperation with the regulator (Fitzwalter 2008). The one-hour arts slot became a two-and-a-half minute news

magazine item. Now, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, many people will have forgotten that this opportunity for idiosyncratic, non-formulaic filmmaking ever existed in the outer reaches of the public service schedule outside of London, as Purves noted.

Often overlooked is what the government did to television. The proud old ITV franchises – Granada, Anglia, Tyne Tees, YTV and the rest – were duty-bound to meet a quality threshold serving regional identity. Their programmes were a popular source of pride. But Mrs. Thatcher abolished the threshold and threw franchises open to the highest bidder, however scummy. Successive governments welcomed digital rivals and foreign ownership. Now ITV makes no programmes bar brief news bulletins (and resents for paying for those). Such things erode a sense of belonging.

(Purves 2014, p.25)

I am not writing this as a lament. While many in the industry spent the latter half of the 1990s mourning the end of this era of patronage and benevolence for the few, we are now within sight of a new opportunity for the many made possible by the arrival of low-cost digital equipment, online and mobile platforms, niche audiences, long-tails and, I am going to suggest, the stirrings of a practice-as-research agenda in Higher Education. It would be wrong to exaggerate the extent of the freedom that was given to programme makers in the benevolent era of monopolistic commercial television: for much of my professional life I have felt as if I have been constrained by television journalism, informed by the dominance of a culture of print journalism seeking to simplify and anchor the meaning of a potentially ambiguous visual image through words. During my career I contributed to the production of mainstream entertainment, from *Harry Secombe's Highway* to afternoon game shows and true-crime drama on ITV, and in the process learned valuable skills in how to speak in a popular idiom to a mass audience. Nevertheless, I was fortunate to find a path in a public-service oriented commercial context that also gave me the chance to explore the lyrical, whether that was in documentary films involving the arts, or films about other matters that incorporated what I will call for the moment the poetic use of images.

The public service monopolistic system of licensed ITV franchise holders in the second half of the twentieth century permitted and funded the indulgence of producers and directors who could be creative autonomously in a way that is

no longer sanctioned in the highly competitive, de-regulated commercial environment we have encountered in the first decades of the twenty-first century. The indulgence of that creative space allowed me to travel in a very particular direction during the 1980s and 1990s. Following deregulation, as programme slots became shorter, edits faster, and narration anchored every image very firmly in case the viewer couldn't be trusted to work it out for themselves, I found myself going in the opposite direction. I set out to experiment with techniques that would test the patience of any viewer, let alone a commissioning editor with an eye on the ratings: long takes, static frames, ambiguous images, and the use of that most ambiguous image of all, silence (see for example, *Art in the Living Room*, Border Television, 1997; *The Garden of Cosmic Speculation*, Border Television, 1998). I was interested to see how these techniques could help to counter the cultural dominance of resolution and naturalism. I wanted to create a space for doubt, for interpretation, and for multiple meanings, but also to make use of my knowledge and skills in engaging a wider audience. By the early 2000s, there was no longer a space for me in broadcast television and I became a lecturer in Higher Education.

Now I teach and research at a university I have the opportunity to reflect on the way I have developed as a film-maker and the ideas that became important to me over 25 years of public service broadcasting. At the same time, the opportunity for examination and analysis has brought with it a fear of "letting daylight in upon magic" through problematizing my previously internalised, instinctual practice: I have found the idea of moving from an agenda of simplification, most apparent in populist television journalism, to the requirement to make a virtue of complexity at the other end of the spectrum in academia, both unsettling and liberating. My apprehension that analysis takes away any magic there might be in connecting with the unconscious in creative practice has been matched only by my fear of speaking an unfamiliar liturgy in the company of the high priests of academia, a church with which I have had to become re-acquainted after two decades in the land of mammon. Therefore what follows should be seen as a report on how I have begun to speak about my practice, perhaps simply an articulation of an attitude towards filmmaking, which I have formulated into a more organized form of knowledge and tested through undertaking this research.

In the process of becoming an academic I discovered that there is a word for my method of filmmaking as a documentary filmmaker when applied to academic research: ethnography. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) have suggested “ethnography usually involves the researcher participating, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts – in fact, gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry (2007, p.3). I had been doing that for years (see *Billy Johnson- A Horseman’s Life* 2008). The turning point for me came in the year 2000. I had reached the furthest point of a journey in my filmmaking career, professionally, culturally and geographically, which had taken me away from the mainstream of television and as far away from the hub of London-centric television as it is possible to get. I was running a small independent production company in a remote rural corner of North East England making an ethnographic film about a fishing community, *Village By The Sea*, when I came across events that had all the ingredients of being an international story of significant historical and contemporary interest.

It was the summer of 2000. Millennium Year. A year when people were expecting something dramatic to happen in their lives, except they knew it wouldn’t. But it did happen in mine.

I had arrived to make a documentary about a fishing village at the turn of the millennium. I was renting a small office in Seahouses on the coast of Northumberland, further north in England than much of Scotland. Seahouses tasted of salt, smelled of vinegar and sounded of seagulls. We were on the first floor above a parade of shops: an amusement arcade with a relentless singing machine, a chippie and a hairdressers. Jimmy’s daughter worked at the hairdressers and sometimes she popped up to see her Dad for a lift home or to borrow a fiver. Jimmy worked with me, making documentary features and news items for the local TV station. Sometimes people would drop in for a chat and a coffee. Lloyd, forty-something with a blue fisherman’s smock and greying beard, was a regular customer when he wasn’t taking out divers or fishing parties on his boat. Time was different in Seahouses, governed by the tides and the weather. People had time for stories and I had had to learn that. I called Lloyd our chief researcher because he knew everybody and everything and his stories would sometimes take all afternoon. This particular story was going to take years. I hope you’ve got time to

hear it, because this will be the strangest story you will ever hear. And yet it is true. That is to say, I will tell you in all honesty, what happened to me and what was told to me. And then you must make up your own mind about what really happened.

Lloyd was in the office. It was early summer. You could see the beach from the window, the white breakers on the sand, the dog walkers and the distant walls of Bamburgh Castle, ancient capital of the Kingdom of Northumbria. I put the kettle on. He wanted me to come up to the house to look at some metal bars. They had been found by a party of divers he had taken out to a shipwreck. The romantic in me thought about Conrad's *Nostromo* and the treasure of the Sulacco, a story from the turn of another century. I thought about silver. The sceptic in me thought about fishermen's tales. A few days later I called by the pebble-dashed house with the lobster pot on the coalbunker. As I sat on Lloyd's sofa turning over the weighty silver-coloured ingots in my hands like giant silver bars of Toblerone chocolate I listened to his story.

(Voice-over from documentary film: *Ships That Pass In The Night*)

I approached Channel Four Television, who expressed immediate interest. It seemed that the story was suitable for the documentary strand *Secret History* and development funding was arranged to research the evidence. Despite a tantalizing tale and a willing subject, in the event the evidence was not deemed sufficient to support the radical claims being made about the history. After three years, research in India and repeated visits to the commissioning editor at Channel Four, the plug was pulled. I felt I had the story of a lifetime, and yet I could not get the funding from Channel Four to make the film. Television had changed. I had changed. It was time to move on.

Over the next few years as I became an academic, and as Channel Four blew hot and cold, and mostly cold, I started to reflect on what had led me to find this story and why I wasn't able to tell it in the mainstream of television broadcasting. I thought about how I might use the experience to explore the use of documentary video as an ethnographic methodology to reflect on documentary video as a scholarly method. Moreover, because I had become part of the story, this was going to be auto-ethnography and an opportunity to reflect on the way I have performed my own evolution from television producer to academic filmmaker, self-consciously noting Bourdieu's conception of the researcher as "an active presence" (Bourdieu 1990, p.56).

When I looked back at my unconsidered, internalised and intuitive approach to my documentary filmmaking over two decades, I could see how the process of television documentary production might be adopted as a reflective research tool or method, whilst not making any claims for it being a methodology with all the characteristics of a systematic paradigm that would require. The television documentarist immerses their self in a subject and asks the ‘research’ question: would it make a good story? Time is spent reading and “on the ground”, finding the characters and the story arc. The proposal is imagined and written as a ‘treatment’. The data is collected through a managed process of filming and the results are interpreted, a story told, through a process of editing. Finally the work is published through a screening or broadcast, and then discussed. Through this lived experience as a filmmaker, I was in a position to consider how my industrial professional career, and my more recent reflective activity in a university context, could enable me to test a more complex “writing” with video to articulate a layered understanding of the world, by redefining my practice as a method of academic research.

My transition from following the broadcast industry imperative of making simple, inherent in journalism, to comprehending the value the academy places on complexity and contradiction, is illustrated by the film, *Ships That Pass In The Night*. This film forms the model presented in Chapter Four of this thesis, illustrating the risks involved in leaving the certainties of resolution behind and learning to live with the doubt engendered by evocative and provocative, documentary practice. In that sense, as a documentary filmmaker transitioning from industry to academia, I became the data for my inquiry. It is for these reasons that I chose to undertake this study in the field of Performative Social Science under the supervision of a leading researcher in the field, Dr. Kip Jones, and located my research in the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences at Bournemouth University that has facilitated this methodology.

Acknowledgement

This work would not have been possible without the help, guidance and support of many people. In particular I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Kip Jones, whose inspiration and wise counsel have been my guiding lights. Dr. Jones helped me set the ship on its course, navigate past the dangerous rocks, and find a safe anchorage. I would like to thank Professor Neal White for providing useful charts and pointing out where new lands might be discovered. I would like to thank Professor Hugh Chignell for his benevolent eye in the formative stages of the work. Prior to commencing my PhD at Bournemouth University, Professor John Storey, Professor Andrew Crissell and Dr. Amir Saeed all provided valuable encouragement to set out on the journey at the University of Sunderland. I am grateful to my shipmates Dr. Richard Berger, Dr. Shaun Kimber, and Dr. Chris Pullen for their support and advice throughout.

I would like to thank my parents for inculcating the value of education and their keen anticipation of the journey's end. Lastly, I would like to thank my wife Jill for her patience and understanding and my children Thomas, Jamie and Francesca for showing me the way to academic achievement.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

On Art 12

Tell us the Way of the Books
The Manifold Path of Enlightenment
The Discipline of the Mean
The Abstract of all Knowledge
Give us the Key
Come down from the mountain
With stones of Eternal Truth
So we can ride to market
Eat at the scrubbed table
Used for courts martial
And get on with our lives
As if nothing had happened

Edward Bond (1978)

The problem addressed by this research has been a refinement of the question posed by Lanham (1995), written in the very early days of the personal computer and before the widespread adoption of the Internet. On being asked to define the “Great Books” for the new generation, he wrote:

The real change we must confront and understand is not a new selection of canonical great books but, as our expressive radical moves from print to screen, a new conception of human reason and how Western culture creates and transmits it.

(Lanham 1995, p.98)

This conceptualisation of the need to re-examine the very basis of how we create and transmit our culture has informed the question I wish to consider with regard to the specific use of video in the context of scholarly research: *How can we develop a more complex “writing” with video to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world?* This is the research question at the heart of the inquiry. In the Background to the Research that follows, I describe how the research question has been predicated firstly on the technological shift from analogue to digital media and secondly, the development of Performative methodology, coinciding with my own journey as outlined above.

A. Background to the Research

1. Scholarly argument: Ingraham's Call to Action

My personal development as an academic has occurred in the context of the so-called “digital revolution” (Gulan, 2009) and the disruption surrounding “The Electronic Word” (Lanham, 1993). This has led to my interest in the opportunities that have arisen to develop new forms of scholarly expression using some technologies with which I am familiar and some that are new. Specifically, I am seeking to develop a complexity of understanding appropriate to scholarship that might be articulated through what Jenkins has identified as an emerging “convergence culture” (Jenkins, 2006), which Jenkins subtitled a “new paradigm for understanding media change” (Jenkins, 2006 p.1) and which has set the scene for understanding the changes in popular culture media. I am interested in the impact these changes are making or could make in the way we use media, and specifically here documentary film, in the academy and the consequent impact on how we structure academic argument.

Various researchers have identified the threats to, and opportunities for, academic communication associated with the technological and social innovations in communications, in particular the threat to the book and reading as traditionally conceived (Cope and Phillips 2006). As Thompson (2005) stated in his analysis of the state of academic publishing in the developing digital environment, “The book publishing industry today is going through a process of change which is probably as profound as anything it has experienced since Johann Gutenberg adapted the traditional screw press for the purposes of manufacturing printed texts” (Thompson 2005 p.1). As an historian, Poe (2012) has identified the need to adapt to the media that are prevalent and popular, in order to engage with society, and in the context of his film productions presented in *YouTube*, he views the changes in technology as an opportunity to be grasped by academics.

Advances in technology—computer applications and the Internet, specifically—have made it possible for historians like me to reach the public quite easily. Not, of course, with books. People still don't like to read academic books, and they never will. We now can, however, reach them with audio and video, two media that people

like very much.... As far as I can recall, almost no layperson (that is, a non-academic) has ever contacted me about my published research. In contrast, "users" of *YouTube* comment on the above-mentioned historical videos daily. Thousands of comments have accumulated. Some are thoughtful, and some aren't. But all of them are evidence of engagement.

(Poe 2012)

Whilst there is universal awareness of the technological shift, few have considered the relationship between text, meaning, and modes of scholarship and the impact of changing media technology on these. One academic who has considered the problem is Ingraham (2000).

My particular and autobiographical interest has lain in investigating the scope for novel forms of documentary filmmaking as a method of scholarship. In the course of my research I have adapted the techniques I learned as a television filmmaker to "write with video" as an academic researcher. The impetus to take this line of questioning further was provided by a paper (Ingraham 2000), which I noted in the early stages of my personal academic journey. Writing at an early stage in the development of the digital moving image (for example, six years before the advent of *YouTube*), Ingraham states that he addresses the hypothesis

...that scholarly argument as it is presently pursued is mediated through print; but the advent of modern ICT [Information and Communication Technologies] offers alternative media to support scholarly publication. However, few academics have much expertise with these media. Accordingly, if this technology is to be fully exploited the academic community will need to acquire such expertise and this may have significant implications on the way in which scholarly argument is constructed. This hypothesis is addressed from a rhetorical perspective and consideration is given to what the impact of alternative publication media may be on the structure of scholarly argument.

(Ingraham, 2000 p.1)

I have reflected on this as I have developed the film *Ships That Pass In The Night*, which I have employed as the research data for the exploration of the creative use of non-fiction narratives. I have been inspired by the example of Jones' (2013) award winning short film *Rufus Stone* developed from the research project *Gay and Pleasant Land? (Fenge and Jones 2012)*, a study about sexuality, ageing and rurality in South West England and Wales from which Jones has developed other narrative expressions:

Both the film and this short story are fiction, or what I prefer to call ‘fictive reality’. Fictive reality is conceived as the ability to engage in imaginative and creative invention while remaining true to the remembered realities as told through the narrations of others. Several, in fact, may recount a similar incident. When these reports are combined into one person’s story or a “composite” character, a “fiction” is born.

(Jones 2013a)

In the process, I have become interested in exploring the dynamic spaces where documentary film overlaps with art, drama, journalism and academic reflection and the way we tell stories using objects as a focal point for our “witness”. As such, this thesis is a report on my response to Ingraham’s call to the academic community to examine “the way in which scholarly argument is constructed” in the light of new technology and “alternative publication media”, and to explore what “the impact of alternative publication media may be on the structure of scholarly argument” (Ingraham 2000, p.1).

The documentary film seems to me a particularly apposite form in which to investigate this topic because the genre has traditionally been associated with the production and dissemination of knowledge based on direct observation. The application of the form to academic study has long been recognized as a valuable tool for research, for example, in areas such as visual anthropology and medicine (Banks and Morphy 1999). Ellis (2011), however, notes the impact of changing technology on how the subject, filmmaker and audience have engaged with documentary films in increasingly complex ways. I am interested in how Ellis’s observation of “the inherent imperfection of the documentary project” in which “documentary communication may be adequate but never perfect” (Ellis 2011, p.155) lends itself as a method within a philosophical framework of reflective practice. Ellis (2011) notes the developing self-referential response of filmmakers to the increasing sophistication of subjects and audiences and concludes, “...documentaries still excite argument and debate just as much as they provoke strong empathetic emotions. As communication they are all the more urgent now that we can appreciate their complexity both in their production and in their viewing” (Ellis 2011, p.156). The complexity offered by the documentary imagination, here expressed in the form of film, is the starting point for my inquiry into its usefulness in academic discourse and its impact on the structure of performative scholarly argument.

2. Performative Social Science: Re-thinking Scholarly Argument

I have used the opportunity provided by the "data" of my documentary *Ships That Sail In The Night* to explore the use of film as a creative academic research tool and extend knowledge about the application of the methodology known as Performative Social Science, as Jones (2006, p.5) has adapted it from the term first coined by Denzin (2001). See Definitions for further discussion of this. Although there is a growing body of literature in the field of written performative methods in service of the methodology, there has been very little research undertaken in the context of using video technology. Because this research seeks to develop a more complex use of images as a way of organizing knowledge in the documentary form, I argue an empiricist methodological framework is not appropriate. The positivist discourse of hypothesis and the subsequent testing and recording of observations is replaced by a qualitative approach underpinned by Performative Social Science, which understands knowledge as a process of creation rather than discovery. Roberts (2008) asks "What would a performative research "practice" in general or in a particular case...look like?" and "what kind of researcher is a "performative social science" researcher?"(Roberts 2008, p.38). The research presented here is intended to contribute answers to these questions in the specific context of the performative application documentary film production using video technology.

In a similar vein, (Shields 2011) examines how the barriers between forms are starting to dissolve and questions, "What happens when an essay begins to behave less like an essay and more like a poem. What happens when an essayist starts imagining things, making things up, filling in blank spaces, or leaving the blanks blank? What happens when statistics, reportage, and observation in an essay are abandoned for image, emotion, expressive transformation?" (Shields 2011, p.27). The practice element of this thesis examines and reports on these questions in the context of performative documentary film and scholarship. I have found Jones' (2006) application of Bourriaud's (2002) philosophy of *Relational Aesthetics* valuable in this regard. Jones suggests that Bourriaud "offers a post-modern, contemporary framework that allows social scientists to think about aesthetics and means of dissemination from the arts in our work in refreshing ways" (Jones 2006 p.72). This has given

me the confidence to consider ‘a renewed interest in an aesthetic of storytelling’ (Jones 2006 p.66) in an academic environment. Jones asks, where can we find an aesthetic in which to base our new “performative” social science. He suggests a need to move beyond the imitation of the traditional Western rationalist scientific method, and emphasises the need to discover a new place for the creative and (counter?) intuitive. This position is underpinned by the neo-pragmatist approach of contemporary philosophers such as Rorty (1989), who highlights the “contingent irony” in the rejection of representational forms of knowledge. Rorty states: “I find it tempting to think of our culture as an increasingly poeticized one...and to say that we are gradually emerging from scientism... into something else, something better” (Rorty in Hiley et al. 1992, p.80).

3. The Research Gap

Despite the valuable contributions each of these and other writers make within their own fields, there has been no research that draws together a clear conceptualisation of how we can develop a more complex performative “writing” with video to articulate an understanding of the world that goes beyond the “offer” of documentary film in its popular cultural forms. Returning to the catalyst for the inquiry that I am reporting here, Ingraham (2000) states:

Underlying this hypothesis is, as will doubtless become apparent, a very real concern, of the post-modernist kind, about the legitimacy of current modes of scholarly argument. However, I do not really wish to enter into that debate here. Rather I want to address the problem from a somewhat more practical point of view by asking, first, what contemporary ICT [Information and Communication Technologies] has to offer to scholarly argument; and, then, by asking what, in practical terms, are the implications of that for scholarly argument as it presently pursued.

(Ingraham, 2000, p.2)

Ingraham underlines that it is not his intention to interrogate “the legitimacy of current modes of scholarly argument” in the context of what new forms of media have to offer, whilst noting that it is “a very real concern” (Ingraham 2000, p.2). This is precisely the terrain in which I am staking my claim, narrowing the field

down to the questioning and reporting on, the specific confines of the performative application of documentary video.

By extending the boundaries of the documentary form using a worked example and reflecting on the articulation of scholarship, the research reported on in this thesis will ask whether a creative approach to documentary film, by way of an example, may offer new ways of speaking, drawing on examples of practice in other fields from the literary non-fiction and New Journalism (Wolfe, 1973) of the 1960s and 1970s, to the Verbatim Theatre of the present day (National Theatre 2015), and ask if it is possible to identify similar conditions for the creation of a new performative form of documentary in video led by metaphor. As noted in my own journey from broadcaster to academic, the limitations of an increasingly formulaic broadcast environment have served to encourage experiment elsewhere. As Dams (2010) reports, this has been identified by Woolcock: “A real documentary adventure is where the outcome is uncertain...Does it matter that we lie to people? I think that it does...Times change. They must. There is a thriving documentary scene outside television”(Woolcock, cited Dams 2010). Parker (2014) quotes the celebrated documentary filmmaker Roger Graef commenting on the rise of formulaic television:

He recalls a conversation with Discovery-owned TLC, which had three conditions for a series on global crime: no more than 20% sync dialogue (for translation purposes in its 167 markets); no scene more than 80 seconds long; and no music in a minor key. “You can imagine what I said,” he recalls wryly. “My dears, I have no idea how much dialogue there will be, and it seems like the minor key might work for crime...” He laughs. “It didn’t happen.”

(Parker 2014)

With the development of documentary video practice and distribution no longer constrained by the formulaic constructions of current broadcast formats, many filmmakers have felt able to adopt the more complex notions of truth marked by contradictory and competing narratives in a manner more familiar to artists and academics (Galloway et al. 2007). My research has led me to develop a novel documentary method based on the competing narratives and contradictions in the lived experience of the filmmaker, which is embodied in my own practice and that I am reporting on in this thesis. The personal challenge has been to let go of my own broadcast training and view the material in new ways that engage with

the values of scholarship as, for example, identified by Boyer (1997). In this regard, in trying to reposition myself as a scholar, I have found it useful to refer to the “Quality conception of scholarship” identified by Brew (1999).

It is perhaps in the Quality conception of scholarship that the question of value is uppermost. This conception is qualitatively different from the others because it refers not to what is done; i.e. the content of scholarship, but rather to the way academic work is done. It is here that the idea of what it means to be a professional in the academy resides. The Quality conception contains the *raison d’être* for academic work; a reason why it is special. It gives expression to why and how academic work is different from activities engaged in, for example, in other contexts. This is where the idea of value is uppermost.

(Brew 1999, p. 11)

Brew suggests that understanding “the Quality conception of scholarship” has a particular relevance to “the context of changing ideas of knowledge and knowing” and that it will help us to find a new basis for judgement as scholars “in the face of challenges to traditional notions of objectivity and rationality brought about by critical perspectives” (Brew 1999, p.11). This approach understands the dynamic nature of the term scholarship and the way it has been informed by historical context. Brew identifies the malleability of the term and that the understanding of scholarship is subject to the needs of the moment.

If we are to understand the nature of research in academic contexts, we would need to understand more about the historical context which shaped an academic world with such diverse notions of scholarship and where its relationship to research is so confusing. For as one of the researchers interviewed said: “Scholarship isn’t just a static category, but it’s developing and evolving along with people’s interests. So what people thought scholarship was in the 19th Century or the early 20th Century is not what people think scholarship is today...”

(Brew 1999, p.11)

The understanding that scholarship is evolving has contributed to asking how “writing with video” might be an opportunity offered by the changing technologies of digital media and how this has the potential to shape the structure of scholarly argument. Having considered the circumstances that have led me to question the nature of scholarship in “The Digital Age” (Ginsberg 2008) I am now going to outline how I have refined the questioning that I have identified in the preceding sections into an investigation with a specified aim.

B. The Research Problem

1. The Aim of the Research

The aim of the research has been to discover by practice new ways in which documentary video might be developed and extended as a performative academic research tool, through the exploration of the coinciding developments in the newly emerging field of Performative Social Science and in the "new subjectivity" appearing in documentary film practice (Renov 2004). The aim of the research has required the examination of opportunities for developing new forms of understanding brought about by changing social, cultural and technological contexts that have made it possible to apply new tools and methods in researching and disseminating knowledge. Self-consciously working in the context of an academic tradition that has grown out of a literary culture and developed its own linguistic power relations (Bourdieu et al. 1996), the aim has involved consideration of how a visual culture might be reclaimed from a dominant popular discourse and applied in a context of scholarship. The aim of the research has required questioning what a documentary film as a performative academic research tool might look like, what new methodologies of investigation and reflection might be developed using video, and how it might differ from the industrial conventions of broadcast documentary film. The aim of the research therefore has required that I reflect on the transition in my own practice. These are the intentions of the research that are explored through the written thesis and accompanying practice, as articulated in the research question formulated below.

2. The Research Problem and Sub-Questions

The research problem has been identified as an investigation by video practice into the performative application of documentary film in scholarship. The research question can be broken down into the following two sub-questions:

- 1) How might knowledge be constructed performatively in documentary film?
- 2) How might documentary film be employed as a Performative Social Science research tool?

The documentary film, *Ships That Pass In The Night*, which has been developed as “data” for this inquiry, will be used to explore the research question and sub-questions above. Referring to this “data”, I will question whether we can develop a more complex expression with video than is commonly found in popular culture, to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world by using the term scholarship as defined by the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise: ‘A process of original investigation undertaken to further knowledge and understanding of particular phenomena’ (see Appendix III). Responding to the call from Nelson (2006), I will be considering how we can utilize novel and convergent technologies to create a new academic aesthetic incorporating what Nelson terms “arts research” as a counter to the positivist model “scientific research”. Nelson claims “it is time to speak less of “practice as research” and to speak instead of arts research (a significant methodology of which just happens to be based in practices)” (Nelson 2006, p.105). Jones (2006) cites Taylor (2001), an Associate Professor of Physics at the University of Oregon, in this context: “Art and science have a common thread - both are fuelled by creativity. Whether writing a paper based on my data or filling a canvas with paint, both processes tell a story.” Jones notes the need to look

....beyond the safety of our own discipline, with its protocols, procedures and “ring-fenced areas of expertise”The trick is, I believe, to remember that art and science are both ‘fuelled by creativity’ (Taylor 2001) and that the potential for inventiveness resides within all of us. After all is said, creativity is that uncanny ability to work within rule boundaries while, at the same time, changing them.

(Jones 2006, p.12)

This dissertation will contextualize the research problem outlined above, and the associated research sub-questions, borrowing from theories of subjective cinema, literary journalism, and digital convergence in the search for a new method of performative scholarship utilizing documentary video. The two sub-questions will follow on systematically from one to another. To ask ‘how knowledge is constructed performatively in documentary film’ will lead to the more specific drilling down into ‘how we can employ documentary film as a performative research tool’.

C. Justification For The Research

If we take Lanham's call for "a new conception of human reason and how Western culture creates and transmits it" (Lanham, 1995, p.98) as the root of the research problem identified here, we can identify as yet unexplored areas of inquiry with regard to the use of film in the context of scholarly research on both theoretical and practical grounds. We can note three significant disruptions to 'traditional' scholarship as expressed by three writers, mapping out this territory as fertile ground for further exploration. Specifically, these disruptions can be conceptualized around new conceptions of pedagogical knowledge (Bourdieu 1995), new technology (Ingraham 2000), and new methodology (Jones 2006).

1. Disruption to Pedagogy

One justification for the inquiry lies in the historical understanding of the development of scholarship as a linguistic and text-based mode of discourse. Bourdieu's work is predicated on the crucial dependency of education (and hence scholarship) on language, and the notion that academic discourse is an expression of pedagogical power (Bourdieu 1990). Bourdieu considers how the "scholastic point of view" informs a systematic approach that determines the nature of study and denies alternative logics. He identifies the use of text-based scholarship as a means to maintain 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu 1990) using the concept of 'Field' in relation to education. This gives rise to questions about scholarship in the context of new media technologies, technologies that may become less dependent on the written word in the future but which will transform the way in which we creatively engage with text. Bourdieu's work leaves unanswered questions about the future direction of scholarly 'habitus' defined as "schemes of perception, thought and action" (Bourdieu 1989, p.14) as expressed through a linguistic register that may itself become redundant. His work sets the stage for further investigation into the way the essential schemes of our thinking are shaped by and inform the discourses we use, and his emphasis on a reflexive methodology suggests new ways forward for the self-conscious, performative use of film and other digital media forms in a scholastic context.

2. Disruption to Technology

A second justification for the research is based on the advent of new technology as identified by Ingraham (2000). Ingraham notes the ways in which scholarly argument has been mediated through print historically and, as noted, suggests that the advent of new technologies “may have significant implications for the way in which scholarly argument is constructed”. He states this “has received too little consideration.” He identifies “a very real concern, of the post-modernist kind, about the legitimacy of current modes of scholarly argument” but states that he does “not really wish to enter into that debate here”(Ingraham, 2000, p.2). Instead he pursues the practical implications of the use of new technology with particular reference to the use of hypertext and other forms of multimedia in the delivery of print-based scholarly argument, and considers this in the context of the concept of rhetoric. However, he notes, “at this early stage of multimedia scholarship there are as yet no well-developed scholarly models”. (Ingraham, 2000,p.6) For example, Ingraham states that in a broadcast television documentary, “there are no footnotes. However sound the argument, the one thing contemporary television documentaries never are is ‘well-documented’” (Ingraham, 2000,p14). This is not insurmountable, as Jones has shown by including footnotes in the scripts for his productions, for example, *The One About Princess Margaret* (Jones 2007). It is the purpose of this thesis to report on the search for a model of performative scholarship through the medium of documentary film that may offer an alternative strategy to the textual forms of academic expression and suggest new forms of rhetoric that will evolve, where even the concept of footnotes may not be relevant to new conceptions of reason.

3. Disruption to Methodology

The third justification for this inquiry is the recent development of Performative Social Science as a methodological approach to scholarship that has shifted the emphasis away from a dependence on the written text and towards the use of “tools” from the arts and humanities to aid our understanding. This innovation in qualitative methodology, drawn partially from ethnography, is open to new

forms of research and dissemination that emphasize particularly a reliance on reflexivity, for example through auto-ethnography, in which the researcher can use their own life as a resource or as a conduit for expressing ideas. For this aspect, as mentioned above, I am drawing on the work of Jones (2006) who identifies and contextualizes “publication” of research as a performative act, demonstrating the understanding of inter-human relations through Bourriaud’s (2002) philosophy of “Relational Aesthetics”. Jones states that “One place to start is in our (re)presentations of narrative stories, through publications, presentations and performances” (Jones 2006, p.66) and I use this as a springboard for my own research into novel forms of research and presentation of scholarship through documentary video. This is an evolving and dynamic area of inquiry that invites further research that will be undertaken in this inquiry.

To summarise the rationale for the inquiry, clear gaps in the academic discourse from these three disruptions can be identified to justify the contribution to knowledge that will result. Specifically they are:

1. The changing historical conceptualisation and questioning of text-dominated knowledge as a construct that has been identified by Bourdieu (1990) as a form of pedagogical power;
2. The opportunity offered by technology for new forms of scholarly understanding as indicated by Ingraham (2000);
3. The creation of new performative forms of research and publication as highlighted by Jones (2006).

These three disruptions suggest justification for the inquiry into the performative application of documentary film in scholarship. The questions that have been identified arising from the changing landscape as delineated above will help to shape and inform the research, whilst the absence of previous work in the field of documentary technique and Performative Social Science suggests an opportunity for novel inquiry in this area.

D. Methodology

The methodology adopted within this inquiry is a qualitative, performative and auto-ethnographic form of practice-based research, whereby the process of discovery and expression of the outcomes has involved documentary film production for the creation of the data and for the dissemination of the findings.

Nelson (2006) notes the primacy accorded to the relationship between the artwork and the documentation in adopting this methodology:

One of the major issues to have emerged from the investigation of PaR [Practice-as-Research] over the past five years, then, is whether practice-based arts research can be aligned with established research paradigms or whether, for the academy fully to embrace its outcomes, requires a shift in the conception of what constitutes research, and even what constitutes knowledge.

(Nelson, 2006, p.2)

Nelson's identification of the possible need for "a shift in the conception of what constitutes research, and even what constitutes knowledge" as forms of practice-based research are adopted, is closely aligned to Ingraham's (2000) assertion that the new technologies and platforms for mediating scholarship "may have significant implications on the way in which scholarly argument is constructed". The methodology of practice-based research chosen for this inquiry is, therefore, directly relevant to the questions identified as being at the heart of the research.

E. Outline of the Report

The written dissertation is structured as a companion document to the documentary film that forms chapter four. The dissertation outlines the background to the research, sets a context to the work in a review of the existing literature, and describes the methodological approach undertaken. The documentary film is presented both as data and as reflection on the data as a method of performative research in relation to the questions asked (Chapter IV). Finally the last chapter is presented as a written text to consider data and the directions future research might take in understanding how we can we develop the performative application of documentary film to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world. Jones has written:

I believe that the writing up of our projects should be ancillary to this new performative work; the text should never be our main output. For me, more interesting as documents are the scripts themselves or the notes or the diagrammatic evidence that our projects leave behind as a kind of trail, trace or map.

(Jones 2013b, p.14)

This dissertation has been written to provide a map of the trail that led to the thesis, for as Edward Bond wrote, “After your meal, write, Art is not magic” (Bond 1978).

F. Definition of Terms

Documentary

Ellis (2012, p.1) states “Documentary is easy to identify but difficult to define”. In using the term ‘documentary’ I am referring here to a broadly understood set of intentions, practices and philosophies involving the observation and recording of the world in literary, photographic, electronic and other media. I find it useful to consider this set of intentions, practices and philosophies under the term “the documentary imagination”, embracing the full range of modalities identified by (Nichols 2001) in the context of documentary filmmaking. I am making a distinction in practice, intention and history with journalism and with art, though both these categories of activity may overlap with the documentary imagination in some aspects and this will be considered later.

New Media

In using the term ‘new media’ I mean the electronic forms of communication that have emerged in the last decade of the twentieth century utilising digital and computer-based electronic processes. These media have developed and extended existing media forms: for example television and radio have become interactive in some respects and the remediation (Bolter and Grusin 1999) of existing texts is apparent. In addition, novel and hybrid forms have been developed that are specific to digital technology such as websites, blogs, and tablets and mobile

phones. They are characterized by: wider access to the means of production and distribution; the breakdown of boundaries between producer and consumer through “user-generated” content; and non-media experiences by users who are no longer passive ‘audiences’.

Performative (and Performative Social Science – PSS)

The terms, “performative” and “performativity” have a wide range of meanings (Schneider, 2002 p.110). The linguistic philosopher J.L. Austin introduced the concept of performative ‘illocutionary’ acts whereby an utterance becomes performative so that ‘to *say* something is to *do* something’ (Austin 1975), such as “I pronounce you man and wife’. This is a useful starting point in understanding the application of the term, though limited to performed speech that is based on actions. Developed by others subsequently (Searle 1969; Lyotard 1984; Butler 1988), the concept of “performativity” has since been linked to the idea that everything in society is socially constructed, in common with the philosophical stance of post-structuralism. Subsequently, the term “performative” has been used in the context of a sub-set of qualitative social science research methodologies and should not be confused with the application of performance in the context of theatre practice or staging. Moreover, since this investigation is actively considering documentary practice it is important to point out the use of the term here is not to be confused with the specific documentary mode (as in “performative documentary” meaning the active participation of the filmmaker on-screen) categorized by Nichols (2001), though it is not unrelated in its usage. Denzin (2001) identifies “a performative sensibility” in considering the place of the interview in reflexive ethnographic research and suggests it can be viewed as an interpretive practice through creative expression in the pursuit of knowledge.

The present moment is defined by a performative sensibility, by a willingness to experiment with different ways of presenting an interview text. The performative sensibility turns interviews into performance texts, into poetic monologues. It turns interviewees into performers, into persons whose words and narratives are then performed by others. As Richardson (1997:121) argues, in the post-experimental period no discourse has a privileged place, no method

or theory has a universal and general claim to authoritative knowledge.

(Denzin 2001,p.25)

The interest here is more radical in turning the “performative sensibility” in directions that propose alternatives to the use of text. Interestingly, Jones (2008) in referring to Performative Social Science (PSS) during an editorial conversation with Mary Gergen, notes:

Those particularly attracted to PSS in higher education include people who bring creative problem solving skills to their academic pursuits. These are the same people who saw standard PowerPoint presentations and said, "Hey! We can do this better!"

(Gergen and Jones 2008, p.29)

For Jones, the key indicator of the performative method is the acknowledgement of the role of the audience in interpreting the work.

When we move to the performative as researchers, we cede "control" of interpretation of our work to our audience. This is the singularly most important shift in practice that PSS makes. Ironically and at the same time, we gift ourselves with the opportunity to be more interpretive, more intuitive, more creative, in our outputs. Our job is not so much to convince as to provoke and stimulate.

(Gergen and Jones 2008, p.10)

This report is undertaken in the spirit of provocation as Jones intimates above and acknowledges Jones’ highlighting of the imperative of Performative Social Science to trust the audience with whatever interpretation they bring to the work.

Practice-based Research

Practice-based Research (Nelson 2006) is defined here as a method of original investigation to obtain or create new knowledge at least partly involving the use of creative practice such as artistic creation through painting, music, design, media production or performance to provide the data of the research. The outcomes might include artefacts and the work is underpinned by a subsequent written contextualization, reflection and documentation of the process.

Practice-led Research

Practice-led research (Nelson 2006) is defined here as inquiry where the practice forms the early stages of the inquiry and is a catalyst for non-practice outcomes.

Practice-as-Research (PaR)

Practice-as-research (Nelson 2006) is defined here as a method of inquiry whereby the artistic practice informs every aspect of the research and dissemination process. It may be that there is no reliance on other non-practice contextualization, reflection and documentation.

Scholarship

The 2014 UK Research Excellence Framework defined *research* as “a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared”, and defined *scholarship* as “the creation, development and maintenance of the intellectual infrastructure of subjects and disciplines, in forms such as dictionaries, scholarly editions, catalogues and contributions to major research databases”(REF 2014). The term scholarship is used more broadly here to refer to the practices that underpin research and dissemination of the research within the context of the social and cultural practices of teaching and learning in Higher Education.

In the context of Higher Education in Britain, the terms ‘research’, ‘scholarship’ and ‘scholarly activity’ have been used interchangeably in recent years as a shorthand for professional practices in Higher Education that are differentiated from teaching. The exclusion of teaching from ‘scholarly activity’ is an inappropriate limitation to the scope of this research. However, the term ‘scholarship’ can be applied more usefully, without the institutional baggage attached to ‘scholarly activity’. Therefore, it is useful to think more critically about the discourse of pedagogy in the context of this inquiry to achieve a more precise application of the term ‘scholarship’, which is a key term in this investigation. In order to develop confidence in the use of the term in this thesis,

it is relevant to include Boyer's (1990) four "domains of scholarship", namely, Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching.

A Note on the Use of the Terms 'Film' and 'Video'

In common with general usage, I apply the terms 'film' and 'video' interchangeably, although both have roots in different technologies. The term film tends to be used currently as a generic expression for moving image immaterial of the technology on which it was originated. Therefore it is possible that a film might have been made using video technology, which is frequently the case now in both production and postproduction. The term "digital film production" is becoming familiar as an expression of this understanding. The novelist William Gibson made this observation at a key moment of the technological disruption that has already been noted:

Digital video strikes me as a new platform wrapped in the language and mythology of an old platform. Lamb dressed as mutton, somewhat in the way we think of our cellular systems as adjuncts of copper-wire telephony. The way we still "dial" on touchpads. We call movies "film," but the celluloid's drying up. Film today is already in a sense digital, since it's all edited using an Avid.

(Gibson 1999)

I use the term video to refer to the electronic origination of the image whether analogue or digital. Whist my practice invariably involves the use of video technology, I regard myself in common with my fellow video practitioners as a filmmaker.

G. Conclusion

In this chapter I have laid the foundations for the report. In the introduction I have made clear the background to the research, indicating the challenges for a practitioner in bringing a critical perspective to their intuitive professional and creative practice. I have noted the implications for the academy of the advent of digital technology and the ontological imperative as academics seek new forms

of articulation that do not depend on a positivist, scientific paradigm and epistemology. I have noted the consequent research gap that has become evident in considering the impact of new media forms on the processes of scholarship and scholarly argument. The aims of the research were clarified and the notion of developing a performative method I am calling a Creative Academic Research Tool was proposed.

I have formulated the gap in knowledge noted above as a research problem and I have specified the research question: *How can we develop a more complex “writing” with video to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world?* and the associated research sub-questions. I have justified the rationale for the research based around the identification of three disruptions: to knowledge, technology and methodology. I have indicated the potential value of Performative Social Science through reflective practice as a methodology to examine the problem. The definitions of terms were set out and the report was outlined. On these foundations, the report will proceed with a review of the literature to aid our understanding of how we might develop a more complex “writing” with video to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world, using a performative, knowledge-making documentary film as the practice on which this report rests.

Chapter II

Literature Review

On Art 7

Whenever you see an artist
Look at him closely

He should look like a man
Who's come round a corner

He should look like a man
Who expects surprises

Who distrusts maps
But carries a map in his pocket

Edward Bond (1978)

A. Introduction To The Literature Review

Three clear and recent disruptions to 'traditional' scholarship have been noted. These are:

- (1) Changing conceptions of knowledge;
- (2) Developments in the media technology available to academics;
- (3) New thinking in qualitative methodologies.

This thesis suggests that these distinct areas of study could be drawn on and drawn together to make a coherent argument for further research discovering the potential value of reflective filmic practice as a re-conceptualised form of scholarly understanding and expression, and more specifically, the application of documentary video as a "creative academic research tool" in the service of performative methodology.

The rationale is summarized as follows:

- (1) There has been recent questioning of the construction of text-determined knowledge that informs this research;
- (2) There is an opportunity offered by new technology for innovative techniques and outputs of scholarly understanding;
- (3) There is increasing interest in the academy in the creation of performative forms of discovery, publication and dissemination.

The summary above forms the basis for the organization of a survey of the contextualizing literature into three coherent sections, which are sub-divided, creating a path for the progression of the argument. This will lead towards the rationale for the performative methodology to be outlined as a means by which to address the research questions of this thesis. This is the map that I am carrying in my pocket.

Firstly, I will look critically at the literature on scholarship, questioning what it means to be scholarly, noting the historical and institutional determinants of the term, and its codification within pedagogic and research practice as the process of creation and dissemination of new knowledge. This will be examined in relation to the institutional context of the communication of knowledge in Higher Education, to understand the purpose of scholarly communication within Higher Education (for example through the teaching of writing for academic purposes, ‘papers’ and presentations). This will lead to a consideration of the literature about the relationship between scholarship and language, the literary and textual basis of knowledge and its codification in scholarship as a form of power, as explored by Bourdieu (1990) and others. The concept of irony (Rorty 1989) will be examined in some detail as a philosophical under-pinning, anchoring the research in a performative context. This leads directly to considering the justification of Lanham’s (1995) assertion of a crisis in knowledge, which has already been noted as a catalyst for this research. Then I will consider the impact of technology on the development of scholarly rhetoric and the production of a canon of work. I will review the value placed historically on non-textual practice in scholarship, for example through music, art and dance, and by extension, therefore, setting the scene for what might be required of a

filmic documentary methodology to function in the academy. In summary, the contextualization will locate what might be expected of documentary film as an alternative non-textual scholarly mode of discourse in response to the research problem of discovering *how we can develop the performative application of documentary film in scholarship*.

Secondly, I will be reviewing the literature concerning technological changes in media production and dissemination, considering critically the significant outputs around the concept and terminology of the “digital revolution” (Ginsberg 2008), the perceived displacement of the “book” by other forms of electronic media (Cope and Phillips 2006), and assessing the extent of technological convergence of the last fifteen years and its impact on the academy (Jenkins 2008). Consideration will also be given to the context of the development of a visually based popular culture and its impact on academic communication. The growing body of work researching contemporary developments in how we perform our lives with screen media will be considered, asking how researchers can respond and adapt if they are to communicate beyond the academy as well as exploit the benefits of new media within the academy (Vannini 2012).

Thirdly, to locate the relevance of documentary filmmaking to the research problem that has been identified, I will consider literature that might link the search for new qualitative methodologies and creative practice in this context. It is important to note that whilst observational documentary techniques have been a long-accepted tool of ethnography and visual anthropology using film, photography and other media within an analytic, positivist and quasi-scientific paradigm, the intention here is to review the literature pertaining to the evocative trend within auto-ethnography. I acknowledge the value of recent developments in visual anthropology such as the turn towards “sensory ethnography” developed by the Harvard Sensory Ethnography Lab utilising current audio-visual technology, whilst noting that foregrounding myself as the subject requires an understanding of subjective reportage drawn from areas founded upon an epistemology of doubt and engagement with the incoherence of self. Therefore I am borrowing not from literature underpinned by a naïve realism of objective ethnographic recording of the “other”, but rather from the

altogether different traditions of subjective literature and cinema. By turning the gaze upon myself and the landscapes that inhabit me, I am contextualising the work in the literature of the performative, auto-ethnographic expression of self, rather than engaging in more detail with the literature of ethnographic filmmaking and visual anthropology per se. Instead, this section will look at texts that question how we may learn from models of reflective practice in related areas, for example by considering characteristics of literary journalism, aspects of poetic documentary practice, and what has been termed “subjective” and “essay” cinema (Rascaroli 2009). This paves the way for me to locate my own reflective documentary film practice. This section concludes with deliberation as to how the research question might be extended as filmmaking itself is being challenged by developments in new media and multi-platform technologies, which are reflected for example in Jenkins conceptualization of the “world-making” role of knowledge practices (Jenkins 2008).

The review of literature in these diverse fields will draw on the relevant texts to suggest that there is scope for research into how documentary methods might offer new possibilities for performative research and dissemination in scholarship. This survey of the field will lead me to ask whether performative scholarship might be a response to Nelson’s (2006) call for ‘art research’ as distinct from the dominant models of ‘scientific research’, in seeking to understand how we can develop a more complex “writing” with video.

B. The Historical Context of Scholarly Discourse

To investigate how we can articulate a scholarly understanding of the world performatively through documentary film, it is necessary to review the way in which academic discourse has developed historically in relation to previous developments in communication, and examine how future developments in the digital era might be located within that trajectory. Although the focus here is limited to the developing relationship between scholarship and communicative technology, we need to place scholarship within an understanding of how means of expression, ontology and epistemology have developed relative to each other.

The contemporary organization of academic discourse takes place within an international framework of Higher Education rooted in a Western intellectual tradition. Derrida located the origins of the dominant epistemologies of the Western intellectual tradition within an Hellenic, Judaic and Christian heritage characterised by a belief in a transcendental being to whom meaning could always be traced (Derrida 1998), drawing on an ontological conception of logocentrism, in which written communication was historically positioned as a symbolic representation of the real.

We can connect this “tradition” to notions of religious perennialism from the monastic foundations of Medieval Europe following Thomas Aquinas in the twelfth century to Cardinal Newman’s Christian educational perennialism, articulated in *The Idea of a University* in the nineteenth century (Newman 2014), in which knowledge was valued for its eternal truths. This has been echoed subsequently in secular perennialism, for example through “The Great Conversation” (Hutchins 1952) in which a canon of textual knowledge is promoted as foundational to scholarly discourse. The secular perennialism of the twentieth century (Hutchins 1952, Adler and Doren 2011), has endured with a self-conscious appreciation of a classical legacy of literary texts, articulating the Socratic method as well as a canon of work. It is the idea of a canon, which is of interest here. Without suggesting a reductive and naive technocratic determinism, there is a growing body of work (Ridder-Symoens 1991) that shows how the creation of books contributed to the establishment of libraries and subsequently universities, campuses, and eventually the foundation of the institutional arrangements of Higher Education, with which we are now familiar on an international scale. This links directly to the research problem presented here in relation to the impact of the digital revolution on the modes of research and transmission of scholarship.

In recent years there has been a systematic attempt to model historically the relationship of the means of communication available at a particular time to the contemporary ontology and epistemology (Postman 1985). In the early twenty-first century, some (Albéra and Tortajada 2010) have suggested that we are beginning to see the impact of digital communication on our current epistemological framework. In contrast to the proposition of a canon and fixed

body of knowledge of preceding generations, Katz (2010) has characterised the progression to the “scholarly enterprise in the digital age” as culminating in

...new teaching and learning practices and even in declarations of a "new epistemology." Elements of this new epistemology include a belief in socially constructed knowledge and in the existence of multiple right answers. The new epistemology treats knowledge as a continuity rather than a dichotomy, and its proponents distrust the professed expert, the fixity of curriculum, and the equation of academic progress or attainment with the mastery of facts.

(Katz 2010, p.52)

Dede (2008) has indicated that the changes in epistemology in the digital age will be far-reaching as universities were founded in a context of scarcity for the control of knowledge. Katz notes “today the Digital Age is turning scarcity into abundance, it is eroding the exclusivity of the scholarly enterprise, and it is opening academic information and resources to all”. He asks, “Could a millennium-old jig be up?” (Katz 2010, p.52). The impact of communication technology on the framing of knowledge has been described by Ong (1982).

C. Ong’s Typology of Orality and Literacy

To understand how text has had a significant impact on the dominance of particular epistemologies, and hence on the barriers to non-textual communication in the academy, we need to refer to Ong’s typology of systems of communication (Ong 1982). This is relevant to the research question as it underpins the possibility of a shift to new forms of communication in an era that might be conceived as “beyond text”. Ong’s work has been foundational in understanding the impact of print technology on society, subsequent to the development of type by Gutenberg in 1440. The work is relevant to the research problem presented here in that we might extend Ong’s typology and understanding as we move beyond print.

Ong’s research was extended in a populist vein by McLuhan during the 1960s and, whilst headline titles such as “The medium is the message” (McLuhan 2005) and *The Gutenberg Galaxy* (McLuhan 2011) caught the popular imagination, their research, together with others in a similar vein (see

Havelock's analysis of pre-Platonic orality and post-Platonic literacy (1986), was dismissed as marginal but have received renewed attention more recently.

It was the technologically deterministic vein in particular that was highlighted by writers such as the classicist O'Donnell, before he himself picked up the baton, citing the need for a more complex analysis of the process of historical change in which any model would need to reflect the disorientation of the experience (O'Donnell 1998, p.25, cited Cooper 2007, p.294).

The late antique Latin experience in the making and shaping of power and community through the written word had a technological basis in the adoption of the codex form of the book, but the real change was cultural and social. So too, at other moments of transformation, the impulse, often very powerful, can be technological, but what saves the process from determinism is that thousands of small and particular choices are made by individuals and institutions to channel that force to shape society and its institutions.

(O'Donnell 1996, pp. 39-40)

Notwithstanding this criticism, the subject has received increasing attention in recent decades as the transition to a digital environment has gathered momentum (Birkerts 2006; Rettberg 2014; Sauerberg 2009). Much of this work has been summarized by Pettitt (2010), who has suggested that the Gutenberg print revolution is now being reversed and that we are “we are going forward to the past” (Pettitt, cited Garber 2010). One recent model can be found in Sauerberg's conceptualization of the “Gutenberg Parenthesis” (Sauerberg, 2008), referring to the era that began with the invention of the printing press in Gutenberg in the fifteenth century, and which is perceived to be ending with the advent of the digital communication in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Pettitt emphasizes the authority that typeface has conferred on the communication.

In the parenthesis, people like to categorize — and that includes the things they read. So the idea clearly was that in books, you have the truth. Because it was solid, it looked straight, it looked like someone very clever or someone very intelligent had made this thing, this artefact. Words, printed words — in nice, straight columns, in beautifully bound volumes — you could rely on them. That was the idea.

(Pettitt, cited Garber 2010)

Pettitt (2010) notes that we can identify related changes. The advent of printing was concomitant with significant changes in other aspects of the organisation of knowledge — “for example, the way we look at the world and the way we categorize things in the world” (Pettitt cited Garber 2010). Whilst subsequent researchers have paid particular attention to the impact of print, Ong’s original conception was based on a wider canvas. Ong initiated the identification of sequential and parallel forms of communication in relation to the exchange of ideas using a typology of communicative forms: Ong conceptualises Primary Orality to describe the use of speech; Literacy commences with the advent of writing in the third millennia BC; Printing is identified in China in the 11th century and in Europe in the fifteenth century; Secondary Orality is expressed through speech in media developed in the nineteenth century and applied on a significant scale in the twentieth century through telephony and broadcast media; and although not identified by Ong, Secondary Literacy has been subsequently associated with writing in digital media, including the internet in the late twentieth century (Rettberg 2013).

The conclusion thus far with the conceptualization of Secondary Literacy is particularly interesting in the context of this thesis because of the gap the typology leaves vacant in the field of visual media. It might be useful to consider the research problem in the context of adding to the typology the possibility of a subsequent Third Orality based on audio-visual digital screen media.

A more recent conceptualization has been proposed by Pettitt (2010b) who notes the pre-Gutenberg person-to-person period of communication, the Gutenberg-to-Google period in which the spoken word was inferior to printed text, and now the post-Google revolution “in which textual mediation is challenged by electronically transmitted spoken communication, and in which as a medium for the preservation of textual material, print is increasingly subordinate to digital technology and the Internet” (Pettitt 2010b). Pettitt characterizes the conceptualization of the interval of print as “an alternative strategy of historical rescheduling....discerning in our post-modern times a re-birth of something pre-modern, enabling a Mad-Hatter’s Tea-Party at which we all move forward one place, so that it is the modern, ‘Gutenberg’, period that now occupies the position of an intervening, ‘middle, age’” (Pettitt 2010b). He notes that the hard edge implied by the curved brackets of the parenthesis

metaphor is not entirely appropriate and, echoing O'Donnell, he cautions against "the absoluteness of the distinctions signalled by the brackets" (Pettitt 2010b). He suggests that the transition is better characterized as a more dynamic shift in dominant modes, in which existing technologies live side by side with the legacy of the previous phase and the novel modes of the developing phase. He proposes that an alternative conceptualisation might be to consider how as the current, second post-print media revolution, or even Third Orality, has become established, this stage is in many ways a reversion, at a higher level of technology, to the first. This links directly to the research problem addressed by this thesis.

In this regard, Birkerts (2006), using the term verbal in the sense of oral, suggests that "looking from the larger historical vantage, it almost appears as if we are returning to the verbal orientation that preceded the triumph of print" (Birkerts 2006,p.160). Similarly Ong (1982) had previously suggested that we were witnessing a period of 'secondary orality' with the advent of the telephone, radio and television, indicating a return to an earlier, 'primary orality' with a higher level of technology, following an intervening period mediated by literacy and reading. More recently there have been attempts to demonstrate that "our oldest and newest thought-technologies – oral tradition and the Internet – work in strikingly similar ways" (Foley 2008). Foley's 'Pathways' project at the University of Missouri (Foley 2015) tests the idea that both old and new "thought technologies" share the need for multidimensional networks and the active engagement of users rather than the passive consumption of viewers and listeners.

The goal of the Project is to explain and illustrate a central thesis - namely, that humankind's oldest and newest thought-technologies, oral tradition and the Internet (abbreviated throughout as OT and IT), are fundamentally alike. Hardly identical, of course, but surprisingly similar in their structure and dynamics.

(Foley 2015)

In the context of the research problem presented here, we might question the assumptions Foley makes concerning the passivity he associates with linear media when he states:

Both media [Oral Tradition abbreviated to OT and the Internet abbreviated to IT] depend not on static products but on continuous processes, not on stationary points but on vectors with direction and

magnitude, not on “What?” but on “How do I get there?” In contrast to the fixed, spatial linearity of the conventional page and the book, the twin technologies of OT and IT mime the way we think—by navigating along pathways within an interactive network.

(Foley 2015)

It is useful with regard to the experience of reading a book or viewing a film to consider how Foley adopts Plato’s critique of the written word and preference for Orality when he conflates the form of physical interaction or navigation with the experience of the engagement of the mind. His project is founded on the difference between what he perceives as the fossilization inherent in the object but confuses the object with the linearity of the narrative.

OT and IT don’t operate by spatializing, sequencing, or objectifying. They don’t fossilize ideas into free-standing museum exhibits, as books typically do. Instead, they invite and require active participation and support a rich diversity of individual, one-time-only experiences. In place of the single, predetermined route typical of texts, they offer myriad different routes for exploration by engaging each user in nothing less than co-creating his or her own contingent reality.

(Foley 2015)

In relation to the linearity we might associate with performative filmic scholarship, the pre-determined route of a film does not preclude the possibility of each user co-creating their own contingent reality, but on the contrary the performative aspect makes it a requirement to imagine and bring their own interpretation: to complete the meaning.

If we are, therefore, to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world by making a performative knowledge-making research tool using documentary methods, we need to consider what might be characteristic of the secondary orality of mass mediation, and look beyond that question to ask what elements of documentary method might be used to engage with the possibility of a third stage, audio-visual screen mediated, electronic orality. Although we might question the absence of visuality, audibility or even musicality from Ong’s conceptualization of forms of communication, I will use the typology to consider briefly the characteristics that accompany each stage, so that we can locate our understanding of how we might develop a more complex “writing” through film.

Primary Orality

Ong (1982) lists the following characteristics as typical of expression in a primary oral culture: expression is additive rather than subordinate, in that it is linear and sequential; similarly it is aggregative rather than analytic; orality tends to be redundant, or more than sufficient; there is a tendency for it to be conservative rather than progressive; thought is necessarily expressed with close reference to the human lifeworld; expression is agonistic in tone; engagement is subjective, close, empathetic and collective; orality is homeostatic and adaptable; it is positioned in the world rather than abstract (Ong 1982).

The initial consideration of epistemology taking place within the first orality finds expression in the work of Plato. In *The Phaedrus* (Plato 1999), Socrates in conversation with Phaedrus concludes with a critique of writing. The Socratic method of eliciting knowledge places emphasis on asking questions. One of Plato's key arguments for privileging orality is that one cannot ask questions of writing. Moreover, writing does not discriminate between those who read it. Socrates comments: "It doesn't know to whom it should speak and to whom it should not" (Plato 1999). As Socrates elucidates, "the speaker always gives one unvarying answer":

SOCRATES: I cannot help feeling, Phaedrus, that writing is unfortunately like painting; for the creations of the painter have the attitude of life, and yet if you ask them a question they preserve a solemn silence. And the same may be said of speeches. You would imagine that they had intelligence, but if you want to know anything and put a question to one of them, the speaker always gives one unvarying answer. And when they have been once written down they are tumbled about anywhere among those who may or may not understand them, and know not to whom they should reply, to whom not: and, if they are maltreated or abused, they have no parent to protect them; and they cannot protect or defend themselves. *PHAEDRUS*: That again is most true.

(Plato 1999)

In Plato's view, the inevitability of the presence of the speaker associated with speech was a guarantee of knowledge. We can understand this also in the context of the use of the English suffix "-ness", which indicates a state of being, as in happiness. Thus 'witness' is derived from the Old English term *witan*, which means being in a position to know. The "ness" of the state of being adds value to the knowing. As Socrates comments, "If men learn this [writing], it will implant forgetfulness in their souls; they will cease to exercise memory because they rely

on that which is written, calling things to remembrance no longer from within themselves, but by means of external marks"(Plato 1999).

There is an irony in being able to hear Socrates voicing his suspicion of books through reading Plato's writing. Being able to do so at the end of a long line of technological development, which allows me to read his ideas through printing and ultimately via the Internet, is even more so. Yet Plato's discrimination of speech and writing it provides a starting point for understanding the complexity of the relationship between orality and literacy that is central to this thesis, and, in the relation to the question of the performative application of film to scholarship, which is at the heart of the inquiry, it provides a starting point to question and reconsider the limitations and the performative value of a 'solemn silence' to which a viewer might bring their own story.

Primary Literacy

Ong's second categorization is literacy, the value of which, as we have seen above, was contested by Socrates in Plato's writing in *The Phaedrus*. Ong similarly identifies the distancing of writer from reader in the transmission of a thought "which cannot be directly questioned or contested as oral speech can be because written discourse is *disembodied* from the writer" (Ong 1982, p.78). Ong identifies a transition from an oral-aural sensory world to a world that privileges vision. This leads to interiorization of thought, positioning in time and the documentation of detail.

We have noted that the relationship between orality and literacy is not simple, and Ong illustrates the interplay of writing and orality with reference to the development of rhetoric and Latin. The move towards a structured codification of scholarly activity in Europe followed the didactic allegory of the fifth-century pagan Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis philologiæ et Mercurii* ("The wedding of philology and Mercury") (Grotius and Capella 2011), based on the seven liberal arts. These consisted of the "three ways" of Grammar, Rhetoric and Logic, (the Trivium) and the "four ways" of Arithmetic, Geometry, Music and Astronomy (the Quadrivium). These subjects remained the foundation of scholarship until newly available Arabic texts and the works of Aristotle became available in Western Europe in the 12th century accompanying the development of Medieval Scholasticism.

The French philosopher Peter Abelard adapted the Socratic method by requiring his students to sit in front of two separate texts contradicting each other. This method of critical disputation was adopted by universities and necessitated students asking each other questions and deriving their own conclusions. The School of Chartres employed the Abelard method but went further in requiring students to synthesize Aristotelian logic with Christian theology and resolve contradiction through dialectical reasoning. The notion of assembling a body of knowledge developed in the work of Thomas Aquinas (Aquinas 1999), Isidore of Seville (Isidore of Seville 2006), and Bernard of Clairvaux (Clairvaux et al. 1987) who attempted to comprehend the entire world of learning through an attitude that was encyclopaedic or all encompassing. This is relevant to the research problem of this thesis because it has remained the foundation of inquiry in the epistemology of the Western academic process, which assumes there can be a summated body of knowledge that can be collected and which requires external criticism, internal critique and synthesis. The process continues to find expression in the digital age using text through initiatives such as Worldcat.org, Wikipedia.org, and the many other cataloguing functions of the Internet.

The privileging of the visual text through the computer screen extends Ong's conceptualisation of the interiorization of thought. As we have noted, the boundaries between the categories are permeable and we might take forward the idea of screen visibility and interiorization of thought in placing the viewer in a performative role.

Print

The next part of Ong's typology identifies the impact of print on ways of thinking informed by literacy. One major consequence of print technology was the extension of access to literacy. Rettberg (2008) suggests "in most Europe, only 20-30 per cent of the population were literate in the early seventeenth century, while 70-90 per cent were literate by the end of eighteenth century" (Rettberg 2008, p. 40). As Chartier indicates, this was not universally regarded as beneficial by those "who had hitherto enjoyed a monopoly of the production and discussion of knowledge" (Chartier et al. 1993, p.124). Whilst significant social and political changes such as the Protestant Reformation have been linked

directly to the development of print technology (Eisenstein 2012), at an epistemological and ontological level, Ong suggests we can observe an even greater privileging of sight over sound in perception because "print suggests that words are things" (Ong 1978, p.118).

The consequence of the "interiorization" of knowledge, and the forms of consciousness that accompanied it, was that printing was no longer primarily intended to speak knowledge back into world, as had been the case with the medieval disputation of Scholasticism based on handwritten manuscripts. Printed texts that "fostered a solitary and private relation between the reader and his book through silent reading... redrew the boundary between the inner life and life in the community" (Chartier et al. 1993, p.157). Interestingly, he notes a gender aspect to the transition from orality to print: that the male religious preserve of public reading during the era of primary literacy was overtaken during the eighteenth century by an iconography portraying reading as exclusively private, female and secular (Chartier et al 1993, p.135). He suggests "This privatization of reading is undeniably one of the major cultural developments of the early modern era" (Chartier et al 1993, p.125). Rettberg (2008), citing Ong, underlines the solipsistic nature of writing as well as reading. "In composing a text, in "writing" something, the one producing the written utterance is also alone. Writing is a solipsistic operation" (Ong 1983, p116).

Rettberg notes six aspects of the "transition from a society where spoken discourse was the norm to one where silent reading and writing was a main form of communication" (Rettberg 2008, p.37). The six aspects are: the dissemination of ideas as the reading of texts became more commonplace; standardization, as it was possible to correct mistakes and multiple copies were produced; reorganization, through pagination, contents and indices; data collection, through subsequent editions; preservation, through printing ink and paper quality; amplification and reinforcement, through repetition. (Rettberg, 2008).

Ong suggests that printed text roots words in space more significantly than did writing (Ong 1983). Printed words could be graphically organized with a spatial sensibility in lists and tables. Moreover, Ong maintains that print brings with it a fixed and final arrangement of text that suggests a closure that was previously absent in the temporality of orality and handwritten texts (Ong 1983). These characteristics of finality and certainty might be seen as contributing to the

conditions that gave rise to the certitude in the epistemology we associate with the scientific paradigm of the Enlightenment and its subsequent expression in the methodology of scientific empiricism, underpinned by an ontology of positivism, that has remained largely unchallenged as a scholarly methodology for generating knowledge across a range of disciplines into the twenty-first century.

Schon demonstrates how the academic orthodoxy of Empirical Positivism can be associated with the framing of ideas through print media:

Technical Rationality depends on agreement about ends. When ends are fixed and clear, then the decision to act can present itself as an instrumental problem. But when ends are confused and conflicting, there is as yet no 'problem' to solve. A conflict of ends cannot be resolved by the use of techniques derived from applied research.

(Schön 1983, p.41)

As Schon suggests, the 'technical rationality' of the research method is dependent upon how the problem is framed in the first place and how textual literacy expressed through print has had a defining effect on the scholastic culture we currently inhabit. This is despite the subsequent impact of the "Second Orality" on twentieth century popular culture, which will now be considered.

Secondary Orality

Ong typifies the Second Orality occurring in the twentieth century through the emergence of electronic media such as the telephone, film, radio and television. The Second Orality maintains aspects of the characteristics of collective belonging identified in the Primary Orality but is "essentially a more deliberate and self-conscious orality, based permanently on the use of writing and print" (Ong1982, p.136). Inevitably the scale of the involvement is much greater in a mass society. In relation to this thesis it would be appropriate to ask whether the documentary sensibility, when viewed across all media as a self-conscious and self-defining ambition distinct from chronicling and portraying, coincided with the advent of the second orality and the technological capacity to record and distribute images and the impact this might have for scholarly discourse in the mooted "third orality" of the screen.

Secondary Literacy

Rettberg (2008) suggests that “with the coming of blogs, reading and writing again has shifted back to being a social event, though in virtual space instead of taverns” (Rettberg 2008, p.40). Rettberg suggests that we are seeing a reversion to a Secondary Literacy and this can be viewed as an extension of the tradition of pamphlets and early newspapers. “The dialogue [of print] was necessary because the best way to counteract print, it came to be recognized, was through print” (Rettberg 2008, p.41). In relation to the research question of this thesis, it might be relevant to ask how the new technologies are producing new literacies that shape our relationship between our selves and the world around us, and therefore shape our ontological and epistemological understandings: as new forms of mediation are developing might we see an accompanying change in the dominant scientific paradigm? Even before the widespread use of the Internet, Gray and Pirie (1995) tell us that “most [late?] 20th Century inquiries might be characterized by adherence to a post-positivist paradigm, in that many of the classical tenets of inquiry have been (and are being) challenged, in all disciplines” (Gray and Pirie 1995, p.11). They suggest that this is equally evident in not only the science associated with the natural world, for example Chaos Theory, but also in approaches to social science such as ‘new paradigm’ research (Guba 1990).

In the digital age associated with secondary literacy, which we have identified incorporates online and mobile media, the discussion has moved beyond a debate about print literacy in a digital era towards what Rettberg describes as ‘network literacy’, in which the domains of private and public space have collapsed. Viewing this conceptualization in the historical context of public orality and private or “silent” reading, Rettberg (2008) asks if blogs disseminate or engage in dialogue. She notes that the opportunity for doing both was foreseen by Brecht earlier in an age of secondary orality, foreshadowing a possibility that is now with us:

Radio is one-sided when it should be two-. It is purely an apparatus for distribution, for mere sharing out. So here is a positive suggestion: change this apparatus over from distribution to communication. The radio would be the finest possible communication apparatus in public life, a vast network of pipes. That is to say, it would be if it knew how to receive as well as to transmit, how to let the listener speak as well as hear, how to bring

him into a relationship instead of isolating him. On this principle the radio should step out of the supply business and organize its listeners as suppliers. Any attempt by the radio to give a truly public character to public occasions is a step in the right direction.”

(Brecht 1932)

Brecht’s radical suggestion that radio should “organize its listeners as suppliers” is prescient for a generation now familiar with user-generated content. It has already been noted that the opportunity afforded by the widespread accessibility of video and other digital media leads to the possible conception of a new era, which might be described as third stage or tertiary orality.

Pettitt (2010b) argues this is to misrepresent the sense of return to orality and that “the third period it heralds is in many ways a reversion, at a higher level of technology, to the first” (Pettitt 2010b, p.1). His critique is that the characterization is naïve and that the process of change is more complex than the simplicity of the typology suggests. Pettitt’s focus on the era of print identified as “The Gutenberg Parenthesis” (Sauerberg 2007) indicates that the parentheses of the “Gutenberg Parenthesis” should represent complex, as well as gradual, change. There is a danger in neglecting the interaction of both writing and printing and the application of two products, the sheet or page and the pages combined into a codex or book, during The “Gutenberg Parenthesis” of the print era. He notes that there is an incremental progression in both process (writing/printing) and product (folio/book) on a ‘Gutenberg scale’:

Writing on a non-dedicated surface (from runic inscriptions to urban graffiti) or on a dedicated surface (sheet); a printed sheet; a book of bound sheets with writing on them; a book of bound printed sheets. And the effect in a given culture will be additive, none of the ‘lower’ permutations disappearing as the ‘higher’ emerge, any more than does oral communication.

(Pettitt 2010b, p.3)

Pettitt argues that our understanding of the changes taking place in media forms and their impact on thought processes should be more nuanced, and we should be asking to what degree pre-parenthetical features are re-appearing under the post-parenthetical circumstances of contemporary society and technology. He suggests that within the parenthetical period of printing technology, words can be subject to control: “a simple physical containment is enabled by the fact that writing and printing transform discourse from an activity into an artefact”

(Pettitt 2010b, p. 5). This conception of “containment” as a way of understanding the relationship between media artefacts and what he terms the “mindwork” (a shorthand term to avoid the depth of inquiry that would be required to understand the cognitive underpinnings) of the parenthetical era of print is valuable to this inquiry as we seek to understand the legacy of the impact of text on “mindwork” in the academy. Pettitt’s approach to a possible relationship between the dominant media form, cultural products and perceptions of the material world (Pettitt 2010b) lays the wider groundwork for the more specific purpose of this investigation into the place of the performative documentary film at this juncture in scholarship. It refines Ong’s original typologies of the new literacies and oralities that contribute to the map of my inquiry. The questions raised by this contextualizing literature review and historical framework will help to frame the inquiry into how forms of communication have shaped the conception of what constitutes knowledge (epistemology) and the conception of reality (ontology), and how the scholarly application of documentary film should be considered in this context.

D. *The Uncommon Discourse*

To investigate how can we develop a more complex performative application of documentary video through which to articulate a scholarly understanding of the world, we need to locate the use of video as a potential form of scholarly communication within a broader understanding of ‘academic discourse’. We can refer to Foucault for a working definition of discourse as a practice of representation that constructs the knowledge and, as Hall comments, “governs the way a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about” (Hall 1997, p.44). Foucault’s all-encompassing definition is that “Nothing has any meaning outside of discourse” (Foucault 1972) and he finds the place of discourse within education as a site of social and political tension:

Education may well be, as of right, the instrument whereby every individual, in a society like our own, can gain access to any kind of discourse. But we well know that in its distribution, in what it permits and in what it prevents, it follows the well-trodden battle-lines of social conflict. Every educational system is a political

means of maintaining or of modifying the appropriation of discourse, with the knowledge and the powers to carry it out.

(Foucault, 1972 p. 227)

Whilst the discourse of the academy can be perceived as one of exclusion, a survey of literature in this field reveals that there is considerable variation in what is regarded as academic discourse and there is no single genre to which the term can be applied (Harwood and Hadley 2004).

Bartholomae identifies the specialized nature of academic discourse as a critical state of mind that sets apart those who adopt its “code”: “The movement toward a more specialized discourse begins (or, perhaps, best begins) both when a student can define a position of privilege, a position that sets him against a ‘common’ discourse, and when he or she can work self-consciously, critically, against not only the ‘common’ code but his or her own” (Bartholomae 1986, p.17). This necessarily begs the question of what is meant by “common” discourse. The implication is that users of academic discourse need to adopt the codes and conventions of the language of the academic community to participate in its ‘uncommon’ conversations and thereby exclude those who do not share the self-conscious “privilege”. We can see the elitism implicit in this conception reflected in the use of the term “Ivory Tower” since the nineteenth century to indicate disparagingly the disconnect between “town and gown”. It is interesting to note, however, that the reference to “Ivory Tower” was originally applied to writers and philosophers generally, and only since the 1960s has it been more specifically used in the context of academia as metaphorical sites of exclusion. In the early twentieth century the writer H. L. Bergson warned philosophers against being excluding from the wider community stating, “Each member must be ever attentive to his social surroundings...he must avoid shutting himself up in his own peculiar character as a philosopher in his ivory tower” (Bergson 1911). The transparency associated with the generalization of an “uncommon discourse” disguises the possibility that the norms and conventions associated with academic writing and reading are contested constructs and vary according to discipline and culture. Significantly for the research problem presented here, this is being questioned as disciplinary boundaries are bridged, coinciding with the transition to an online and networked environment. Gergen notes:

One of the ideas that I think is influencing the borderland borrowings is that there is scepticism about the necessity of there being a special form that presentations must take on. Rather, there is no sacred language that must be used in order to engage in disciplinary work. Being able to step back and question why an article must be written in a particular way or why the line must be drawn between poetry and prose, or why first person indicators must be avoided—all become open to question.

(Gergen and Jones 2008 ,p.30)

Russell argues there is no “autonomous, generalizable skill or set of skills called ‘writing’ that can be learned and then applied to all genres or activities” (Russell 1995 p.59). Pennycook (1994) asks us to look to local practice to understand this.

1. Language as Local Practice

The assumed “transparency” of academic discourse has been found to be rather more opaque in recent years as a result of debates about teaching English for Academic Purposes, in particular with regard to students whose first language is not English. Bringing a post-colonial critique to the Sapir-Whorf (Whorf and Carroll 1956) hypothesis of language, that “the ‘real world’ is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group” (Sapir 1985, p.162), Pennycook (1994) considers the development of English as an international language in a political and historical context, arguing that the language underpinning any academic discipline can only be understood in the context of its history and the way it has been informed by political struggle as part of the “active process by which people make meaning of their lives” (Pennycook 1994, p. 61). Language, he suggests, is “a material part of social and cultural life rather than...an abstract entity” (1994, p.2). Pennycook considers the way that meanings develop from social interactions involving language in physical and symbolic spaces in what can be called “situatedness”. “Everything happens locally. However global a practice may be, it still happens locally” (1994,p.128).

This understanding has implications for the understanding of the research problem where the highly regulated use of text-based communication situated within academic institutions located in a Western European political, social and cultural history that has been exported globally might be subject to differing and

local non-textual academic practices involving the application of creative methods such as video documentary.

2. Critical Thinking

Pennycook's understanding of the use of language for scholastic endeavour is couched within an approach that views teaching as a process of political engagement in which teachers are not mere ciphers communicating a body of knowledge but are engaged in empowering learners through 'critical pedagogy'. To this end, he proposes "perhaps language – and particularly English as an international language – should also be replaced by a vision of powerful discursive formations globally and strategically employed" (Pennycook 1994, p.64). He is interested in how we can undertake transgressive language practices to change the way we think about linguistic legitimacy and normativity. Pennycook questions what happens "...to our understanding of language as a local practice if we assume not so much the transparency and normalcy of sameness and the opacity of difference, but rather take difference to be the norm and sameness as that which needs to justify itself?" (Pennycook 1994, p.37). This raises questions for the application of such transgressive strategies in the performative application of documentary film instead of text.

The questions Pennycook raises about how social power is mediated through language contain implications for the development and expression of research knowledge in the context of the academy. In the context of this thesis, Pennycook's questions open a space for the consideration of transgression within academic discourse that might take place in spatial and symbolic environments beyond text, which are localized, and which "create the space in which they happen" (1994, p.128). Pennycook has been criticized (Le Nevez, 2011) for not indicating how his proposed transgressive strategies might be realized in any specific sense: Le Nevez (2011) notes "his reluctance to formalise a theory of practice" but it will be considered later in this dissertation whether Pennycook's search for 'discursive formations' and transgressive actions may be relevant in the context of considering performative strategies in this investigation. Pennycook identifies "the struggle to become the author of one's own world, to

be able to create one's own meaning, to pursue cultural alternatives amid the cultural politics of everyday life" (Pennycook 1997 p.39).

This search for cultural alternatives provides a starting point for considering an oppositional, critical and self-defining reflective documentary practice as it might be applied performatively in the academy. Recalling Russell's statement leading into this section where he argues that there is "no autonomous, generalizable skill or set of skills called 'writing' that can be learned and then applied to all genres or activities" (Russell 1995, p.59), it might be questioned whether the search for models of performative documentary research methods might itself become constrained by a formalised theory of practice in seeking to create a new form of academic discourse.

Parfitt (2015) questions the use of the term "academic discourse" and suggests that there are multiple academic discourses as there are multiple disciplines and notes an unquestioning adoption of a positivist framework underlying the concept:

Can we identify any essential features that run across the disciplines? How did they come to look the way they do -- and could they look any different? I would speculate that it would be hard to underestimate the influence of scientific -- or positivist -- thinking on academic discourse(s), even in the humanities.

(Parfitt 2015)

Parfitt identifies the empiricist legacy of the Enlightenment as the source of the apparent transparency in a language that does not question how or why or with what effect it constructs the knowledge created. He notes that the Enlightenment ideal of a "perspicuous" style marked by an independence from the subject has influenced all disciplines so that since the nineteenth century the prestige associated with empirical science has prompted researchers in the humanities to write in quasi-scientific terms. Parfitt goes so far as to contend that recent literary theory from New Criticism to post-structuralism has been configured to conform to the codification of scientific objectivity and thereby ensure its place in the academy. The transparency of academic institutions has meant that any significant self-analysis of academic discourse has failed to materialise, and situates this inquiry in relation to the reflective and performative opportunity that could be presented.

Bartholomae reinforces the specificity of writing as a taught activity situated in a learned tradition but counters the position adopted by Parfitt and others by promoting the self-conscious rather than the transparent nature of being an academic writer, suggesting, perhaps naively, that the very process of academic writing confronts the traditions of power because it engages with the learning and authority present in review of previous work through allusions to sources and quotations and “the messy business of doing your work in the shadow of others” (Bartholomae 1986).

English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which has become an internationally recognised (and contested) discipline in its own right, has foregrounded the debate as a site where those entering Higher Education will invariably encounter the codes and conventions of academic discourse.

Bartholomae contends that in teaching English for Academic Purposes, it is part of the teacher’s role to “make a writer aware of the forces at play in the production of knowledge...I am arguing for a class in time, one that historicizes the present, including the present evoked in students’ writing” (Bartholomae 1986, p.66). He implies that while it is necessary to counteract un-reconstructed transparency, it is the very act of teaching and learning to write by the academic code that enables us to recognize “the forces at play”. This is being challenged as some academics have sought to express their ideas and experiences in a more personal way, as discussed in the next section, raising the question of the validity of performative response in an academic context that is pertinent to this inquiry.

4. The Bartholomae/Elbow Debate

The expansion and internationalization of Higher Education over the past three decades have made the assumptions on which academic discourse is founded increasingly problematic. Progressively, the transparency of the communication register has been brought into focus and questioned. Bizzell (1982) has noted an emerging paradox for a discipline that was founded on the teaching of traditional academic discourse values across subject areas, but whose teachers are now questioning the validity of such an approach.

Bizzell (1992) wrote: “In this decade, however, college writing teachers frequently have found themselves at odds with the institutional goal of initiation into academic discourse, and much of our work has been directed to redefining the nature of "good" writing””(Bizzell 1992, p.106). This is the context in which the debate around formal academic (“critical”) writing versus self-expressive writing crystallised in the USA in the 1990s as the Bartholomae-Elbow debate. Reminding us of Elkins (2006) finding that debates about the status of practice in the academy have illustrated “the incommensurability of studio art production and university life” (Elkins 2006, p.146) in the UK, the Bartholomae-Elbow debate in the USA was prompted by Peter Elbow’s difficulty in being both an academic and a writer, finding the two modes of thinking in conflict, expressed in his work *Being A Writer v. Being An Academic* (Elbow 1995).

Elbow’s work has been characterized as a search for the student’s “authentic voice”, articulating a trend that encouraged students to adopt more personal linguistic registers that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, and was epitomized by Jane Tompkins' celebrated article, *Me and My Shadow* (Tompkins 1987). Parfitt cites this an example of “successful and experienced professional scholars [who] may also feel a good deal of ambivalence about academic writing....Tompkins described her two selves, two voices, and her growing impatience with the hollowness of her professional voice” (Parfitt 2015). Tomkins expressed her dissatisfaction with the traditional academic approach to literary criticism that denied her personal interaction with the work, arguing that she was forced to hide herself in the expression of her critique: “The criticism I would like to write would always take off from personal experience, would always be in some way a chronicle of my hours and days, would speak in a voice which can talk about everything, would reach out to a reader like me and touch me where I want to be touched....” (Tomkins 1987, p.173). Tomkins (and others) were prompted to develop an alternative approach that combined the personal and the academic countering the aggressive and polemical approach associated with traditional scientific-originated and arguably gender-originated academic discourse.

Bartholomae has positioned himself in opposition to this trend towards the inclusion of personal experience, which he describes as “sentimental realism”

(Bartholomae 1995). He criticizes writers such as Elbow, regarding their encouragement of students to adopt a more personal approach in writing as misleading and discouraging the political and historical understandings that come from contextualisation. He finds “the modern curricular production of the independent author, the celebration of point-of-view as individual artefact, the promotion of sentimental realism (the true story of what I think, feel, know and see)” (Bartholomae 1995, p.69) as inappropriate to scholarly endeavour. Bartholomae argues that students who were taught to write in a more personal style are being denied a critical understanding of language as a political and historical construct: “To offer academic writing as something else is to keep this knowledge from our students, to keep them from confronting the power politics of discursive practice, or to keep them from confronting the particular representations of power, tradition and authority reproduced whenever one writes” (Bartholomae 1995, p.69).

For Bartholomae, the “power politics of discursive practice” is embedded in the processes of academic discourse. Bartholomae argues that teachers should enable students through critical reading “to learn to feel and see their position inside a text they did not invent and can never, at least completely, control. Inside a practice: linguistic, rhetorical, cultural, historical” (Bartholomae 1995, p.65). He views this as preferable to allowing students to practice outside of the norms of academic discourse, in order “to make a writer aware of the forces at play in the production of knowledge” (1995, p.66). In doing so, he has turned the argument on its head, suggesting that the dangers of transparency lie not in the use of more formal academic practice but in the uncritical use of the personal in scholarly writing. His critique is focused on those academics who

...use autobiography to do intellectual work. I am thinking of Mike Rose's book, *Lives on the Boundary*. I am thinking of the recent issue of *PRE/TEXT* devoted to "expressive writing." I am thinking of ... scholars like Peter and Chuck Schuster.

(Bartholomae 1995, p.67)

Bartholomae's position is more nuanced than a straightforward rejection of personal narrative however. He is concerned to highlight the danger of privileging the individual vision of the writer who exploits the literary devices of what he calls sentimental realism, such as dialogue and description. He is also concerned not to blur the boundaries between the genre of creative non-fiction

and what appears to be a less clearly defined academic discourse. He views the creative non-fiction approach to scholarly writing as a seductive distraction in its claim to the “real”.

In my department, this other form of narrative is often called "creative nonfiction" or "literary non-fiction" - it is a way to celebrate individual vision, the detail of particular worlds. There is an argument in this kind of prose too, an argument about what is real and what it means to inhabit the real. The danger is assuming that one genre is more real than the other (a detailed, loving account of the objects in my mother's kitchen is more "real" than a detailed loving account of the discourse on domesticity found in 19th century American women's magazines) - in assuming that one is real writing and the other is only a kind of game academics play.

(Bartholomae 1995, p.68)

Bartholomae questions the teaching of creative non-fiction at undergraduate level, but the point is relevant to wider application in academic discourse where literary non-fiction has found credence as an accepted method of qualitative research. Hence it is relevant to consider the debate in relation to the research question posed by this inquiry. Whilst Bartholomae’s position might be regarded as naïve with regard to the assumptions he is making about students’ (and scholars’ more generally) appreciation of the power relations he expects them to identify in the use of formal academic discourse, his position poses valuable questions that can be addressed in the pursuit of the performative application of documentary video in place of personal writing. In particular, his position raises the question of adopting personal reflection in text or in film that might “reproduce the ideology of sentimental realism-where a world is made in the image of a single, authorizing point of view. A narrative that celebrates a world made up of the details of private life and whose hero is sincere?” (Bartholomae 1995, p.69). Bartholomae may be criticized, however, for his inability to come up with a clearer idea of what constitutes “academic writing” beyond it being an endeavour that relies heavily on the catch-all term “critical”:

I find it a corrupt, if extraordinarily tempting genre. I don't want my students to celebrate what would then become the natural and inevitable details of their lives. ... I would rather teach or preside over a critical writing one [genre] where the critique is worked out in practice, and for lack of better terms I would call that writing, "academic writing”.

(Bartholomae 1995, p.71)

As Bartholomae notes, this debate has taken place within the relatively recent discipline in America known as “Composition Studies” that he identifies as being rooted in old-fashioned Nineteenth Century humanism. Bizzell (1992) however, notes the value of a language that maintains “a critical distance on the social processes whereby knowledge is generated and controlled” (Bizzell 1992, p.197), and suggests that the development of Composition Studies in the USA during the 1980s focused attention on the role of writing in the academy: “Composition studies has become established as an academic discipline. Over the past decade, college writing programs have expanded tremendously, and scholarly attention to writing theory and pedagogy has also grown” (Bizell 1992, p.191). This discipline grew out of an academic environment in which teachers made assumptions about the use of written English by students, which we might locate within a mono-cultural Higher Educational environment pre-dating the post-war expansion of Higher Education.

Bizell reminds us of the uncritical acceptance of a particular set of inherited language skills and knowledge that came easily to students from a certain background: “Freshman English students were supposed to be brushing up their ability to produce a certain kind of written product; they were not so much taught about this product as reminded of its characteristics” (Bizzell 1992, p.192). Bizzell notes that Bernstein (2003), in relation to his conceptualization of restricted and elaborated codes, and Bourdieu and Passeron (1990), in relation to the reproduction of social structures, identified that the use of formal and abstract language in academic discourse privileges middle-class students through their prior socialization in language skills and reinforces a class-structure through education. Noting Bizell’s comment appropriating Foucault (1970) that “academic discourse constitutes the academic community” (Bizell 1992, p.197), the next section pays particular attention to Bourdieu’s conceptualization of the way in which the academy is intrinsically intertwined with its language.

4. Bourdieu: Scholarship and Power

The relevance to this research of an historical understanding of the development of scholarship as a linguistic and text-based mode of discourse has been noted in the introduction. To ask how we can “*write*” with video to achieve a performative application of documentary film in scholarship requires that we understand the operation of the dominant modes of language, and thereby textual “writing”, in the academy. The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s work is significant in this regard.

Bourdieu (1997) highlights the crucial dependency of education on language and has expressed the proposition that academic discourse can be viewed as an expression of pedagogical power in much of his published work. Bourdieu’s conception of the power-relations inherent in the use of written language has significance here in understanding the potential for non-textual expression such as filmmaking in scholarly research. The advent of accessible technologies using digital media has been noted by some as a possible fissure in the text-dominated hegemony of scholarship identified by Bourdieu, but generally with reference to the Internet (Halbert 1998).

There has been little attention given to the communicative potential of the digital image or moving image in the context of scholarship and there is a sense in which text on the page might simply be replaced with text on the screen, albeit hyperlinked to other text. This gives rise to questions about the appropriation of new media technologies as extensions of the dominant discourse in academia. New media technologies may result in scholarship being less dependent on the printed word in the future, and at the most basic level of text on screens, they will certainly transform the way in which we creatively engage with writing. The question remains as to how the opportunities presented for digital creation and dissemination will open up the space for new configurations of expression, new discourses of scholarship, which might be loosely grouped together as art-based research or even ‘artistic research’ as opposed to scientific research, which go beyond the limitations of text and challenge our modes of thought and language.

Bourdieu (1977) considers how the “scholastic point of view” informs a systematic approach to power that determines the nature of study and denigrates

the validity of other modes of thought and expression. The consequence of the transparency of scholastic language as a result of being viewed uncritically as ideologically neutral and unconstructed, is to maintain a transparency of power through the hidden role of “cultural capital”, which has a wider impact on the organization of societies and the awareness of participants of its operation.

This privileged instrument of the bourgeois sociodicy which confers on the privileged the supreme privilege of not seeing themselves as privileged manages the more easily to convince the disinherited that they owe their scholastic and social destiny to their lack of gifts or merits, because in matters of culture absolute dispossession excludes awareness of being dispossessed.

(Bourdieu and Passeron 1977, p. 210)

In relation to the research question posed here, the question arises as to whether a non-textual performative method might articulate experiences and knowledge that are not dependent on linguistic power. To address this we need to consider how Bourdieu’s conception of cultural capital incorporates three distinct aspects: the internalization of knowledge through learning in *the embodied state*, such as becoming an academic; the expression of culture through objects such as artworks films or books, in *the objectified state*; and the legitimization of culture through official recognition, for example through the award of a degree, in *the institutionalized state* (Bourdieu 1986, pp. 243-248). I will examine briefly each of these aspects in relation to my research questions, as they contribute to the map of the research journey.

Firstly, in regard to the *embodied state* of the researcher, this is relevant to the development of a methodology of reflective practice, which is a core element of my investigation. Bourdieu emphasizes the need for a sociology in which the researcher must pay conscious attention to the effects of their own position, continually reflecting back upon their own “habitus”: “embodied history, internalized as a second nature and so forgotten as history – [it] is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” (Bourdieu 1990, p.56). The application of a non-textual and linguistically challenging form of communication such as film is a significant disruption to the scholarly habitus and its associated hegemonic power relations, with its attendant measurements of

research outputs and pedagogic values that are dependent on an established and transparent text-based discourse. Borgman, however, cautions against any great expectations of change in this regard, noting

The availability of this environment does not lead directly to changes in scholarly practice. The scholarly communication system has evolved over a period of centuries -- it doesn't shift quickly. Scholarly journals still look a lot like they did in the 17th century, for example. The tenure system is a much stronger driver of scholarly infrastructure than is technology.

(Borgman 2007)

The literature in this area poses questions about the institutional context that will contribute to shaping the direction of the inquiry in relation to the embodied "active presence" of the researcher in reflective practice through academic film making, noting how "schemes of perception, thought and action" (Bourdieu 1993, p.101) may develop and change in the process of transformations in identity and intentions as professional practitioner becomes professional researcher as described earlier.

In this stage of the literature review we have seen how scholarship as it is conceptualized today can be located within a narrative of a particular (Western European) political, social and cultural history. We have also seen how Bourdieu reinforces this understanding with the concept of scholarly habitus based on language. The dominance of textual expression as a form is never fully explored in his work on cultural capital and his opacity in this regard leaves the way open to further explore scholarly appropriation of text as a medium. This leads to the relevance to this inquiry of the second aspect of Bourdieu's conception of cultural capital, *the objectified state*, the expression of culture through artefacts.

Bourdieu's term *the objectified state*, the expression of culture through objects such as artworks films or books, is a type of capital that is owned as a physical object but also 'owned' as a cultural understanding. In relation to video practice, the filmmaker is "embodied" as a researcher, but is also creating and owning an artefact that requires a shared level of cultural understanding between the creator and the viewer for its consumption. This of course applies equally to a written PhD or "any practical outputs in the form of cultural goods (pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.), which are the trace or realization of theories or critiques of these theories, problematics" (Bourdieu

1986, p.241). The idea of a practice output such as a film being the “trace or realization of theories” is particularly valuable in the context of the pursuit of this research problem where the underlying cultural capital might be problematised in a self-consciously creative way through the creation of an artefact that articulates its own trace and tries to highlight the possibility of transparency in its construction. It is even more intriguing that this inversion of the functioning of cultural capital takes place within an institutionalized state such as a formal postgraduate programme of study.

The institutionalized state of cultural capital gives an exchangeable currency to the economy of cultural capital, for example through academic qualification that Bourdieu identifies as

the cultural capital academically sanctioned by legally guaranteed qualifications, formally independent of the person of their bearer. With the academic qualification, a certificate of cultural competence which confers on its holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture, social alchemy produces a form of cultural capital which has a relative autonomy vis-à-vis its bearer and even vis-à-vis the cultural capital he effectively possesses at a given moment in time. It institutes cultural capital by collective magic, just as, according to Merleau-Ponty, the living institute their dead through the ritual of mourning.

(Bourdieu 1986, p.246)

The literature here raises questions about the potential of performative strategies and practices to challenge privileged (scarce) access to the cultural capital founded on language as the determinant in the reproduction of the social structure (Bourdieu 1986). Given that the foundation of this instrument is linguistic and text-determined in the academy, it might be expected that there would be some resistance to the incorporation of media more commonly associated with forms of popular culture into scholarship. This gives rise to questions about the status of scholarship in the academy in the context of media technologies that may become less dependent on the written word in a future dominated by a new orality and one that will transform the way in which we engage performatively.

Bourdieu’s work leaves unanswered questions about the future direction of scholarly ‘habitus’ (“schemes of perception, thought and action” (Bourdieu 1993, p.101) as expressed through a linguistic register that may itself become

redundant in the crisis of scholarship identified by Lanham (1995) and others. However, Bourdieu's work sets the stage for further investigation into the way the essential schemes of our thinking are shaped by the linguistic registers we use, and his emphasis on a reflexive methodology suggests new ways forward for the self-conscious, reflective scholar to use film and other media. To extend the line of questioning in preparation for the research, we must turn to Rorty.

E. *Rorty: A Philosophy of Irony*

Given the historical, epistemological and institutional constraints on how knowledge is communicated that have been described, we need to look to alternative strategies to find a more "open-minded" approach to creative knowledge making. Rorty's theory of contingency is relevant to this inquiry in this regard. Rorty (Rorty 1989, p.73) portrays ironists as fulfilling three conditions:

(1) DOUBTS

They hold doubts about the vocabulary they currently use, because they have a knowledge of other vocabularies that others take as 'final';

(2) UNRESOLVED

They recognize that argument phrased in their current vocabulary cannot resolve these doubts;

(3) NO PRIVILEGE

They do not think that their vocabulary is closer to reality than others or that it is superior beyond themselves.

For Rorty, analytic explanation is no longer relevant in a world devoid of a theory of truth. He encourages us to find new vocabularies through narrative pastiche, so that we may constantly create and recreate ourselves, until we have found our self-created "final vocabulary" by re-contextualising our past. We are required to acknowledge that we are historically contingent. Innate truth and

falsehood are meaningless because only descriptions can be true or false. Arguments in the sense derived from Plato are not useful because they are mainly communication within one vocabulary and as such do not contribute novelty. This conceptualization could be described as removing the “safety net” of belief that there are some absolutes. Removing the safety net of an uncritical reliance on a transparent academic language is core to the proposition of this thesis. As Best and Kellner (1991) comment,

For Rorty, language is a poetic construction that creates worlds, not a mirror that reflects "reality," and there are no presuppositionless or neutral truths that evade the contingencies of historically shaped selfhood. Consequently, there is no non-circular, Archimedean point for grounding theory. Language can only provide us with a "description" of the world that is thoroughly historical and contingent in nature.

(Best and Kellner 1991, p.102)

This understanding lends itself to realizing the place of the imagination in reflective documentary practice. It suggests that a strategy of “successive redescriptions” may be a useful strategy in approaching the performative application of a documentary film method in academic research.

F. *Beyond Specialisation*

We have noted the trend towards increasing specialisation in research linked to the intellectual legacy of the Enlightenment, and inherited, more recently, by those espousing modernist epistemologies linked to the conception of progress founded in natural science. Lanham (1995) notes how this has contributed to an environment where specialisation has been privileged at the expense of research strategies that value the absence of boundaries.

Both groups [students and teachers] always knew that the "serious" world lay in specialized inquiry and hastened to join it. General programs in the liberal arts have failed because they have been, for the last hundred years and more, working against the intellectual orientation of higher education, an orientation built upon the reductive specialized inquiry inspired by Newtonian science and the complexities of the modern world.

(Lanham 1995, p.112)

Specialized inquiry is relevant to the inquiry here because it poses a limitation on the strategies that might be adopted in a performative context, which tend to require a more open and cross-discipline approach. This is referred to in the work of Galvin and Todres (2007) in their phenomenological quest for the re-integration of “spheres of knowing”, who analyse the dangers inherent in research that confines itself to narrow specialisation. Galvin and Todres highlight “the fragmentation of knowledge domains” and “the post-modern separation of science, art and morality” and note the impact of postmodernity on epistemology as both disillusionment in the context of relativism but, more positively, having an impact on diversity (Galvin and Todres 2007, p.34). They suggest that the separation of art, science and morality allowed progress through specializations in which disciplines benefited from ignoring the concerns of each other. Wilber (1995) terms this the “dignity of modernity”. As Wilber notes, there was a serious limitation in the modernist project: “...if the *dignity* of modernity was the differentiation of the Big Three [art, science and morality], the *disaster* of modernity would be that it had not yet found a way to *integrate* them” (Wilber 1995, p.416). Galvin and Todres cite Habermas’s observation that “by the end of the eighteenth century, science, morality and art were even institutionally *differentiated* as realms of activity in which questions of truth (science), of justice (morals), and of taste (art) were autonomously elaborated, that is, each of these *spheres of knowing* [was pursued] under its own specific aspect of validity” (Habermas 1990, p.19, cited Galvin and Todres (2007)).

One consequence of such specialization was the marketisation of knowledge. The impact of such specialization is evident in the way knowledge is communicated and measured for institutional score keeping (Galvin and Todres 2007). Such commodification does not lend itself to performative methodologies and outputs that do not readily fit accepted metrics. Gergen (Gergen and Jones, 2008) reminds us that the specialization we have become accustomed to is relatively recent and a more complex understanding is required when using terms such as creativity in the context of the differentiation of arts and sciences.

When I hear the word, "creativity" I imagine the aesthetic world: artists at their easels, sculptors chiselling away at blocks of marble, actors proclaiming lines of Shakespeare, and musicians, poets, and novelists creating new artistic pieces, often alone in their studios. But then I remind myself that scientists have a lore of creativity, as

well, which stretches far back in time. Each strand of creativity is revered within its own discipline, but the two streams seem quite separate from one another.

(Gergen in Gergen and Jones 2008, p.2)

The identification of the problem of specialisation here lays the foundation for the methodology of Performative Social Science (PSS) to be adopted as described in Chapter III which, as Jones (2013) describes:

When it is at its best and humming along, is a synthesis that provides answers to many of these very requirements. Ideally, our audiences should be almost unaware of the seams where we have cobbled together in-depth, substantial scholarship with artistic endeavour. In my estimation, part of doing PSS is not only in the breaking down of the old boundaries, but also in discarding the old expectations and frameworks of what research is supposed to resemble after it is finished.

(Jones 2010)

Jones' call for the seamless interaction of art and scholarship helps to locate the research question of this thesis that asks how we can performatively apply a documentary film method in the search for new knowledge.

G. *The Transgressive Screen*

The literature reviewed has indicated how the problem of academic discourse has been framed in the USA since the 1980s in terms of formal academic writing versus individual creative expression, and outlined the constraints imposed by disciplinary specialisation in communicating knowledge. These issues have been contextualised with reference to the way linguistic registers can shape our thinking (Bourdieu) and noted how a philosophy drawing on contingent irony and the search for new vocabularies (Rorty) might provide the foundations for new models of academic discourse. Parfitt's quest for new forms that engage new writers and readers suggests a more open-minded direction of travel, but the developing context of filmic expression and new media technologies suggests that there is no reason why such expression could not be contextualized and located within a self-reflective and critical framework that is not text-driven: the literature reviewed prompts the question that this might be a direction in which

we might seek to develop models of performative academic practice using video technology. This opens a space for the consideration of transgressions within academic discourse, which might take place in spatial and symbolic environments beyond text, which are localized, and which, like graffiti, “create the space in which they happen, but also give meaning to that space” (Pennycook 2010, p.128).

Pennycook can be criticised for not proposing a method of achieving transgression within academic practice, but it will be suggested later that Pennycook’s search for ‘discursive formations’ and transgressive actions are relevant in the context of considering performative strategies in this investigation. Pennycook’s identification of the academic mission as “the struggle to become the author of one’s own world, to be able to create one’s own meaning, to pursue cultural alternatives amid the cultural politics of everyday life” (Pennycook 1997, p.39) lies at the heart of reflective documentary practice as it might be applied in the academy. This finds expression in Lanham’s 1995 call for a new appreciation of the role of rhetoric in education.

Lanham (1995), in promoting the teaching of rhetoric within a humanistic discourse in Higher Education in the USA, identified the primary challenge facing researchers as a need to "understand the expressive environment of our time"(Lanham 1995, p.100). As Andrews (1996) notes, Lanham conveys an expectation that “rather than experiencing a complete return to an oral-based culture, the electronic media of our time reintroduce elements of oral culture into our consciousness and will fuse strangely with print literacy” (Andrews 1996). The strangeness of that fusion is viewed here as an opportunity for further research. The bringing together of oral and literate discourses through modern communications technology is in its early stages and was particularly so for Lanham outlining his vision of the possibility in 1995:

We may view the strand of experimental humanism that started with Marinetti's Futurist Manifesto and the Dadaists, then returned as a specifically rhetorical argument with Kenneth Burke and Richard McKeon, exploded again in all the sixties' isms, and then returned again in the seventies as "literary theory," as finally a didactic movement, a long and variously animated argument about what humanistic study should do and be. Experimental humanism aimed to convert the Arnoldian foregone conclusions into an open-ended experimentality; to galvanise the silent and impassive

audience into interaction; to invoke the medium as self-conscious condition of the message; to expose scaling changes as movements to a different register of meaning; to precipitate game and play out of pompous purpose and plead directly to them; to readmit chance to the role it has always played in the human drama; to make war on taste in order to find out what species of censor it truly was; and through all these radically to democratise the arts. To return us, that is, from a closed poetics to an open rhetoric. The electronic word, as pixeled upon a personal-computer screen, reinforces all these purposes, literalizes them in a truly uncanny way.

(Lanham 1995, p.24)

Here the pixelated screen is viewed as a rhetorical tool with which to re-position the conception of truth back in its contextual and language-dependent box, asking us to acknowledge that "the bit-mapped, graphics-based personal computer is ... intrinsically a rhetorical device" (Lanham 1995, p.105). The dynamic and interactive structure of the computer as realized on the screen "expresses the rhetorical tradition just as the codex book embodies the philosophical tradition" (Lanham 1995, p.106). The distinction between the two traditions of rhetoric and philosophy is core to Lanham's perception that "we now find ourselves in yet another rehearsal of this ancient quarrel between the philosophers and the rhetoricians. We pit sacred texts against topical ones, ultimately meaningful ones against ultimately meaningless ones, Plato against Socrates, finally-you can fill in the other contrasted pairs of proper names yourself-pitting Almighty God against what one eminent theorist has called 'the pleasures of the bottomless'" (Lanham 1995, p.110). The threat to the academy in non-empirical uncertainties implicit in "the pleasures of the bottomless", which the rhetorical approach threatens, is indicated in the struggle for acceptance that Lanham's mission has faced.

In popular culture, the return to orality with its inherent rhetorical opportunities offered by the culture of the screen has become manifest since Lanham's initial conception twenty years ago which predated the widespread adoption of smart phones, the internet, video online and social media. Lanham noted the potential for redressing the power relations in research and education that we have seen existing in traditional print-based academic discourse:

The criticism/creation dichotomy automatically becomes, in a digital world, a dynamic oscillation: you simply cannot be a critic without being in turn a creator. This oscillation prompts a new type of teaching in which intuitive skills and conceptual reasoning can

reinforce one another directly. The digital interchangeability of the arts through a common code - that old Platonic dream that everything returns to mathematics - allows us to translate one range of human talents into another.

(Lanham 1995, p.107)

The challenge for the academy is to bring the liberation implicit in the use of digital media in daily life into the realm of more complex forms of understanding associated with scholarship. This is a challenge that has been taken up by Shrum *et al* (2005) who have identified that “a convergence of digital video technologies with practices of social surveillance portends a methodological shift towards a new variety of qualitative methodology” (Schrum *et al* 2005). They have used concepts such as “the fluid wall” and “videoactive context” “to emphasize that (1) the camera is an actor in the research process, and (2) both behaviour and observation occur in both directions--in front of and behind the camera” (Shrum *et al.* 2005). These new concepts in many ways reflect a much older pre-occupation with visuality in discourse that has lain dormant in an era dominated by the printed text, as Erikson makes clear.

Bringing the practices of academic and audiovisual production together is not altogether new. One of the founders of modern science, Leonardo da Vinci, moved effortlessly between the two practices. The visual model – be it of atomic nuclei or social hierarchies – is used throughout the sciences. Historically, the natural sciences have been more accustomed to using images than social sciences have, and scientific visualizations of processes, experiments and data have long been prevalent in the natural sciences. However, in these disciplines the visual material is often illustrational and acts as supporting material.

(Erikson and Sorensen 2014)

The assertion that visual research material has tended to be used in supporting context prompts the research question posed in this dissertation to examine how we can foreground the performative use of documentary film as one instance of a visual method.

The potential to broaden the field of application has been identified by Rose (2001) who has noted the value of visuality in describing and reflecting on “the visual” that is central to how contemporary social life is constructed and “the ways in which social subjectivities are pictured or made invisible, and how those processes are embedded in power relations”(Rose 2001, p.5). Rose

contends that visual culture is emerging as a new field of study and Jordan (2004) suggests that the advent of practice-led research has assisted the transition towards a focus on the visual components of culture, noting that “Prior to the 1980s 'practice-based' research in the visual arts was virtually unheard of, and research activity was restricted to the art historical or theoretical domain” (Jordan 2004). This direction of travel has also been prompted by a developing interest among artists in using art as a research process.

A recent example of the cross-fertilisation of art and documentary research can be found in the work of the artist Deimantas Narkevicius (Tate 2014). Narkevicius originally trained as a sculptor, but made the transition to working with film in the early 1990s with films that examine the relationship between personal memory and political history using archival footage, voice-overs, interviews, re-enactments and found photographs. His work with the filmmaker Peter Watkins, whose celebrated drama-documentaries such as *The Battle of Culloden* (1964) and *The War Game* (1965) also broke the conventional borders of fact and fiction, displays a shared distrust of claims to authenticity and a search for “a cinematic language which embraces ambiguity and blurs the lines between impartial observation and subjective statement, between testimony and storytelling” (Tate, 2014). That their experimental work currently finds a platform in a national art gallery reflects the current aesthetic preoccupation with the fragmentation of the boundaries between art, research and documentary, and gives further credence to an examination of the underlying trends and transformations that underlie the question posed by this research: whether the conditions might be right for a similar blurring of boundaries between documentary art and social science as a performative method of scholarship. The examination will now extend to considering how the subjective portrayal of observation has been developed in the field of literary non-fiction and its bearing on the research problem.

H. *Literary Journalism: “Art’s Status as Document”*

The blurring of boundaries between documentary, art and social observation has come to the fore in the latter part of the twentieth century in the written text, under the generic guise of ‘reportage’, ‘creative non-fiction’ or ‘literary journalism’. During the 1960s, writers such as Tom Wolfe and Truman Capote raised the profile of the genre with the label ‘The New Journalism’ (Wolfe *et al.* 1975) and the ‘non-fiction novel’ (Capote 1965), and the dictum that it was a form in which the journalism would read like a novel or a short story. One of the leading exponents of the method during the era of New Journalism was the author Joan Didion, who commented that “the writer is always tricking the reader into listening to the dream” (Kuehl 1978), and one of the characteristics of the style is to bring the subject as close as possible to the reader through vivid description.

Tom Wolfe’s “Manifesto for New Journalism” summarised the techniques as using scene-by-scene construction, long passages of dialogue in its entirety, scenes in which we see the third-person point of view, and recording every detail of behaviour and circumstance (the “status life”) (Wolfe *et al.* 1975). Notions of objectivity common to press reporting were supplemented with subjective impressions of how the characters felt in their emotional lives, bringing to journalism what Wolfe referred to as an “esthetic dimension”: “The idea was to give the full objective description, plus something that readers had always had to go to novels and short stories for: namely, the subjective or emotional life of the characters” (Wolfe 1972). The implication that the writer became part of the story was inconsistent with the traditional tenets of journalism but the technique of “saturation reporting” as coined by Wolfe resulted in a depth of detail that went beyond the surface questions of who, what, when etc.

The recent foregrounding of the term “reality” in the context of developments in documentary form in broadcast television has already been noted. The inclusion of what Shields (2011) terms self-referential “existential investigation” has been identified as a broader trend in popular culture in his self-styled manifesto “Reality Hunger”(2011). Shields claims “My intent is to write an *ars poetica* for a burgeoning group of interrelated ... artists in a multitude of

forms and media ... who are breaking larger and larger chunks of 'reality' into their work" (Shields 2011, p.4). He highlights the characteristics:

Randomness, openness to accident and serendipity, spontaneity, artistic risk, emotional urgency and intensity, reader/viewer participation; an overly literal tone, as if a reporter were viewing a strange culture; plasticity of form, pointillism; criticism as autobiography; self-reflexivity, self-ethnography, anthropological auto-biography; a blurring (to the point of invisibility) of any distinction between fiction and non-fiction; the lure and blur of the real.

(Shields 2011, p.5)

Shield's provocative work provides a good example of the artist (in this case he also happens to be an academic) who uses his art of literary fiction and non-fiction to blur the boundaries as a means of investigation: "The essential gesture of the contemporary novel is to get people to turn the page, to entertain them, and I hate that. I want a novel where the gesture is towards existential investigation on every page. That, to me, is thrilling" (O'Hagan 2010). His search for "messy truthiness" is characterized as part of a literary movement that promotes the "seemingly unprocessed, unfiltered, uncensored and unprofessional, an arena in which Shields finds the appeal of the mess in the blurring of boundaries where memory meets memoir, and celebrates unreliability as a virtue when it is discovered. His iconoclasm extends to placing plagiarism on a pedestal, seeing no need to reference the patchwork of multiple phrases and thoughts of others that he has incorporated into his own work (to the extent that one author wrote "Reading it, I kept thinking, 'Yes, exactly, I wish I'd said that, and then I realised I had'"(Dyer) and that unacknowledged quote itself was used to promote the book). Seeking authenticity in the chaos of the real, Shields echoes the New Journalism of the late twentieth century (Wolfe 1973), and his embrace of documentary as a vehicle for discovery suggests that it might be possible to identify similar conditions for the creation of a new performative form of documentary in the academy:

I see every art as importantly documentary. Everything is always already invented; we merely articulate, arrange. The forms of art that make art's status as document the most explicit give me real delight.....But things matter in documentary as embodiment, not argument – at least in the documentaries I like, the least narrated ones.

(Shields 2011, p. 68)

Shield's apt phrase "art's status as document" is a key locus on the map of this research journey as it supports the validity of the overarching research problem presented here: how we might apply a performative form of documentary film in the search for embodied knowledge.

This tendency towards "reality hunger" has found renewed opportunity for expression in a media-saturated the digital age, as Burn (2009) has explored by writing the news itself as fiction. "In the digital age, when it is a given that anything digital will be copied, and anything copied once will fill the universe, it can be argued - as I did in my book *Born Yesterday* last year - that the news itself is a novel" (Burn 2009). Burn identifies the opportunity to travel in the opposite direction to the journalistic imperative of simplification using the same material of the world as observed.

The imaginative challenge in writing *Born Yesterday* [(Burn 2008)]lay in making connections that hadn't previously been apparent. John Berger once said something that struck me very forcibly, and that I recalled continually in the writing of the book: "Imagination is not, as is sometimes thought, the ability to invent; it is the ability to disclose that which exists." As its subtitle - "The news as a novel" - suggests, the book sets out to restore some ambiguity and complexity to stories that have been stripped of those things in their broad-brush retelling on TV, online and in the press. My intention was to re-complicate reality and, in doing that - in making connections between the visible and invisible worlds - to show that it can have the poetry and some of the mysterious resonance of fiction.

(Burn 2009)

Burn's intention to "re-complicate reality" points towards the possibility that this might be achieved in an academic context using similar devices and tools in video that the research here sets out to discover.

A similar and contemporaneous initiative has been developed in a performed context by playwrights working in the field of what has become known as 'verbatim theatre' (National Theatre 2015). A leading exponent of the form, David Hare has written plays about the political establishment and the detail of its processes from the privatisation of the railways to the invasion of Iraq and the financial crisis of 2008. Hare notes "this kind of timely writing which seeks, as Balzac's work once did, to provide society with its secretarial record, continues to attract reproach from those good souls who believe that the results cannot be regarded as "proper" plays – in the sense, say, that Sophocles or

Racine wrote "properly"(Hare 2010). Despite the nature of the play as a matter of "secretarial record", Hare distinguishes his role as an artist from that of a journalist in a way that is directly relevant to the shaping of the research question presented in this report.

I need to make clear that I therefore regard *The Permanent Way*, *Stuff Happens*, *Murder in Samarkand*, *Gethsemane* and *The Power of Yes* as something entirely different from journalism...Journalism is reductive. This is not always the fault of journalists. It is in the nature of the job. At its best and worst, journalism aims to distil. It aims to master, even to subjugate, a particular topic.

(Hare 2010)

Hare's response to the question of where is the art in a document of record points to the question of metaphor in relation to documentation, prompting a question that this research sets out to address:

Tebbit showed impatience with some fellow guests in a radio studio by declaring that he was tired of hearing about the claims of art. In his view, a Rolls-Royce aeroplane engine was far more beautiful than most things living artists had created. Why was an engine not a work of art? There are certainly many different answers to his question – plenty of people would say it was – but my personal response would be that an aeroplane engine is an object without metaphor, and without metaphor we have no art.

(Hare 2010)

The role of art in achieving a complexity of understanding is highlighted in Hare's work as a self-defined artist but this research will set out to ask if it might apply equally to a researcher utilising an art form for the purposes of research. Specifically Hare's work provokes the question of the ostensive narrative in relation to the poetic treatment.

The most interesting reaction of all came from a painter friend, who was struck by how much the look of the play resembled an installation by Bill Viola. How strange, he said, that an ostensibly prosaic, ostensibly factual play should unleash some of the purest visual poetry he had ever seen in a theatre.

(Hare 2010)

The question this poses for the research undertaken here is how that effect might be achieved or that device enabled in the context of using documentary video in the pursuit of scholarship. As Hare puts it, echoing the reference to Bagehot's (2001) phrase "Letting daylight in upon magic" quoted at the beginning of this

dissertation, “Art frequently reminds us that things are never quite as simple as they seem. Nor are people. Journalism is life with the mystery taken out. Art is life with the mystery restored” (Hare 2010). This seemingly antithetical suggestion in the context of academic training and analysis is that mystery can help the process of understanding. The question that this prompts is how might “mystery” be appropriated and applied in the context of scholarship founded on the notion that understanding is predicated on letting in the daylight. Hare’s work suggests a clue in how we might approach the task of introducing metaphor as a creative device using documentary video, which this research will explore in more depth. Again Hare asks us to look confidently towards an area in which we might ask the right questions:

As the years went by, it became clear to me that I had not understood aesthetics. They were not your enemy. They were your opportunity. Style was the only means by which you could suggest that what you were writing about was something more than what you appeared to be writing about. Without style there was no suggestiveness, and with no suggestiveness, no metaphor. The processes of art could begin nowhere else.

(Hare 2010)

For Hare, the boundary of fact and fiction is far more complex than most of his critics allow. The suggestion that is explored in this research is that the reward of bridging that boundary lies in a deeper level of understanding that takes us from the evocative questioning of what, who and when to what we might call the provocative questions which we might find are harder to answer. As Hare describes it, “If we accept the simple distinction that factual work asks questions for us, whereas fictional work is more likely to ask questions of us, then why can some work not do both?”(Hare 2010). It is the purpose of this research to discover if it is possible for a video documentary to do both with a claim to performative scholarship.

There are inherent dangers, which are pertinent to the research problem of how documentary film might be applied as a method of Performative Social Science, when the verbatim element is misplaced or misunderstood. This can be the case when dramatic fiction makes claims for veracity whilst, to repeat Didion’s phrase, “tricking the reader into listening to the dream”(Kuehl 1978).

An example in the fields of literature and screen might be drawn from the writing of David Peace, whose novel and subsequent television drama, *Red Riding*, is based on the infamous case of the Yorkshire Ripper, with echoes of one of the pioneering works in the field, Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood* (Capote 2000). Jack describes Peace's style: "The way Peace told it stood out as singular and memorable. He wrote - writes - like nobody else, in brief incantatory sentences, two-word paragraphs and dialogue that is usually moving ominously towards the next abducted child, the next dead prostitute and the next bent policeman. It can be both poetic and cinematic..." (Jack 2009). As a journalist, Jack acknowledges that in the world of crime fiction the claim of the novelist that they are "making it up" is acceptable.

The trouble with Peace's series is the length it goes to suggest the opposite. Most fiction draws on reality, but *Red Riding* goes much further, to sponge off it. "I want to read fictions torn from facts that use those fictions to illuminate the truth," Peace has said.

(Jack 2009).

Whilst Jack finds the claim of using fiction to shine a light on the truth acceptable, Jack questions the quality of the truth that can be drawn from the apparent authenticity of a work that distorts detail for imaginative effect.

Red Riding, therefore, is like those opaque parcels of debt sold on by banks, reflecting both real and imaginary assets. Unlike bankers, we should take care to separate the real from the imaginary - if, that is, we insist on seeing these films as a profound meditation on English life 30 years ago, accurate in its evidence, rather than a compelling fiction, Jacobean in its brutality, that owes more to a dark imagination than the sorrowful facts of Leeds.

(Jack 2009)

Without devaluing the role of fiction as a tool of performative scholarship, this suggests that in the field of documentary film, the success of a project that trades in the intersection of imagination and the sorrowful facts under the title 'documentary' should borrow more from the power of verbatim record combined with metaphor than from the casual use of factual detail, if it is to succeed in its claim as a documenting tool of scholarship. This is a claim that will be taken up in the next section which focuses on documentary as a newly developing performative space and which will be tested in the research that follows.

I. *Documentary Film: The Performative Space of the 'B' Roll*

It has been stated that the aim of the research is to discover by practice new ways in which documentary video might be developed and extended as a performative academic research tool. The intention is to explore coinciding developments in the newly emerging field of Performative Social Science and in the "new subjectivity" (Renov 1996, p.175) appearing in documentary film practice to find out if documentary film might provide a locus for performatively styled inquiry. To this end I have examined the literature relevant to two aspects of the inquiry: firstly, changes in the conception of knowledge; and secondly, the digital shift in technology. The literature already cited has suggested that the development of scholarship has been structured and constrained by the use of written text.

To pursue the inquiry beyond the limitations of text, I will now review work which suggests where we might look towards new ways of knowing that are relevant to academic discourse and might be mediated through forms which have been more associated with popular culture rather than the academy. I will be seeking to frame these around the application of what can be termed a "documentary imagination", conceptualized here as a diverse set of practices, norms and behaviours with varied claims on the real as an expression of knowledge. This section will then interrogate the relationship of these practices to academic discourse historically across a range of disciplines: for example in ethnographic methodologies in anthropology, and increasingly as performative, auto-ethnographic methodologies in fields as diverse as media production and health and social care. Past models offered by literary journalism and contemporary models offered by developments in the application of 'B' roll images will be considered in the context of the search here for new paradigms of academic discourse to complete the map and find out where the research question rests in relation to the literature outlined.

If we are to understand how the documentary imagination might be employed as a scholarly method, it is necessary to review the literature relevant to documentary methods as they might apply to scholarship. Boyer's (1990) frequently cited classification of the areas of scholarship as (1) the generation of new knowledge through discovery; (2) the transfer of the knowledge gained through the process of dissemination and teaching; (3) the application of new

knowledge in society; (4) making the connection between disciplines through understanding all have been noted here.

Through an examination of the literature we can identify a role for the documentary method in relation to each of these aspects: the camera can be used to select and record data; the recorded film can be analysed and ordered; the encapsulated narrative of the research can be distributed and displayed for learning; the work can be promoted to the wider society; and the filmmaker-scholar can share understandings beyond the immediate discipline. The field of literature in relation to documentary is so extensive and diverse that I will confine my review here to the specific consideration of recent trends in ethnographic documentary and the turn towards auto-ethnography and reflexivity that has been identified in contemporary documentary film practice.

Nichols (2001) has famously identified documentary as a “discourse of sobriety”, founded upon a generalized notion of objective factual observation of the world in keeping with a positivist epistemological framework. The use of film technology to record human experience of everyday life has found traction in both the personal and professional domains. We need look no further than the pithy advertising catch phrase to see that the notion of ‘capturing’ the world on film has enjoyed popular currency, from Eastman Kodak’s slogans such as “We capture your memories for ever” and “Capture the Kodak moment” (Jacobs 2012), to documentary film titles such as *Capturing the Friedmans* (2003) and *Capturing Reality* (2009). Ignoring for the moment the ontological assumptions implicit in the idea that a frame of film or video may contain an objective reality, we can note that the impulse to document the world through audio-visual “data” has a long history in anthropological ethnographic documentary filmmaking, almost as long as the history of the technology itself. The genesis of the documentary form can be located in the study of anthropology through films such as Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* (1922) and Grierson’s *Drifters* (1929). The camera has become a well-established tool of anthropological research, resurfacing in the most recent trend in ethnographic filmmaking, *Sensory Ethnography*, as defined, curated and collated by the Harvard Sensory Ethnography Lab.

One of the most recent examples of the genre is Véréna Paravel and Lucien Castaing-Taylor’s award-winning portrayal of life aboard a fishing boat,

Leviathan (Paravel and Castaing-Taylor 2012). Again we can take note of the impact of technological change on the expression of knowledge as they exploit the recent miniaturization and low cost of high quality cameras to obtain multiple and unusual viewpoints, combined with long takes, carefully composed sound, dialogue as sound texture, and rhythmic editing to achieve a novel direct sensory experience which evokes the patterns we more commonly associate with music. The art-house cinematic result is reminiscent of Raymond Williams' conception of a "structure of feeling" (Williams 2001), a concept that Corner remarks "is entirely appropriate to the affective emphasis...toward which a new documentary energy has been drawn" (Corner 2008, p.45). *Leviathan* (2012) is a particularly interesting example in that it echoes in the twenty-first Century of one of the earliest ethnographic documentaries of the twentieth century which has already been noted, John Grierson's *Drifters* (1929), which itself was a product of technological innovation. Grierson's canonical film was also about a fishing fleet, inspired by a similar informational ambition, not dissimilar aesthetic modes and intentions, and employing a not dissimilar mode of cinematic distribution (not withstanding YouTube promotion) to disseminate its knowledge. The similarities and differences of these two films can be seen to encapsulate a moment in the historiography of scholarship that is relevant to this inquiry.

In the way that print has been conceptualized as a parenthetical era, broadcast television, as an intervening parenthetical era between these two films, during which film makers could be said to have abandoned the original conception of the anthropological documentary project, might be similarly be conceptualised. As Corner identifies it, the period of television broadcasting has been a time in which there was a "relocation of the documentary project within revised, expanded and often considerably 'lightened' terms for portraying reality" (Corner 2006, p.96). Corner notes "a 'dramatic turn' in documentary crafting, ... brought about largely by changes in the documentary economy, the conditions for commissioning, funding and scheduling in competitive market structures, and we can see it having three prominent aspects – the intensity of events, the pull of story and the attractions of character" (Corner 2006 p.90). A re-conceptualisation of the documentary project for scholarly purposes as distinct from the pull of the market might seek to counteract, to use Corner's terms "the intensity of events, the pull of the story and the attractions of character". A

strategy using what is termed the 'B' roll to relegate the role of events, story and character in the scholarly application of documentary form will be tested in Chapter IV (the film).

Corner describes the category of broadcast entertainment documentary described above as "Diversion", which has a commercial objective and now dominates the schedules. Corner comments: "Documentary is no longer classifiable as a "discourse of sobriety" to use Bill Nichols's much-cited phrase (see Nichols 1991). It has become suffused with a new "lightness of being,""(Corner 2002, p.264) as it strives for popular appeal in a commercial environment. Following the de-regulation of much of broadcasting in the UK, which has already been noted, the 'reality-ness' of unscripted formats has been co-opted for television entertainment. For example, in the previous era of public service television in for example the UK, underwritten by Reith's trilogy of "inform, educate and entertain" (Reith 1922), and more recently, Jay and Birt's "mission to explain" (Chesshyre 1981), the informational and educational status of the documentary form was privileged and protected. This suggests that following the reformulation of broadcast documentary as 'reality television', driven by the commercial imperative to entertain, we might seek a reformulation of documentary modes outside the institutional constraints of broadcast television, driven by a priority to inform and educate.

Corner goes so far as to suggest that the 'lightened' burden of the real in recent television has in effect created a broadcast 'post-documentary culture'. The suggestion raises the question relevant to this inquiry of whether the relocation of the documentary form in broadcasting to more entertainment-based formats and formulas, with its concomitant marginalization of the more serious work, has opened up the opportunity to reconfigure the form and its purpose, outside the mainstream of the broadcast marketplace, reclaiming and valuing the uncertainties of documentation (recalling Dams reporting Woolcock, cited earlier: "A real documentary adventure is where the outcome is uncertain....Does it matter that we lie to people? I think that it does...." (Dams 2010)).

Corner (2002) has pinpointed three functions which the documentary has been required to perform in the era of public service broadcasting: 'democratic civics' where documentary is engaged in the cause of citizenship; 'journalistic inquiry' and exposition, where the mode is reportage "which importantly

includes an experience of looking at kinds of visual evidence, an experience of witness”; and thirdly, and relevant to the research question posed in this inquiry, documentary as “Radical Interrogation and Alternative Perspective”, in which Corner notes: “A wide range of styles has been deployed, including techniques of disruption and distancing taking their cue from non-realist cinema but also including direct-cinema styles of observationalism, modes of dramatization, and kinds of personal testimony extending well beyond both the duration and format of the conventional interview. The anthropological levels of scrutiny offered by some projects in observational and oral history television could be included here”(Corner 2008, p49). This suggests a fruitful line of inquiry for further research in regard to the performative use of documentary video.

Corner, noting the instability of the term ‘documentary’ suggests that for it to continue to be meaningful, “the term needs pressing back toward the broader category of “documentation” (Corner 2002 p.258), while not to deny the categorization and history of a tradition that has built up despite the contingency of meaning. The opportunity provided by this re-location is perceived by Corner to offer a description of a spread of practices evident across a range of platforms. Corner (2000, 2002) notes his preference for using the term documentary as an adjective, as originally “championed by the cinema pioneers and established through sheer familiarity. To ask “is this a documentary project?” is more useful than to ask “is this film a documentary?” with its inflection toward firm definitional criteria and the sense of something being more object than practice” (Corner 2002, p.260). Corner’s proposition to return documentary to documentation opens the way to ask whether an understanding of documentary as practice rather than reified object could assist the return of the form as a method of documentation open to acceptance by the academy, and whether it might open up the possibility for utilisation within the wider ambit of cross-disciplinary scholarship, extending beyond its traditional confinement in academic research to realm of anthropology.

Winston (2008) argues that the only claim that can be made for the most transparent form of documentary filmmaking, the so called “*verité*” as defined by Rouch (Rouch and Feld 2003) and inspired by Vertov, is that the physicality of what was before the lens is above all a record of the presence of the film maker. Winston describes the celebrated documentary filmmaker Fred Wiseman’s films

as “ the experience of making them” and “the narrativising of recorded aspects of observation”(Winston, 2008 p.85). More recently Renov (2004) has noted “the recent turn to filmic autobiography” as “the defining trend of “post-verité” documentary practice...” (Renov, 2004 p.xxiii). Subsequently, Renov developed the observation to suggest that “the very idea of autobiography challenges/reinvents the very idea of documentary” (Renov 2008, p.42). This turn towards the idea of documentary as autobiography is highly relevant to the notion of embodied practice that has been noted in relation to Literary Journalism and will be considered in relation to the potential of the ‘B’ roll as a performative method as outlined next.

In relation to the research problem presented here, the practice of autobiographical documentary film production suggests we can understand the construction of knowledge as a ‘trace’ of the research through documentary film practice in two ways, referring to conventions in the way a film is edited using an ‘A’ roll and a ‘B’ roll. The terms ‘A’ roll and ‘B’ roll are derived from the traditional method of editing celluloid film using a flatbed editing table. The ‘A’ roll constitutes what is conventionally regarded as the primary source material theatrically performed for example by interviewees in the case of factual material or by actors in the case of fiction, edited into a narrative sequence. The ‘A’ roll tends to employ synchronous picture and sound footage. The ‘B’ roll contains the material that is relegated to background information, such as geography shots, scenic material and cut-aways that are used to dress the ‘A’ roll. The ‘B’ tends to use non-synchronous footage.

The report presented here, which has emerged as result of testing the data through the embodied praxis, will examine how knowledge might be constructed performatively through a documentary film aesthetic by reversing the traditional film production perspective on the process and the product. In contrast to industry norms, in the performative approach applied here it is the ‘B’ roll which will be fore-grounded in the research film and it is the ‘A’ roll which becomes less significant. The consequence for the study of social science is that the ‘bigger picture’ enables a perspective which transcends the individual and locates the moment in a broader context of both space and, crucially, time.

Whilst there are literary comparisons which can be made with this filmic technique, such as in the writing of novelist W.G. Sebald (1996), whose work is

centred on memory and landscape as much as character, the film aesthetic lends itself to accomplishing this task far more readily. Gee remarks, “Just gawp at something for long enough and it might start to get a life of its own” (Harris, 2012 in an interview about his documentary about the life of Sebald, and making reference to comparisons with the filmmaker Patrick Keiller’s visual style. Recalling Mackendrick’s (2005) statement that it is important to understand that the film director’s task is not to direct the camera or the performance but to direct the audience’s attention, the mission of requiring the audience to ‘gawp’ serves as a description for my own *modus operandi* in the context of a performative method. The consequence is that the construction of knowledge through performative documentary film practice opens a space in which to ask questions rather than have them answered. The landscapes, the scenic shots, the non-synchronous sound, all counteract the trend towards transparency and diversion in making evident their construction as a trace of the ostensive research which has gone before: the role of these images is to ask questions of it. The roles of metaphor and irony become significant in this regard and the research film presented in Chapter IV illustrates this.

Chapter III

Methodology

On Art 5

Write about an explosion
By the light of the explosion

Don't wait: you will write of the great beam
That fell on the white horse

And forget how dust forced you to gasp
Till your hand shook

Now while you write the dust in your lungs
Slowly begins to kill

If you had written
By the light of the explosion

You would have told us your hand shook
And we would have known the killer dust

Edward Bond (1978)

A. *Introduction to Methodology*

To tell you how my hand shook and to know the killer dust, I will describe how and why I have applied a qualitative, performative methodology, whereby the process of discovery and expression of the outcomes has been undertaken by a practice-as-research method, drawing on documentary film production for the research and dissemination of the findings.

Once upon a time, on a beach, a man sat down on a rock in front of my camera and began to tell me a story. It was a fisherman's tale literally and metaphorically. I did not know whether to believe him. That was when the germ of this research was planted. As his extraordinary story continued over the

months and then years, I set out on my journey to understand that the knowledge we can gain from people telling stories can be more complicated than asking whether the story is true or false. The fisherman's story became the basis of my filmic inquiry into witness, which I am using as the data for this thesis to examine the performative application of documentary film in scholarship. To understand the ambiguities that are embodied within the narrative of my own research journey I have adopted a performative methodology.

B. *Performative Methodology*

I have chosen to adopt a performative methodology as a qualitative approach with an established record of application in Performative Social Science. In this section I am going to consider in detail the rationale for this preferred methodology, by which I have examined how we can develop a creative method of investigation using documentary film and articulate a scholarly understanding of the world.

In one sense, distinguishing between method and methodology, the entirety of this research can be understood as an inquiry into scholarly method. By method I mean the tool or tools used to undertake the research, and by methodology I mean a theory of research design and decisions, underpinned by ontological and epistemological understandings. Therefore, in this part of the thesis I am proposing and justifying a methodology appropriate to understanding the application of a proposed method of scholarship (the subject of the research). Documentary filmmaking is the method of scholarship that has been investigated and it is appropriate to examine this form of creative practice using Performative Social Science, a methodology that incorporates the use of artistic forms in the investigation.

Roberts (2008) notes the development of performance studies as a progenitor of Performative Social Science, arising from a trend towards the recognition of the place of drama in social relations. Roberts identifies this trend as symptomatic of a broader change in epistemology from "social or cultural fixity to that of fluidity, from scripts to improvisations, from mentalities to the

habitus” (Burke 2005, p.35 cited Roberts, 2008 p.11). Roberts suggests that what he describes as the "turn to performance or, more specifically, the idea of "culture as performance"” can be identified in other areas of social and cultural study such as gender or architecture (Roberts 2008, p.11). Gergen and Gergen indicate the broad range of arts-based activity that is now embraced by this qualitative approach.

Such forms may include art, theater, poetry, music, dance, photography, fiction writing, and multi-media applications (Madison & Hamera, 2006). Performance-oriented research may be presented in textual form, but also before live audiences, or in various media forms (film, photographs, websites).

(Gergen and Gergen 2011, p.1)

Roberts (2009), however, points to the risks inherent in making performance an unconsidered part of any research activity without paying adequate attention to the researcher’s skills and aims, and the tradition and context of the research. He stresses the differentiation “between "performance" which he describes as forms of art and social science, and the "performative", which he describes as processes and tools from the arts and social sciences (Roberts 2008, p.2).

In the context of this research we are concerned with a performative methodology in which “the "performative" should be conceived as a "provisional" or "shorthand" term: to describe the collection, organisation and dissemination of research which moves beyond traditional modes, such as the text based journal article or overhead presentation” (Roberts 2009 p.3). Jones (2014) sums up Performative Social Science (PSS) in its current configuration:

I define PSS as the use of tools from the Arts (and Humanities) in carrying out Social Science research and/or disseminating its findings. Philosophically, I no longer consider Art and Science a binary, but both as a result of the same activity: creativity. For me, creativity is about working within certain boundaries while, at the same time, somehow changing them.

(Jones and Leavy 2014, p.1)

Specifically I have selected a performative methodology because in this investigation I have used creative practice to examine creative practice. Creative processes, outputs and outcomes are at the heart of the performative methodology. To understand process, output and outcome through practice I have needed to document the process of documentary practice, reflect on the

process of documentary practice and contextualise the documentary practice. A performative methodology offers an accepted and systematic framework within a tradition of social science on which to build this activity, which as Gergen and Gergen note, comes “out of a social constructionist alternative to traditional empiricist view of science. From the constructionist standpoint, one’s observations of the world make no principled demands on the forms of communication used to represent these observations.” (Gergen and Gergen 2011, p.9) Therefore the methodology is suited to the examination of documentary film production not only as a method of research but also as a method for the dissemination of the research. Jones (2006) highlights the “publication” of research as a performative act demonstrating, as has been noted, the understanding of inter-human relations through Bourriaud’s philosophy of “relational aesthetics”.

On the basis of the above, a performative methodology can be summarised as a qualitative approach through which the artist/researcher employs creative and imaginative means in the discovery and/or transmission of the findings. The artist/researcher would seek not to privilege access to the data through a “higher” or excluding form of discourse, such as we have identified is traditionally associated with the academy, but would seek to maximise the impact of the research through alternative forms of understanding. Jones (Gergen and Jones 2008) comments that in the context of impact, outcomes are more significant than outputs, and a performative methodology is likely to have increasing resonance in the current political climate and ensuing research agenda. In this sense, there is no reason why the communication of scholarship might not be “entertaining” or why the experience might not be heightened to aid the understanding.

The connection of research to popular cultural forms brings with it the opportunity to engage a wider audience outside of the Ivory Tower by exploiting the popularity of the form. In the context of theatre, Saldana (2005) believes that an ethnographic performance has a "responsibility to create an entertainingly informative experience for an audience, one that is aesthetically sound, intellectually rich, and emotionally evocative" (Saldaña 2005, p.14). The shift towards an expectation of audience engagement is clear. Above all, performative social science places an emphasis on the audience as a maker of meaning. As

Jones notes, quoting Norma Desmond, the fictional silent movie star in the film *Sunset Boulevard*, “I just put my faith in “those wonderful people out there in the dark”” (Gergen and Jones, 2008, p.46).

When we move to the performative, as researchers, we cede "control" of interpretation of our work to our audience. This is the singularly most important shift in social science practice that PSS makes. Ironically and at the same time, we gift ourselves with the opportunity to be more interpretive, more intuitive, more creative, in our outputs. Our job is not so much to convince as to provoke and stimulate.

(Jones in Gergen and Jones 2008, p.10)

Roberts (2008) cites Springgay et al. (2005, p.898) to support the claim that arts based inquiries must be accepted on their own terms with their own criteria and as “methodologies in their own right”. A question here is whether it would be more appropriate to use the term ‘methods’ rather than methodologies, but the point remains that there is a crucial levering open of epistemological doors to reveal new ways of thinking and showing: “A/r/tography, they state, is fundamentally informed by "a loss, a shift, or a rupture" which "create openings", "displace meaning", and "allow for slippages" (Springgay *et al.* 2005, p.898). One of the key aspects of the displacement is to accept that the way we sense meaning may need to change to accompany the epistemological dislocation.

Eisner (1997), an early advocate of the use of the arts as a scholarly method, advises: “think within the medium we choose to use...To know a rose by its Latin name and yet to miss its fragrance is to miss much of the rose’s meaning. Artistic approaches to research are very much interested in helping people experience the fragrance” (Eisner 1997, p.74). The trust that is placed in the audience to smell the fragrance that cannot otherwise be described is a critical aspect of the performative methodology.

Eisner (1997)) identifies empathy, particularity, and productive ambiguity as some of the virtues of “alternative forms of data representation”, He finds that the particularity of situation and people contribute to authenticity in the research and that the credibility of the portrayal of the data is an essential component of data representation. Productive ambiguity contributes to the evocation and

complexity of the subject, and suggests that film may be a useful medium to achieve these.

One job that scholars increasingly want done is engendering a sense of empathy for the lives of the people they wish us to know. Why empathy? Because we have begun to realize that human feeling does not pollute understanding. In fact, understanding others and the situations they face may well require it. Forms of data representation that contribute to empathic participation in the lives of others are necessary for having one kind of access to their lives. Artistically crafted narrative, including the crafting of film, comes into play here.

(Eisner 1997, p.8)

This is supported by Jones who states that Performative Social Science must place its trust in the end-user to make meaning by “allowing for intrusions, shocks and surprise endings by focussing the development and production of performative pieces on the audience as the final interpreter, interlocker, magician, sage. This is where the politics become profoundly embodied; the evocative transformed to the provocative; and the possibility of social science research contributing to changing hearts and minds a reality”(Jones in Gergen and Jones 2008, p.41).

The implicit destabilizing message of the performative methodology for the academy is appreciated by Rapport and Harthill (2012). They find the “non-conformity” of ethnographic poetic representation of, for want of a better term, the “data”, “containing qualities that enable us to crack open academic restrictions”(Rapport and Harthill 2012, p.8). The legacy use of the term data with its scientific origins and connotations is an indication that the language is still evolving in this field. Jones recognizes the need to shift the balance in our thinking towards a more intuitive understanding:

Thinking performatively is about putting aside that analytical part of ourselves that normally deals with data and such, and moving to the other side of the equation and getting in touch with that earlier place where we were energized by the data itself—how it was sparking ideas that were coming from our own personal experience which, every creative person will tell you, is the fount of all creativity.

(Jones in Gergen and Jones 2008, p.14)

Gergen and Gergen (2011) point to the risks of abandoning the traditional paper with its orientation towards an ontology and epistemology that embraces

the definitive and objective: “While traditional writing seeks to bring the full content into a logically coherent whole, a performative orientation invites explorations into ambiguity, subtle nuance, and contradiction” (Gergen and Gergen 2011, p.9). Spiers and Smith argue the case for this approach in the context of exploring poetry as a vehicle for understanding the experience of patients in a health care setting. They draw on Eisner’s (1997) championing of communication of artistic expression employing the rhetoric of poetry to create a meaning that would otherwise be absent, “using rhythm, rhyme, assonance, alliteration, pitch and tone that combines to create a resonance that is more than the sum of its parts” (Spiers and Smith 2012, p.21).

We can think of the application of equivalent and similar tropes in film production that might elicit an emotional as well as cognitive response from the viewer and the implicit transfer of onus to the viewer or reader to take from the work what they will. “Poetry was invented to say what words can never say. Poetry transcends the limits of language and evokes what cannot be articulated” (Eisner 1997 p. 5). Ambiguity that is characteristic of poetry hints at a direction for the application of other art forms such as film in scholarly research and expression, where there is already a tradition of poetic filmmaking that can be drawn upon. Similarly, Rapport and Harthill (2012) note the benefits of this approach to ethnography and specifically ethnographic writing, pointing to the evocation of open-ended connections; the cognitive and emotional connectivity that can be induced; the openness to interpretation “without excessive researcher influence”; and the sophistication of the communication because “it allows us to arrive at a more complex, nuanced and thoughtful conclusion than might otherwise be the case”(Rapport and Harthill 2012, p.20). Rapport and Harthill also note the importance of both concision and precision in the practice of poetry that is also a requirement of good scholarship: The focus on the particular detail from which the generalising statement can be drawn and understood exists in both the poetic impulse and in the accurate reporting of research observations. They cite Jackson quoting Goethe: “Whoever grasps the particular in all its vitality also grasps the general, without being aware of it, or only becoming aware of it at a late stage” (Jackson 2003, p.xi cited Rapport N., 2003, p. xi cited Rapport and Harthill 2012, p.22).

There is a growing body of work in the area of health and social care whose authors not only find value in the creative expression of ethnography but also who find a synergy and shared understanding with the methods of narrative research. In seeking to examine how documentary video can contribute to performative scholarship, I have drawn upon the work of Goodall who asks “why couldn’t a research-based form of inquiry also be a compelling narrative?” (Goodall 2012, p.22). Goodall’s creative practice as a writer, invoking Gusdorf’s (1979) concept of “calling the world into being” (Gusdorf 1979, p.47), where Gusdorf suggested that “to name is to call into existence” (1979, p.38), illustrates the value of creative narratives shaped out of personal experience, where the writing forms part of the research. In the next section I will examine the resonance between auto ethnography and Narrative Research methods.

C. *Narrative Research Methods*

In the previous section I have identified a performative methodology incorporating reflective practice as being appropriate to this thesis. In this section I am going to examine the place of narrative research within the proposed Performative methodological framework, bearing in mind Shields (2010) claim that “Biography and autobiography are the lifeblood of art right now. We have claimed them the way earlier generations claimed the novel, the well-made play, the language of abstraction” (Shields 2010, p.27).

Spiers and Smith (2012) have identified the knowledge-value of representing stories through creative practice as a form in which memory can be understood as stories that we tell ourselves about the past. Much of the research and literature in this field employs oral and literary methods of representation frequently known as creative non-fiction. I am intrigued to find out the implications for filmic documentation using the same conceptualizations. To proceed we need to understand the difference between the terms *story* and *narrative* as employed for the purpose of this dissertation.

In the context of answering the research problem presented here, stories are understood at the micro level of the research method as closed texts. Conversely, narrative is understood at the macro level of the research methodology, being open to systematic connections between stories. Jones states that “One place to start is in our (re)presentations of narrative stories, through publications, presentations and performances” (Jones 2006, p.66). I use this as a starting point for my own research into novel forms of research and presentation of scholarship through documentary video. I am interested in how I can construct a scholastic approach to narrative in approaching the specific data of the film material I am working with to craft a scholarly film (the methodology). The strategies and techniques of the established discipline of Narrative Research as described by Polkinghorne (1995) are useful in this regard:

Narrative inquiry refers to a subset of qualitative research designs in which stories are used to describe human action. The term narrative has been employed by qualitative researchers with a variety of meanings. In the context of narrative inquiry, narrative refers to a discourse form in which events and happenings are configured into a temporal unity by means of a plot.

(Polkinghorne 1995, p.5)

Polkinghorne invokes Bruner’s (1985) designation of types of cognition, drawing on one of the roots of narrative research methodology in psychology, which refer to paradigmatic cognition involving categorization and narrative cognition involving the combination of elements into plot. A further sub-division is created between paradigmatic-type narrative inquiry, categorising common elements of stories and narrative type narrative inquiry that views stories as explanation of events (Polkinghorne 1995, p.5). It is appropriate in this study to use “narrative-type” narrative inquiry to gather together the events surrounding the production of the documentary film, to use aspects of narrative analysis to understand the way stories are told, and derive patterns and meanings that can be drawn from them. Bamberg (2012) clarifies this.

One of the most central ways this complexity plays out is in what can be taken as the most basic intersection, namely between research *on* narratives, where narratives are the object of study, and research *with* narratives, where narratives are the tools to explore something else--typically aspects of human memory or experience.

(Bamberg 2012, p.2)

Bamberg confuses the issue by using the term narrative in two senses. I prefer to make the distinction between story (closed text) and narrative (open research journey making connections between points on the journey). Bamberg refers to *narrative means*, by which I mean story, and *narrative analysis*, by which I mean the narrative of the research journey. Bamberg distinguishes between narrative as genre (what I call here, stories), narrative as method (my proposed documentary method of recording and ‘performing’ (i.e., making art out of stories), and narrative methods (what I am calling the methodological analysis using narrative):

In order to get a clearer conception of what spurred the recent surge of interest in narrative and narrative methods, as well as to better understand debates among proponents of different analytic practices, it is worthwhile to distinguish between (i) how it was possible that narratives have become accepted as a genre that seems to closely reflect people’s sense making strategies--particularly narratives of lives, as in (auto-)biography, life writing, confessions and other disclosures of identity; (ii) how narrative could catapult into the role of a method--one that is said to be the main portal into individual and communal sense making, experience, and subjectivity; and (iii) how there are differences (and commonalities) between a variety of narrative methods that are seemingly competing with one another as analytic tools.

(Bamberg 2009, p.6)

In relation to the research question presented here we can look at the analytic tools of narrative analysis that are relevant to the identified performative methodological approach. The metaphor of a narrative as a journey has found traction in the past twenty years through the work of Hollywood story analysts (Vogler 1992), drawing on the ideas of Joseph Campbell (1949). I find it useful to conceptualise the use of narrative here in the context of research journeys. Specifically I have organised the tools of narrative analysis into the following narrative journeys that I have employed in reflecting on the data:

1. The filmmaker’s narrative journey
2. The researcher’s narrative journey
3. Interview as narrative journey
4. The audience’s narrative journey

1. The filmmaker's narrative journey

This is the metaphorical journey I embarked on as a filmmaker in the process of listening to someone's story and turning it into a film. It might be called the narrative of the lens, in that the vision of the video camera becomes a net catching the detail of the location, temporality, form and content in a way that is not possible through writing. This brings attendant dangers inherent in the transparency of the lens that we can sometimes see played out in the privileging of conventions in documentary form and even more clearly in news, where the "rawness" of the footage may not be tampered with through the application of filters, colour correction, slow motion or music for example, lest it contaminate the authenticity of the apparently transparent image.

2. The researcher's narrative journey

This is the journey of the process of research as an academic. Usher notes the value of the metaphor in the context of experiential research in a world that is in every sense provisional.

The metaphor of research as the texts of personal journeys which readers as potential fellow travellers are invited to a) follow imaginatively in thought and b) possibly retrace themselves in action, offers valuable insights into how 'real-world' enquiries (with their frequent detours and false trails) are actually carried out. It represents an experiential view of research, one in which 'experiences' are not taken as given but provisional, i.e. subject to continuing critical review by all parties.

(Usher *et al.* 1997, p.220)

Drawing on the New Paradigm for action research that became prominent in the 1980s, Usher was pre-empting the subsequent trend towards reflective practice in calling for "relocating the self in research" (Usher *et al.* 1997, p.216). He describes how "until the emergence of so-called 'new paradigm' research, there was little appreciation of researchers as sense-making agents involved in developing understanding through dialogue." He foregrounds the notion of the 'self' as a questioning practitioner on a journey of inquiry and proposes that

“having identified the importance of seeing practices as scripted and of research as the practice of generating a convincing narrative, we can proceed from this to the idea of the self as an author” (Usher *et al.* 1997, p.217). This conception of the researcher involves the act of writing themselves into the narrative to reflect on the situational aspects of the personal experience: “scripting oneself as an affective researcher can assist one to become an effective researcher, especially in an action research/reflective practice context” (Usher *et al.* 1997, p.227). The notion of the researcher’s journey has been useful in reflecting on my presence in the research process and outcome. Sparkes (2007) cites Pelias’ (2004) plea for “a methodology of the heart” (Pelias 2004, p.11 cited Sparkes 2007, p.521) in which the researcher’s body and mind might be acknowledged as integral to the research process. This sentiment has significant echoes in my own experience in the very physical form of presence required of a documentary filmmaker, with a camera being held or ‘embodied’ in a very literal as well as metaphorical sense.

Sparkes (2007) used the construction of a narrative in a university context to examine the experiences of academics “inspired by partial happenings, fragmented memories, echoes of conversations, whispers in corridors, fleeting glimpses of myriad reflections seen through broken glass, and multiple layers of fiction and narrative imaginings” (Sparkes 2007, p.522). This approach has been a motivation to reflect on my own transition from television producer to academic researcher and to consider how such narrative techniques might be applied in a filmic context.

3. Interview as narrative journey

Bamberg (2012) views the interview in the context of narrative research as a valuable device to counter traditional survey techniques that “radically de-contextualize and disconnect the respondents’ meaning making efforts from the concrete setting for which they originally were designed” (Bamberg 2012, p.9). Formal research interview techniques have been created to develop a systematic approach to narrative research, ranging from the open to the more structured. Examples Bamberg identifies include the *free association narrative interview method* (Holloway & Jefferson, 2008); the *biographic-narrative interpretive*

method (Wengraf, 2006, the *narrative oriented inquiry* (Hiles & Cermák, 2008). These techniques have concentrated on the ways in which narratives have been elicited and recorded with an emphasis on the form and content, while other studies have concentrated more on the occasions and locations of storytelling practice. We can identify some problematic aspects of interviewing as well as benefits in drawing out stories. For example there is the problem of the temporal and contextual difference in that we tell different stories about our experiences in different ways at different times. This inevitably has an impact on the organisation of the narrative and the meaning. Another problem is the assumption of transparency of meaning and authenticity in the voice of the respondent:

Although narratives can become, and in particular settings can be used as, reflective means, there is no a priori reason to render stories unanalyzed as reflections of subjectivities or presentations of participants' 'own' voices.

(Bamberg 2012, p.8)

The counter to both these problems is to operate with the idea of narratives as defined texts or what I refer to as stories (e.g., the filmed interview), presenting them as constructed and performed aspects of the broader methodological research narrative. Stories as texts provide us with the opportunity to study the “textual properties” of narrative, specifically the content, form and the way they are presented in time and place, and, as Bamberg acknowledges, the focus on practice takes us beyond the actual accounts and their transcripts to new occasions for the telling of stories (Bamberg 2009, p.10) in which the teasing out of the accounts can consider the who, what, why and when of the occasion of the story.

Pursuing Bamberg's narrative type narrative inquiry as distinct from the cognitive type, this approach lends itself to an understanding of the whole as being greater than the sum of its parts. The stories as texts contribute to the wider picture of the research narrative. Here I will concentrate particularly on the circumstances of documentary filming as a condition and context for the emergent story and the overall narrative methodology.

4. The Audience's Narrative Journey

The audience's narrative journey in this context is the inevitable narrative, usually linear, of the shared experience of watching a film or reading a thesis, where the artist/researcher invites the viewer to share the experience of watching/reading from beginning to end. This is your journey. Sparkes adopts the performative strategy that "In the end, the story simply asks for your consideration" (Sparkes 2007, p.521).

Given that I have chosen to offer a story for consideration, then the story must do its work, on its own, as a story. To enhance this possibility, I prefer to operate as what Thomas Barone (2000) describes as an 'artful writer-persuader' who understands the necessity of relinquishing control over the interpretations placed on a story, inviting an aesthetic reading whereby readers interpret the text from their own unique vantage points, contributing their own questions- answers-experiences to the story as they read it, as co-participants in the creation of meaning. My hope is that the reader might think *with* the story and see where it takes them.

(Sparkes 2007, p.540)

"Thinking *with* the story" is a useful shorthand for the process of evocation and provocation in which the reader or viewer participates and to this end Sparkes employs the device of incorporating reader responses in the text. One reader summarized the approach by commenting "everyone is a kind of research method" (Sparkes 2007 p.54).

The revelatory experience of not knowing, anticipation, and then knowing is significant to understanding the audience's narrative journey. In reviewing Kirsty Gun's novel, *The Big Music* in which the author experiments with the form of the novel as music, Thorpe comments, "Conservative with our own stories, we repeat them in endless loop tapes with only minimal variation, yet this is rarely reflected in literature. The pleasure we take in strong, suspenseful narrative precludes it" (Thorpe 2012). In performative methodology, the audience's narrative journey in the completion of meaning is the one that really matters, and the question examined in the research problem here is whether the performative method of documentary film can provide the space for the loop tape of our storied selves.

D *Our Storied Selves*

To summarize, the approach of narrative analysis offered here draws on three narrative methods:

1. Textual properties
2. Presentation in time and space
3. Why this story here and now

This approach provides a matrix for understanding the place of a story or stories in the scholarship of the creative academic research tool, which, combined with the understanding of the open narrative of the scholar and the scholarship, creates a powerful tool for understanding academic discourse through film production. The value of bringing together these themes in a matrix is evident in Jones' film *Rufus Stone* (Jones 2013b) in which we can see the process of data being continuously revised and worked on to speak to the research question presented. Andrews' (2006) work on stories that challenge the received narrative ("counter narratives") is particularly pertinent to this inquiry. Citing Bruner (1990) and others, she claims that "we are storied selves....that there is a close relationship between the stories we tell and hear and who we are; and that our stories are the cornerstone of our identities (Holstein and Gubrium, 1999; Widershoven, 1993)" (Andrews 2006 p.100). Andrews makes the point that the articulation of our own stories "bears a strong relationship to the storylines which are already 'out there.'" (Andrews 2006, p.100). What is of interest here is how we can use these stories as a source of understanding.

Part of the appeal for research in this area, which Andrews identifies, is "the dynamic and messy nature of data" (Andrews 2006, p.100) in which meaning can change according to context and time, and which Jones refers to as "swimming in the data" (Jones 2015). Leaving aside any ontological qualification, engagement with the 'mess' of the real on location and in the cutting room has had particular appeal to me as a filmmaker and now as a researcher. She states, "Data cannot be captured in pure form, even on transcripts, as the same words mean something different across time and place" (Andrews 2006, p.100). This is particularly borne out by observational

documentary film production, surely one of the messiest forms of data collection and one most open to audience interpretation. One of the lessons for the apparent transparency of video as an applied technology in a performative context is to realize that however appealing it might be to suggest that the data is sealed in the video frame, meaning in a performative context rests with the viewer and remains temporal, contextual and constructed.

Drawing on the conceptualization of “our storied selves”, one of the intriguing aspects of this “new aesthetic of storytelling” (Jones 2006, p.1) is the opportunity for the (self) identification of the researcher as an artist or creative practitioner. This innovation in qualitative methodology, drawn partially from ethnography and partly from narrative research, is particularly open to new forms of research and dissemination that emphasize reflection and reflexivity, for example through auto-ethnography in which the researcher can use their own life as a resource. This has a bearing on my own transition, previously acknowledged, from self-identification as a professional filmmaker to self-identification as an academic who uses film. Applying a performative methodology provides a basis for reflection, incorporating questions about how I might view my practice and myself. The identification of the researcher as artist or creative practitioner also interrogates assumptions about the transparency of text as a mediated form in the academy, and asks us to acknowledge the possibility that any form of communication in the academy might be considered creative in its construction.

The consequence of acknowledgment that the act of scholarship is creative in any manifestation and, regardless of who is undertaking it, is to question whether privileging the terms “art”, “artist” and “creative practitioner” as a distinct activity or identity is appropriate in this context. It might be claimed that all researchers bring creativity to their expression in whatever form. Jones has cautioned what he regards as the risk of poor quality research resulting from academics with low-level skills attempting to create a performative work which they are not equipped to achieve and champions collaborations with working artists as one possible solution (Jones 2014, p.2). This is not the same as labelling people as either artists *or* academics and such a differentiation is especially redundant in the pursuit of a methodology of research that embraces the removal of boundaries and barriers. Whilst acknowledging these questions, for the time

being I will identify myself as a filmmaker/researcher and reflect on that dual, dynamic, contested and unresolved self-identification as I consider the specific application of a form of ethnographic research, reflective auto-ethnography, which places the researcher firmly within the frame as a subject.

E. *Auto-ethnography*

The investment of the self in a performance method, which is often associated with the performative methodology of research, requires an exceptional degree of investment and confidence on the part of the researcher. Ellis defines auto-ethnography as “research, writing, story, and method that connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural, social and political (Ellis 2004, p. xix). As Gergen and Gergen (2011) illustrate, the revelation of the self on the part of the researcher is a *sine qua non* of the approach and the choice of this type of research perhaps raises questions about the relationship between the personality of the researcher and the method undertaken: “Performative modes of communication typically make apparent the investments and implications of one's work. They often rely on dramatic tension to carry their message, demonstrating that the scientist deeply cares about an issue and wishes to share these concerns with others” (Gergen and Gergen 2011, p.9). Putting oneself “out there” is even more the case in adopting an auto-ethnographic mode, which addresses biographical personal experience as the core data to be analysed through creative interpretation. Ellis, Adams and Bocher state

“Auto-ethnographers recognize the innumerable ways personal experience influences the research process. For instance, a researcher decides who, what, when, where, and how to research, decisions necessarily tied to institutional requirements (e.g., Institutional Review Boards), resources (e.g., funding), and personal circumstance (e.g., a researcher studying cancer because of personal experience with cancer). ...auto-ethnography is one of the approaches that acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher's influence on research, rather than hiding from these matters or assuming they don't exist. ”

(Ellis, Adams and Bochner 2010, p.3)

The participant observation associated with ethnography, already defined, and even more intensely with auto-ethnography, with its attendant methods of taking field notes, is closely aligned to the documentary filmmaker's experience on location with a camera. We have noted the developing trend within non-research filmmaking for self-referentiality, particularly as cameras become smaller and more manageable as hand-held devices, and this development lends itself to filmic auto-ethnography in a research context. The distinction of scholarship lies in the application of the method for the purpose of systematic and analytic understanding. Adams cites an interview with ethnographer Mitch Allen:

look at experience analytically. Otherwise [you're] telling [your] story—and that's nice—but people do that on *Oprah* [a U.S.-based television program] every day. Why is your story more valid than anyone else's? What makes your story more valid is that you are a researcher. You have a set of theoretical and methodological tools and a research literature to use. That's your advantage. If you can't frame it around these tools and literature and just frame it as 'my story,' then why or how should I privilege your story over anyone else's I see 25 times a day on TV?

(Allen cited in Adams 2012, p.158)

Given acceptance that there is an academic research purpose, there are multiple tools open to the documentary ethnographer in both the acquisition of “footage” and the use of the material in a poetic narrative informed by the embodied experience of “being there”. For example Ellis (2010) mentions the use of vignettes, multiple voices and introspection as tools to “invoke” others to “enter into the emergent experience”.

The inquiry here has included an aspect of studying the concept of ‘witness’ and Ellis (2010) reminds us of the value of personal stories in helping the audience to share the testimony that might otherwise be isolated or hidden: “As witnesses, auto-ethnographers not only work with others to validate the meaning of their pain, but also allow participants and readers to feel validated and/or better able to cope with or want to change their circumstances” (Ellis 2010, p.27). The interesting aspect of video as a tool of documentation and validation is its relationship to contingency compared to other media forms. As an electronic record undeviating within the frame, it acts as a counter to the fallibility of memory and brings a different take to terms such as reliability and validity. The credibility rests within the spatial and temporal parameters

viewfinder and then the frame. The authenticity of the “factual” evidence in front of our eyes is seductive in asking the viewer to enter the subjective world of the filmmaker with its convincing detail and association with the texture of ‘fact’. The onus is on the ethnographer to draw back from the detail and draw out the general lesson, to make it meaningful in the terms of social science, and on the viewer to draw back and relate the finding to their own experience. The task for the filmmaking auto-ethnographer is to strike a balance between the artfulness of drawing the audience into the world and holding the audience back with the obligation for reflection born of both intimacy and distance. Ellis writes that

As part autobiography, autoethnography is dismissed for autobiographical writing standards, as being insufficiently aesthetic and literary and not artful enough. Autoethnographers are viewed as catering to the sociological, scientific imagination and trying to achieve legitimacy as scientists. Consequently, critics say that autoethnographers disregard the literary, artistic imagination and the need to be talented artists (GINGRICH-PHILBROOK, 2005). MORO (2006), for example, believes it takes a "darn good" writer to write autoethnography.

(Ellis 2010, p.38)

For Ellis, these criticisms are evidence of a false dichotomy between science and art and it is the task of auto-ethnography to navigate this divide through being both rigorous and emotional (Ellis 2010). I regard this as a further indication of the need to find a new discourse that does not rely on the terms ‘rigorous’ and ‘emotional’ for justification, for as Ellis asks, “The questions most important to autoethnographers are: who reads our work, how are they affected by it, and how does it keep a conversation going?” (Ellis 2010, p.39). The balancing act in auto-ethnography in knowing when to go forward and when to hold back, in order to “keep the conversation going” depends on the reflective capability of the researcher.

Alvesson and Sköldböck (2009) state “uses of reflexivity or reflection typically draw attention to the complex relationship between knowledge production and the various contexts of such processes as well as the involvement of the knowledge producer. This involves operating on at least two levels in research work and paying much attention to how one thinks about thinking” (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009, p8). This emphasis on self-knowledge, the turn inwards towards the researcher’s own perceptions and interpretations has the

distancing effect of problematising the awareness of the researcher and thereby all aspects of their mission, from society as a whole to the research community and its traditions to the relationship with the subject to the terms of the discourse. Alvesson and Skoldberg note how difficult it is for researchers to stop taking for granted the assumptions they live with, stating that “we must proceed with care and reflection, pondering a good deal more upon what the empirical material means, and why we make just these particular interpretations, before forming any opinions of ‘reality’ as such” (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009, p.10). They note that the research process involves reconstructing the social reality through persistently recreating and interpreting the circumstances and conditions. Here we can see discretion at work through reflection in practice.

F. *Practice-as-Research Method*

We can identify different models in the use of practice in a research context, as noted in the Definitions (1.5): *practice-as-research* whereby the practice informs every aspect of the research and publication process; *practice-led research* where the practice forms the initial part of the inquiry and stimulates subsequent non-practice outcomes; and *practice-based research* where the practice forms the base data of the research and is written up after the fact (Nelson 2006). The centrality of practice to this inquiry determines that I will begin this section by setting out the context for the method that has been utilized in this inquiry.

The three models of practice-informed research described above reflect the attempt to bring non-textual practice into the academy, which continues to be contested, and remind us of the dynamic status of forms and expression of scholarly knowledge and the questions raised by this inquiry. Jordan (2004) dates the origin of the acceptance of practice in higher degrees as 1974, “when in the UK, the regulations of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) were changed to allow for the presentation of creative work in conjunction with a written thesis for a higher degree submission in the visual arts. In the Irish context, the newly created University of Ulster was the first to accept the validity of such a combination” (Jordan 2004, p.1), coinciding with the 'Art and

Language' movement during the 1970s. The impact of institutional change should also be noted as many previously vocational art colleges and courses became absorbed into Polytechnics and then Universities (1992) and staff became required to undertake research. The definition of research in the context of art and design became problematic and the solution was found in identifying the reflective practitioner who was required to reflect on and document the process of creation (Schon 1983). This ensured that the research remained firmly anchored within text. The interesting exception was music where “it was recognised that music had a "long established tradition of 'compositional' doctorates - premised on the claim that the composition embodies, and in consequence is indicative of, the research process, and that this is clearly accepted by the academic community” (Jordan 2004, p.2).

In 1989 the CNAA extended the discussion around practice in the academy by stating that practice as well as reflection on practice could be an appropriate aspect of a research degree. There has been a vocal debate since then articulated at various conferences such as RADical, European Academy of Design, Doctoral Education in Design, Research into Practice, and through initiatives such as AVPhD (Audio-visual PhD) and PARIP (Practice as Research in Performance). The evolution of practice-as-research (PaR) as a method has coincided with the developments indicated in Section 1.3 and, as Nelson (2006) has demonstrated, “it has engaged debate within the arts community and between the arts and other academic disciplines about the place and status of creative practices as research in the context of Higher Education” (Nelson, 2006,p.1), with contributors to the debate in the last decade (Macleod and Holdridge 2009) suggesting that art itself can be a theorising practice, which can produce a research thesis that does not require translation into other terms express coherent meaning.

We can identify three models that can be applied to practice in a research context as described by Nelson (2006):

- **Practice-as-Research** whereby the practice informs every aspect of the research and publication process;
- **Practice-led Research** where the practice forms the initial part of the inquiry and stimulates subsequent non-practice outcomes;

- **Practice-Based** research where the practice forms the base data of the research and is written up after the fact.

The models described above reflect the questions raised by this research as to the status of form and expression of scholarly knowledge that embrace practice and can be linked to Frayling's (1993) landmark categorisation of arts-related research practice as "research into art and design, research through art and design and research for art and design" (Frayling 1993, p.5). Nelson (2006) has acknowledged the positive value of such categorisation in that it "has engaged debate within the arts community and between the arts and other academic disciplines about the place and status of creative practices as research in the context of Higher Education" (Nelson, 2006, p.1). More pessimistically, Elkins (2009) has found that the ensuing debates about the status of practice in the academy have illustrated "the incommensurability of studio art production and university life" (Elkins (2009, p.128).

To focus solely on the more recent debates around the term 'practice' is perhaps to ignore a much longer history denying the place of practice in a scholarly context that Cazeaux identifies as stemming from "arguments which try to wedge conceptual judgement and aesthetic experience apart. I am thinking here primarily of the epistemologies of Plato and Descartes, both of which argue to the effect that rational knowledge is of a wholly distinct order from sensory experience" (Cazeaux 2002). Cazeaux identifies the insistence of this distinction between the rational and the sensory as lying at the heart of the theory-practice debate in contemporary Higher Education:

Given the way in which the theory-practice question ultimately unfolds itself to become the question of how we theorize knowledge or kinds of knowledge, it is understandable why discussion continues with such vigour. The amount of history behind the debate might prompt one to think that any intervention at this stage is futile; it must surely be impossible to resist or redirect the millennia-old patterns of thought which lead us to separate reason from sensation.

(Cazeaux 2002, p.1)

Cazeaux looks to Kant's theories of art and knowledge to resolve the problem of the separation of the conceptual and the aesthetic and find a role for artistic practice in contributing to knowledge. In particular, the artist-researcher should

take responsibility for establishing the epistemological foundations of their research through their own aesthetic judgements of their work and thereby achieves a synthesis of theory and practice. This idea underpins the methodology of this thesis, namely reflective practice drawing on the intuition of the artist. There has been a history of theorisation about intuition in relation to knowledge. The early twentieth century Italian philosopher Croce's (1990) theorization of artistic works as intuitive knowledge realised by the artist was one such conceptualisation, whilst Heidegger drew on classical Greek notion of 'aletheia,' in which it is argued that aspects of the world can be revealed through artefacts. In particular Heidegger (1996) drew attention to the Greek word as an expression of "unconcealedness" and it is in this context that we might think of practice in the academy, in which the work of art might be used to disclose a "clearing" or make space for meaning. For Cazeaux metaphor is significant in this context, whereby we "summon a concept from a remote or 'non-determinative' part of our conceptual scheme in order to get a purchase on the object before us" (Cazeaux 2002, p.5). It is the art that provides space or clearing in which we might make associations and through which we might enrich our knowledge of the world. The challenge is how to integrate such thinking into the existing academic structures with their attendant institutional constraints.

It is interesting to consider how documentary video as a form of practice as research lends itself to existing research paradigms more readily than some other forms of temporal creative practice. For instance, as with text, the output can be recorded in a permanent form, it can maintain a linearity of narrative or argument, and it may make explicit its relation to the research question. More readily than text, it may document the process of its genesis and development (for example, "the making of..." is a term readily used in the application of documentary video to the creative process of an artefact such as a feature film in a popular culture context). Moreover, in a performative context, it may offer the potential that additionally resides in the creative interpretation of what might be loosely termed 'art'. The object of this thesis is to develop a methodology that might be used to present such a doctoral method using a combination of creative artefact and reflection. Nelson (2006) identifies the opportunity offered by the context of postmodern thinking, whether incidental or causative, to create an

intellectual space within which to challenge the primacy of text. While we must be careful to distinguish between the terms ‘performance’ and ‘performative’ (see Appendix III), and Nelson’s interest is in performance, Nelson notes George (1996) states, “It is only the postmodern debunking of modernist hierarchies which has enabled performance to claim its place as a legitimate field of inquiry in its own right and as a primary phenomenon enabling us now to reverse the relationship in which text is seen as prior and to hold performance as the primary ontology, and the one to be examined and theorized”(George, 1996, p.19, cited in Nelson 2006, p.9).

With regard to my own interest here in a different art form, I might transpose the word “performance” with the word “film” and propose that film might be “the primary ontology, and the one to be examined and theorized” and go beyond Nelson’s claim to suggest that the medium itself might be the method for that examination and theorization.

Specifically, I will use documentary video as a tool in undertaking a performative, auto-ethnographic methodology, with the data being the documentary video film. The analysis will be contained within the film, and in this accompanying contextualisation. This methodology has been chosen to explore and understand the challenges of producing artefacts in a performative manner using video, which is core to the scope and nature of this inquiry.

Fuschini *et al.* (2009) highlight the fracturing of established knowledge boundaries by new cross-disciplinary approaches and point to the value of creativity as a bridge between theory and practice in scholarship, with video and new media platforms offering new routes in this direction.

The need to identify and demarcate the distinct identities of scholarship and creative practice are highlighted by Bell (2006, p.86). He notes that each has a different relationship to knowledge and knowing. Bell (2006, p.86) clarifies the need for creative media practice to be critical and reflexive in the service of scholarship, without compromising its own aesthetic purpose and value. Whilst my own approach is predicated upon practice as research (PaR), with the practice informing all aspects of the research and the dissemination, in this thesis I will also draw upon Bell’s research paradigm for practice-based research that is formulated upon a theory of art as performance, in which the artwork expresses and embodies the process of research that preceded it. That process of research

might encompass, for example, materials, conceptualisation and reflection. I will also highlight the significance of 'play' in the research process that creative practice can offer, which is noted by Nelson (2006, p.9). In Bell's view, the documentation of the process is key when he states "a practice like art is [...] best justified not by referring it to an external tribunal of justification but through a patient codification of that practice and of innovations within it (Bell 2006, p.96).

In summary, the methodology adopted here is an evidenced process embodied in the performative work, demonstrating not just that new knowledge has been produced but the material conditions by which that knowledge has been created. I am using a performative research methodology shaped by documentation of the process, reflection on the process and contextualisation of the process, which explores the opportunities offered by the performative application of documentary film as a means of contributing to scholarship. It is the embodied nature of the practice to which I will now turn.

G. *Embodied research*

I will begin this section with an image. When I was filming the construction of the *Angel of the North* sculpture for days on end in the construction yard at Hartlepool, the sculptor, Sir Antony Gormley, suggested that I was so familiar and comfortable with the camera on my shoulder, one hand to the focus ring on the lens, another hand on the servo zoom grip and one eye to the viewfinder and one eye differently focused on the scene around me, that the camera was part of me and I was part of the camera. That was how I felt. I was an embodied filmmaker. But unlike the quote from the opening of Christopher Isherwood's novel *Goodbye to Berlin*, "I am a camera with its shutter open, quite passive, recording, not thinking" (Isherwood 1939, p.13), I am thinking. The comparison with Dziga Vertov's 'second eye' is probably more appropriate as a representation of an embodied filmmaker researcher, a Kino Man with a Kino Eye: "I am an eye. I am a mechanical eye. I, a machine, I am showing you a world, the likes of which only I can see" (Vertov 1922, p. 69). The documentary filmmaker perhaps carries that feeling of embodiment more obviously and more readily than

other artists as the part human and part technical channel of experience. As Hume observed:

When I enter most intimately into what I call myself, I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. I can never catch myself at any time without a perception, and never can observe anything but the perception. When my perceptions are removed for any time, as by sound sleep, so long am I insensible of myself, and may truly be said not to exist.

(Hume 1934, p.239)

There is a sense in which I feel as a documentary filmmaker that I am only “sensible of myself” when I am heightening the perception by consciously looking at the subject through the viewfinder and making decisions about it: the rest of the time I am asleep, and may truly be said not to exist. The analysis of the data is intimately connected to the acquisition of the data in so far as one is making decisions constantly in the process of deciding what and how to film. This finds resonance in the observations of Bagley (2009) with regard to dance as a method of analysis.

One of the choreographer’s most important tools is the body/mind that connects emotionally with the participants through kinaesthetic awareness. The choreographer who has access to embodied techniques can tap into the participants’ feelings. Many people ask me why I dance as a way of making sense of the data. I tell them that when I dance I find something important to say.

(Cancienne and Bagley 2009, p.177)

The kinaesthetic awareness to which Bagley refers is directly applicable to the ‘dance’ that the documentary filmmaker performs with the subject, in which both filmmaker and subject are participants.

The embodied self of the researcher is the vehicle for a phenomenological approach developed by Todres (2007) drawing from an existential-phenomenological body of work founded upon a conception of humanity that is not limited by the Kantian epistemology of a duality of mind and body (Gendlin 1997). Nelson acknowledges the value of the phenomenological base underlying the performative project of social science in relation to reflective practice stating, “Self-reflexiveness reciprocally on the part of practitioner-researchers has established, at least analogic consonances between performance/performativity

and phenomenology, post structuralism and post-classical science” (Nelson 2006, p.14). Nelson parallels the late rise of phenomenology with post structuralism in contributing to the conceptual framework of practice-as-research noting that “in particular, the sub-branch of “existential phenomenology” derived from Heidegger's *Sein und Zeit*, 1927, particularly as taken up by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, emphasises, amongst other things, a life practice of becoming (as distinct from being), and the embodiment of thought rather than the Cartesian discrete mind” (Nelson 2006, p.10).

The first hand knowledge gained from praxis stresses the value of experience that can be traced back to the French derivation of experiment or putting to the test, bringing us back to the core of research: “Experience is an experiment. In such late twentieth century approaches, action, the doing of things, has thus, contra Plato, been conceptually rejoined to thinking. Indeed, the concept of the “performative” has brought scholars from a range of disciplines to seek ontological insights from the performing arts” (Nelson 2006, p.11). As such, the discourse it adopts “emphasizes the implicit aspect of experiencing the “more than words can say”” and at the same time enhances the possibility of expressing this implicit aspect through language by embracing the relational process of the parts and the whole. The implicit also carries the mystery, the mysterious, the mystic, the spiritual, the not knowing and wonder, thereby interlinking the spectrum between unconscious and conscious, the “borderland consciousness” (Heß 2012, p.26). There is a clear connection here with the ambition of the performative project: the emphasis on the word ‘implicit’ reminds us of the onus placed on the audience as the bringer of meaning in the arena of performative methodology, while the reference to “the mystery” reminds us of the conceptualization of creativity referred to at the outset of this thesis in questioning the academic rationale of “shining daylight upon magic” (Bagehot 2001, p.71).

As a specific method, Todres and Galvin (2007) suggest that embodied interpretation utilizes two forms of data analysis. They propose in the first instance the application of descriptive procedures incorporating imaginative variation. This is followed by a second stage of embodied interpretation,

“...reaching out to the reader by bringing the phenomenon to life as much as possible. This is done by moving back and forth between words that describe the phenomenon and words that communicate the qualities and embodied understanding of the phenomenon. This includes evocative and poetic forms of writing that can carry meaning forward towards “the more than words can say.”

(Todres and Galvin 2007, p.41)

This process holds much in common with the aims of Performative Social Science, incorporating embodied understanding with its characteristics of transcendence of language, non-linearity and emotional ‘reach’: “Embodied expressions intertwine us with our senses, moods, qualities and multiple intersubjective and cultural contexts, and as such they are “aesthetic emotional presences” (Galvin & Todres, 2012, p.15) interconnected with you and me as a “living body” (heß, 2012, p.26). The implicit assumption here is that the ‘living body’ is a human body in its entirety. Concluding where we started, with the metaphorical embodiment of Kino Man, and extending Lyotard's (1984) sense that contemporary culture is characterised by a techno-rational sense of the “performative”, we might consider how what McKenzie has called the “onto-historical formation of power and knowledge” (McKenzie 2001, p.194), which has been implicit and explicit in the discussion here of discourse in the academy, is leading us towards a new conceptualization of technological reflective embodiment that is expressed orally rather than textually and disseminated through *YouTube* rather than in print.

H. *The Synthesis of Methodology and Method: The Creative Academic Research Tool (CART)*

The “Creative Academic Research Tool” (CART) is a conceptual term I have created to explore the idea of using digital media and platforms instead of the traditional writing of papers as a means to investigate and express academic research or “inputs”. A CART could be a single item or portfolio of material (original moving image, archive images, written text, spoken word, still images, graphics and so forth), which is acknowledged as a creative artefact with scholarly coherence in its own right, which could be shaped as a reflexive

academic artefact and performs as a research paper might in the pursuit of scholarship. As Jones states, “Moving our work to arts-based procedures is not a series of isolated acts; it requires an adjustment in how we approach everything in which we engage—including writing for academic publication” (Jones 2013b, p.16). In the instance of this research, the Creative Academic Research Tool is the documentary film *Ships That Pass In The Night*, which is used to provide the data and its interpretation for this inquiry and represents what would be Chapters IV and V of a more traditional thesis.

The CART is a response to a perceived need to formalize, legitimize, and curate, creative and predominantly non-textual research outputs in a form that can be readily identified, archived, disseminated and cited within a research context. In this particular instance, I am exploring the concept of using documentary film production articulated as a Creative Academic Research Tool, instead of the traditional gathering of data, its interpretation or analysis, and writing of papers as means to investigating and expressing academic research.

A CART could be understood as an actual or virtual envelope containing a map or narrative of the research journey and the associated fragments collected along the way. Instead of a written essay or critical paper, or even Chapters of a PhD Thesis, a CART is an indicator of a portfolio of material (original moving image, archive images, written text, spoken word, still images, graphics...), which is acknowledged as a creative artefact in its own right, which is shaped as a reflective academic output, and performs as a paper traditionally does, pursuing an argument or exploring a question with supporting references. “Any academic written texts reporting our efforts at arts-based research should be supporting ancillary documents to our productions, providing a trace, trail or map, not the other way round. Texts should certainly not be the final results or *raison d’êtres* of our investigative efforts” (Jones, 2014). As twenty-first century scholarship, creative work can contain sidebars of reflection, which might be blogs, podcasts, texts, graphics. Here, the research is expressed as a documentary film in linear and fragmented form as an example. In this regard we need to consider the characteristics of the academic paper that can be identified as follows:

- is an expression of abstract thought
- can itself be treated as a source
- can be referred to / cited
- can be quoted
- has academic status – it is peer reviewed
- can be “read” , re-viewed, re-read,
- exists in a stable form
- advances an argument / proposition
- answers a question
- has agreed mechanics in the process
- can be performed (“giving a paper”)
- is created, though often unacknowledged as such

The CART is designed as a map of performative spaces that locates the viewer/reader/respondent/correspondent in relation to the work in all its iterations and component parts. Examples of the contents that might be located on the map (the CARTographic) might include:

- text
- images – video clips
- graphical texture
- different types of text
- sound spaces
- audio commentaries
- presentation to camera

The Creative Academic Research Tool adopted here will be presented in the form of a DVD which follows this Chapter, containing a documentary film functioning as a map of performative spaces to provide the data for this inquiry to test the viability of a CART.

In replacing the function of text with alternative creative methods, the question arises in a general context as to the quality of the skill sets to be required and used in performative work. It has already been noted that Jones (2014, p.2) has referred to the risk of low quality work stemming from researchers attempting to work in a performative vein when they are not equipped with the relevant skills. Jones highlights collaboration as one possible

solution, but with increasing access to high-quality technology, many academics will be seeking the opportunity to bring their own skills to bear in delivering creative work. It is becoming a matter of debate whether and how quality thresholds might be applied in practice-based research using performative methods, echoing the arguments we have already noted around quality in creative “academic” writing (Parfitt 2015). As an intervention in this debate it is useful to reiterate Brew’s (1999) argument for the “Quality conception of scholarship” which identifies the importance of professional academic standards in the achievement of research and the communication of that research, where he notes that “The Quality conception contains the *raison d’être* for academic work; a reason why it is special (Brew 1999, p. 11). As noted previously, Brew indicates that his conception of “Quality”, in which there is a clear demonstration of the professional manner in which the research has been undertaken, will help to establish new criteria by which to judge work which goes beyond the limiting understandings of objectivity and rationality and to assess the value of diverse forms of delivery. If we are to locate a ‘professional’ standard against which academic filmmaking might be judged, then the concept of the Creative Academic Research Tool can be used to set out the professional academic competencies according to the criteria listed above, understanding that in writing with video the work is subject to the skilful use of the camera just as text is subject to the skilful use of the pen. In the particular context of this dissertation, this is illustrated in the film “Ships That Pass In The Night”, presented here in Chapter 4.

I. The Ethical Application of Documentary Film Making in Performative Scholarship

We can understand the application of ethics in scholarship to mean the systematic organization and judgement of our moral conduct as researchers who recognize an obligation to others in our pursuit of knowledge. Our moral conduct as researchers in any field in response to Socrates’ fundamental question ‘how should I live’ is underpinned historically by the three often-cited philosophical strand of thinking about living virtuously, as expressed by Aristotle’s notion of ‘telos’(Hauskeller 2005), Mill’s utilitarian notion of most beneficial outcome

(‘Consequentialism’) (Mill 1998) and Kant’s universal moral ends being the imperative result of categorized behaviour (‘Deontology’) (Kant 1964) . These three approaches have helped to shape moral behaviour in general and have helped to inform recent thinking in response to the question ‘how should I research?’ Acknowledging these broad ethical frameworks, we are in a position to reflect on the questions that are likely to arise when we encounter the particular obligations and responsibilities incurred when using the tools of a performative method such as documentary film.

The application of documentary film making as a performative and auto-ethnographic method of scholarship raises ethical issues that go beyond the generic and institutional moral obligations of conventional academic research, or what Guillemin and Gillam (2004) describe as the “procedural ethics” familiar in a university context. Documentary film making in a scholarly pursuit places additional demands on the researcher to take responsibility for what Guillemin and Gillam (2004) denote as “situational ethics”: the practice prompts continuous, morally-based decision-making that arises from working in the field with a camera and a subject, or in an edit suite constructing a narrative. As Ellis notes, “Much ethnographic and auto-ethnographic research is emergent” (Ellis 2007, p.23) and this is particularly true in the application of documentary practice, where the uncertainty of the circumstance (there is no script) is inherent in the method. Therefore the creative use of documentary film requires the scholar to pay persistent and close attention to the additional responsibilities incurred by the documentary process as a qualitative method.

We have noted how documentary film techniques applied to performative research practice might draw on aspects of other cultural activities such as journalistic reportage or broadcast documentary film practice in shaping a tool that can be used for scholarship. This provides the opportunity to consider how those working in these professions have encountered and managed ethical questions in ways that might be relevant to those engaged in scholarly activity using similar techniques. In some institutional or professional areas the expected behaviours have been codified. The National Union of Journalists’ (NUJ) code of conduct states for example,

A journalist:

- At all times upholds and defends the principle of media freedom, the right of freedom of expression and the right of the public to be informed.
- Strives to ensure that information disseminated is honestly conveyed, accurate and fair.
- Does her/his utmost to correct harmful inaccuracies.
- Differentiates between fact and opinion.
- Obtains material by honest, straightforward and open means, with the exception of investigations that are both overwhelmingly in the public interest and which involve evidence that cannot be obtained by straightforward means.
- Does nothing to intrude into anybody's private life, grief or distress unless justified by overriding consideration of the public interest.
- Protects the identity of sources who supply information in confidence and material gathered in the course of her/his work.
- Resists threats or any other inducements to influence, distort or suppress information and takes no unfair personal advantage of information gained in the course of her/his duties before the information is public knowledge.
- Produces no material likely to lead to hatred or discrimination on the grounds of a person's age, gender, race, colour, creed, legal status, disability, marital status, or sexual orientation.
- Does not by way of statement, voice or appearance endorse by advertisement any commercial product or service save for the promotion of her/his own work or of the medium by which she/he is employed.
- A journalist shall normally seek the consent of an appropriate adult when interviewing or photographing a child for a story about her/his welfare.
- Avoids plagiarism.

(National Union of Journalists, 2015)

Whilst most of these journalistic ethical criteria are relevant to researchers employing the same techniques and tools in the pursuit of scholarship, professional codifications can be viewed as a response to professional agendas

that do not necessarily align with the requirements of research or with understandings of ethical practice in other professions. For example, in journalism the referencing of sources may be of less significance than is required in the process of academic scholarship, and the expectations of ethical practice in medicine are of a different order compared to those in journalism, reminding us that it is misleading to understand moral values and imperatives as immutable and independent of context.

As has been noted earlier, the documentary ‘impulse’ as it has developed in the twentieth century has traditionally been associated with a “discourse of sobriety” (Nichols 1991) and social purpose in which the values of education, diversity, inclusion and accountability have frequently found articulation, along with accuracy and public interest, in the acquisition and dissemination of information. This historical context suggests that we might consider documentary practice as a tool that might readily be appropriated by the academy, bringing with it an ethical apparatus and history from which to draw. For example, the understanding of documentary method as a dynamic, ‘ad hoc’, frequently unscripted and improvisatory form of filmmaking complements the notion of ethical behaviour as a dynamic activity that is responsive to changing circumstance. Moreover, the application of the documentary imagination requires us to put ourselves in the place of others to understand and empathize in a way that helps us as researchers to reflect on our obligations to participants and the wider society. In this context “Learning to name things anew, to become alert to exclusions and to forgotten aspects in a people’s history, to overhear what is usually drowned out by the predominant values, to rethink what is ordinarily taken for granted, to find out how to hold itself in quest: these are aspects of the thought of the question of ethics” (Scott 1990, pp.7-8). We might even consider how the documentary method might be used to reignite and demonstrate the emotional engagement of the researcher in the research process, which, as Jones has noted, has tended to be extinguished through the institutional processes of ethical compliance in the academy:

As our skills at in-depth interviewing continued to develop, we became better and better at acting as but “silent witnesses” to the lives of others. Ethical considerations and sensitivities became ethical procedures and limitations over time. As the subtleties of the interview

environment became more familiar, at the same time, our encounters with strangers became more constrained by committees and the management culture pervading academia. These drove narrative researchers further into taking the position of the “neutral observer” and the disengaged participant.

(Jones 2015, p.86)

Creative documentary film practice as a qualitative method offers the opportunity of re-engagement through recorded presence, meeting Denzin’s call for

criteria for evaluating qualitative work [which] are moral and ethical. Blending aesthetics (theories of beauty), ethics (theories of ought and right) and epistemologies (theories of knowing), these criteria are fitted to the pragmatic, ethical and political contingencies of concrete situations.

(Denzin & Lincoln, 2002, p.229)

Noting Guillemin and Gillam (2004)’s two dimensions of ethics, procedural and situational, outlined above, Ellis (2007) adds a third dimension, “relational ethics, a kind closely related to an ethics of care (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984), feminist ethics, and feminist communitarian ethics” (Ellis 2007, p.13). Ellis stresses “the connectedness between researcher and researched”, as a dynamic relationship which is not static and might be considered as an on-going conversation. Ellis asks

“If our participants become our friends, what are our ethical responsibilities toward them? What are our ethical responsibilities toward intimate others who are implicated in the stories we write about ourselves? How can we act in a humane, none-exploitative way, while being mindful of our role as researchers?”

(Ellis 2007, pp.4-5)

Ellis cites Josselson in questioning the possibility of an ethical practice that is selective and edited. “Language can never contain a whole person, so every act of writing a person’s life is inevitably a violation,” says Josselson (1996, p. 62). If this is true, how do we research and write ethically? (Ellis 2007, p.5). The mitigation of this violation can only be answered in the responsible and reflective performative application of the researcher’s situational practice as demonstrated from moment to moment in the viewfinder and in the edit suite. This characterization is particularly pertinent to the embodied and reflective method

of documentary filmmaking adopted here and relevant to the narrative of the research that will be expressed in Chapter IV.

The strangeness of others implicit in conventional procedural codes of ethics is not appropriate to the circumstance of much documentary discovery and inevitably not to the circumstance of auto-ethnography. Ellis characterizes auto-ethnography as an ethical practice in itself that inevitably expresses “the tug of obligation and responsibility. That’s what we end up writing about. Auto-ethnographies show people in the process of figuring out what to do, how to live, and what their struggles mean” (Ellis 2007, p.26). The tug of those responsibilities is the evident in the trace of the research presented in the practice that follows.

J. *Conclusion to the Methodology*

It is an axiom of the methodological framework and the associated methods of this inquiry that the researcher has been closely engaged with the subjects filmed. In addition, the researcher himself has been implicated in the work as an auto-ethnographer, living and working in the community over a period. Ethical issues have come to the fore in various respects and have been kept in mind during the performance of the inquiry. The subject has given his written consent and has been kept informed of the research throughout and has seen the completed film. In addition he has given his response to the work reflecting on how he has been represented. It should be borne in mind that the majority of the filming was undertaken in a professional broadcast context and has subsequently been incorporated into the research. Echoing Sparkes performative strategy referred to previously, that “In the end, the story simply asks for your consideration”(2007 p.521), at this point in the research I draw on Shields’s axiom, “It must all be considered as if spoken by a character in a novel (minus the novel). You need say nothing, only exhibit” (Shields, 2010, p.6).

CHAPTER IV

NOTE: CHAPTER IV IS CONTAINED WITHIN THIS THESIS AS A DVD

Chapter V

Conclusion

On Art 7

Whenever you see an artist
Look at him closely

He should look like a man
Who's come round a corner

He should look like a man
Who expects surprises

Who distrusts maps
But carries a map in his pocket

Edward Bond (1978)

A. *Introduction*

The research problem was identified as an investigation by video practice into the performative application of documentary film in scholarship, and was divided into two sub-questions:

- 1) How might knowledge be constructed performatively in documentary film?
- 2) How might documentary film be employed as a performative social science research tool?

To investigate these questions and the overarching research problem, I have reflected on the circumstances that have led me to identify and investigate the research problem. These have included: consideration of how the research problem has been embodied in my own development as a filmmaker and scholar; the recent disruptions to pedagogy, technology and methodology that have been identified as the catalysts for the research; and the dynamic historical positioning

of scholarly discourse in the context of orality and literacy. I located the research problem within the parameters of literary journalism, verbatim theatre and recent developments in the subjective performance of documentary filmmaking. The methodological approach under-pinning the reflective practice-based approach to the thesis was outlined, indicating the role of Performative Social Science as an appropriate methodology, whilst drawing on narrative research methods.

I have focused on a form of filmmaking that might lend itself more readily to the application of a performative scholarly methodology. In particular, the review of the literature suggested that the personal form of filmic autobiography identified by Renov (2004) and others was particularly applicable to the design of a filmic academic research tool.

I have applied this approach as a reflective methodology through my filmmaking practice to examine how I have constructed knowledge intuitively as a creative practitioner and reflected on this as a scholar. I have created the research film *Ships That Pass In The Night*, presented in Chapter 4, to provide the data with which to consider the research questions, but also to embody the reflection in the work itself. The consequence of the ‘thinking’ and the ‘doing’ being contained within the praxis has been the production of a novel contribution to knowledge in the shape of a method of filmmaking that might be applied to scholarship as a performative tool of research.

The literature review has indicated that there are many ways in which knowledge has been constructed and communicated through documentary film and associated forms of factual reportage. Despite what Bond calls the map in my pocket, I have come around the corner to discover unexpected outcomes in relation to the research questions and the overarching research problem. These will be reviewed in the conclusions about the research questions and the conclusion about the research problem, followed by a consideration of the implications for theory and practice, a consideration of the limitations of the research, and a consideration of the implications for future research.

B. Conclusion about research question 1:

How might knowledge be constructed performatively in documentary film?

We have noted that Shields (2011) asked “what happens when an essay begins to behave less like an essay and more like a poem? What happens when an essayist starts imagining things, making things up, filling in blank spaces, or leaving the blanks blank?” (Shields 2011, p.27). The artistic work of Antony Gormley expressed in the installation of *Another Place* in the tidal ‘interzone’ of Cuxhaven, which is neither land nor sea, and in the construction of *The Angel of the North*, has provided the thesis with a starting point for understanding the implications of a performative knowledge that has left the blanks blank in a way that can be both threatening and enlightening. The work has provided multiple metaphors for the mystery behind the ostensive story of the fisherman and his treasure, in which fact and fiction become mingled. Without wanting to cast too much daylight on the magic, we might note for example, how the film trades on metaphorical interpretations of the making of *The Angel of the North* sculpture in relation to the making of the narrative of the film about the fisherman, or in relation to the making of mythical totems such as the Golem, or in relation to the making of the nuclear weapon that originated in the same landscape. We might also note how the film uses the figures on the beach at Cuxhaven to hint at the paradox of the faceless men witnessing the passing ships and the constantly changing state of the tide, referencing the more sinister aspects of the anonymous men in fisherman’s ostensive story with which the research film begins. Yet the attempt to put into words the thoughts and feelings evoked by the images immediately diminishes the effect of the metaphor and illustrates how a device such as a film works performatively within the parameters of its own aesthetic, by allowing the viewer to bring their own sensibility to the images, and to draw their own conclusions from the trace of the research presented.

The conclusion here points to the utility of a research tool in which there could be a new synthesis of the ‘A’ roll of fore-grounded character, plot and detail posited by the strategies of New Journalism, and the ‘B’ roll strategies of subjective film-making in the manner of Gee (2012) or Keiller (1997), which

privilege reflective space, context and metaphor. The thesis tested by this research suggests that the scholarly application of documentary in a performative mode should re-balance these two aspects, whereby the fore-grounded 'A' roll of the dramatic presentation of character favoured by New Journalism is diminished, and the 'B' roll of quiet ambience and reflection is advanced, privileged and heightened to create a space and context for the imagination of the audience to play in whilst drawing on the autobiographical trace of the filmmaker.

The filmmaker Godfrey Reggio expresses this idea through the landscape images in work such as *Koyaanisqatsi* (2003) that asks the audience to reverse their expectation of how a film works: "if you look at film as a metaphor, only through the negative can you have the positive print. What I'm trying to get to is the positive value of negation" (Reggio, 2002). Prioritization of the 'B' roll helps to create a 'negative' space from which the audience is invited to create their own 'positive' print, thereby offering one possible response to the sub-question posed of how knowledge might be constructed performatively in documentary film. The thesis presented here and tested in the research film, in response to the problem of how the researcher might both use the 'magic' of artistic methods and let daylight in upon knowledge through writing with video, suggests that we should allow the aesthetic of the medium to speak to the problem.

C. *Conclusion about research question 2:*

How might documentary film be employed as a Performative Social Science research tool?

This section will report on how I have developed an unconventional approach to documentary film that can be adopted as a creative academic research tool within the methodology of Performative Social Science on the basis of my auto-ethnographic engagement. The question has been tested and embodied by my own practice as a documentary filmmaker and the practice offered as my own very specific response to Roberts (2008) questions where he asks, "What would a performative research "practice" in general or in a particular case....look like?"

and “What kind of researcher is a “performative social science” researcher?” (Roberts 2008, p.38).

I have indicated that the research presented here can be characterized as an inquiry into method, making the distinction between method as a tool, and methodology as a theory of research design with its underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions. It has been shown that the method of documentary filmmaking employed is more appropriate to qualitative methodologies and specifically to the newly emergent methodology of Performative Social Science. I have outlined the intention to discover by practice new ways in which documentary video might be developed and extended as a performative academic research tool, drawing on developments in creative non-fiction and in the "new subjectivity" evident in contemporary documentary film practice (Renov 2004). Therefore in the context of developing documentary film as a Performative Social Science research tool, the research film *Ships That Pass In The Night*, that has been presented as the “data” for this inquiry, can be understood as an articulation of a scholarly understanding of the world using the term scholarship as defined by the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise: ‘A process of original investigation undertaken to further knowledge and understanding of particular phenomena’.

The film took the ostensive form of one man’s investigation of a mystery surrounding the discovery of some metal ingots on a shipwreck, which themselves might form empirical evidence for historical research. I have characterized this aspect as the ‘A’ roll. As the voice-over states, “there is nothing more certain than seven pounds of metal”, itself a trace of scientific research and its origin. In the context of the film the metal becomes uncertain evidence, locked away and untested, the story unrecorded, providing an apt metaphor for the value of the ‘B’ roll when the ‘A’ roll is fails to deliver. Whilst the historical mystery is the ostensive subject of the fisherman’s investigation, the film itself becomes an investigation into investigation through its performative approach developed in what I have termed the ‘B’ roll. The method of the ‘B’ roll utilizes the aesthetic of the medium and relies on metaphor. Extending the notion of allowing the creator to use the medium to play to its own strengths rather than coercing the linguistically dependent styles of theatre or

reportage to predominate, Baggini notes how film as a medium trades on metaphor and that this has a value equal to language.

It is simply that the symbols of orthodox philosophy are those of language and logic, whereas those of film are metaphor and imagery, in its visuals as well as dialogue. But there is no objective reason why we should allow a traditional logocentric bias in western philosophy to prejudice us against the equal merit of non-linguistic forms of representation.

(Baggini, 2003)

The employment of the performative power of the 'B' roll, bringing the researcher's embodied understanding to play upon 'the trace' of the data, becomes evident when the character in the film states: "are you still recording? Switch it off". This key moment at the end of the first part of the research film is a cue for the exploration of alternative strategies.

This approach is counter to Denzin's stress on the individual interview in a performative context. Denzin (2001) states "We have become an interview society, a cinematic society, a society which knows itself through the reflective gaze of the cinematic apparatus", foregrounding the performance inherent in an interview as a performative technique. He observes: "the active, reflexive and dialogical interview is a central component of this interpretive project" (2001 p.10). The alternative strategy presented here is to acknowledge the value of a cinematic trace that plays to the creative strengths of the filmic aesthetic rather than the transparency inherent in the form of the dialogic interview. Whilst the performative presentation of the subject through presence in speech is paramount in the ostensive narrative of the 'A' roll, the danger is that the demonstration of authenticity in the performance of the interview seduces the audience into an uncritical acceptance of the video text, privileging elements of the documentary filmmaker's aesthetic identified by Trinh (1991). These include tropes such as lip-synchronous sound, the filmmaker as observer rather than creator, and the notion of capturing reality and personal testimony. By contrast, the performative strategy employed here is to diminish the role of the interview and to use the 'B' roll to evoke and make strange. The technique of the para-documentary sets out to achieve this as developed and used in the research film *Ships That Pass In The*

Night. The effect is to communicate the trace, trail or map (Jones, 2013, p.16) of the experience of the research.

The film uses the device of what I have termed 'para-documentary' to problematize, or make more complex, the understanding of an ostensive transparent observation. By para-documentary I mean the technique that weaves together multiple narratives into one film, using one as a metaphorical commentary on another. The three subsequent films contained in the overall research film serve to problematize the first. This device delineates and distinguishes one film as the ostensive narrative and the others as metaphorical narratives. Using what is termed the "B-roll" footage, the result is a reflective space for the imagination to interact with the "A-roll" documentation presented. The film is crafted to highlight its construction as a practice that deliberately reflects on the "trace or realization of theories" which underlie its transparency. Gergen notes that "There is something positive about keeping a trace of a performance, even if it involves more passivity on the part of the viewer" (Gergen and Jones 2008).

The notion of passivity might be questioned as the interaction of the viewer in interpreting the material lies as the core of the performative methodology, as Jones (2012) states in the film. Whilst it is not possible to film things that cannot be shown ("Switch it off"), we can acknowledge that those things can still make an impression on our understanding in less direct ways. The ambiguity in the absence can be a useful performative provocation to our imagination. In opening shot of the film the footprint on the sand, the ripple of the water in response to the movement, are traces in which the ambiguity of the absence asks the audience to contribute their imagination and construct the knowledge by making their own connections, making a positive print from the negative presented. Sontag notes the positivity inevitable in all perception, so there can be no silence and no empty space. "As long as a human eye is looking there is always something to see. To look at something that's "empty" is still to be looking, still to be seeing something — if only the ghosts of one's own expectations" (Sontag 1978 p.9). The "ghosts of one's own expectations" is a valuable summation of the concept of the documentary imagination that can be brought into play in the application of a performative methodology. In this way,

the film plays with notions of time and space to suggest an opportunity for the viewer to dwell on movement and stillness in the image.

Ellis (2012) identifies that this approach requires work on the part of the viewer who must take time to consume the “slow food” presented, a slowness that insists on observing the particular, the local and the specific.

[Slow Film] insists that time should be taken, that the evidence should be weighed up by the viewer, and that instant reactions are to be distrusted. Slow Film also insists on the individuality of its subjects and their situations. It does not seek to reduce them to types or to generalize from their plight. But a viewer might well draw such conclusions once they have been through the process of the encounter that the Slow Film will yield to them.

(Ellis 2012, p.94)

It is the trust placed in the reader or viewer to make their own meanings that characterizes the methodology of Performative Social Science (Jones, 2013). The conclusion of this investigation in relation to the research question of how documentary film might be employed as a Performative Social Science research tool is that documentary film used appropriately can create the experience of a meal in which the slow food of the ‘B’ roll provides the frame of time and space for new and differently measured modes of scholarly digestion.

D. *Conclusion about the research problem*

In his paper, which became the inspiration for this research, Ingraham (2000) claims that it is not his intention to interrogate “the legitimacy of current modes of scholarly argument” in the context of what new forms of media have to offer, whilst noting that it is “a very real concern”. The quest for alternative legitimate modes of scholarly argument has been the terrain in which my research has taken place. In response to this problem, I have brought together different approaches to documentary film and creative non-fiction to suggest that by re-ordering what has been seen traditionally as the foreground and the background in film-making, the positive and the negative, we might develop a new tool of performative inquiry.

By extending the boundaries of the documentary form using a worked example and reflecting on the articulation of scholarship, I have suggested that new forms of factual story-telling employing the moving image are possible which would satisfy the criteria of a creative academic research tool as elaborated in Chapter 3. I have demonstrated how a documentary film which is acknowledged as a creative artefact in its own right, could be shaped as a reflexive academic output, to perform as a paper traditionally does, pursuing an argument or exploring a question with supporting references. As Jones states, “Moving our work to arts-based procedures is not a series of isolated acts; it requires an adjustment in how we approach everything in which we engage - including writing for academic publication” (Jones, 2013 p.16). The transition is also reflected in the way I have performed my own evolution from television producer to academic filmmaker and embodied this change in the trace of the film presented. Moreover, the performative method adopted here reflects another important aspect of Performative Social Science methodology: that documentary film production not only offers a means of investigation (a method of research), but also provides a vehicle for impact through accessible dissemination of the research.

E. Implications for Theory and Practice

It has been noted that the idea of a practice output such as a film being the “trace or realization of theories” has been useful in conceptualization of the research problem. The suggestion has been that the knowledge might be constructed in a self-consciously creative way through the creation of an artefact such as a film that expresses its own trace and highlights the problem of transparency. The evidence of the research film treated as the data in Chapter 4 suggests that the trace is embodied in the directed capture and editing of images, just as it would be in a written text, but in a manner which could not be expressed through the written word. The implication of the research is that the written word is not critical to the adoption of narrative analysis.

The research tool presented here suggests an alternative approach to narrative analysis as conceptualised in the context of research journeys. I organised the tools of narrative analysis into the following narrative journeys which I have employed in reflecting on the data around the filmmaker's narrative journey; the researcher's narrative journey; the conception of interview as narrative journey; and the audience's narrative journey. These conceptions can be identified in the structure of the film to provide a matrix of understanding. The filmmaker's narrative journey is understood through the trace of the images presented through the lens and microphone. The researcher's narrative journey is understood through the trace of the ostensive story. The interview exists as a minimal and reported trace in the film to minimize the performance of character. The audience's narrative journey becomes privileged and fore-grounded as the primary site of meaning through the use of metaphor.

This is the defining difference of the Performative Social Science methodology and one that sets it aside from more general 'arts-based research' (only) approaches. The "mess of the real" is conveyed without explanation but demands the balancing act previously referred to as a key judgement in auto-ethnography, of knowing "when to go forward, when to hold back" (Usher, 1996), and that depends on the reflective sensibility of the researcher. It is the trace of these narratives that the film makes evident through non-linguistic narratives. Sparkes (2007) notes that it is "a worthy goal" to escape what he terms "the sort of 'oppressive empiricism' that is in opposition to interpretation....IF the enactment allows something to be seen that could not otherwise be seen. Somewhere Foucault calls this 'increasing the circumference of the visible'"(Sparkes 2007, p.541). The theory tested by the practice here is that the performative application of documentary film can increase "the circumference of the visible" as illustrated by the research film in this thesis.

F. *Limitations of the Research*

The highly specific nature of auto-ethnographic inquiry inherent in embodied research is both a strength and a limitation of the research. The research problem of this thesis has required the investigation of a method that has necessarily been examined in a particular context. It is one of the conclusions of the study that whilst the method developed here might be adopted and adapted by other researchers in other contexts, the embodied nature of the research restricts generalizations that might be drawn from the findings. Conceptually, video can be used in many different forms of documentation and the video documentary scholar must necessarily bring their own documentary imagination to bear in different ways, whilst leaving their own unique traces, trails and maps, depending on the investigation being undertaken.

G. *Implications for Future Research and the Development of the Thesis*

This dissertation has been written to provide a map to accompany the traces evident in the film offered here. For as Edward Bond wrote, “After your meal, write, Art is not magic” (Bond, 1978). The celebrated filmmaker Errol Morris shares a naïve conception of ontology in common with many other documentarians that their mission lies in “recovering reality” and critiquing the postmodernist analysis of documentary. He has expressed this sentiment thus: “We are walking around in the world, the world is not walking around in us.” (Morris, 2000). My experience as expressed in the report on research presented here has shown that while I have been walking around in the world, that world has been walking about in me. Future research would take up this theme in three areas.

Firstly the idea of a practice output such as a reflective documentary film being the “trace or realization of theories” is particularly valuable in the context of the further development of this research problem. Future research might examine how the specificity of the underlying cultural capital inherent in the

biography of the researcher might be problematised through developing the notion of the Creative Academic Research Tool as a systematic matrix which both articulates its own trace and overcomes the restricted ability to generalize noted above.

Secondly, it has been noted that distinguishing between method and methodology, the entirety of this research can be understood as an inquiry into scholarly method. The method or tool used to undertake the research, underpinned by ontological and epistemological understandings has been specifically identified as the use of the 'B' roll as a filmic technique. The production of this film has led me to conclude that it is the use of the often neglected scenic material of landscape and incidental memory rather than the foreground drama of character and dialogue which is often most relevant to the performative imperatives of provocation and evocation in the application of creative documentary filmmaking to scholarship. This is an indication of medium-dependency and is counter-intuitive to the expectation outlined earlier of adapting the conventions of literary media such as New Journalism or Verbatim Theatre and directly applying them in a filmic context. There is scope to extend and refine this line of inquiry into Performative Social Science across a range of other topics where we might learn by 'gawping' or 'dwelling' using image.

Thirdly, a performative methodology offers an accepted and systematic framework within a tradition of social science not just to undertake the research but also as a method for the dissemination of the research. Distribution and exhibition have been outside the scope of this research but the next stage of exploration would be to examine strategies for scholarly impact through 'writing with video' inside and outside the academy, on the basis of the "Third Orality". The conclusion thus far with the conceptualization of Secondary Literacy is particularly interesting in the context of this thesis because of the gap the typology leaves vacant in the field of visual media, so that it might be useful to consider the research problem in the context of the adding to the typology the possibility of a subsequent Third Orality based on audio-visual digital screen media.

Ong (1982) lists the following characteristics as typical of expression in a primary oral culture: expression is additive rather than subordinate, in that it is

linear and sequential; similarly it is aggregative rather than analytic; orality tends to be redundant, or more than sufficient; there is a tendency for it to be conservative rather than progressive; thought is necessarily expressed with close reference to the human lifeworld; expression is agonistic in tone; engagement is subjective, close, empathetic and collective; orality is homeostatic and adaptable; it is positioned in the world rather than abstract (Ong 1982).

The privileging of the visual text through the screen extends Ong's conceptualisation of the interiorization of thought. As we have noted, the boundaries between the categories are permeable and we might take forward the idea of screen viscosity and interiorization of thought in placing the viewer in a performative role. In relation to this thesis it would be appropriate to ask whether the documentary sensibility, when viewed across all media as a self-conscious and self-defining ambition distinct from chronicling and portraying, coincided with the advent of the second orality and the technological capacity to record and distribute images and the impact this might have for scholarly discourse in the mooted "third orality" of the screen.

References

- Abelard, P., Boyer, B. B., and McKeon, R. P., 1978. *Sic Et Non: A Critical Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Adams, T. E., 2012. *Narrating the Closet: An Autoethnography of Same-Sex Attraction*. Left Coast Press.
- Adler, M. J. and Doren, C. V., 2011. *How to Read a Book*. Simon and Schuster.
- Albéra, F. and Tortajada, M., 2010. *Cinema beyond film media epistemology in the modern era* [online]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
<http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=675611>
[Accessed 31 Dec 2014].
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldbberg, K., 2009. *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. SAGE.
- Andrews, J., 1996. *A Review of Richard Lanham's The Electronic Word* [online]. Available from: <http://www.vispo.com/writings/essays/lanhama.htm>
[Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Andrews, M., 2006. Living Counter Narratives. In: Seale, C., Silverman, D., Gubrium, J. F., and Gobo, G., eds. *Qualitative Research Practice*. Concise Paperback Edition. SAGE.
- Drifters (1929) Directed by John Grierson | BFI* [online]. Available from: <http://explore.bfi.org.uk/4ce2b69ebd8d5> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Aquinas, T., 1999. *Thomas Aquinas: Selected Writings*. London ; New York: Penguin Classics.
- Austin, J. L., 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2 Rev e. edition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bagehot, W., 2001. *The English Constitution*. New Ed edition. Oxford ; New York: Oxford Paperbacks.
- Bamburg, M., 2012. Narrative Analysis. In: Cooper, H. M., ed. *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology*. American Psychological Association.
- Banks, M. and Morphy, H., 1999. *Rethinking Visual Anthropology*. Yale University Press.
- Barthes, R., 1978. *Image-Music-Text*. Hill and Wang.

- Bartholomae, D., 1986. Inventing The University. *Journal of Basic Writing* [online], 5 (1). Available from: <http://wac.colostate.edu/jbw/> [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Bartholomae, D., 1995. Writing with Teachers: A Conversation With Peter Elbow. *College Composition and Communication* [online], 46 (1). Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/358870>.
- Bates, C., ed., 2014. *Video Methods: Social Science Research in Motion*. 1 edition. New York: Routledge.
- Bell, D., 2006. Creative film and media practice as research: In pursuit of that obscure object of knowledge. *Journal of Media Practice*, 7 (2), 85–100.
- Belton, J., 2014. If film is dead, what is cinema? *Screen*, 55 (4), 460–470.
- Bernstein, B., 2003. *Basil Bernstein: Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. 1 edition. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Best, S. and Kellner, D., 1991. *Postmodern Theory*. 1 edition. New York: The Guilford Press.
- BFI, 2014. *Trevor Hearing* | BFI [online]. BFI / Explore film & TV / People & organisations / Trevor Hearing. Available from: <http://explore.bfi.org.uk/4ce2ba83a56ce> [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Billy Johnson- A Horseman's Life*, 2008. Directed by Trevor Hearing Northumberland. Available from: <http://vimeo.com/36681811> [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- Birkerts, S., 2006. *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. Macmillan.
- Bizzell, P., 1992. *Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Bolter, J. D. and Grusin, R., 1999. *Remediation understanding new media* [online]. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=9351> [Accessed 30 Dec 2014].
- Bond, E., 1978. *Theatre Poems and Songs*. 1st edition. London: Methuen Ltd.
- Borgman, C., 2007. 'Scholarship in the Digital Age' @insidehighered. [online]. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/11/14/borgman> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].

- Bourdieu, P., 1986. The forms of capital. In: Richardson, J., ed. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, 241–258.
- Bourdieu, P., 1989. Social Space and Symbolic Power. *socitheo Sociological Theory*, 7 (1), 14–25.
- Bourdieu, P., 1990. The Scholastic Point of View. *CUAN Cultural Anthropology*, 5 (4), 380–391.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C., 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, 2nd Edition*. 2nd edition. London ; Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. et al, 1992. *The Logic of Practice*. first edition. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C., and Martin, M. D. S., 1996. *Academic Discourse: Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professorial Power*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourriaud, N., 2002. *Relational aesthetics*. [Dijon]: Les Presses du réel.
- Boyer, E. L., 1997. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. 1 edition. Princeton, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brecht, B., 1932. *The radio as an apparatus of communication* [online]. telematic connections :: telereal :: bit/BANGBANG. Available from: http://telematic.walkerart.org/telereal/bit_brecht.html [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Brew, A., 1999. The value of scholarship. In: *Annual Conference of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, University of Melbourne* [online]. Available from: <http://www.herdsa.org.au/wp-content/uploads/conference/1999/pdf/Brew.PDF> [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Bruzzi, S., 2006. *New Documentary*. 2 edition. Abingdon, England ; N.Y: Routledge.
- Bryant, I., Johnston, R., and Usher, R., 1997. *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge: Learning Beyond the Limits*. 1 edition. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Burke, P., 2005. Performing History: The Importance of Occasions. *Rethinking History*, 9 (1), 35–52.

- Burn, G., 2008. *Born Yesterday: The News as a Novel*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Burn, G., 2009. Gordon Burn on a media-saturated world. *the Guardian* [online], 7 March 2009. Available from:
<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2009/mar/07/gordon-burn>
 [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- Butler, J., 1988. Performative acts and gender constitution. *Theatre Journal*, 49 (1), 519–531.
- Cancienne, M.B. & Bagley, C. (2008). Dance as Method. In *Knowing Differently: Arts-Based and Collaborative Research Methods*. Liamputtong, P. & Rumbold, J. (eds) New York: Nova Science Publishers, 187-204.
- Candy, L., 2006. *Practice based research: a guide : CCS report* [online]. Sidney: University of Technology. Available from:
<http://www.creativityandcognition.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/PBR-Guide-1.1-2006.pdf>
 [Accessed 28 Dec 2014].
- Capote, T., 2000. *In Cold Blood : A True Account of a Multiple Murder and Its Consequences*. New Ed edition. London: Penguin Classics.
- Capturing Reality* 2008, Film Directed by Pepito Ferrari. DVD. Canada: National Film Board of Canada
- Capturing the Friedmans*. 2003. Film Directed by Andrew Jarecki. DVD. USA: HBO Documentary, Notorious Pictures
- Carnaby, P., 2005. E-learning and digital library futures in New Zealand. *Library Review*, 54 (6), 346–354.
- Cazeaux, C., 2002. Art and knowledge in Kant's aesthetics. Working Papers in Art and Design 2.
- Chartier, R., Aria]s, P., and Duby, G., 1993. *A History of Private Life: Passions of the Renaissance*. Harvard University Press.
- Chesshyre, R., 1981. 'Peter and Frosty for breakfast', *Observer*, 4 January, p.9
- Clairvaux, B. of, Cousins, E., and LeClercq, J., 1987. *Bernard of Clairvaux: Selected Works*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Cooper, C. R., 2007. *The Politics of Orality*. London: BRILL.
- Cope, B. and Phillips, A., eds., 2006. *The Future of the Book in the Digital Age*. 1 edition. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.

- Corner, J., 1996. *The Art of Record: A Critical Introduction to Documentary*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Corner, J., 2006. 'A Fiction (Un)Like Any Other'? *Critical Studies in Television: The International Journal of Television Studies*, 1 (1). Available from: <http://manchester.metapress.com/content/a56t7u51k01218wn/?p=5b043a0797ed4e27ac979d9b869c7b90&pi=11> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Corner, J., 2008. Performing The Real. In: Murray, S. and Ouellette, L., eds. *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture*. NYU Press.
- Croce, B., 1990. *Benedetto Croce: Essays on Literature and Literary Criticism*. SUNY Press.
- Dams, T., 2010. The trouble with documentaries. [online]. Available from: http://www.televsual.com/blog-detail/The-trouble-with-documentaries_bid-178.html [Accessed 28 Dec 2014].
- Dawkins, R., 1998. *Unweaving the rainbow: science, delusion, and the appetite for wonder*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dede, C., 2008. A Seismic Shift in Epistemology. *Educause Review*, 43 (3), 80–81.
- Denzin, N. K., 2001. The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research*, 1 (1), 23–46.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S., 2002. *The Qualitative Inquiry Reader*. California: Sage.
- Derrida, J., 1998. *Of Grammatology*. Corrected Edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eisenstein, E. L., 2012. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. 2 edition. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisner, E. W., 1997. The Promise and Perils of Alternative Forms of Data Representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26 (6), 4–10.
- Elbow, P., 1995. Being a Writer vs. Being an Academic: A Conflict in Goals. *College Composition and Communication*, 46 (1), 72–83.
- Elkins, J., 2006. On Beyond Research and New Knowledge. In: Macleod, K., ed. *Thinking Through Art: Reflections on Art as Research*. Routledge.
- Ellis, C., 2004. *The Ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

- Ellis, C., 2007. Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives. Relational Ethics in Research With Intimate Others. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13 (1) 3-29.
- Ellis, C., Adams, T., and Bochner, A. P., 2010. Autoethnography: An Overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), Art. 10, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101108>. [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Ellis, J., 2011. *Documentary: Witness and Self-Revelation*. London ; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Erikson, T. and Sorensen, I., 2014. Reflections on Academic Video. *Seminar.net* [online], 10 (2). Available from: <http://www.seminar.net/index.php/component/content/article/75-current-issue/186-reflections-on-academic-video> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Fenge, L.-A. and Jones, K., 2012. Gay and Pleasant Land? Exploring Sexuality, Ageing and Rurality in a Multi-Method, Performative Project. *British Journal of Social Work*, 42 (2), 300–317.
- Foley, J., 2008. *Apple Learning Interchange 2007 - Navigating Pathways: Oral Tradition and the Internet* [online]. Available from: <http://pathwaysproject.org/> [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Foley, J. M., 2012. *Oral Tradition and the Internet: Pathways of the Mind*. 1st Edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Foley, J. M., 2015. *Pathways Project* [online]. Pathways Project. Available from: <http://www.pathwaysproject.org/> [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Foucault, M., 1972. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Psychology Press.
- Galloway, D., McAlpine, K. B., and Harris, P., 2007. From Michael Moore to JFK Reloaded: Towards a working model of interactive documentary. *Journal of Media Practice*, 8 (3), 325–339.
- Galvin, K. and Todres, L., 2007. The Creativity of ‘Unspecialization.’ A Contemplative Direction for Integrative Scholarly Practice. *Phenomenology & Practice* [online], 1 (1). Available from: <https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/pandpr/article/view/19804> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Garber, M., 2010. *The Gutenberg Parenthesis: Thomas Pettitt on parallels between the pre-print era and our own Internet age* » *Nieman Journalism Lab* [online]. Available from: <http://www.niemanlab.org/2010/04/the->

- gutenberg-parenthesis-thomas-pettitt-on-parallels-between-the-pre-print-
era-and-our-own-internet-age/ [Accessed 31 Dec 2014].
- Gergen, M. and Gergen, K. J., 2011. Performative Social Science and
Psychology. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative
Social Research* [online], 12 (1). Available from: [http://www.qualitative-
research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1595](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1595) [Accessed 5 Jan 2015].
- Gergen, M. and Jones, K., 2008. Editorial: A Conversation about Performative
Social Science. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative
Social Research* [online], 9 (2). Available from: [http://www.qualitative-
research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/376](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/376) [Accessed 30 Dec 2014].
- Gergen, M. M. and Gergen, K. J., 2012. *Playing with Purpose: Adventures in
Performative Social Science*. Left Coast Press.
- Gibson, W., 1999. *Wired 7.10: William Gibson's Filmless Festival* [online].
William Gibson's Filmless Festival. Available from:
<http://archive.wired.com/wired/archive/7.10/gibson.html> [Accessed 30
Dec 2014].
- Gibson, W., 2012. *Distrust that Particular Flavor*. Penguin UK.
- Gilligan, C., 1982. *In a different Voice: Psychological theory and women's
development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ginsberg, F., 2008. *Re-thinking The Digital Age*. In: Hesmondhalgh, D. and
Toynbee, J., eds. *The Media and Social Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Goodall, H. L., 2000. *Writing the New Ethnography*. Writing In Book edition.
Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- Goodall, H. L., 2012. *Writing qualitative inquiry: self, stories, and academic life*.
Left Coast Press.
- Gray, C. and Pirie, I., 1995. 'Artistic' research procedure: *Research at the edge
of chaos?* In: *Design Interfaces Conference Proceedings*. University of
Salford.
- Grierson, E. and Brearley, L., 2009. *Creative Arts Research: Narratives of
Methodologies and Practices*. Rotterdam; Boston: Sense Publishers.
- Grierson, J., 1929. *Drifters* [online]. BFI. Available from:
<http://explore.bfi.org.uk/4ce2b69ebd8d5> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Grotius, H. and Capella, M., 2011. *De nuptiis philologiae, et Mercurii, et de
septem artibus liberalibus libri novem. Ad codicum manuscriptorum*

- fidem cum notis Bon. Vulcanii, Hug. ... L. Walthardi, Jo. Ad. Goezii.*
Nabu Press.
- Guba, E. G., 1990. *The Paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Guerin, F. and Hallas, R., eds., 2007. *The Image and the Witness: Trauma, Memory and Visual Culture*. London; New York: Wallflower Press.
- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L., 2004. Ethics, reflexivity, and “ethically important moments” in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 10 Number 2, 261-280.
- Gusdorf, G., 1979. *Speaking (La Parole)*. Northwestern University Press.
- Habermas, J., 1990. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halbert, M., 1998. *Performativity, Cultural Capital, and the Internet: An Analysis of the Internet as a Proposed Medium for Scholarly Communication Using Concepts from Lyotard and Bourdieu*.
- Hall, S., ed., 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. First Edition. London ; Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P., 2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. Routledge.
- Hare, D., 2010. Mere Fact, Mere Fiction. *the Guardian* [online], 17 April 2010. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/culture/2010/apr/17/david-hare-theatre-fact-fiction> [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- Harwood, N. and Hadley, G., 2004. Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 23 (4), 355–377.
- Hauskeller, M., 2005. Telos: The Revival of an Aristotelian Concept in Present Day Ethics. *Inquiry* (Oslo). 2005 Feb; 48(1): 62–75.
- Havelock, E., 1986. *Muse Learns to Write: Reflections of Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heidegger, M., 2008. *Being and Time*. Reprint edition. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Heß, R., 2012. Poetic embodied interpretation of re-search findings: an evocative approach to social sciences methods.. *Creative Approaches To Research*, 5 (2), 26–33.

- Hiley, D. R., Bohman, J. F., and Shusterman, R., 1992. *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture*. 1 edition. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hume, D., 1934. *A Treatise of Human Nature*. ed A. D. Lindsay London: J.M.Dent.
- Hutchins, R. M., 1952. *Great Books of the Western World: The great conversation*, by R. M. Hutchins. W. Benton.
- Ingraham, B., 2000. Scholarly rhetoric in digital media. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education* [online]. Available from: <http://jime.open.ac.uk/jime/article/download/2000-3/53> [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Isherwood, C. 1939. *Goodbye to Berlin*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Isidore of Seville, 2006. *Isidore of Seville's Etymologies: Complete English Translation, Volume I*. Lulu.com.
- Jack, I., 2009. Red Riding leads us up the garden path. *The Guardian* [online], 14 March 2009. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/mar/14/ian-jack-comment-red-riding> [Accessed 3 Jan 2015].
- Jacobs, D., 2012. *What Will Become Of The 'Kodak Moment'?* [online]. Forbes. Available from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/deborahljacobs/2012/01/19/what-will-become-of-the-kodak-moment/> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Jenkins, H., 2008. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. Revised edition. New York: NYU Press.
- Jenkins, H. and Thorburn, D., eds., 2003. *Democracy and New Media*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Jones, K., 2006. A biographic researcher in pursuit of an aesthetic: The use of arts-based (re) presentations in 'performative' dissemination of life stories. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 2 (1), 66–85.
- Jones, K., 2007. How Did I Get to Princess Margaret? (And How Did I Get Her to the World Wide Web?). *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [online], 8 (3). Available from: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/281> [Accessed 30 Dec 2014].

- Jones, K., 2010. *Performative SocSci: What it is, What it isn't* Seminar script [online]. Available from: http://www.academia.edu/4769877/Performative_SocSci_What_it_is_What_it_isnt_Seminar_script [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Jones, K., 2013a. Infusing Biography With The Personal: The Writing of Rufus Stone. *Creative Approaches To Research*, 6 (2), 4–22.
- Jones, K., 2013b. *Research as Fiction: 'The Return of Rufus Stone'* [online]. The Sociological Imagination. Available from: <http://sociologicalimagination.org/archives> [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Jones, K., Leavy P., 2014. *A Conversation Between Kip Jones and Patricia Leavy: Arts-Based Research, Performative Social Science and Working on the Margins*. The Qualitative Report 2014 Volume 19, Article 38, 1-7 Available from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/jones38.pdf> [Accessed 28 Jan 2015].
- Jones, K., 2015. A Report on an Arts-Led, Emotive Experiment in Interviewing and Storytelling. *The Qualitative Report*. Volume 20, Number 2, Article 6, 86-92 Available from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR20/2/jones6.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2015].
- Jordan, P., 2004. Recent Developments in Practice-based/led Research in Art and Design. Presented at the All Ireland Society for Higher Education inaugural Conference.
- Josselson, R., 1996. On writing other people's lives: Self-analytic reflections of a narrative researcher. In R. Josselson (Ed.), *Ethics and process in the narrative study of lives* (Vol. 4, pp. 60-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kant, I., 1964. *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. London: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Katz, R., 2010. Scholars, Scholarship, and the Scholarly Enterprise in the Digital Age. *Educause Review*, 45 (2), 44–56.
- Kuehl, L., 1978. Joan Didion, The Art of Fiction No. 71. *Paris Review* [online], (74). Available from: <http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/3439/the-art-of-fiction-no-71-joan-didion> [Accessed 3 Jan 2015].
- Lanham, R. A., 1995. *The Electronic Word: Democracy, Technology, and the Arts*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.

- Lawson, M., 2006. *Jeremy Paxman cried on TV. But sometimes it's better not to reveal all* [online]. the Guardian. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2006/jan/13/broadcasting.arts> [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Leavy, P., 2008. *Method Meets Art, First Edition: Arts-Based Research Practice*. 1 edition. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lebovic, N., 2013. *The Philosophy of Life and Death: Ludwig Klages and the Rise of a Nazi Biopolitics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leviathan*, 2012. Film. Directed by Verena Paravel and Lucien Castaing-Taylor. [online]. Available from: <http://www.arretetoncinema.org/leviathan/> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015]. USA
- Lyotard, J.-F., 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacAdams, D. P., 1997. *The Stories We Live By: Personal Myths and the Making of the Self*. 1 edition. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Macleod, K. and Holdridge, L., eds., 2009. *Thinking Through Art: Reflections on Art as Research*. 1 edition. London; New York: Routledge.
- Martianus, 2011. *De Nuptiis Philologiae Et Mercurii Et De Septem Artibus Liberalibus Libri Novem* Nabu Press.
- McKenzie, J., 2001. *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- McLuhan, M., 2005. *The Medium is the Message*. New York GP.
- McLuhan, M., 2011. *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. University of Toronto Press.
- Mill, J.S., 1998. *Utilitarianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Nanook of the North*, 1922. Film. Directed by Robert Flaherty. USA. American Film Institute.
- National Theatre, 2015. *An Introduction to Verbatim Theatre* [online]. National Theatre. Available from: <http://www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/video/an-introduction-to-verbatim-theatre> [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- National Union of Journalists, 2015. *NUJ Code of Conduct* <https://www.nuj.org.uk/about/nuj-code/> [Accessed 15 May 2015].
- Nelson, R., 2006. Practice-as-research and the problem of knowledge. *Performance research*, 11 (4), 105–116.

- Nelson, R., ed., 2013. *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Newman, J. H., 2014. *The Idea of a University*. Assumption Press.
- Nichols, B., 2001. *Introduction to documentary* [online]. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press. Available from:
<http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=129783>
 [Accessed 30 Dec 2014].
- Noddings, N., 1984. *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- O'Donnell, J. J., 1996. The Pragmatics of the New: Trithemius, McLuhan, Cassiodorus. In: Nunberg, G., ed. *The Future of the Book*. University of California Press.
- O'Donnell, J. J., 2000. *Avatars of the Word: From Papyrus to Cyberspace*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- O'Hagan, S., 2010. *Reality Hunger by David Shields | Book review* [online]. the Guardian. Available from:
<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2010/feb/28/reality-hunger-book-review>
 [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- Ong, W. J., 1982. *Orality and literacy: the technologizing of the word*. London; New York: Methuen.
- Paget, D., 1998. *No Other Way To Tell It: Dramadoc/Docudrama on Television*. Manchester, UK. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Parfitt, M., 2015. *Our Love-Hate Relationship with Academic Discourse* [online]. Teaching Composition. Available from:
<http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/english/tc/parfitt/parfittmodule.html>
 [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Parker, R., 2014. *Roger Graef, Films Of Record* [online]. Available from:
<http://www.broadcastnow.co.uk/features/roger-graef-films-of-record/5071396.article>
 [Accessed 28 Dec 2014].
- Paulus, T., Lester, J. N., and Dempster, P., 2013. *Digital Tools for Qualitative Research*. 1 edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Pelias, R. J., 2004. *A Methodology of the Heart: Evoking Academic and Daily Life*. Rowman Altamira.

- Pennycook, A., 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. 1 edition. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A., 1997. Cultural Alternatives and Autonomy. In: Benson, P. and Voller, P., eds. *Autonomy and Independence in Language Learning*. London : New York: Longman, 35–53.
- Pennycook, A., 2010. *Language as a Local Practice*. Routledge.
- Pettitt, T., 2010a. Containment and Articulation: Media, Cultural Production, and the Perception of the Material World. Presented at the Gutenberg Parenthesis Research Forum, Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies, University of Southern Denmark.
- Pettitt, T., 2010b. *The Gutenberg Parenthesis*. [online]. Available from: http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/forums/gutenberg_parenthesis.html [Accessed 31 Dec 2014].
- Phillips, A. and Cope, B., eds., 2006. *The Future of the Book in the Digital Age*. Oxford: Woodhead Publishing, Ltd.
- Plato, 427 BCE-347 BCE, 1999. *Phaedrus* [online]. Available from: <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/1636> [Accessed 1 Jan 2015].
- Poe, M., 2012. Every Monograph a Movie. *Chronicle of Higher Education* [online]. Available from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Every-Monograph-a-Movie/131106/> [Accessed 27 Dec 2014].
- Polkinghorne, D. E., 1995. Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8 (1), 5–23.
- Postman, N., 1985. *Amusing ourselves to death: public discourse in the age of show business*. New York: Viking.
- Purves, L., 2014. With no licence fee, the radio we love is lost. *The Times*. 24 March 2014. <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/article4042495.ece> [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- Randall, W., 2014. *The Stories We Are: An Essay on Self-Creation*. 2 edition. University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.
- Rapport, F. and Harthill, G., 2012. Crossing disciplines with ethnographic poetic representation. *Creative Approaches To Research*, 5 (2), 11–25.
- Rascaroli, L., 2009. *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film*. London: Wallflower Press.

- REF, 2014. 2011-02 : REF 2014 [online]. Available from:
<http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2011-02/> [Accessed 30 Dec 2014].
- Renov, M., 2004. *Subject Of Documentary*. 1 edition. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.
- Renov, M., 2008. First person films - some theses on self-inscription. In: Thomas, A. and Wilma, de J., eds. *Rethinking Documentary: New Perspectives And Practices: New Perspectives and Practices*. McGraw-Hill International.
- Rettberg, J. W., 2013. *Blogging*. 2 edition. London: Polity.
- Rettberg, J. W., 2014. *Seeing ourselves through technology: how we use selfies, blogs and wearable devices to see and shape ourselves*. London: Palgrave
- Richardson, V., 1997. *Constructivist Teacher Education: Building New Understandings*. Psychology Press.
- Ricoeur, P., 1967. *Husserl: An Analysis of His Phenomenology*. Northwestern University Press.
- Ridder-Symoens, H. de, ed., 1991. *A History of the University in Europe: Volume 1, Universities in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riessman, C. K., 2007. *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Roberts, B., 2008. Performative Social Science: A Consideration of Skills, Purpose and Context. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* [online], 9 (2). Available from:
<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/377>
 [Accessed 29 Dec 2014].
- Rorty, R., 1989. *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. 1st PB edition. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R., 2000. *Philosophy and Social Hope*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rose, G., 2011. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. Third edition. London ; Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Rosenthal, A. and Corner, J., eds., 2005. *New Challenges for Documentary*. 2 edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Rothman, W., 1997. *Documentary Film Classics*. Cambridge, Eng. ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouch, J. and Feld, S., 2003. *Cine-Ethnography*. 1 edition. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.
- Rufus Stone*. 2011. Film. Kip Jones. Bournemouth: Parkville Pictures
- Russell, D., 1995. Activity Theory and Its Implications for Writing Instruction. 51-78. In: Petraglia, P., ed. *In Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Saks, A. L., 1996. Viewpoints: Should Novels Count as Dissertations in Education? *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30 (4), 403–427.
- Saldaña, J., 2005. *Ethnodrama: An Anthology of Reality Theatre*. Rowman Altamira.
- Saldaña, J., 2011. *Ethnotheatre: Research from Page to Stage*. Left Coast Press.
- Sapir, E., 1985. *Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality*. University of California Press.
- Sauerberg, L. O., 1991. *Fact into Fiction: Documentary Realism in the Contemporary Novel*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sauerberg, L. O., 2009. The Gutenberg Parenthesis – Print, Book and Cognition. *Orbis Litterarum*, 64 (2), 79–80.
- Schmitt, C. B., 1981. *History of universities*. England: Avebury.
- Schneider, R., 2001. Performance Remains. *Performance Research*, 6 (2), 100–108.
- Schön, D. A., 1983. *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, C. E., 1990. *The Question of Ethics: Nietzsche, Foucault, Heidegger*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Searle, J. R., 1969. *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, D., 2011. *Reality Hunger: A Manifesto*. New York: Vintage.
- Shrum, W., Duque, R., and Brown, T., 2005. Digital Video as Research Practice: Methodology for the Millennium. *Journal of Research Practice*, 1 (1), Article M4.
- Smith, H. and Dean, R., eds., 2009. *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Sparkes, A., 2007. Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: a story seeking consideration. *Qualitative Research*, 7 (4) 521-550
- Spiers, J. and Smith, J., 2012. Using autobiographical poetry as data to investigate the experience of living with end-stage renal disease: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Creative Approaches To Research*, 5 (2), 119–140.
- Springgay, S., Irwin, R. L., and Kind, S. W., 2005. A/r/tography as Living Inquiry Through Art and Text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11 (6), 897–912.
- Sullivan, G., 2004. *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in the Visual Arts*. 1 edition. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- TateShots: Deimantas Narkevicius*. 2014. Film. Tate [online]. Available from: <http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/tateshots-deimantas-narkevicius> [Accessed 2 Jan 2015].
- The Battle of Culloden*, 1964. Film. Directed by Peter Watkins. UK: BBC.
- The War Game*, 1965. Film. Directed by Peter Watkins. UK: BBC.
- Thompson, J. B., 2005. *Books in the Digital Age: The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States*. 1 edition. Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity.
- Thorpe, A., 2015. *The Big Music by Kirsty Gunn – review* [online]. the Guardian. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/jul/27/big-music-kirsty-gunn-review> [Accessed 6 Jan 2015].
- Tompkins, J., 1987. Me and My Shadow. *New Literary History*, 19 (1), 169–178.
- Turn, H., Bohman, et al, eds INTERPRETIVE, 1991. *The Interpretive Turn - Philosophy, Science, Culture*. Edited. by Hiley, Bohman, & Shusterman. Cornell Univ. Press. 1991. Cornell University Press.
- Vannini, P., ed., 2012. *Popularizing Research: Engaging New Genres, Media, and Audiences*. 1 edition. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- White, H., 1975. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Reissue edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whorf, B. L. and Carroll, J. B., 1956. *Language, thought, and reality: selected writings*. [Cambridge, Mass.]; New York: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology ; John Wiley & Sons.
- Wilber, K., 1995. *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*. London: Shambhala.

- Williams, R., 2001. *The Long Revolution*. Broadview Press.
- Winston, B., 2008. *Claiming the Real: Documentary: Grierson and Beyond*. 2 edition. London : New York: British Film Institute.
- Wolfe, T., 1972. *Tom Wolfe Gives an Eyewitness Report of the Birth of 'The New Journalism* [online]. New York Magazine. Available from: <http://nymag.com/news/media/47353/index4.html> [Accessed 4 Jan 2015].
- Wolfe, T., 1990. *The New Journalism*. New York: Pan Macmillan.
- Wolfe, T., Wolfe, T., and Johnson, E. W., 1975. *The New Journalism*. 1st. edition. London: Pan.