

Chapter 43

“Styles of Good Sense”

Ethics, Filmmaking and Scholarship

Kip Jones



Crew shooting early scene for the short, research-based film, **RUFUS STONE**

Since the question of ethics is a question of knowing and thinking as well as choosing and everyday action, our subject matter concerns the ways by which we customarily establish bodies of knowledge and patterns of reflections, our way of producing and maintaining certainty, and our styles of good sense.

(Scott, 1990, p. 5)

INTRODUCTION

Ethics is the practice of integrity in human relationships.

I am getting old enough now that I finally realise that certain times/moments in my life were pinnacles, not predictors of things to come. I recall the dizzying heights of firsts: the initial film that spoke to me personally, the foundational book that changed my thinking, that earliest piece of music that clutched my heart and made me cry. I thought that such moments would continue throughout life ad infinitum. Never mind a love that I thought would last forever, a body abused that I assumed would always recover, the promise of undying friendship that simply withered away. Indeed, *I now find myself no longer astonished when people lack integrity, but am surprised that I still have some.*

(Jones, 2010)

The key difference between ethics in the everyday narrative research of the Social Sciences (*ESRC Research Ethics Framework: ‘integrity, honesty, confidentiality, voluntary participation, impartiality and the avoidance of personal risk to individuals and groups’* [ESRC, 2005, p. 26, cited in Wiles et al., 2008]) and research using filmmaking as research and/or dissemination is a shift in emphasis to the viewer or, in Performative Social Science terms (Jones, 2014a), the audience. This emphasis on the “end-user” or viewer is a development of the more traditional ethics in journalism (and, therefore, documentary filmmaking) where the journalist’s driving concern is with the truthfulness and accuracy of what is reported and, therefore, read or seen by the public. The ethical considerations for

journalists appear to have a quite different focus and emphasis than those typically considered in Social Science studies. For example, ethical expectations of journalists from the *Code of Ethics of the Society of Professional Journalists* (1996):

- Honest, fair and courageous
- Respectful of sources and subjects
- **Obligation only to public's right to know**
- **Accountable to readers, listeners, viewers and each other**

In terms of research using filmmaking for academic scholarship, the ethical emphasis must remain balanced between the two: the active research participants and their worlds, and multiple viewing audiences and their worlds. This is the key fundamental shift in ethical protocols for filmmaking as an arts-based academic research method.

THE ETHICS CONUNDRUM

Narrated stories turned into written text (the vast majority of the outputs of the Social Science interview culture) beg for a fresh approach. The constructed memories that are the building blocks of narrated accounts, like dreams, are simultaneous layers of past and present - the visual and the spatial - and these added dimensions, beyond the purely temporal, demand further attention, perhaps an expansion into new and unknown territories. 'Like you, I believe in public scholarship and making our work accessible to broad audiences. I believe there is an ethical and practical mandate for getting our work beyond the academy. And frankly from a personal point of view I think about the overall impact of my work and the further we disseminate our work the higher the impact' (Leavy, in Jones & Leavy, 2014, p. 3). This

unease within the familiarity of narrative research, its procedures, “rules and regulations”, and constant textural outpourings, convinces some to turn to new methods of construction and diffusion. We review, therefore, the very heart of arts-based research: its aesthetics and its ethical procedures.

Where do we find an aesthetic and an ethic in which to base this new attention to narrative and its performative, arts-based possibilities? ‘The criteria for evaluating qualitative work ... 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). Ethics, much like aesthetics, is often misunderstood as something effusive, illusive and somehow, decision-making by the few on a rarefied echelon, involving pronouncements of grand moral impact and/or sophisticated discrimination. For these kinds of reasons and to avoid potential headaches, it is often assumed that checklists and committees will be far better at making such decisions than mere individuals.

A word of warning, however: inherent dangers remain in the ever-increasing scholarship-by-management system:

As our skills at in-depth interviewing continued to develop, we become better and better at acting as but “silent witnesses” to the lives of others. Ethical considerations and sensitivities become ethical procedures and limitations over time. As the subtleties of the interview environment become more familiar, at the same time, our encounters with strangers become more constrained by committees and the management culture pervading academia. These drive narrative researchers further into taking the position of the “neutral observer” and the

disengaged participant.

(Jones, 2015, p. 86)

For example, Fenby-Hulse (2015), in article entitled, “Arts projects need research ethics”, admitted that there are no simple answers to these questions, but then proceeded to recommend that ‘it is important to have ethics committees commenting’ and ‘the right safeguards ... put in place’ (Fenby-Hulse, 2015). For Fenby-Hulse, it seems important to ensure that these discussions take place in advance of involvement of the research relationship. The concept of an on-going, working relationship developing between researcher and participant is absent here. In contrast, the *Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association* (BSA, 2002) begins its ‘Guidelines’ by reminding associates that ‘the purpose of the statement is to make members aware of the *ethical issues that may arise throughout the research process* and to encourage them to *take responsibility for their own ethical practice*. The Association encourages members to use the Statement to help educate themselves and their colleagues to behave ethically’ (BSA, 2002; emphasis mine).

The truth remains that the seeds of moral maturity and good taste, or both ethics and aesthetics, are imbued in us culturally as children and develop over our lifetimes through our relationships both within communities and through exposure to objects of worth or merit. Far better than sending the novice researcher off to an ethics committee would be to start the dialogue or narrative that will help the neophyte to continue to develop her/his moral compass and aesthetic judgment. Such conversations produce worthwhile tools useful at all stages, particularly for arts-based research and dissemination processes, and certainly central to research such as film and the craft of filmmaking itself.

The development of sensitivity to issues of integrity and responsibility to others, or Scott's 'good sense' (Scott, 1990, p. 5), takes time and practice. '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, p. 7-8). Relational humanism (Jones, 2009) in research ethics is developed in this very way and means that personal autonomy, dignity, liberty and responsibility are considered positive values for consideration throughout the on-going dialogue created through the research process and in its dissemination.

Moving from traditional research, to using film to both answer research questions and disseminate data, holds the promise of vast horizons opening up for the academic. Indeed, particularly within the audience's interaction with film, opportunities arise for meaningful communication through images conjured up - a kind of theatrical, magical dialogue that takes place in the cinema. Emphasis is on shared cultural and societal resources or the 'habitus –our second nature, the mass of conventions, beliefs and attitudes which each member of a society shares with every other member' (Scheff, 1997, p. 219). It is in these moments of shared, extended reality that we connect to what it means to be human and, therefore, reach a higher plane of mutual understanding and a blurring of individual differences. A relational humanism urges us as theorists, human scientists and practitioners to seek ways –multiple ways - of generating these integrative conversations through publications of course and naturally through presentations, but especially through films. By extending our gaze beyond the status quo, to new technologies and modes of presentation, we open doors to new understandings and resources.

It is within this communicative process that I will now address my own personal experience with, and ethical participation in, extending the boundaries of narrative research by making a short research-based film. It was through such practice itself that aesthetic and ethical issues were confronted and addressed. This process covered participation ranging from researcher to filmmaker, author to producer, from overseeing the conduct of interviews and subsequently creating composite characters to encouraging full audience engagement within a cinematic reality.

RESEARCHING AND MAKING RUFUS STONE: THE ETHICS OF FICTIVE REALITY IN FILM

It's very simple to get a cross section of society within a village; you get a microcosm of the social macrocosm.

(Haneke, Director, *The White Ribbon* [2007]; cited in Jablonski, 2010)

The two questions concerning ethics and making the film, RUFUS STONE (2012), that come up most frequently in Question & Answer sessions following screenings are: “Is it ethical to combine participants’ interviews into composite fictional characters?” and “How was combining your own auto-ethnographic story with those of the participants ethical?” Both questions recall the BSA advice: ‘ethical issues ... may arise throughout the research process’ (BSA, 2002). I will try to explain in depth how the circumstances for both of these practices developed over time through the research and filmmaking processes (the whole process took seven years - from applications for funding through the research process to finally shooting, editing, screening, and distributing the film).

RUFUS STONE began with stories, stories collected using several research methods, including the Biographic Narrative Interpretive Method (Jones, 2001), which are outlined elsewhere (Jones, Fenge, Read & Cash, 2013).

These stories, along with other rich data from the focus group and the visual ethnographic study, were foundational in creating the film. The research team and advisory panel used this material to inform the development of the film's composite characters, treatment and script, creating the "fictive" reality that resulted in the story and characterisations for the film, *Rufus Stone*.

(Jones et al., 2013, p.18)

Allowing the characters to develop over time and through several versions of the story in collaboration with the filmmaker provides an example of the joint effort necessary in developing a “fictive reality”. A 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. For example, (and a frequent device used in RUFUS STONE), several interviewees may recount a similar incident. When these reports are combined into one person’s story, a “fiction” is born.

Later, I realised that I had been working on this concept for some time, perhaps as early as 2002 for a conference presentation and later, published as a script (Jones, 2011). I produced a conference multi-media presentation that described an imagined conversation between psychologists Klaus Riegel and Ken Gergen on a train in 1976. This dream-like production, supported by narrative biographical theory, extended the illusory biographies of these two scholars and constructed and created by an imaginative projection of my “self” onto their

worlds. In terms of the approval or disapproval by research subjects, Gergen wept after viewing the presentation.

I continued to develop fictive reality in earnest in writing the treatment for RUFUS STONE (2012). One example was the character, “Abigail”. Her make-up began from two directions - initially she was the contemporary neighbour of Rufus. The role of young Ellie, Rufus’ sister (who came to me in a dream), was a separate character developed early on. Then, at the suggestion of the director, Josh Appignanesi, Ellie and Abigail became one person and the triangle between the teenagers Rufus, Flip and Abigail was born. The dialogue for Abigail was, in part, taken from a transcription of an interview with a woman that I had done many years earlier. When commenting on her string of disastrous marriages, she said, “Oh, well. Some day my Prince will come!” This comment stayed with me over the years and ended up spoken by Abigail to Rufus, when she encounters him all those years later (RUFUS STONE, 2012).

What of the second query, the involvement of your personal story in creating the story for RUFUS STONE?

When writing auto-ethnography, I endeavor to remain a minor character and/or a conduit to a time, place, and other people. I become fictionalized through writing. I am the sorcerer who reminds audience of themselves. In terms of visual representation of such stories, I become the keen observer, allowing cultural images to become private and iconic. These remembered images twist and turn and eventually morph in various ways to be included as my own graphic memories. These visual “mash-ups” are truly Ethno-Graphic. Indeed, our visual memories can become imbued with both intense cultural and personal meaning.

This is the visual auto-ethnography that I hope to represent in my work.

(Jones, 2012a, p. 14)

How this autobiographical practice moved into the writing of the treatment for RUFUS STONE began almost by stealth and in stages.

I began to comprehend that I had to rely on myself, my own background, and my own story, if I was ever to put flesh on the bones of the players and their tales. I always expected that the inhabitants of the film would be “composite” characters - that is, the interwoven and combined biographies of several people whom we had interviewed separately for the study. I then, however, began to realise that my own story was an additional one that I could potentially mine for detail. “Bonus material!” I initially thought. By beginning to recall some of the physical settings (the three-dimensionality) of various scenarios from my own life, I was able to start to imbue the writing for the film treatment with a sense of place and detail that might otherwise be missing.

(Jones, 2013, pp. 7-8)

But was this “ethical”? Should I have asked the interviewees if they wanted their stories portrayed in this way, to be combined with each other’s backgrounds and narratives, and even embellished with events from my own story? What convinced me that it was “ethical” to proceed in this way?

I listened to the devastating stories from the men in our study who were accused of unsubstantiated sexual acts in their youth, then threatened with incarceration or worse and often shunned by family and community (see Jones, Fenge, Read & Cash, 2013). My own youthful experience became a resource that breathed propinquity into such tales as they were subsequently woven into the plot of RUFUS STONE. My own tale of the mother with a knife, full of vitriolic condemnation, made it possible for me to reinvigorate the similar stories that I was hearing for the film.

The naïveté of same-sex attraction and young love, too often forbidden and misunderstood love, was a story reported over and over again in our study and, therefore, became central to the plot of the film. By compositing these stories in RUFUS STONE, at last we remember them together, finally gaining strength in each other for something misunderstood and condemned from our isolated youthful experiences.

(Jones, 2013, pp. 10-11)

Writing the past meant mining my own experiences for detail and validity, for visual references that would fill in detail and bring the stories we had been told to life cinematically. Not certain at first, but as the writing of the back-stories progressed, I realised that I was mining the emotional content of my own life. I needed it to relate to the stories that had been told to me and so I searched my own life for clues (Kubler, 1962). Mining the tunnels of the past, to find not only the gems, but also the very construction of the tunnels and mines that the past leaves behind. The mother-load for story is in these artefacts. The difference between this approach and earlier narrative interview reports is that the personal embedded in the process

now becomes more transparent, is acknowledged and even used in storytelling. I have learned, in this way, to let the characters lead the writing and come to life through me. In terms of the research participants, their stories become enriched and, ironically, more clearly delineated, through this fictive embellishment.

If we plan to work in film to create story from research, we must be willing to move into new territories and ways of working. Leaving trepidation behind, the creative impulse now drives the stories to their natural fruition. Film is an observable medium - the stories must be visual. As we witness throughout life, certain cultural images become private and iconic. We recall and utilise the 'Ethno-Graphic' (Jones, 2012a, p. 14) mentioned earlier. The lines between the cultural and the personal become blurred - much like the lines between what we hear from others and what we remember ourselves. Bravely, we incorporate these images into our storytelling to give it resonance. These are the mother loads from mining the tunnels of our pasts, which become the *leitmotifs* and *Gestalt* shaping our own narratives and contributing to the narratives of others.

I continue to explain how this affected the risk-taking involved in creating RUFUS STONE:

That's not to say that the research wasn't very, very in-depth and well-constructed. Certainly, any project that takes place over three years is almost a gift these days in terms of an opportunity to carry out substantial research. To be able to do in-depth interviews and follow-up interpretation by citizen panels, then to conduct focus groups and to use theatrical interpretation of some of the data - all this wealth of data added to the richness of the story that we finally were able to present as a treatment of the story to the filmmaker.

It was a risk in the sense that it was doing something that hadn't been done at this level before. There certainly have been films made involving social science projects and they tend to be a film of a theatrical production put on by participants in a project. No one has gone to the next stage, which is, in a sense, fictionalising the research - and that's what we've done here. By using composite characters we've created a fiction in the end. They're still true to the research and even lines that they say in the dialogue often are verbatim lines that people said in the interviews. The story, however, is fictional - it didn't really happen exactly as it is told in the film to any one person.

Using fiction we were able to enhance not only the interpretive utility of the research, but also the entertainment value, and by entertainment value I mean that in the strictest terms of entertainment as something that makes people really think and makes them think at a very deep level.

(Jones & Hearing, p. 186, 2013)

**YOU MENTIONED A SYNCHRONY BETWEEN AESTHETICS AND ETHICS -
HOW COME?**

Our intentions need to consist of conveying the human sciences and the social sciences from "scientistic" paradigms to ethical - aesthetic paradigms.

(Guattari cited in Bourriaud, 2002, p. 96)

We recall that when we were children, we learned how to view the world and how to treat others around us. In this way, principles evolved - in both how we developed a sense of taste for the things in the world around us, and our ethical compasses. 'Each of us have an ethical orientation and a reservoir of resources, values, and attitudes upon which we draw when we reflect and act on moral issues' (Stadler, 2008, p. 3). Performative Social Science (Jones, 2012a; 2012b), the method of arts-based research and dissemination that I have developed, is theoretically based in Relational Aesthetics (Bourriaud, 2002). Relational Aesthetics is conceived of in terms of co-operation, relationship, community and a broad definition of public spaces. Bourriaud's theory offers a post-modern, contemporary framework that allows social scientists, particularly those with an interest in arts-based research such as filmmaking, to think about aesthetics and means of dissemination in fresh ways. Relational Aesthetics also forms a structure on which we can begin to think about a "performative" Social Science - a science that includes more emphasis on collaborations with our research participants as co-authors, co-producers or co-performers themselves. It is here that Ethics and Aesthetics become intertwined and support one another. It also provides a platform on which to base the production values of our dissemination efforts and gauge the effects that our fabrications have on our audiences as well, allowing for their own participation in a dialogical, creative social exchange. This allows for the ethics of journalistic accountability to viewers and audiences rights to know.

There are aesthetic values that come into play when creating arts-based research or Performative Social Science as well. I have often remarked that it is a mistake, I believe, for academics to assume the mantles of artists, poets, dancers, actors or filmmakers and that the best arts-based research involves collaboration with professional artists and crafts people. Still, there is no reason that the academic cannot develop a more refined aesthetic sense through efforts in arts-based research, particularly learning through collaborations. For

example, I learned an immense amount during the shooting of RUFUS STONE. I also knew, at the same time, to stay well out of the way of the director and other professionals who were skilfully representing the story I had written that they were crafting in film. This is the stage in collaborations where things can frequently go awry, with researchers not being able to ‘let go’ of control of the project, and allow the collaborator to do what she or he does best (see Jones, 2013).

The academic interested in pursuing film as an outlet might begin by engaging in creative writing practice. As academics, we are used to writing in a very scholarly, formal, somewhat stilted style. This sticks, and after some time it is difficult to break the habit. It is certainly not the prose that film scripts are made of. I sometimes suggest that narrative researchers begin by more creatively writing reports of interview materials as a starting point. Instead of disjunctive patches of ‘dialogue’ lathered with interjected ‘scholarly analysis’, why not try to tell a better story from the research data itself? How about a narrative with a beginning, middle and end? When we proceed in this manner, we have the beginnings for a film, or another creative output for our efforts.

This may be the very point at which the Ethics Monster begins to nag: “But have you asked your participants if you can write a ‘creative story’ about them or their experiences? How have you alerted them to the fact that you may playfully embellish certain aspects of their stories, in order to better reach and engage an audience? Is using your ‘imagination’ a scholarly practice?” The answer is to bring the participants along on your journey. At each stage and transformation, allow them to be informed of how things are progressing, where you are taking their materials and why. Allow them to be part of the process. No, they are not suddenly critics or included in the process to give “permission”, nor are they holders of the artistic license. They are included in order to keep them informed of the transformations

taking place and to make them feel that something worthwhile is being created from their input and openness. Both of you are taking part in a community. Hopefully, you are embellishing their story in order that it is better heard (and seen). Using this method, their contributions continue to flow, only enriching an already rich research process.

The following is a touching example of this that I often share. The stories of Rufus and Flip were composited from the narratives of several of the gay men who were interviewed in depth for the research project. All involved in the interviews were asked if they also would like to be involved in the Advisory Committee for the project, a focus group that was held, etc. Several continued to be involved right up to the premiere of the film and continue to be involved in dissemination of the film. Neither Flip or Rufus were based on any single interview nor were the key moments of their stories specifically something that had occurred in the lifetime of one interviewee. Nonetheless, each major plot turn was something that we had heard in at least two stories, sometimes more. Much of the dialogue that ended up in the final script was word-for-word narrative heard in the interviews.

The film was enthusiastically received by an audience at a première of nearly 500 at Bournemouth University in autumn 2011 and went on to win two awards at the prestigious Rhode Island International Film Festival a year later. After the screening, two of the interviewees came up to me, each separately, and thanked me for “telling their story”. Each believed that the film was about them! To me this represented the “universality” of the story for these particular men and its strong emotional pull.

NARRATIVE INTEGRITY IN HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

It is an essential characteristic of narrative to be a highly sensitive guide to the variable and fleeting nature of human reality because it is, in part, constitutive of it. This makes it such an important subject of inquiry for the human sciences in general . . . Narratives are both models of threshold and models of the self. It is through our stories that we construct ourselves as part of our world.

(Harré, 1997, pp. 278-79)

As human beings we love stories, particularly when they are told to us, or narrated. There is a magical quality to listening to and/or viewing a story. We listen and watch because we want to know how a life can be different from our own or how it can be exactly the same. Stories compel us to pay attention. When I, as a researcher, look for stories to tell there is another overarching story to tell in how I came to be in this particular landscape in the first place. What was it about me (my peculiar interface with society, policy, trends, and conventions) that led me on this particular path? If I disclose this half of the circle then the second half makes sense. It is within the fullness of this circle that the hermeneutic process becomes complete. Only when I can find myself in an 'other' can I begin to understand what is unique and individual about an 'other' and ultimately what is distinctive about myself. It is in these moments of shared, extended reality that we connect to what it means to be human and, therefore, reached a higher plane of understanding and a blurring of individual differences (Jones, 2001, p. 181). This is the precise theoretical thinking that puts me at ease in utilising my own story to enhance the stories of others.

The intuitive aspects of shared culture, coupled with a more universal response to life's tribulations and injustices (and, therefore, artistic expressions of these emotive components), compete for resolution with the more rigid academic ethical frameworks and methodological

constraints served up by traditional dissemination possibilities available for academics. By developing a trust in instinct and intuition and the naturally expressive and moral potential of our personal resources, research involving people's stories can become richer and more human, if we only are willing to jettison some of the baggage of the old academic rigor and dry procedural ethics (Jones, 2012a, p. 17).

An ethical position in terms of a relational humanism in dissemination means that personal autonomy, dignity, liberty and responsibility are considered values for consideration throughout the connections to community created by the research itself, its dissemination and in affecting meaningful change in that very community. Humanising research methodology means consideration of any community's part in the overall process and building community participation into the overall plan. A relational humanism urges us as theorists, artists, human scientists and practitioners to seek ways – multiple ways – of generating integrative conversations. “How might these research narratives reach beyond the boundaries of the scholarly community to serve the needs of those who do not research, of those who have not yet seen or heard?” (Gergen & Gergen, 2011, draft)

(Jones, 2012b, p. 4)

We examine ethics in filmmaking and the concepts of continual ethical negotiations in film as post-modern scholarship. This produces scholarship originating in ethnographic and sociological ethical principles, but influenced and expanded by inclusion of the ethics of journalism and, in turn, documentary filmmaking. I turn to documentary filmmaker, educator and my frequent collaborator, Trevor Hearing:

The application of documentary filmmaking 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.

(Hearing, 2015, p. 104)

It may seem ironic that one should look to narrative to study ethical life, rather than face the raw experience of life directly. But experience is never raw, it is always mediated through the filters of affective and sensory perception, language, and conception. . . . film has the advantage of being able to show us *how* we see, whereas in life we are only able to see *what* we see. By looking, for instance at how perception works in film and at how it is expressed, we may realize something previously overlooked about how it works in life, and also see more clearly the relevance of perception to ethics.

When all is said and done, Art and Science are strange bedfellows. Or so it would seem. I have always believed, however, that the impulse to investigate and produce scientific discovery is the same compulsion that moves artists to create. My father, who was a scientist, dismissed the interests of his children in the arts. As a child himself, he had lived through the Great Depression and became fearful of any pursuit that would not guarantee an income. Nonetheless, he returned to painting and poetry at the end of his life. To those who refuse to accept my case for the utility of the arts to the sciences, remember that I developed a resilience and resistance to that argument at the knee of a very powerful man.

In my defence, who best to translate the excitement of scientific discovery to an audience but an artist? How better to take sometimes dry and tedious data and transform it into story and action? Who better to help to achieve impact on a wider public with our research findings than those who are capable of entertaining (*‘instilling interest or consideration in an audience’* [Jones, 2014b]) through art? This is the premise behind my filmmaking efforts. A side benefit is that, through the process of creating film (and for me, late in my career as well), I am picking up some additional skills that include enriched and extended ethical and aesthetic approaches to narrative research. I often have said, “Creativity is the uncanny ability to change boundaries whilst working within in them”. This necessitates knowing the rules; it also demands the opening up of dry procedural ethics to the possibilities of change and innovation and a lot less rigidity by committees and academic management. Expanding research through film requires a reconfiguration of a *modus operandi* that includes the ongoing participation of research participants and a willingness to truly produce film that stimulates dialogue with its audience, even instils contemplation and reconsideration of their

own ethical positions. Indeed, ethics holds a key to the practice of integrity in human relationships through such production.

NORMA DESMOND (to newsreel camera)

**You see, this is my life! It always will be!
Nothing else! Just us, the cameras, and those
wonderful people out there in the dark!**

(Wilder et al., 1950)

REFERENCES

- Bourriaud, N. (2002; English version) *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon, France: Les Presses du Reel.
- BSA (British Sociological Association) (2002) Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association. Available from:
<http://www.britsoc.co.uk/media/27107/StatementofEthicalPractice.pdf>. (Accessed 30 December 2015).
- Denzin, N, K., Lincoln, Y.S. (2002) (Eds) *The Qualitative Inquiry Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, C., 2007. Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives. Relational Ethics in Research With Intimate Others. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 13. (1). pp. 3-29.
- Fenby-Hulse, K. (2015). Arts projects need research ethics. *Research Fortnight*. 27-05-2015.

Available from:

http://www.researchresearch.com/index.php?option=com_news&template=rr_2col&view=article&articleId=1352362. Accessed 30th December 2015).

Gergen, M. M. & Gergen, K. J. (2011, Draft). *Playing with Purpose: Adventures in Performative Social Science*. Walnut Creek CA: Left Coast Press.

Guillemin, M. & Gillam, L. (2004) Ethics, reflexivity, and ethically important moments. In research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Vol. 10. Number 2. pp. 261-280.

Harré, R. (1997) He lived to tell the tale. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*. 7. 1-4. pp. 331-334.

Hearing, T. (2015) The documentary imagination. An investigation by video practice into the performative application of documentary film in scholarship. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Bournemouth University.

Jablonski, Simon (2010) The white ribbon. *Dazed Digital*. Available from:

<http://www.dazeddigital.com/artsandculture/article/5645/1/the-white-ribbon>.

(Accessed: 30th December 2015).

Jones, K., Fenge, L.-A., Read, R., & Cash, M. (2013) Collecting older lesbians' and gay men's stories of rural life in South West England and Wales: 'We were obviously gay girls ... (so) he removed his cow from our field'. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. 14. (2), Art. 7. Available at: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs130275>.

Jones, K. & Hearing, T. (2013) Turning Research into Film: Trevor Hearing speaks with Kip Jones about the process of creating the short research-based film. RUFUS STONE. Chapter for: Lichtman, M., Ed., *Qualitative Research in the Social Sciences*, New York: Sage Publications.

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. Vol. 19. Article 38. Available

at:<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/jones38.pdf>.

Jones, K. (2001) *Narratives of identity & the informal care role*. Unpublished PhD Thesis.

DeMontfort University. Available from:

https://www.academia.edu/2570520/Narratives_of_Identity_and_the_Informal_Care_Role_unpublished_PhD_Thesis. (Accessed 30th December 2015).

Jones, K. (2009) Relational Humanism in documentation and dissemination. KIPWORLD. 24

November 2009. Available from:

<http://kipworldblog.blogspot.co.uk/2009/11/relational-humanism-in-documentation.html>. Accessed 30th December 2015.

Jones, K. (2010) Embracing Serendipity. KIPWORLD. 18 April 2010. Available at:

http://kipworldblog.blogspot.co.uk/2010/04/embracing-serendipity_18.html.

Jones, K. (2011) On a train from Morgantown: a film script. *Psychological Studies*. June

2012. Volume 57. Issue 2. pp 224-235.

Jones, K. (2012a) Short film as performative social science: the story behind Princess

Margaret. Chapter in *Popularizing Research*, P. Vannini (ed.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Jones, K. (2012b) Connecting research with communities through performative social

science. *The Qualitative Report*. 17. pp. 1–8. Available from:

<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/jones.pdf>. (Accessed 30th December 2015).

Jones, K. (2013) Infusing biography with the personal: writing RUFUS STONE. *Creative*

Approaches to Research. Vol. 6. No.2. pp.6-23. Available from:

http://www.academia.edu/attachments/31739870/download_file. Accessed 30th December 2015.

Jones, K. (2014a). What is performative social science? The potential of arts-based research

and dissemination. *Discover Society*. May 06 2014. Available from:

<http://discoversociety.org/2014/05/06/what-is-performative-social-science-the-potential-of-arts-based-research-and-dissemination/>. (Accessed 30th December 2015).

Jones, K. (2014b) Once upon a time on the set with John Huston. *Creative Quarter Creative Bites*. 21 July 2014. Available from: <http://cq.iriss.org.uk/inspiring/creative-bites/once-upon-time-set-john-huston>. (Accessed 30th December 2015).

Jones, K. (2015) A report on an arts-led, emotive experiment in interviewing and storytelling. *The Qualitative Report*. 20. (2). pp. 86-92. Available from: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR20/2/jones6.pdf>. (Accessed 30th December 2015).

Kubler, G. (1962) *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

RUFUS STONE (short film). (2012) Directed by Josh Appignanesi. Story by Kip Jones. UK: Parkville Pictures and Bournemouth University. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/109360805>.

Scheff, T.J. (1997) *Emotions, the social bond, and human reality Part/whole analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, C. E. (1990) *The Question of Ethics Nietzsche, Foucault, Heidegger*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Society of Professional Journalists (1996) Code of Practice adopted by the 1996 SPJ National Convention. Available from: <https://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf>. Accessed 30th December 2015.

Stadler, J. (2008) *Pulling Focus Intersubjective Experience, Narrative, Film, and Ethic*. London: Continuum.

Wilder, B., Brackett, C., & Marshman, Jr., D. M. (1950) *Sunset Boulevard* (feature film). Paramount Films, Hollywood, CA.

Wiles, R., Prosser, J., Bagnoli, A., Clark, A., Davies, K., Holland, S. & Renold, E. (2008).

Visual Ethics: Ethical Issues in Visual Research. ESRC National Centre for
Research Methods Review Paper. National Centre for Research Methods
NCRM/011.