

Gerald Saul Associate Professor of Film and Video Production Department of Media Production and Studies University of Regina

August 22, 2006

Presentation at Knowledge Translation Workshop, QEOL Research Group, St. Thomas Moore College, University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon.

I had hoped to tell you about the brave new world that media is going to lead your research into. However, this is more of a cautionary tale about the pitfalls of the relationships you may enter into in trying to achieve these goals. First, what are the benefits of media as data collection and dissemination in research? Simply put, media is the future. Historically, transferring research and educational material to media ignored issues of pleasure. Years ago, it was enough of a novelty of seeing any film in the classroom that students were instantly engaged. However, the abundance of media now has created a new situation. With the development of digital technologies, we now have the power to watch whatever we want, whenever we want. Handheld units such as ipods are rapidly growing in popularity; a downloaded video can be watched on a bus, during a picnic, at the supper table, or wherever else the viewer wishes to be. The nature of the personal device interface, hand held and equipped with earphones, is extremely intimate. Users are literally plugged in. A rising percentage of people already have their own tv and computer by the time they are teenagers. It would not be difficult to imagine a future where you assign students to download and watch a video before the next class. It is increasingly common for books to come with a dvd (far more universal than a cd rom ever was and now much more economically viable to produce) that will supplement the written text. Therefore, it is important that researchers and educators explore ways to use media to deliver information or lessons to students, clients, and other researchers. A common use of media for research and education has been in the form of didactic informational films in which an expert, such as a teacher/professor/scientist delivers material in front of the camera in the form of a lecture or demonstration. While this can be powerful and even commercially successful such as in the work of Spalding Grey (*Swimming to Cambodia*), Michael Moore (*Roger and Me*, *Fahrenheit 9/11*), Al Gore, and Orson Wells (*F Is For Fake*), this type of media work is often not engaging. Too much of the emphasis is on the charisma of the presenter. Selecting subjects that will assist in humanizing your project rather to lecture/preach to the audience will be more successful. Using video to capture interviews and discussions with normal people speaking about specific events as they relate to your research topic will draw a spectator interest. The intimacy of this type of subject matter, combined with the more intimate nature of video viewing (ipod, computer, or televisions in own bedroom), suggest a private conversation between the subject and the viewer rather than the dichotomy created by the teacher/student relationship. Through this strategy, your audience may learn and understand a greater deal about your research material. To accomplish this, you need to develop a relationship with a filmmaker, a film company, or a filmmaking team. The reasons for not charging into content creation yourself (the cameras are not difficult to use, nor is much of the editing software), is because of the many subtleties of media that may have serious repercussions if misused or misunderstood. Audiences have become very media literate. While we are certainly not so savvy that we see through the almost continuous manipulation of mainstream media (such as politicized news

broadcasts), we quickly see when something in the media is NOT effective. Take for example the well documented television debate between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon where, even though Nixon rated better to radio audiences, he floundered before television audiences. To accurately express the intended tone within your media presentation, you must have the ability to control the tools of the medium. This may include camera angles, lens choices, make up and wardrobe, location and lighting, audio qualities, and editing. Therefore, unless you are already a transdisciplinary researcher, combining your own research field as well as media, you will need to work with someone who has the necessary skills. As an educator, I have spoken to hundreds of students as they enter our media program and I ask them why they are interested in making films. While there is a range to the answers, the one commonality is that they all enjoy watching film and want to create films of their own that will affect people like they are affected by others' films. This desire to affect, or manipulate, is in the nature of people wanting to make movies, a characteristic you need to be aware of when you invite these individuals to become part of your research process. Consciously or unconsciously, filmmakers will arrange the camera, lights, and other aspects of the filmmaking process to make the image "interesting", changing personalities, and even introducing tension. As a result of a century of mainstream entertainment, we equate media with pleasure. If this expectation is not satisfied by your project, then you will have a difficult time engaging your audience. This may be at odds with honest, integrity, and the educational intentions of your project. I will outline a number of issues to consider when working with media and filmmakers. You must understand is that media ALWAYS creates changes in the subject. What is on the screen is not "reality" and it is not "truth" (or at least truth is highly subjective). The best you can do is to be aware of the changes and control them as best you can. What you need to do is to have very clear discussions with your team regarding the intended tone. This will need to be done in advance of the shooting event, it would be inappropriate to tell the filmmaker in the presence of the subject that you want him or her to appear "sympathetic" or "indifferent" or "authoritative". Such conversation will have pronounced, probably undesirable, effects upon the outcome. Regarding truth, on our project we had an image of an elder holding a particular feather while interviewed standing inside a teepee. One other elder who viewed it pointed out that this was a significant breach of protocol to have that feather inside the tent. There was no way of correcting this. Regardless, we had no way of anticipating every error when dealing with communities that have such complex social rules. Radio never had the power of television because it allowed multi-tasking; you could do other activities while listening. Television, while little more than a radio with a flickering image corresponding to it, engages both visual and aural senses and pins you down to the place where you must watch. However, sound continues to be more important than image. If we can hear the voice of the subject and we are engaged by it, then we will forgive a substandard image or the replacement of the image of the speaker with other footage (second unit). The sound must be monitored during the recording. The volume of material being collected will likely be large and is time consuming to view. It is important to watch portions of it, even if you were there while it was being taped. Trust your first impression as you view it; if it doesn't feel right then tell your production team and ask them about possible changes to bring things closer to what you want. As Paul Graham referred in the previous presentation sometimes a researcher often "can't take the time to review the evidence" (citation missing). This is even more the case with media than with written sources. A video interview cannot be skimmed, as an article or book might be. If it is not watched in real time, then nothing can be discerned.

As the project progresses and images are edited together, the work is reshaped. This is where the largest time commitment is for the team, as well as the most significant manipulations will occur. There will not be many people involved who will have watched all of the footage shot. In the case of our last project, it was only the editor, John, who was familiar with ALL of the material. To assist the research team in monitoring the progress and process, transcriptions were done of all interviews done. This is another time consuming job, taking at least three times the original running time to complete. Transcriptions should be done by someone outside of the filmmakers, probably a research assistant in your own field who can assist you by bringing fresh eyes to the work. The transcriptions do not solve all your problems. While the researcher(s) may be inclined to try to suggest an order to the interviews based upon those transcripts, the editing must follow some of its own conventions. The way the words were said, the quality of the image, and the movement or the eye-lines of the subjects, all contribute to how editing must occur to create a sequence acceptable to a viewer. Many filmmakers I know have strong ethical values. However, there is no code of ethics for filmmakers. That is why laws and governing bodies have been created to monitor labor, slander, privacy, copyright, animal usage, etc. It will be up to you to make sure that all procedures are kept within appropriate parameters. When shooting begins, you may want to ask the filmmakers about the technical aspects of what they are doing and what the psychological effects of those decisions will be. When preparing to shoot a subject, you may want to ask: What is the background behind subject, and why? What is focal length of the lens used for the shot and why? What is depth of field for the shot and why? What is the camera height relative to the subject in the shot and why? Will the sound be clear and free of interference? There may be times when you come into conflict with the filmmakers. If this is not quickly resolved, you must not hesitate in changing teams. You need to have an open, trusting relationship with the filmmakers. Filmmakers tend to have strong egos and may have a hard time taking orders or making changes to aspects of the work that they have invested time and creativity into. In some cases it might be you who is being unreasonable, so an outside opinion may be useful. Release forms are absolutely necessary: These can often be intimidating to the subject, they will feel that they are losing control. They are primarily to protect the filmmaker and owner of the production (you the researcher) from the subjects wanting to retract statements or make demands or place restrictions on you. Time lost from such an event might be devastating to a project. Release forms in the industry are all encompassing and absolute. They tell the subject of his/her rights and makes the seriousness what they are saying clear. Within the confines of the academic research, these will not be the same. It will be important to counteract any negative aspects by comforting your subject as best you can. There must be a team shooting your subjects. The production team (which might only be one or two people) may need to concern themselves with the technology. This creates a distance between the camera and the subject, making the subject feel ignored and alienated. You need to have an interviewer there who keeps constant contact with the subject to make him or her feel connected. Microphones that are unobtrusive are best. We usually use pin-on lavalier radio microphones so that the subject often forgets that it is there. Humanize the subject, pay attention to people and not the camera. Crew will need to be prepared ahead of time, insuring that equipment is complete, tapes and batteries are ready, light bulbs work, etc. When going to new locations, bring a range of cloth backgrounds that might be used if nothing is appropriate. When working with subjects whom you need to maintain a relationship over a period of time, you would be well advised to give more rights that are dictated in the release form to your subjects. In our last project, Elders were

continued to be consulted and shown works in progress for their approval throughout the editing process. Not only did we not burn any bridges, we gained further insights that allowed us to improve the project. If a subject in this situation were to wish to remove some particular statement they had made, I would suggest that this would be done conditional on the shooting of new footage to replace the “flawed” material. In mainstream documentary and journalism, this would rarely be done. However, since you are looking at media as researchers, and that you as researchers you are likely to continue to investigate a select area for many years, it is in your interest to foster good will with people connected to that field.