Video Ethnography: Culture, Technology & Interpretation

EDCP 510.031

University of British Columbia

Winter 2 2019 (W, 4.30-7.30)

Course Description:
This is an advanced methodology course balanced across the history, materiality, practice, and theory of videography and videoethnography. The course focuses on video data collection and analysis with assignments that accommodate students' research interests and projects. While photography, filmography, and videography have been central to ethnography since the nineteenth century, the course also addresses mobile media and technologies that introduce profound questions of ethics and protocols. This section of EDCP 510 emphasizes micro-video, micro-analysis, and a particular type of qualitative reasoning and empirical analysis informed by actor-network theory (ANT) and object-oriented ontology (OOO).

Instructors: Adrienne Boulton & Stephen Petrina   **Graduate Assistant:** ?
Office: Scarfe tba & Scarfe 2331   **Office Hours:** By appointment
Email: adrienne.boulton@ubc.ca & stephen.petrina@ubc.ca
WWW: http://blogs.ubc.ca/msts/ + http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/

Valued Ends of the Course:
Our intention is to help you develop a background and a depth of expertise—as a researcher—as an intellectual—for doing video ethnography @ culture, technology & interpretation.

Readings (Required):
1. *Readings in Video Ethnography (Culture, Technology & Interpretation)*. (Download all from tba)
2. Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacci, J. (2016). *Digital ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Assessment (for details, see below):	Deadline:
1. Participation in Seminars (10%)	Ongoing
2. Seminar Leadership (20%)	Ongoing
3. 10 x 6 x 600 (Micro-video & Analysis) (25%)	January 30
4. Proposal (10%)	February 27
5. 300 x 12 x 1200 (Video Ethnography) (35%)	April 3

- **Academic Honesty and Standards, and Academic Freedom: Please refer to** *UBC Calendar*
- **Policies and Regulations (Selected):** http://www.students.ubc.ca/calendar
- **Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:** Students with a disability who wish to have an academic accommodation should contact the Disability Resource Centre without delay (see UBC Policy #73 www.universitycounsel.ubc.ca/ policies/policy73.pdf).

EDCP Grading Guidelines
July 2008

A level - Good to Excellent Work
A+   (90-100%) A very high level of quality throughout every aspect of the work. It shows the individual (or group) has gone well beyond what has been provided and has extended the usual ways of thinking and/or performing. Outstanding comprehension of subject matter and use of existing literature and research. Consistently integrates critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. The work shows a very high degree of engagement with the topic.

A   (85-89%) Generally a high quality throughout the work. No problems of any significance, and evidence of attention given to each and every detail. Very good comprehension of subject and use of existing literature and research. For the most part, integrates critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Shows a high degree of engagement with the topic.

A-   (80-84%) Generally a good quality throughout the work. A few problems of minor significance. Good comprehension of subject matter and use of existing literature and research. Work demonstrates an ability to integrate critical and creative perspectives on most occasions. The work demonstrates a reasonable degree of engagement with the topic.

B level - Adequate Work
B+   (76-79%) Some aspects of good quality to the work. Some problems of minor significance. There are examples of integrating critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. A degree of engagement with the topic.

B   (72-75%) Adequate quality. A number of problems of some significance. Difficulty evident in the comprehension of the subject material and use of existing literature and research. Only a few examples of integrating critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Some engagement with the topic.

B-   (68-71%) Barely adequate work at the graduate level.
_____

NOTE: For UBC's Faculty of Graduate Studies (FOGS), a final mark below 68% for Doctoral students and below 60% for Masters students is the equivalent of a Failing mark.

C & D level - Seriously Flawed Work
C   *(55-67%)* Serious flaws in understanding of the subject *material*. Minimal integration of critical and creative perspectives in relation to the subject material. Inadequate engagement with the topic. Inadequate work at the graduate level.
D level
D   (50-54%)
F level - Failing Work
F (0-49%)

EDCP 510 Course Schedule & Readings

The schedule primarily consists of a series of seminars & student projects.

Date	Forum	Assignment	Readings & Topics
Week 1 January 2	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Video Ethnography, Culture, Technology & Interpretation + Research Ethics** **Image, Text, Sound, Object**
Week 2 January 9	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Micro-Video & Micro-Analysis**
Week 3 January 16	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Doing Video Ethnography**
Week 4 January 23	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Micro-Video & Micro-Analysis II**
Week 5 January 30	Student Project	Readings & Assignments	**Student 10 x 6 x 600 Projects**
Week 6 February 6	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Culture: Thick & Thin Description**
Week 7 February 13	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Ethnographic Film**
Week 8 February 20	Proposal / Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Video Autoethnography Videography**
Week 9 February 27	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Videography**
Week 10 March 6	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**Interpretation: Latour, ANT, and Ethnography**
Week 11 March 13	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**First Nations, Culture, Race: Video, Ethics, Protocols**
Week 12 March 20			**Reading Break**
Week 13 March 27	Seminar	Readings & Assignments	**TBA**
Week 14 April 3	Student Projects	**Presentation**	**Student Projects + Wrap up** Your 300 x 12 x 1200 work in progress

Week 1

Topic 1: Ethnographic & Video Research Ethics

> **Reference:**
> Lecture Notes (Ethics) http://blogs.ubc.ca/educ500/files/2014/06/02-EDUC500-Lecture-Notes-Ethics.pdf
> AAA. (2009/2012). Code of ethics. http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf + http://ethics.americananthro.org/category/statement/
> AERA. (2011). Code of ethics. *Educational Researcher, 40*(3). 145–156.
> RTNDA. (2007). Code of ethics. https://www.rtdna.org/content/rtdna_code_of_ethics + https://www.rtdna.org/content/guidelines_for_ethical_video_and_audio_editing

Graham, A., Powell, M., Taylor, N., Anderson, D., & Fitzgerald, R. (2013). *Ethical research involving children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti. Retrieved from: http://childethics.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ERIC-compendium-approved-digital-web.pdf

Lowman, J. & Palys, T. (2000). Ethics and institutional conflict of interest: The research confidentiality controversy at Simon Fraser University. *Sociological Practice: A Journal of Clinical and Applied Sociology 2*(4), 245-255.

Week 2

Topic 2: Micro-Video & Micro-Analysis

Readings:
Markham, A. N. (2018). Ethnography in the digital internet era: From fields to flows, descriptions to interventions. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.) (pp. 650-668). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nguyen, P. X., Rogez, G., Fowlkes, C., & Ramanan, D. (2016). The open world of micro-videos. *CoRR – Cornell Computing Research Repository*, abs/1603.09439.

Redi, M., O'Hare, N., Schifanella, R., Trevisiol, M., & Jaimes, A. (2014). 6 seconds of sound and vision: Creativity in micro-videos. *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.

Secondary Reading:
Rukszto, K. (2005). The other heritage minutes: Satirical reactions to Canadian nationalism. *Topia, 14*, 73-91.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (1984). What is an image? *New Literary History, 15*(3), 503-537.

Week 3

Topic 3: Doing Video Ethnography

Readings:
Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T., & Tacci, J. (2016). Ethnography in a digital world. In *Digital ethnography* (pp. 1-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pink, S. (2001/2014). Video in ethnographic representation. In *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research* (3rd ed.) (pp. ?-?). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goldman-Segall, R. (1993). Looking through layers. *Points of viewing children's thinking: A digital ethnographer's journey* (pp. 21-42). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Secondary Reading:
Pink, S. (2001/2014). The visual in ethnography. In *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 17-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pink, S. (2001/2014). Video in ethnographic research. In *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media and representation in research* (3rd ed.) (pp. ?-?). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pink, S. (2009). Situating sensory ethnography. In *Doing sensory ethnography* (pp. 7-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Week 4

Topic 4: Micro-Video & Micro-Analysis II

Readings:
Berry, M. (2017). Mobile filmmaking. In L. Hjorth, H. Horst, A. Galloway, & G. Bell (Eds.), *Routledge companion to digital ethnography* (pp. 308-317). New York, NY, Routledge.

Bene, R. (2014). Opportunities and challenges of using video to examine high school students' metacognition. *Qualitative Report, 19*, 1-26.

Moerman, M. (1987). Society in a grain of rice: An exercise in micro-ethnography. In *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis* (pp. 68-100). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Knoblauch, M. & Tuma, R. (2011). Videography: An interpretative approach to video-recorded micro-social interaction. In E. Margolis & L. Pauwels (Eds.), *Handbook of visual research methods* (pp. 414-430). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Secondary Reading:
Mueller, B. (2014). Participatory culture on YouTube: A case study of the multichannel network Machinima. *Media@LSE Electronic MSc Dissertations Series*.

Week 5
Student 10 X 6 x 100 Projects

Week 6
Topic 6: Culture: Thick & Thin Interpretation

Readings:
Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3-32). New York, NY: Basic Books.
Love, H. (2015). Close reading and thin description. *Public Culture, 25*(3), 401-434.
Wolf, M. (1992). Writing ethnography. In *A thrice-told tale*: *Feminism, postmodernism, and ethnographic responsibility* (pp. 127-142). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Reference:
Said, E. W. (1989). Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry, 15*(2), 205-225.
Yon, D. A. (2003). Highlights and overview of the history of educational ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 32*, 411-429.
Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2012). Complicating the concept of culture. *Comparative Education, 48*(4), 441–454.

Week 7
Topic 7: Ethnographic Film

Readings:
Suhr, C. & Willerslev, (2012). Can film show the invisible? The work of montage in ethnographic filmmaking. *Current Anthropology*, *53*(3), 282-301.
MacLure, M., Holmes, R., MacRae, C., & Jones, L. (2010). Animating classroom ethnography: Overcoming video-fear. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*(5), 543-556.
Pink, S., Leder Mackley, K., & Moroşanu, R. (2015). Researching in atmospheres: video and the 'feel' of the mundane. *Visual Communication*, *14*(3), 351-369.

Film Ethnography:
Paradzhanov, S., Chiaureli, S., Aleksanian, M., Minasyan, H., Galstian, V., Gegečkori, G., . . . (Directors). (1969/2018). *Nṛan guyne* [*The color of pomegranates*] [Video/DVD] New York, NY: The Criterion Collection.

Week 8
Topic 8: Video Autoethnography

Readings:
Müller, S. M. (2016). Becoming the phenomenon? An alternative approach to reflexivity in ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *22*(9), 705–717.
Pidduck, J. (2009). Queer kinship and ambivalence: Video autoethnographies by Jean Carlo Musto and Richard Fung. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 15*(3), 441-468

Autoethnographic Video:
Haworth, G. and Shapeshifter Films (Directors). (2007). *She's a boy I knew* [Video/DVD]. Vancouver, BC: Moving Images.

Week 9
Topic 9: Videography

Readings:
Minh-Ha, T. T. (1990). Documentary is/not a name. *October, 52*, 76-98.

Beech, H. & Siqi, Y. (2017). How China is remaking the global film industry. *Time*,
http://time.com/4649913/china-remaking-global-film-industry/

Reference:
Anwer, M. (2014). Cinematic clearances: Spaces of poverty in Hindi cinema's big budget productions.
Global South, 8(1), 91-111.
Musburger, R. B. & Kindem, G. (2009). *Introduction to media production: The path to digital media
production* (Chapter 2). Boston: Elsevier.
Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. (2008). *Teachers guide series*.
http://www.oscars.org/education-outreach/teachersguide/index.html
TBA

Week 10

Topic 10: Culture: Latour, ANT, and Ethnography

Readings:
Latour, B. (2014). On selves, forms, and forces. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory 4*(2), 1-6.
Latour, B. (2005). Plasma: The missing masses. In *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-
network theory* (pp. 241-246). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Latour, B. & Katti, C. S. G. (2006). Mediating political "things," and the forked tongue of modern culture:
A conversation with Bruno Latour. *Art Journal, 65*(1), 94-115.
Latour, B. (1993). Ethnography of a high-tech case. In P. Lemonnier (Ed.), *Technological choices:
Transformations in material culture since the Neolithic* (pp. 372-398). London, UK: Kegen-Paul.

Secondary Readings
Johnson, J. (1988). Mixing humans and nonhumans together: The sociology of a door-closer. *Social
Problems, 35*(3), 298-310.
Fischer, M. M. J. (2014). The lightness of existence and the origami of "French" anthropology. *Hau:
Journal of Ethnographic Theory 4*(1), 331–355.

Week 11
Topic 11:   First Nations, Culture, Race: Video, Ethics, Protocols

Readings:
LaFlamme, M. (2014). Unsettling the West: First Nations films in British Columbia. In Levitin, J., Plessis,
J., & Raoul,V. (Eds.), *Women filmmakers: Refocusing* (pp. 403-418). Vancouver, BC: University
of British Columbia Press.
Downie, G. & Lemire, J. (2016). *Secret path* [Story of Chanie "Charlie" Wenjack]. http://secretpath.ca

Reference:
Telefilm Canada. (2013). *Indigenous feature film production in Canada: A national and international
perspective*. Ontario, ON: Author.
Krings, M. & Okome, O. (2013). *Global Nollywood: The transnational dimensions of an African video film
industry*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Video Ethnography:

https://www-newday-com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/streaming/index.php?film=TRA-
01&license=7ad4c95d22193c28833901f0d9d43742

Week 12
Reading Break

Week 13

Topic 13:   TBA

Readings:
TBA

Reference:
TBA

Participation

We refer to scholarly levels of participation as **academic conversation, academic dialogue,** or often **performance**, which entail a variety of things including articulation and presentation. Throughout, the challenge is to develop a facility for both **description** and **depiction**. Description *and* depiction are key practices across *all* the disciplines and interdisciplines. **Commentary** *and* **criticism** seem to presuppose a **close reading** of a text or work, immersion, *and* a transgressive reading, subversion, although this is neither always possible nor the case. If commentary presupposes **solemn reverence** for a discipline, text or work, then criticism presupposes **gentle mocking** or **subversive irreverence** for that same discipline, text and work. Indeed, interdisciplinarity (cross, meta, multi, trans, etc.) demands and presupposes immersion *and* subversion. All of this necessitates a certain **vulnerability**. Avoid **defensive readings**; read for **understanding**.

Participation is variant whereas modes have proliferated. Participation is interdependent with **preparation** for each class, which involves *reading* (highlighting, pagination margin notes, comments & questions, etc.), *writing* (note-taking, outlining, questioning, defining, mapping, framing, summarizing, journaling, blogging, tweeting podcasting, exposition, etc.), *organizing* (documenting, labeling, ordering, archiving, filing, sequencing events, chronicling, etc.), *reflecting* (rethinking, reincorporating, remapping, analyzing, synthesizing, etc.), and *speaking* (discussing, corresponding with peers, social media, etc.). While a variety of apps and media are readily available for organizing notes, consider *Evernote* for starters.

Assignments

1. **Seminar Leadership (20%)**— (Groups of 2-3, 1.5 hrs) Choose one week on the schedule and coordinate the discussion. It will be your responsibility to clearly re/present the readings, and to move the discussions through the text. For the discussion that you lead, please prepare to:

   - Outline the key reading for the week.
   - Distribute key texts that inform or contextualize the reading.
   - Define key concepts or methodological and theoretical concepts that are challenging.
   - Provide handouts, focus, or discussion questions and presentation media for clarifying the reading.
   - Moderate and bring closure to the reading.

2. **10 x 6 x 600 (25%)**— This is a micro-video and micro-analysis of micro-social or micro-cultural data. Produce or extract a 10 second video and provide a micro-analysis or interpretation with 6 images and 600 words. The micro-video can be drawn from a 3rd party public site (e.g., Vine), a clip from a larger research project with Ethics approval, or shot within the parameters of EDCP 510 (i.e., with peers from the class). ***** See elaboration below

3. **Proposal (for 300 x 12 x 1200 Video Ethnography) (10%)**— Develop a brief proposal for a specific research issue or problem. State the research problem, briefly set it in a theoretical context or framework (i.e., "what are the key theoretical terms?") and discuss how you will address the research problem through a short video ethnography (See outline). *****Ideally this will build on the 10 x 6 x 600 project.

BRIEF Proposal Format

Section	Pages
Working Title	NA
1. Introduction & Site: What are your general and more specific interests for the video ethnography? What is the "site" from which the video will be drawn (i.e., 3rd party, data collection, etc.)?	**(1/4 page)**
2. Question(s) or Problem: What is the question (or are the questions) that ground(s) your research?	**(1/4 page w/ purpose)**
3. Purpose: Why is this important? Who is the potential audience or participants that will likely gain from your research?	
4. Key Theoretical or Critical Concepts: Identify 2-3 concepts that you intend to explore or focus on in your research. Provide a brief description of these or definitions.	**(1/2 page)**
5. Ethical Considerations: Identify any ethical considerations that may arise in your research or ethical problems that will have to be resolved before or during the inquiry (e.g., consent).	**(1/2 page)**
6. References	**Attach**

4. **300 x 12 x 1200 Video Ethnography (35%)**— This is a video data and representation project. Produce or extract a 5 minute (approx.) video and provide an analysis or interpretation with 12 images and 1200 words. The micro-video can be drawn from a 3rd party public site (e.g., Vine), a clip from a larger research project with Ethics approval, or shot within the parameters of EDCP 510 (i.e., with peers from the class).

Each video assignment has 3 parts: image (motion or moving & still), text, and sound (ITS). The **first part** challenges you to select a video clip that meets the temporal requirement (10 seconds & 300 seconds). The subject and content of the moving & still images— representation— are entirely your choice. The **second part** requires that you capture or extract still images (6 images & 12 images) that will provide examples (exemplification) in the analysis and be referred to within the analysis to illustrate, emphasize, clarify, etc. We use "capture" and "extract" somewhat loosely, as you may choose to sketch or illustrate instead of actually extracting or taking a snapshot of a frame. Think of the still images as frames (e.g., capture or extract 6 & 12 frames). The **third part** requires analysis of the images and sound (600 & 1200 words) or more technically of the ethnographic data. Analysis should include two parts: description and interpretation. Description requires fidelity to the data (i.e., to human & nonhuman actors or participants) or a provision of what is happening to help readers see and hear or draw one closer to the actors, action, culture, phenomena, or data, etc. Describe with an audience in mind to direct attention to specific actors, actions, interactions, artifacts, discourses, quotations, etc. in the images and sound. Interpretation requires an elaboration of meaning. Think of interpretation as paraphrasing. This challenges ethnographers to make dimensions of culture compelling through emergent or selective codes, categories, themes, conceptual or theoretical filters, lenses, etc. Again, interpret with an audience in mind to make the data meaningful— to direct attention to meanings of specific actors, actions, interactions, artifacts, discourses, etc. in the images and sound. In three words, these assignments challenge you to represent, describe, and interpret. Or they challenge you to resolve two processes: representation and signification.